

It has always been an accepted principle in industry that financial undertakings must be subject to audit. In using such strategies as **Management by Objectives** (an approach that moves beyond the forward-planning of expenditure to the careful blueprinting of other factors of production such as time, people and equipment) modern business practice is ahead of the school systems. In a word, most human enterprises accept the idea of **accountability**.

To what extent is education able to account for the astronomic amounts spend on it? Peter Drucker, sometime consultant to the President of the United States of America, and a household name among managers in South Africa, commented that in 1972 the USA was spending 10 cents of every dollar on education. "One way or another", he remarked, "Education will become accountable for its performance". Professor Drucker confesses that he does not know how we are going to **measure** educational **performance**. It is easy enough to measure a child's ability to read. But how does one assess the degree to which a school may have succeeded in civilising its pupils? A difficult (but not insoluble) problem. But whatever the problems, "the school will be expected to think through its goals, get them accepted and be accountable for them. "If it fails to do so", Drucker adds ominously, "measurement standards will be imposed from outside, and educators who protest will have only themselves to blame".¹

In plain words, for any organisation to be **accountable** means that it can not only show how it spent public money, but that it has means for demonstrating that **wisely chosen goals were achieved efficiently**. In our times this sort of accountability requires the measurement of clearly defined objectives.

Educators have been increasingly aware of the need to define educational objectives since B. S. Bloom of Harvard University offered the first major taxonomy of educational objectives of the century.²

If we acknowledge the fact that part of the intention of our schools is to communicate that knowledge, those skills and those moral and philosophical principles that have sustained our community in the past, it is nevertheless true that contemporary education is seen as an instrument for blueprinting economic and social change. Perhaps the greatest weakness in educational planning is the tendency to allow the **content** of educational systems to lose touch with the **needs of a rapidly changing society**: the risk of fossilisation. Nothing would so effectively betray the future as reliance on worn-out formulas.

Provincial Education departments in South Africa provide for the public maintenance of standards by a system of school inspection which has moved from the coercive rigidities of earlier years to the growing professionalism of the consultant in more recent times. But the extent to which current school practice does **in fact** meet public needs escapes this type of "accounting". One might ask, for instance:

- Are the products of our schools articulate? Can they communicate easily?
- Have they initiative in moments of crisis?
- Have they the skills necessary for teamwork?
- Beyond the mere regurgitation of bits of information, are they equipped with problem-solving skills?
- Do they know how to relate to other people in a warm, on-going way, whether in families or offices?

How many of these questions could one answer positively?

SYMPOSIUM 1973 is very much concerned with the broad theme of accountability. Dr. Harold Holmes in a fine analysis of the loss caused by the drop-out of would-be teachers, points not only to the cash cost involved in educational failure but to the wastage of human effort and potential. It is not surprising to find that a well-known industrial consult-

ant, Mr. H. McGregor, should delineate the criteria that the businessman expects of the school leaver, and that once again one finds emphasis by industrial management on a certain reliability and pliancy in the face of stress. But, as Mr. Clive Acton points out, the concern of industry in the **continued education** of its employees is today by no means limited to management training — for modern management includes foremen and supervisors, whose people-skills have become of prime importance to production. Professor Drucker estimated in 1972 that about 6 cents of each dollar in the USA were spent on formal education — the remaining four cents going to “non-formal” endeavour that includes industrial and management training.

With more available funds for research and perhaps greater internal freedom than the school systems, much new thinking about **objective setting** and **assessment** has come from industry. There is a great need for educators in both systems to share resources and problems.

It is with a view to taking a step further current concern about educational accountability that the Johannesburg College of Education has planned a major conference on Assessing Education for mid-1974. An unusual facet of this conference will be that it will have a four-tier workshop approach involving the formal school systems, teacher and university education as well as industrial training and management development. Johannesburg College of Education hopes through dialogue to restore the essential educational unity that is all too easily fractured.

It is this dialogue that Mr. Clive Acton suggests in his article **Education and Industry**, and we believe that the writer is by no means the only man at the head of a major industrial education unit who feels that one not only needs to create an educational **climate** that is open to new ideas, but that one also needs to set up **within education at all levels** machinery for validating innovative ideas and traditional approaches alike. Most of us, to use Morris Cogan's phrase, are “buying blind”.³ Indeed, Cogan's recent plea for inservice follow-up of newly introduced innovations — quite apart from their objective evaluation — points to a need that is becoming urgent in formal and industrial education alike. Most

of us seem to be satisfied with educational conversions without (possibly wisely, in many cases!) asking how long they continue. What Industrial Trainers call “the re-entry problem” is as familiar to the primary school teacher returning from a course to a sceptical staff-room as it is to management trainees puzzled by the resistance they encounter to the practice of their new ideas. At least we have pinpointed a major and a common problem. Johannesburg College of Education's **Assessing Education Conference** will provide the first stage in an on-going strategy of action.

Symposium 1973 provides for a wide scatter of interests. The Proctor and Verschoor article on the language difficulties of black university students, for instance, expresses a very real problem that many of us may have briefly canvassed without expressing ourselves as succinctly as these writers have done. The writers take us beyond grammar, to problems of lexis and idiom that, as Bernstein has shown, create a barrier even between middle class teachers and working class pupils in Britain who are usually assumed to share the same language.⁴ The article should prove suggestive of more extensive research. We seem to be passing through a period of teacher self-consciousness. “Are we professionals?” we ask, “Are we really accountable?” “Are we doing what we think we are doing?” Ask your pupils, your students,” says Dr. Lee, in a persuasive article that invites us “to see ourselves as others see us”.

Peter Buegger, a former Johannesburg teacher now working in Canada, examines the role of the teacher in “tomorrow's school”, and then Mrs. Honey Gluckman of JCE, writing as parent and teacher, takes the heat off the harassed educator and holds the mirror of life to the parents.

If Canadians are beginning to wonder about the school of the future, it remains to Don Walton to remind us that the **past** may inspire us equally as well as the future. Speaking as a man who has worked in Gordonstoun, Walton writes convincingly of an approach to educational objectives we all too easily bury under our modern avalanche of fact and information: skills of leadership and standards of endeavour.

The reader will find in the other articles, ideas and reflections which we believe will hold

his interest; but we are glad to proffer a special welcome to two eminent American scholars. Franklin Parker, one of the major authorities in comparative education and **Benedum Professor of Education** at the university of West Virginia, gave the keynote address at the **Conference for Accelerated Development in Southern Africa**, held in Johannesburg in 1972. With RAU as one of its sponsors, the conference was preceded by an educational workshop which largely originated at Johannesburg College of Education. The workshop documents will be published soon. Professor Parker foresaw a point that was to be reiterated by so many of the delegates, a majority of whom were black educators — that most African communities were involved in a major psychological grafting operation through their schools.

Their need to have access to every resource that could be made available was quite clear. Not the least urgent was their need to assure themselves that money spent on education was spent to maximum advantage. Our other guest contributor from the USA was Jim Jarrett, whose books on the philosophy of education have wide currency.

In his article Professor Jarrett moves into a field closely related to philosophy and considers how personality style enters into effective communication — something every teacher is concerned about. In fact, as one wise old teacher once remarked, "You may think you're teaching Latin or English or Arithmetic. One thing's inevitable: you teach **yourself**."

Lord James of Rusholme, one of the most distinguished of contemporary British educators, offers in the perceptive article that we are privileged to publish in this issue a blueprint for Colleges of Education that might well be of interest to our South African educational statesmen, as well as to the general reader.

REFERENCES

1. Drucker, P. The School in Crisis, in **Psychology Today** 1972.
2. Bloom, B. S. "Taxonomy of Educational Objects." Handbooks 1 and 2.
3. Cogan, M. L. **Clinical Supervision**, Houghton Mifflin, 1973. (See our book review section.)
4. Bernstein, B., Social Class and Linguistic Development, in: **Education, Economy and Society**, ed. Hasley, A. H., et al NY. 1961 pp. 288-314.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

If you would like to receive SYMPOSIUM on a regular basis, please complete the form below and return it to:—

SYMPOSIUM,
College of Education,
Hoofd Street,
JOHANNESBURG,
South Africa.

NAME: Prof./Dr./Mr./Mrs./Miss.....

ADDRESS:

.....
.....

Please send me copy/copies of the 1974/75 edition of SYMPOSIUM as soon as it is published. I would/would not like my subscription continued until I cancel it.

Signature