

Effective Values Education: What Schools Are Not Doing Today

By Stan Friedland, Ed.D.

In 1987, I had the pleasure of writing an article that appeared in the Fall edition of the Journal of the School Administrators Association of New York State, (SAANYS), entitled, Teaching Values Through Confluent Education. Later that year, I presented a workshop on this topic at the annual convention of this organization. Because this issue is still such an important challenge today, it is relevant to see our take on it then and whether we've made any significant progress in the ensuing years.

My article started off as follows:

“American education is at a curious crossroads. Social and political leaders from all points of the philosophical spectrum are calling for our schools to teach values and morals to our children. Reacting to the epidemic problems of our young people such as suicide, drug and alcohol abuse, and high teen-age pregnancy rates, our leaders, perhaps for the first time in some concert with each other, have challenged our schools to take a more forceful role in developing the character and moral fiber of our nation's youth. Furthermore, several recent Gallup Polls indicate that the vast majority of American parents, for the first time ever, also want our schools to elevate values and morals education to become a major agenda objective in their daily instructional activities.

American educational leaders appear to be receptive to this challenge, judging from their initial responses, but they also seem to be hesitant and confused as to how to go about meeting it. While they've voiced affirmation as to this being a major area of need of our young people, when asked how they plan to meet this need, they've responded only with generalities, rather than with any specific programs or activities.”

In the years that followed the publication of my article, not much happened and very little changed in our schools, with respect to their trying to do more in initiating programs or activities to develop the values, morals and affective character of students. I know this to be the case because I toured the country extensively during the 90's & early 2000's, presenting workshops to teachers and administrators in specific instructional methodologies and programs that would foster "character development" in their students, while, at the same time, resulting in higher academic achievement. In each area I visited, my inquiry and research about what was happening educationally, led me to believe that very few schools had deviated from their cognitive-based approach of content mastery. When I asked what schools were doing to develop the "affect" of their students, which is the learning domain pertaining to the development of values, morals, ethics, etc., virtually all of the answers could be summed up in two words; "Not much".

Progress in this area has not gotten any better since then, either. The Bush years saw us envelop our schools with the "No Child Left Behind" emphasis, which, while sounding good, became, in reality, a completely test-based approach for evaluating schools. Naturally, school leaders and teachers, knowing full well that they would be evaluated strictly by how well their kids did on state-wide tests in the major academic areas, spent their entire instructional time concentrating on those subjects, much to the exclusion of other, equally valuable activities.

After eight years of this rather narrow approach to education nationally, and with statistical indices showing meager if any real improvement in achievement test levels country-wide, it was to be hoped that the incoming Obama education plan would be a more innovative and comprehensive one, aimed at the development of both "head and heart" of our children. Dr. Arne Duncan, who did such a credible job as Superintendent of the Chicago public

schools, was chosen to be the new Secretary of Education. He visited around the country, made some eloquent speeches and hopes for the improvement of our nation's schools under the Obama/ Duncan leadership were high. They took their time and then instituted their new program, which they called, "Race To The Top". It's impetus was to get states to come up with their own dynamic plans and programs that would result in developing the "whole child", with specific emphasis on the core of familiar academic areas, but with more room for and attention to the cultural arts, as well.

Regrettably, it hasn't worked out that way thus far. A close perusal of the first group of accepted plans, submitted by states to gain desired federal funding under this program, reveals a continued emphasis on academic skill mastery, a more frequent mention of programs in the cultural arts, but barely any mention of programs or intent for the development of character, values, ethics and the like. Once again, this vital area has been pushed aside as schools "race to the top" in the safer areas of conventional subject mastery.

Have they done any better with even this more limited target? It doesn't appear so. Headlining page one of my New York Times, yesterday (October 12, 2010) was an article, entitled, State Long Ignored Red Flags on Test Scores, detailing how the New York State Education Department, reacting to criticism that it had dumbed down its achievement tests so that it would look like its schools had made significant progress in improving achievement levels, finally upgraded the difficulty of these tests that first were administered this year. Their results recently published, were quite disastrous throughout the State, as most school districts, especially New York City, which had been proud of its previous "improved" scores, showed a significant drop in these latest & more appropriate, grade-level tests.

So we face the same problem we faced some 23 years ago, namely the vital challenge of doing what needs to be done to help our students, throughout their 13 year public school career, develop their values and character via specific school targeted programs and methodologies. However, the challenge today is even more difficult than it was then because now there is comparatively little push for schools to go into this realm because they now feel compelled to spend all of their instructional time on preparing students to do well on their content based achievement tests.

Regrettably, this excuse by the schools is a more viable one today because they indeed are judged primarily by test based criteria. But, it's still a cop-out because there are extraordinary though unused teaching approaches and strategies that, when skillfully applied, can accomplish both objectives of higher learning levels, along with specific affective development of values and morals in students. I will detail for the reader several of these most important instructional methodologies that, when implemented correctly and consistently, can meet this difficult challenge of developing both the minds AND hearts of our students.

I begin with “Confluent Education” because it's the most instructive. The term was coined in an excellent book, entitled, “Human Teaching for Human Learning: An Introduction to Confluent Education” by George Isaac Brown (Viking Press, 1971).

He defines the term of Confluent Education to mean: “the integration or flowing together of both the cognitive and affective elements of all subject matter as taught in individual and group learning settings.” Since the affective domain is somewhat obscure, he explains that the “affective refers to the feeling, emotional or valuing aspects of the subject matter being learned by a student.” The cognitive domain of subject matter, which is the dominant one in use today, refers to the elements of that subject matter in terms of its cognitive levels, starting at the lowest and

ascending upwards. The base level of the “cognitive taxonomy” is “knowledge”; being able to remember and to regurgitate the material (rote learning). Next comes “comprehension”, which is understanding the material in some depth. Then comes “applicability” or being able to apply the material. Next is “analysis”, or being able to take apart the material. Then comes “synthesis” or being able to put the parts back together in a different or improved manner. The 6th or highest thinking level is “evaluation” of the material, or the ability to make judgments about the subject matter through specific intrinsic or extrinsic evidence.

Please take special note of this highest cognitive level thinking skill; “evaluation”. Its stem: “valu” gives the word its entire meaning, namely the action of making informed judgements based on either intrinsic or extrinsic criteria. When this vital critical thinking skill is then mixed with the component parts of the Affective Domain of Learning, most of which also deal with the invaluable thinking activities of appraising and valuing, then one can see why the intertwining of both domains into “confluent” instructional methods is so uniquely effective in helping students to make the greatest progress in the hard to reach areas of values and character development.

We now have identified the essential ingredients of confluent instruction, which brings us to the next challenge, which is to integrate them into daily lesson plans for implementation. All teachers generate lesson plans for their classes and each one covers a specific segment of the year’s curriculum. Basically, a confluent lesson plan should have three levels (like an isosceles triangle). The bottom one, or base is the “facts” level; next is the “concepts” level and the highest is the “values” level. (think “evaluation”). Of course, the cognitive lesson plan only has the first two levels.

Let’s take a closer look at two lesson plans I have used in my

workshops on Confluent Education. Suppose we're near Thanksgiving and we teach a lesson and unit on the Pilgrims and their trip on the Mayflower to Plymouth Rock, etc. The facts level tells what they did, how they did it, when they did it and why they did it (knowledge and comprehension). The concepts level relates to religious freedom; oppression, flight from oppression and other related concepts, (higher cognitive levels). Then comes the values level, which is basically connecting the subject matter to the lives of students so that it impacts them on the feelings, beliefs, opinions and values levels, which really is not difficult to do. In this lesson, the teacher can ask the question: "What generational level of American are you?" Silence; no-one may know the answer or even understand the question. Next question: What member of your family came to this country first? When? Why? Count every generation of your family since then and that is "your" number? Which member of your family first came to this country and why? Discussion. Is he/she still alive? Can you interview him/her for your homework assignment? Does he or she feel they made the right choice? What jobs did they get or could they get? Were they discriminated against & forced to live together, etc.?

Not hard to do. Connects students to their content; makes it more relevant and meaningful; compels them to bring their feelings, opinions and values to the menu of learning and elevates their appreciation of the material, which, in turn, improves their general mastery levels.

One more example. A senior class lesson in Physics; make it Newton's Laws of Gravity and his Laws of Motion, with a confluent lesson plan. Facts of the matter; what is the correct substance of these laws; when did he create them; what research did he do to discover them. Concepts: What did they mean to society; how were they used then as well as today, etc. Values level: Question to a senior class of hot-shot drivers. "How many of you have ridden in a car going 90 miles an hour or faster?"

Come on, it will be confidential. Okay. 80 mph or faster? Okay. Now, of the 15 hands raised, how many of you were NOT wearing seat belts?” Ouch, 6 of you. Now, your car suffers a sudden blow-out, goes out of control, hits a curb & may roll over and doors fly open, etc. Would you now apply Newton’s Laws of Motion to the un-belted occupants? What happens to them?” Silence, let it remain; revelation. “Say a sad goodbye to these 6 of your classmates”! Discussion. “Do Newton’s Laws of Motion now have meaning to you?” You bet!

Confluent Education is indeed what the “way ahead of his time” George Isaac Brown meant when he said it was “human teaching for human learning.” Confluent teaching is relevant to the inner lives of students and makes BOTH a stronger cognitive and affective impact upon them. While the confluent approach has not been used enough to warrant many research studies on its effectiveness, whatever few there were (about 10 found in the research directories), all were rave reviews and attested to higher cognitive levels of mastery as well as definitive affective learning outcomes. The latter experiences for students; impacting their feelings, attitudes and opinions, go a long way towards helping them to develop their values like no other instructional format. But, here comes reality and the formidable road-blocks to the desired use of confluent instructional strategies. Because curricula have increased in size and because schools are so bent on developing test-based proficiency in their students, virtually all lesson plans are fuller than ever. To cover their material for each period, teachers almost always feel compelled to teach the subject matter primarily through lecture and primarily at the lower ends of the cognitive scale because they feel it’s the fastest and most comfortable way to do so and also that’s where the curriculum is at. They see it as too time consuming to get into the upper cognitive levels of analysis, synthesis and evaluation, especially since most recent standardized tests, which they use as guidelines, focus more on the lower levels than not. As for taking the next

essential step of injecting affect into cognitive lesson plans to make them into truly confluent lessons, most teachers, in all candor, either do not know how to do so, or, strongly feel that they don't have the time in any class for this purpose. These observations, critical as they are, are readily borne out by research studies on prevalent teaching behavior in American classrooms, ("A Place Called School; 20th Edition", John L. Goodlad, 2004, McGraw-Hill, et. al), and by my lengthy experience as a high school principal, professor of graduate education and national workshop presenter. George Isaac Brown's excellent book and brilliant origination of this dynamic teaching methodology has gone mainly for naught as the term Confluent Education is barely known by the educational community and doesn't appear to be in much if any use today. What a pity.

I used to be saddened and angry to tour my high school after Regents Week each June because I'd find the corridors littered with torn up, dismembered Regents review books. By taking such action, students were proclaiming, "I'm happy as Hell to be rid of this subject!" The worth and meaning of each subject, so carefully placed in each high school curriculum and intended to result in the valuing of these subjects by students was, instead, leaving a vile after-taste in their mouths. How sad. Yet, those teachers in my school who volunteered to take my "in-service" course in Confluent Education and then applied its techniques, experienced the best learning results of their career. Similar evaluations were received by most participants in my many workshops given on this topic. Yet, most teachers today cannot tell you what Confluent Education is, nor can you find it in any teacher education syllabus, either under-grad or graduate level. How sad and really inexcusable! What a great time it would be for its revival!

The next important instructional strategy, one of my very favorites, is Cooperative Learning and I've had the genuine pleasure of training close to 800 teachers in it over a 12 year span. Why is it

important, what does it do and just what is it?

It's essential to understand that classrooms in which content mastery is the major and usually singular objective, compel teaching techniques that are determined by this objective. So, as stated above, with an ever expanding curriculum to cover, most teachers maintain a teacher-centered, lecture-based approach aimed at covering their lesson plan chunk of this vast curriculum day by day by day. This explains why virtually all classrooms, especially on the secondary level, are set up in the conventional format of rank-file seating rows, all eyes and ears directed to the teacher. Students constantly are reminded to "work on your own, do not copy from anyone else and do not help anyone else". In actuality then, with these instructions directing student behavior for their 13 year, K-12 careers, we virtually "seal" them off from their peers in each of their academic class settings. What are their typical behavioral and learning outcomes from being in this type of learning format for 13 consecutive years?

Actually, I also wrote an article on this very topic for The Executive Educator (October, 1994), which is one of the journals of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the largest such organization of school principals, with an international membership. Entitled, "Bridging The Gap", it spoke to the question of how schools, by their prevalent use of the rank-order seating format and by their directives to students to operate incommunicado in the classroom from their peers, inadvertently foster discrimination and prejudice in students towards many of their peers who usually are from minority groups. Citing some 15 bibliographic research studies and sources, my article stated that the faster learning, higher grade earning students, at the top of their classes, usually had very little interaction or respect for the slower learning, lower achieving, more problematic students in their classes. And who were most likely to be in the latter category? Minority students.

My article, also based on these same research sources, went on to extol the only instructional strategy that could be used by teachers to address this problem successfully AND which would lead to higher learning outcomes for all students as well. Converting discriminatory and prejudicial attitudes by students into more tolerant and open-minded attitudes also would result in developing stronger social values and behaviors in all of them. Enter Cooperative Learning and justly take stage center.

There are only three instructional formats used in schools today. They are the conventional, rank-file format; the individualized or small group format for students with special needs and the cooperative, small team learning format of Cooperative Education. Oddly enough, of these three formats, the greatest number of articles and research studies in the literature at present, (some 600) is on Cooperative Learning. From that base, plus my own extensive experience in doing workshops on this methodology, let's examine Cooperative Learning up close.

Cooperative Learning is NOT small group instruction where the teacher has the students divide into small groups and do a learning project without any further direction. Instead, this format is firmly systematized and tightly structured into learning teams of four students, each chosen by the teacher. Every team is heterogeneous academically and must include a good student, a weak student and two average students. The four students always sit in a square so as to face each other and to be close to one another. There is both "individual and team accountability" because regular, periodic tests are given, so that students earn and own their own scores. But, because they work as a team, they each can earn bonus points when their team test averages improve. There must be "positive interdependence", which results from each team member having a defined team role, such as task coordinator, recorder, response coordinator and social skills coordinator. Each student "owns"

25% of his team and is responsible for it. The response coordinator makes sure that each student is “on task” and that no “parasiting” takes place. With each learning task for the day, which is led by the task coordinator, there is also a social skill given to each team to be used to enhance the way the team functions. For example, if “praise and encouragement” is the social skill given for that lesson, it’s the job of the social skills coordinator to be sure that all remarks are made in that direction. The task then is a dual one, both to accomplish the content task of subject mastery AND to interact positively in order to do so. Before an exam is given, the skilled teacher may assign a preparatory exercise on the material the day before so as to promote higher mastery for everyone on each team. Teams also break into homework buddy pairs, so that when one is absent, the buddy can call him/her to share the homework assignment and to maintain desired social contact. Teams are changed about every 5-6 weeks so that all students in a class can have as much contact with each other as possible. Teams own their own management. If a student becomes problematic, the teacher, of course, will react and attempt to remedy the problem. But teams have the right to suspend a student from the team when he/she is deemed too disruptive to the team. That student then works alone until the teacher plays the intermediary role to process him/her back into the team.

Why is Cooperative Learning such a desirable and effective instructional format? A substantive body of research and my own experience offer the following reasons and observations: Students at all learning levels interact as members of the same team for the very first time. Since the better students now have a vested interest in wanting the weaker students to succeed, there is far more tutoring and time on task learning that takes place. The weaker students, hampered in the conventional classroom by boredom, lack of motivation, and probable hostility or turn-off by an irritated teacher, now get the academic attention of their peers in a more upbeat and friendly manner. Students, often of different

social strata, get to know each other better; get to understand some of the personal handicaps some are operating under and they then have reason to react more kindly and knowingly as a result. When student A, a faster learner, gets to work and interact with student B, to improve his learning, student B, formerly accustomed to turning off the demanding adults in his life, now has no place to hide and even can become an “MVP” to the team by elevating his subject mastery and improving his test scores. A student, with a “no place to go” average of say, 40, suddenly, has reason to work towards a 50 and earn the accolades from his team-mates who then share in the bonus points of an improved team average. The increased motivation and effort of this “slower learning” student then has a residual effect as he becomes a more efficient and successful learner, which, in turn, pays off in continuing improved grades and peer acclaim from his/her team-mates! Such a dynamic pays dividends for all the students on the team. Bright students are not always too skilled in the social aspects of helping others. Now, they will be, as are the other team members. When you mentor others on the material, you also learn it better yourself. Everyone in a well run team-learning format benefits both academically and in character development.

I had the pleasure of training some 500 teachers in Cooperative Learning at the Lehigh Valley Lead Teacher Center in Easton, Pennsylvania, over a 10 year span, (50 at a time). They took a two year program from me consisting of 7 days spread out over the first year and 3 days the second year. Well over 90% of them reported, on their 2nd year follow-up survey forms, that they achieved all of the outcomes and results detailed above. Students’ grades had improved significantly; the kids really were showing better socialization skills; disciplinary and attendance problems were way down and the class division of time was working remarkably well. Furthermore, most of them reported that their own motivation and enjoyment of teaching had been enhanced by their transforming their classrooms, via Cooperative Learning, into more dynamic

places, both for their students and for themselves.

It's important to understand that Cooperative Learning is intended to supplement the conventional format, not to replace it. A typical class lesson of 45 minutes should see the teacher lead off with his "best shot" instruction of the lesson plan, via the regular rank-file format. Then, after 15-20 minutes, when in a conventional class, attention begins to wane (listening research), the class shifts into their teams and students work in their team format until 5 minutes before the end of the period, when the learning objectives for that class, as shared with them earlier by the teacher, are reported out by each team to demonstrate its collective mastery of that day's material. The class has been transformed from a "Me to a We" cooperative learning environment. The "SEAL" (Separate, Each Accomplishes Less) on kids, has been replaced by TEAM (Together, Everyone Accomplishes More!).

I worked for the Bangor, Pennsylvania Public Schools for several years, training their entire secondary faculty in Cooperative Learning. They then changed their entire high school schedule into a "block schedule" format of four 90 minute periods per day, which replaced their more conventional schedule of eight 45 minute periods a day. By doing so, they cut down on four class change periods of four minutes each, thereby adding 16 minutes of class time daily. Multiply that number by a school year of 180 days and you get the equivalent of an additional week of instructional time each year! Obviously, they were quite pleased with the totality of educational gains made in all of their targeted goal areas.

Yet, sadly and frustratingly, Cooperative Learning is being used approximately in only 7% of all class time in public schools when last measured nationally. Why? The fingers of blame have to be pointed at teacher prep programs and at school districts themselves. The former just don't recognize what a powerful methodology Cooperative Learning is and their under-grad and

graduate curricula are sparse in their offerings of it. School superintendents and principals, operating under their test-based criteria, seem not to be fully informed, as they should be, of the tremendous benefits of its use and are content to go with what they perceive to be the tried and the true of the conventional classroom format. Sadly and even tragically, they're dead wrong.

As for the development of such wonderful values as tolerance, understanding, open-mindedness, kindness, compassion and the joy of helping others, there is no better classroom format to develop these desirable traits in all students than the magic of Cooperative Learning! We desperately need its use in ALL K-12 classrooms today.

The next important instructional strategy that would enable schools to develop both the minds and the hearts of their students is SERVICE LEARNING.

As defined by the National Service Learning Clearinghouse, Service Learning is a “teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service into the curriculum with instruction and reflection to: enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility and develop desirable character qualities for participant students.”

Service Learning is implemented via the following sequence:

Apply the curricular subject matter to the investigation of a relevant community or societal problem;

Create a specific plan to solve it;

Take action on that plan via service;

Make verbal or written reflection on what occurs;

Demonstrate or explain the results.

Of course, to publicize my advocacy for the exceptional worth of Service Learning, I simply had to write an article about it. Aptly entitled, “Developing Hearts and Minds”, it appeared in the April,

2003 issue of “Principal Leadership”, another main journal of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. In it, I not only explained what Service Learning is and does, I also presented two outstanding programs in the Long Island, New York area where I live; one of which I’d like to share with you.

Mr. Kevin Mann is a Social Studies teacher at Shoreham-Wading River high School in the town of the same name. In the late 90’s, dissatisfied with the overall lack of attention being paid by senior students to their social studies course, he sent a proposal to the New York Education Department for a new, year-long senior course, entitled “Community Relations”, which would consist fully of service learning activities proposed, owned and fulfilled by the students, themselves. They would identify a community problem; go out into the community to get an appropriate sponsor; then work with that sponsor to develop a definitive plan to remediate that problem; all of which had to be approved by Mr. Mann. The student then would work on that plan, writing and reflecting about his/her activities until the identified objectives are achieved.

The program, now over ten years old, has turned into one of the best service learning programs, I dare say, in the country. Since I was writing an article about it, I had to visit the school and did so on several occasions. I interviewed many of the students in the program and asked them this question: “What have you gotten out of this program?” Not one of them had less than rave reviews about their experiences. Here are their most prevalent answers. “By far, it’s been the most meaningful and satisfying course I’ve ever taken in my entire school career.”

“From our projects, we have proven to ourselves that we can make a great difference in our community & in the lives of others. It has given us tremendous satisfaction and a greater belief in ourselves”. “Much better communication skills; teaming skills; easier outreach to others; perseverance to see a difficult job through to completion; better understanding and empathy for people and their problems”.

Asked for a downside, the students, semi-kiddingly, talked about how hard they had worked right through to the June month we then were in, as compared to their senior peers who had been goofing off for most of the last semester.

Mr. Mann had some interesting things to say. “The glaring reality is that students will work harder and longer for activities that they have created and own fully. The unmistakable value of any service learning program, whether it stands as a full course like mine, or whether it comes from being integrated into a subject-matter course, is three-fold: Teachers get better work from their students; students become better citizens and communities get the best productivity from their young people.”

Service Learning is easy to start by any receptive teacher at any grade level, with any interested students. It is just the ticket to achieve our targeted dual objectives of higher learning levels that will translate into better test scores, AND greater development of desired values and character traits.

There is even reason to be optimistic about the more frequent use of Service Learning than the first two described instructional strategies. Service Learning does have increasing representation nationally in the form of different organizations that promote its use in public schools all around the country. I happen to be a member of the executive committee of the Long Island Regional Service Learning Network, funded no less by the New York State Department of Education. Our mission is to help all 125 school districts here on Long Island to develop programs in Service Learning. We recently learned of a new and heartening mandate from the State that all of the 70 plus universities, colleges and junior colleges that comprise the State University of New York (SUNY) system must develop Service Learning “components” in each of their courses, starting next year. Our Network already has been asked to assist in this worthwhile endeavor and we look forward to doing so.

There are other instructional strategies that can be used by schools to develop values in their students, but, I believe that the three elaborated above are the most exceptional ones out there to accomplish this important task. They have some common threads in each of them that are important to identify and that also explain why schools have done and continue to do such an inadequate job in this important area. Values, morals, ethics and other significant character traits do not get their required developmental attention unless they are targeted as specific instructional goals and then contextualized into actual lessons taught, either in formats used, or as outcomes of the particular lesson. It is clearly evident that these dynamics are fully present in all three methodologies presented above, in sharp contrast to the prevalent teacher-centered techniques that monopolize most K-12 classrooms today and which focus almost exclusively on cognitive content mastery. The affective domain does require greater presence in our classrooms because basically, that is where almost all character traits reside. Until this absence is corrected, schools will continue to be mostly ineffectual in this important area.

Where are the roadblocks that impede progress? There are two major fingers of blame that have to be pointed here. The first is leveled at collegiate undergraduate and graduate education programs that long have neglected to present substantive courses and course-work in affective teaching techniques, including the three methodologies described in this article. Curricula to prepare teachers adequately for the demands and challenges they'll face in the 21st century simply must be changed to provide 21st century competence, rather than lagging behind in the "We've always done it this way" rationale. Newly minted teachers still appear to be pretty much in the dark in this general area, a deficiency that rarely will be corrected later on when they become caught up in the pressures of the current system.

The second finger of blame has to be leveled at school leaders who are reluctant to offer rigorous in-service training opportunities to their teachers in affective instructional strategies, either because they don't recognize their value, or because they want their teachers to remain strictly focused on cognitive content mastery via conventional and traditional teaching methods. It is likely that both of these reasons are responsible for the general absence today of in-service programs that are intensive enough in both length and quality to make a real difference in teacher behavior.

Are things likely to change? Realistically, given the continued domination of test-based criteria by which schools and educators are measured as to their effectiveness, little change appears likely. If one is a realist and looks objectively at the national school scene, there are oases around, but in insufficient number to make a real difference. "Waiting For Superman" will continue to be just that; a continuing wait.

I ended my article in 1987 with an inspiring quotation from Martin Luther King that is just as timely today as it was then: "We must remember that intelligence is not enough. Intelligence plus character; both must become the true goal of a sound education!"

Dr. Stan Friedland is in his 58th year in education and considers himself a "lifer". During his career, he was a teacher, guidance counselor, high school principal (15 years). graduate school professor (Adjunct, 4 universities) and presenter of some 500 workshops nationally. He has written some 20 plus articles for educational journals and has had his own television show on education for 8 years. Dr. Friedland holds a doctoral degree from Columbia University and also has authored 3 non-fiction books not

on education.