

Section IV. COMMENTS BY PANELISTS

Comments by Panelists

At the close of the conference, panelists were invited to submit brief comments relating to the work of the conference or expressing their own views on education of the disadvantaged.

Regarding the conduct and accomplishments of the conference, most of the panelists commented favorably, and many offered generous praise. A number gave valuable suggestions for making future meetings more productive. A few expressed grave dissatisfaction with the makeup, conduct, and usefulness of the conference.

The Office of Education, and the conference staff, are grateful for these candid expressions of opinion—both the “bouquets” and the “brickbats.” Panelists’ suggestions will be carefully studied and taken into account in the planning of future meetings.

For inclusion in this section of the conference report, however, only statements bearing directly on the subject matter of the conference have been selected, and these are, of necessity, excerpts only.

Not every panelist is represented. In the interest of brevity and to avoid unnecessary reiteration of the same or similar points of view, the comments quoted below were chosen to present to the reader a broad range of panelist opinion. In no sense should they be regarded as summarizing the views held by the panelists. On the contrary, this section of the conference report purports to do no more than offer a series of interesting vignettes which, it is hoped, will prove stimulating and thought provoking and serve as a useful supplement to the Summary of Panel Discussions (section I).

Edward B. Fort, director, Division of Instruction,
Detroit Public Schools

The issue of school desegregation is the area wherein school leaders can really prove their leadership.

Arthur Pearl, professor of education, University of
Oregon

There was anger expressed at the conference, anger at those who argued that this was not the best of all possible worlds, those who insisted that education is falling farther behind in meeting the needs of youth.

This is misplaced anger. The anger should be at those institutions which inhibit growth. Title I must be a beachhead for schools; it must (1) provide everyone freedom of life choice, (2) generate skills necessary to citizenship in a complicated democratic society, (3) develop capacity to be a culture carrier, and (4) foster the strength to thrive in a mass society. The conference failed to crack through complacency. The conference did not provide a conceptual outlook for whole-sale educational change. Thus, this major job is still before us. At the present time we are too timid, too tired, too conservative.

Adron Doran, president, Morehead State College

College teachers today continue to teach those preparing to teach in elementary and secondary school in the same manner as they themselves were taught.

We need to know far more about how the disadvantaged children respond and learn, and then we need to modify the teacher education programs of preparation accordingly.

J. K. Haynes, executive secretary, Louisiana Education Association

Today, we are in a face-to-face confrontation with another important challenge in the desegregation process—that of desegregation of faculties. This will require a posture of leadership that this Nation cannot abdicate. A segregated faculty is discriminatory to all school children—thus, faculty desegregation becomes a vital component in desegregation of our public schools.

Harriet Reynolds, assistant director, Education and
Youth Incentives, National Urban League

We must quickly develop new educational methods for reaching the so-called unmotivated student and his parents. Students will learn to the degree that education is made important to them, reasonable in terms of their value system, and rewarding. Parents will assist in motivation for education to the degree to which they are involved and understand both the process and the value which it holds for the child. These statements have been demonstrated, and what is now needed