

DR. WOODROW W. WILKERSON: HIS LIFE AND WORK AS STATE  
SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION IN VIRGINIA  
1960-1974

by

Emmett G. Shufflebarger

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
in  
Administration

APPROVED:

-----  
David J. Parks, Chairman

-----  
M. David Alexander

-----  
Fred J. Brieve

-----  
Thomas C. Hunt

-----  
W. Keith Roberts

May, 1975

Blacksburg, Virginia

## DEDICATION

This manuscript is dedicated to my family: my wife, Barbara; my daughter and son, Ann and Tom; and my parents, Virginia Dudley and Curtis Lockard Shufflebarger. Without their constant love, support, understanding, and encouragement this study would not have been possible.

A special tribute is given to Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson, the subject of this study. My admiration for this outstanding leader in public education in Virginia has increased throughout the study.

E.G.S.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have been of help and support in this project. While it would be impossible to mention all of them, special appreciation is expressed to the following:

Dr. David J. Parks for his valuable assistance.

Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson for providing the stimulus for the study and giving willingly of his time and support.

Committee members, Dr. M. David Alexander, Dr. Fred J. Brieve, Dr. Thomas C. Hunt, and Dr. W. Keith Roberts.

Participants in the interviews and questionnaires.

Associates and friends with the Virginia Department of Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and Radford College.

Brenda W. Farmer, Peggy W. Griffitts, Arlene L. Strauss, and Sherry Williams, who assisted with the manuscript.

A special thanks is given to the author's wife, Barbara, for her untiring assistance in the preparation of this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION . . . . .	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
 Chapter	
1    THE OVERVIEW . . . . .	1
2    METHODOLOGY . . . . .	8
3    WOODROW W. WILKERSON: THE MAN AND HIS WORK . . . . .	46
4    COMPARISON OF PROGRESS IN VIRGINIA TOWARD ACHIEVING EACH OF TEN GOALS WITH PROGRESS MADE IN THE NATION AS A WHOLE . . . . .	94
5    MAJOR EDUCATIONAL GOAL DURING DR. WILKERSON'S TERM . . . . .	118
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	153
 APPENDIXES	
A    QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEW WITH DR. WOODROW W. WILKERSON, FALL AND WINTER, 1974-75 . . . . .	159
B    QUESTIONS AND SAMPLE OF LETTER FOR INTERVIEWS WITH PERSONS CONCERNING DR. WOODROW W. WILKERSON . . . . .	164
C    QUESTIONS AND LETTER FOR INTERVIEW WITH FORMER GOVERNOR J. LINDSAY ALMOND . . . . .	168
D    LEGAL BASIS FOR THE POSITION OF STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION . . . . .	171
E    THE IDENTIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL GOALS IN VIRGINIA 1960-1973 . . . . .	183
F    THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND ACCOMPANYING LETTER CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL GOALS IN VIRGINIA 1960-1973 . . . . .	217

G	CLASSIFICATION AND RANKING OF EDUCATIONAL GOALS . . . . .	223
H	GOAL SELECTION PANEL'S RANKING OF GOALS BY CATEGORY ON SIGNIFICANCE TO EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA . . . . .	228
I	QUESTIONNAIRE PARTICIPANTS . . . . .	243
J	QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS OF VIRGINIA EDUCATION GOALS 1960-1973 . . . . .	246
VITA	. . . . .	253
EPILOGUE	. . . . .	254

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Composite Grouping of Virginia Educational Community Representation . . . . . 38
2	The Availability of Data in Pairing of Educational Goals and General Measures of Educational Quality . . . . . 96
3	Certificates Held by Instructional Personnel in Virginia, 1961-1973 . . . . . 99
4	Number and Percent of Degrees Held by Instructional Personnel in Virginia, 1962-1973 . . . . . 100
5	Kindergarten Enrollment and Percentage of Increase for Virginia . . . . . 102
6	Vocational Education Programs, Federally Aided - Enrollment - Percentage of Increase . . . . . 104
7	Virginia's Appropriation for Special Education, 1960-1974 . . . . . 106
8	Estimated Percent of Revenue for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools From Local and State Governments . . . . . 108
9	Pupils Per Teacher in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools . . . . . 109
10	Ratio of Pupils to Classroom Teaching Positions in Virginia . . . . . 110
11	Percentage of High School Dropouts in Virginia (Grades 8-12) . . . . . 112
12	Public High School Graduates as a Percentage of Ninth Grade Enrollment Four Years Earlier . . . . . 113
13	Number of One-Teacher Schools in Virginia (Based on Report of Number of Elementary Schools According to Average Daily Membership and Number of Teaching Positions) . . . . . 115

## Chapter 1

### THE OVERVIEW

Dr. Woodrow Wilson Wilkerson served as State Superintendent of Public Instruction, an office instituted by the Constitution of Virginia, from August 16, 1960, to April 1, 1975. Dr. Wilkerson's length of service exceeded that of any of the thirteen previous superintendents in the 103-year history of public education in Virginia. Dr. Wilkerson took office on August 16, 1960, by appointment of Governor J. Lindsay Almond. An editorial in the Richmond Times Dispatch of August 30, 1973, stated that ". . . while not a flamboyant personality he (Dr. Wilkerson) has given a calm, workman-like, professional direction to the pressure for change in this, his record-breaking superintendency."

As an institution is affected by the social issues of its time, an individual and his responsible position is also affected. Dr. Wilkerson's accomplishments were influenced by the many issues of his time, by the personalities that he encountered, and by the legal framework placed upon him by the various political and economic situations. In turn, the man and his unique personality had a marked effect upon public education in Virginia.

#### The Thesis

The thesis of this dissertation is that the Commonwealth of Virginia made strides toward improvement in the quality of education during the leadership of Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson as State

Superintendent of Public Instruction in Virginia. As background for the thesis, the legal basis of the position of State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the qualifications and biographical background of Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson will be described. The significant issues prevailing during the term of Dr. Wilkerson will be reviewed along with his role in a major goal during his term in office.

As one observes certain landmarks in the history of education in the United States and in Virginia, it becomes evident that certain changes in the quality of education in Virginia came about during Dr. Wilkerson's term and some of these changes may be attributed to his ability to influence the State Board of Education, the State Department of Education, the legislature of Virginia, and local school divisions. The extent to which Dr. Wilkerson contributed to these changes will not be determined by this study; however, the growth of elementary and secondary education in Virginia during Dr. Wilkerson's tenure as Superintendent of Public Instruction will be presented.

### The Researcher's Perspective

The writer became interested in this topic because of his seventeen years of varied experience in education in Virginia. After serving for five years in one high school as classroom teacher of English, American history, and government and as an assistant principal, he joined the Virginia State Department of Education as an assistant state supervisor of history, government, and geography. For more than



ten years he has served as an assistant supervisor and then supervisor of secondary education with the regional office in Radford, Virginia.

The writer's major responsibilities have been to assist local school divisions to achieve specific objectives. These services include interpreting the policies of the State Board of Education; providing leadership in the general area of curriculum development and instructional improvement; giving direct assistance and impetus to the evaluation of secondary schools; serving as a resource person in studying local school problems; providing consultative services to division superintendents, central office personnel, principals, and college and other school personnel with responsibilities for general secondary administration; and assisting in all phases of the accreditation procedure. In addition, he functions as director of the regional office of the State Department of Education in Radford.

In these years of service, the writer has had the opportunity to participate in and to observe the workings of the State Department of Education under the leadership of Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson. Dr. Wilkerson, while a member of the State Department of Education for a number of years, was appointed State Superintendent less than a year prior to the writer's appointment.

As an employee of the State Department of Education, the writer had contact in many different situations with the chief executive officer of this agency. He observed Dr. Wilkerson's style of leadership in day-by-day routines, read his speeches, studied his publications, and served as a part of his administrative leadership.

He had the opportunity at various times to discuss with Dr. Wilkerson the different aspects of the overall operation of public schools in Virginia. While this contact had some marked influence on the writer, hopefully the methodology selected for this study maintained an objective attitude and permitted the drawing of unbiased conclusions.

#### Limitations of the Study

The study is confined to public education in Virginia, grades K-12. It is limited to the school years of 1960 through 1974. Dr. Wilkerson announced in October, 1974, that he would retire from his position on April 1, 1975. Complete data for the last eighteen months of his term were not available for the writer in order to meet the deadlines for this study.

It must be recognized that the nature of the study lends itself to the use of descriptive research and is not considered inferential in nature. In the attempt to recapture what occurred during this period of time the writer had to rely on many individuals' perceptions and memories about people and events which may have been affected by personal attitudes and opinions.

At certain points it was difficult to distinguish the policies of the office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction from the publications and thinking of the State Department of Education. It must be assumed that many of the Department's documents reflect Dr. Wilkerson's influence and action.

### Need for the Study

There is much to be learned from a detailed study of Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson's term as State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Virginia from 1960-1974. In the period of more than one hundred years of public education in Virginia, no other Superintendent of Public Instruction has served this long a period of time. A close look at the records of this period and an analysis of these records show trends that could affect the future of public education in Virginia. This study provides an opportunity to look into the years that have seen much change in the direction of education, not only in Virginia but in the nation as well.

While this study reflects the philosophy of the man and his time, it could provide a foundation and direction for the next decade. During Dr. Wilkerson's term in office there have been changes in the philosophy of the Virginia State Board of Education and the State Department of Education. These changes may guide education in Virginia well into the next decade.

The detailed biographical study of Dr. Wilkerson points out that he was a unique personality influenced by all with whom he came in contact: his family, his church, his college professors, his educational associates, and others. Each had a marked effect upon the actions of this man.

The role of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction was discussed by the writer with several leading educators and statesmen in Virginia. The relationship of the position with the State Board of Education, the members of the General Assembly, the various

governors under which Dr. Wilkerson served, and the local division superintendents was explored. This composite description of the past fifteen years in public education indicates how the position actually operates. It describes the "give and take" that must exist in working through issues. The personalities involved are described. The changes in emphasis in public education are cited.

Another important aspect of the study was the assessment by educational leaders of significant developments in education in Virginia since 1960. Goals derived from various sources, many from Dr. Wilkerson's influence, are identified. Carefully selected and recognized leaders in education have reacted to these goals and have pointed out the ones that had the highest priority, selecting the one goal they considered the most important. A careful review of these goals indicates areas of considerable interest to the people of the Commonwealth.

Once the most important goal was identified, it was carefully analyzed. This goal had to do with the standards of quality program in Virginia. Dr. Wilkerson gave his reaction to the development of this goal and its place in education today. Close associates of Dr. Wilkerson also gave their reaction to the development and implementation of this one goal. The future direction of education in Virginia might be tied to the further development of this goal.

Finally, it is hoped that this study will serve as a basis for further study at a later time on Dr. Wilkerson's life and influences. This later study could provide the opportunity to relate

further his life with his times, a period of transition in the history of public education in Virginia.

### Organization of the Study

Chapter one contains the statement of the thesis and includes the researcher's perspective, the limitations of the study, the need for the study, and the organization of the study.

Chapter two contains the methodology that was used in developing the thesis.

Chapter three describes the qualifications and biographical background of Dr. Wilkerson, an analysis of his position, and the legal basis for the position of State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Chapter four contains the changes occurring in public education during Dr. Wilkerson's term of office.

Chapter five provides a case study of the decision process on one major issue during Dr. Wilkerson's term of office.

The appendixes provide background and supportive information for the thesis.

## Chapter 2

### METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

This study answered six basic questions about Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson as State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Virginia and the progress of education in Virginia during his tenure in office. These questions were: (1) What were the qualifications and biographical background of Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson? (2) How did Dr. Wilkerson and certain other selected associates view the position of State Superintendent of Public Instruction? (3) What is the legal basis of the position of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Virginia? (4) What changes occurred in public education in Virginia during the first fourteen years Dr. Wilkerson was in office? (5) What significant issues prevailed during the term of Dr. Wilkerson? (6) What was Dr. Wilkerson's role in one major goal during his term in office? The first three questions were included to provide a perspective from which to view the progress of education in Virginia under Dr. Wilkerson's term. Question four was a main concern of this study. Questions five and six provided information on how Dr. Wilkerson approached the task of making decisions in the development of Virginia's public schools. This particular chapter reviews the specific procedures followed in collecting and analyzing the data needed to answer each of these questions.

Procedures for Determining the Qualifications and Biographical Background of Wilkerson

Information was secured from Who's Who in America; Virginia Lives--The Old Dominion Who's Who; Leaders in Education; Who's Who in American Education; Who's Who in the South and Southwest; Dr. Wilkerson's personally prepared "Vita"; a book edited in 1969 by Pearson and Fuller, Education in the States: Historical Development and Outlook, a project of the Council of State School Officials which provides a history of public education in Virginia; a structured personal interview with Dr. Wilkerson; and interviews with associates of Dr. Wilkerson and others.

The personal interview with Dr. Wilkerson was scheduled by the writer and responses were noted from questions found in Appendix A. This biographical section was divided into two parts, personal aspects and educational contributions. The personal aspects included birth, childhood, youth, marriage, and family. Information was added concerning his experiences in elementary school, high school, college and university, public school teaching, and public school administration. Attention was given to his career with the Virginia State Department of Education. This biographical sketch of Dr. Wilkerson's life experiences provides a significant historical record for posterity. Dr. Wilkerson's contributions to education were secured from questions concerning his educational background, the influences upon his career, his experiences prior to becoming Superintendent of Public Instruction, his basic philosophy of education, the people who have influenced his decisions, the areas of personal accomplishment in the improvement

of public education, his disappointments, and his hopes and predictions for the future. This part of the study focused attention on the major events in the life and experience of Dr. Wilkerson that may have influenced his effectiveness as State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

In the interview with Dr. Wilkerson names were secured of persons whom he considered as close associates and friends who have been an important part of his life. Three of these were selected at random and were asked to react to the interview questions found in Appendix B. These same questions were used in an interview with three persons who were not necessarily closely associated with the philosophy and thinking of Dr. Wilkerson. These names were selected at random from lists provided by Dr. Ralph W. Cherry, former Dean of the School of Education at the University of Virginia during most of Dr. Wilkerson's term; Dr. Robert Young, retired Dean, Radford College, former President of the Virginia School Boards Association and part-time consultant with the Virginia School Boards Association and the Virginia Council of Higher Education; and Dr. Robert F. Williams who served as Executive Secretary for the Virginia Education Association during most of Dr. Wilkerson's term.

A short interview was also made with Governor J. Lindsay Almond, the person who selected Dr. Wilkerson as State Superintendent. The interview centered around the criteria used in the selection of Dr. Wilkerson. The questions used are found in Appendix C.



In all, six persons were selected at random to participate in the interviews. These were Mr. Harry Elmore, retired Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction; Dr. Davis Y. Paschall, former State Superintendent of Public Instruction; Dr. J. G. Blount, retired Assistant Superintendent for Administration and Finance; Dr. George Holmes, School of Education, University of Virginia; Mr. Earl Shiflett, former Secretary of Education; and State Senator Hunter B. Andrews, General Assembly of Virginia. The first three would be considered friends of Dr. Wilkerson. The last three were selected from a list that included people not necessarily allied to Dr. Wilkerson and his philosophy.

Dr. Ralph W. Cherry suggested the names of Dr. William H. Seawell, School of Education, University of Virginia; Dr. George Holmes, School of Education, University of Virginia; and Mr. F. L. Frazier, Division Superintendent, Rockingham County Schools, for the interviews.

Dr. Robert J. Young suggested Dr. Davis Y. Paschall, former State Superintendent of Public Instruction; Dr. George Holmes; and Mr. Earl J. Shiflett, former Secretary of Education.

Dr. Robert F. Williams suggested State Senator Hunter B. Andrews of the General Assembly of Virginia from Hampton; Mr. John Meade, Division Superintendent of Petersburg City Schools; Dr. G. Tyler Miller, former President of Madison College; and, Mr. Thomas C. Boushall, former member of the State Board of Education.

Dr. George Holmes was selected because he was mentioned by two different persons. Mr. Earl Shiflett and State Senator Hunter Andrews were selected by a random selection process.

Each of the participants was mailed a copy of the questionnaire found in Appendix B. After several days the interviews were conducted; two were held in person; and four, by telephone. A copy of the accompanying letter is also a part of Appendix B. No exact answer is attributed to an individual; however, in the researcher's private notes he has accounts for each interview. All information contained in this section was secured from the interviews.

Certain comments and observations were noted from each of those interviewed that are worthy of particular attention. They concern the participants' direct relation to Dr. Wilkerson. Earl J. Shiflett had known Dr. Wilkerson prior to his appointment as State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Mr. Shiflett was in 1955 a member of the Henrico County School Board. Mr. Shiflett was appointed the first Secretary of Education in July, 1972, after Dr. Wilkerson had been reappointed State Superintendent by Governor Linwood Holton. He changed cabinet positions to that of Secretary of Commerce and Resources under Governor Mills Godwin prior to the last reappointment of Dr. Wilkerson.

Dr. J. G. Blount was a member of the Department of Education when Dr. Wilkerson joined it in 1945. At that time he served as Finance Director. They had many years of close association and in later years had offices that adjoined.

Mr. Harry Elmore had association with Dr. Wilkerson as early as 1958 while Mr. Elmore was a division superintendent in Pittsylvania County. Mr. Elmore joined the Department of Education in December, 1960, and served first as Assistant State Superintendent and then as Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, both considered the Department's number two position. He had close daily contact with Dr. Wilkerson and was in the position of commuting almost daily to and from work with Dr. Wilkerson.

Dr. Davis Paschall had interviewed Dr. Wilkerson as a prospective teacher in 1934. They had a principal-teacher relationship, a principal to principal relationship, and a relationship within the Department of Education. Dr. Paschall joined the State Department of Education soon after Dr. Wilkerson did. They served as directors together. Dr. Paschall was State Superintendent prior to Dr. Wilkerson. Since Dr. Paschall went to the College of William and Mary as its President in 1960 and retired in 1971, they have had less frequent contact. They did work together in the formulation of the new Virginia Constitution. Dr. Paschall served on the Commission to Revise the Constitution, and Dr. Wilkerson was a consultant to this group.

Dr. George Holmes expressed that his contact with Dr. Wilkerson was not so frequent as perhaps that of the other people interviewed. He had been an observer of the Virginia education scene during most of Dr. Wilkerson's tenure. In more recent years he has attended most of the meetings of the State Board of Education. Dr. Holmes has had

close association with the division superintendents and school board members from throughout the state.

State Senator Hunter B. Andrews' association with Dr. Wilkerson began in 1960 when Mr. Andrews was Chairman of the Hampton City School Board. Mr. Andrews went to the General Assembly in 1964 and presently serves as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Health. He also served on a task force for financing the standards of quality program. These activities provided opportunities for him to work with Dr. Wilkerson.

These six persons were interviewed to validate and, in a few instances, add dimensions to the responses of the interview with Dr. Wilkerson. Totally they provided an accounting of the qualifications and biographical background of Dr. Wilkerson and the role of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

#### Information Sources for the Legal Basis for the Position of State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Virginia

Five primary sources were used to establish the legal basis of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction: (1) The Constitution of Virginia, 1968; (2) The Constitution of Virginia, 1971; (3) Virginia School Laws, 1969; (4) Virginia School Laws, 1972; and (5) Regulations of the Board of Education of the Commonwealth of Virginia, 1973. The exact sections of these documents that relate directly to this study are found in Appendix D.

Changes Occurring in Public Education in Virginia  
During Wilkerson's Term of Office

Procedures for Identifying and Analyzing the Changes Occurring in  
Public Education During Wilkerson's Term of Office

A primary concern of this study was the changes which occurred in public education in Virginia during Dr. Wilkerson's tenure in office. The procedure for determining these changes included: (1) the identification of general measures of educational quality, (2) the identification of the specific educational goals in Virginia, 1960-1973), (3) the establishment of educational goal priorities in Virginia during Dr. Wilkerson's tenure, (4) the association of a measure of quality with each of the top twenty-four goals, (5) the comparison of progress in Virginia toward achieving each of ten measurable goals with the progress made in the nation as a whole, and (6) the determination of a major goal to be used as a basis for a case study of the decision making process during Dr. Wilkerson's term.

(1) Identification of general measures of quality. General measurements of educational quality were determined by reviewing the educational literature of the past fourteen years. These measures were categorized as input or output measures of quality. The input measures were those resources - time, money, and energy - used to create a specific product. The output measures were the products or what actually happened to students' knowledge, attitudes, and skills. These measures of quality reported in the literature are listed below categorized as either "input" or "output".

## Input Measurements of Quality

- Individual attention in class (Com Ed Fin, 1968:p. 45; Gauerke, 1967:p. 291, p. 295; Norton, 1965:p. 40)
- Length of school day (Com Ed Fin, 1968:p. 45; Clark, 1968:p. 50; Gauerke, 1967:p. 291)
- Provisions for libraries (Johns, 1969:p. 42, p. 54)
- Provisions for instructional materials (Clark, 1968:p. 50; Gauerke, 1967:p. 290; Johns, 1969:p. 53; Norton, 1965:p. 53)
- Pupil-teacher ratio (Gauerke, 1967:p. 283, p. 291; Johns, 1969:p. 53; Norton, 1965:p. 44)
- Teacher experience and age (Gauerke, 1967:p. 283, p. 293; Norton, 1965:p. 44)
- Teacher's salary (Gauerke, 1967:p. 292; Norton, 1965:p. 44, p. 53)
- Provision for special education (Gauerke, 1967:p. 292; Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 20; N.E.F.P., 1971:p. 24; Norton, 1965:p. 53)
- Provisions for continuous curriculum revision (Gauerke, 1967:p. 295; Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 18)
- Extent of supervisory and administrative support (Gauerke, 1967:p. 284, p. 285)
- Use of community resources (Clark, 1963:p. 45; Gauerke, 1967:p. 295; Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 19; Johns, 1969:p. 54)
- The teaching of skills (Gauerke, 1967:p. 295; Norton, 1965:p. 40)

Expenditure per pupil (Norton, 1965:p. 40, p. 44; Johns, 1969: p. 54)

Staff differentiation (Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 45; Johns, 1968:p. 41)

Amount of time devoted to planning (Com Ed Fin, 1968:p. 45; Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 19)

Relationship of effort and capability (Johns, 1969:p. 54; Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 23)

Expenditure per pupil for salaries, administration, maintenance (Gauerke, 1967:p. 283; Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 23)

Expenditure for program enrichment (Gauerke, 1967:p. 283; Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 23)

Taxable property value per pupil (Gauerke, 1967:p. 283; Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 23)

Attention to character development (Clark, 1963:p. 14, Gauerke, 1967:p. 295; Com Ed Fin, 1968:p. 46)

Attention to citizenship development (Clark, 1963:p. 14; Norton, 1965:p. 41)

Increase in school year (Clark, 1963:p. 50; Com Ed Fin, 1968: p. 45; Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 120; Johns, 1969:p. 53)

Added years to public education programs (Clark, 1963:p. 50; N.E.F.P., 1971:p. 23)

Number of teachers with master's degree (Johns, 1969:p. 54; Norton, 1965:p. 44)

Teacher endorsement (Com Ed Fin, 1968:p. 46; Johns, 1969: p. 37, p. 57; Gauerke, 1967:p. 295)

Adequate counseling program (Johns, 1969:p. 37; Norton, 1965:  
p. 53)

Adequate supportive services (Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 19;  
Johns, 1969:p. 53; N.E.F.P., 1971:p. 24; Norton, 1965:p. 53)

Kindergarten (Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 19; N.E.F.P., 1971:  
p. 23)

Day care centers (Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 19; N.E.F.P.,  
1971:p. 23)

Nursery schools (Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 20; N.E.F.P., 1971:  
p. 23)

Vocational education programs (Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 19;  
N.E.F.P., 1971:p. 24)

Programs for alternative education (Com Ed Fin, 1968:p. 45;  
Johns, 1969:p. 53)

Compensatory education (Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 20; N.E.F.P.,  
1971:p. 24)

Adult and continuing education (Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 19;  
Com Ed Fin, 1968:p. 46; N.E.F.P., 1971:p. 24)

Flexibility in scheduling (Com Ed Fin, 1968:p. 46; Gauerke,  
1967:p. 19; Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 19)

Open physical environment (Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 19; Com  
Ed Fin, 1968:p. 45)

Well-planned facilities (Com Ed Fin, 1968:p. 45; Johns, 1969:  
p. 37, p. 57; Norton, 1965:p. 53)

Inservice education (Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 19; Johns,  
1969:p. 54)



Extent of democratic leadership (Gauerke, 1967:p. 295)  
 Programs for gifted (Norton, 1965:p. 53)  
 Programs for research (Norton, 1965:p. 53)  
 Use of systematic budget procedures (Johns, Planning, 1971:  
 p. 22)

#### Output Measures of Quality

Achievement test scores performance (Clark, 1963:p. 13;  
 Gauerke, 1967:p. 287, 290, 294; Norton, 1965:p. 40)  
 Percent of college entrants (Gauerke, 1967:p. 290; Norton,  
 1965:p. 40)  
 Average daily attendance (Gauerke, 1967;p. 291; Norton, 1965:  
 p. 53)  
 Holding power of schools (Gauerke, 1967:p. 290; Norton, 1965:  
 p. 44)  
 Relation of income to education (Clark, 1963:p. 15; Johns,  
Planning, 1971:p. 23)  
 Acquired skills in content areas (reading and math) (Com  
 Ed Fin, 1968:p. 46; Norton, 1965:pp. 40-41)  
 Technical training programs (Johns, Planning, 1971:p. 20;  
 N.E.F.P., 1971:p. 24; Norton, 1965:pp. 40-41)  
 Number of students with technical training (N.E.F.P., 1971:  
 p. 24; Norton, 1965:p. 41)  
 Percent of students in advanced placement programs (Clark,  
 1963:p. 12)

(2) Identification of educational goals in Virginia, 1960-1973.

Copies of the Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the Commonwealth of Virginia for the years 1960-61 through 1972-73 were the first and primary sources of those goals of educational quality emphasized by Dr. Wilkerson. Each annual report is submitted to the Governor by the Superintendent and includes the activities and major accomplishments in public education during the specific year. The introductory section includes a statement of goals and priorities for public education in Virginia and is the primary responsibility of the incumbent superintendent. The introductory sections for the years 1960-61 through 1972-73 were used to compile an initial list of goals for Dr. Wilkerson's term of office. A series of lists were developed to show each specific goal, the year that it emerged, and the subsequent years in which it appeared (Appendix E).

The initial list was expanded with a review of the following publications: Facing Up--Statistical Data on Virginia's Public Schools (1966-1974); Superintendent of Public Instruction's Memorandums (1960-1973); State Board of Education Minutes (1960-1973); and speeches that Dr. Wilkerson prepared and delivered to the annual meeting of division superintendents, 1961-1973 (Appendix E).

To avoid biasing the selections of goals and measures of progress made in public education in Virginia, the goals emphasized by the Virginia Education Association, the Virginia School Boards Association, the Virginia Congress of Parents and Teachers, and major legislative studies were compiled. Identified goals were listed in

charted form to show the year that they emerged and the number of times each appeared (Appendix E).

The specific sources used in compiling the goals were the Virginia Journal of Education, 1960-1973; the Virginia School Board Association Newsletter, 1960-1973; the publication of the Virginia Congress of Parents and Teachers, Virginia PTA Bulletin, 1960-1973; and major legislative studies from 1955 through 1973, including the Spong Commission report of 1959 and 1960, the Governor's Conference on Education report of 1966, and the report of the Turner Committee in 1967.

The goals from these other groups were then combined with the goals identified as emphasized by Dr. Wilkerson. The resulting composite list of goals required refinement, as explained in the next section, prior to collection of data. The composite list appears in Appendix E.

(3) The establishment of educational goal priorities in Virginia during Dr. Wilkerson's tenure. The compiled list of goals was presented to a panel of experienced educators for ranking and classification purposes. Three professors of education at Radford College--Dean Robert C. Gibson, Dr. Fred L. Phlegar, and Dr. John Rutherford--were asked to classify the 164 goals into seven basic categories. These categories were school-community relations, curriculum and instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, physical facilities, finance and business management, and others. A similar

classification by more than one of the panel members was considered as valid, and the classification was used.

After the classification procedure the same panel was asked to rank in order of educational significance, from the highest to the lowest, the goals under each classification. In this process they were to combine or clip together any of the goals that were similar in nature and scope. The top forty percent of each category was selected to be used in the study, and sixty-nine goals were used in the continuing study. The procedures used with the panel from Radford College are found in Appendix G.

The following fourteen goals were dropped during the classification procedure because the panel members did not agree on their classification:

Teacher scholarships

Use of closed circuit television for teacher training

Growth in area vocational/technical schools

Reduction in number of pupils in classes of more than thirty

Reduction in number of half-day elementary classes

Increase in number of elementary pupils in classes of less than thirty

Improved pupil-teacher ratio

Increased number of elementary schools with libraries and qualified librarians

Early admission dates for first grade

Technical assistance for school desegregation

Length of school day

Need for local school board written policies

Ethnic/human relations program

Expanded school year (more than 180 days)

Two of the goals were added again to the list by the writer because he considered them important enough to be carried through the ranking procedure. These goals were improved pupil-teacher ratio and technical assistance for school desegregation. The result was that twelve goals were dropped. The number of goals in each category is listed in Appendix G.

The goal selection panel followed a procedure to rank the goals in each of the seven categories. The ranking by each of the panel is found in Appendix H. The results of the ranking in each category are listed below. A line is drawn to designate the top forty percent in each category. Those below the line were dropped from further consideration.

#### Category 1 - School-Community Relations

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Goal</u>
1	Desegregation
<u>2</u>	Urban education problems
3	Decentralization of control of schools
4	Compulsory education law
5	Change in census procedure

## Category 2 - Curriculum and Instruction

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Goal</u>
1	Kindergartens
2	Study of reading abilities
3	Special education programs
4	Program for disadvantaged youth
5	Expansion of industrial education
6	Compensatory education
7	Literacy
8	Teaching of phonics
9	Increased secondary school offering
10	Schools with summer school offering
11	Citizenship education
12	Environmental education
13	Increased library services
14.5	Curriculum guide for civics
14.5	Expanded course requirement for secondary school graduates
16	Curriculum guide for primary social studies
17.5	Curriculum guide for written composition
<u>17.5</u>	Curriculum guide for agriculture education
19.5	Middle school organization
19.5	Need for economic education
21.5	Curriculum guide for elementary geography
21.5	Curriculum guide for distributive education

## Category 2 (continued)

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Goal</u>
23	Curriculum guide for eighth and ninth grade science
24	Curriculum guide for government course
25.5	Adult education programs
25.5	Review of social studies offerings
27	Drug abuse education
28	Year-round education
29.5	More "time to teach"
29.5	Driver and traffic safety education
31	Programs for the gifted
32	Curriculum guide for using maps and globes
33.5	Team teaching
33.5	Career education
35	Art education program
36	Curriculum guide for United States history course
37	Modular scheduling
38	Educational television
39	Programmed instruction
40	Approval of sex education material
41	Change in textbook adoption procedures
42.5	New course approval procedures
42.5	Study of racially fair textbooks
44	Performance contracting
45	Civil defense education

## Category 3 - Pupil Personnel

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Goal</u>
1.5	Reduction of drop-outs
1.5	Increased holding power
3	Increase in number of secondary school graduates
4	Law and order in the school
5	School psychologist program
6	Child abuse
8	Visiting teacher program
8	School nurse program
<u>8</u>	Elementary guidance program
10	Increase in number of full-time guidance counselors
11	Increased percentage of secondary school graduates going to further education
12	Physical fitness testing
13	TB examination
14	Examination of local school records
15	Guidance handbook
16	Expanded testing program
17	Sex discrimination in schools
18	Revision of teacher registers

## Category 4 - Staff Personnel

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Goal</u>
1	Improved pupil-teacher ratio
2	Study of teacher supply and demand



## Category 4 (continued)

3.5	Percentage of teachers holding regular certificates
3.5	Inservice training for teachers
5	Improved teacher preparation program
6.5	Teacher training in reading
6.5	Number and percentage of teachers holding college degrees
8	Ratio of male/female instructional personnel
9	Men in teaching
10	Summer institutes for teachers
<u>11</u>	Increased qualifications for division superintendents
12	Experience of instructional personnel
13	Improved elementary school principal's qualifications
14	Clerical assistance in the schools
15	Master of Arts in Teaching program
16	Guidelines for teacher aides
17	Tenure for teachers
18.5	Differentiated staffing
18.5	Expanded staff of State Department of Education
20	Summer institute for division superintendents
21	Merit pay
22	Fair employment practices
23	Change in sick leave policy
24	Professional negotiations
25	Grievance procedure adoption

## Category 5 - Physical Facilities

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Goal</u>
<u>1</u>	Reduction in number of one-room schools
2.5	Study of school bus safety
2.5	State approval of school buildings

## Category 6 - Finance and Business Management

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Goal</u>
1	Use of sales tax for education
2	Priority financial treatment to less able divisions
3	Expansion of vocational education funding
4	State financial support for school construction
5	Federal Funding - Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
6	Federal aid to education
7	Increased state-aid staff positions
8	Free and/or rental textbook
10	Average instructional personnel's salaries
10	Federal impact money
10	Financing of schools on basis of ADM
12	Average classroom teachers' salaries
13.5	Expanded use of literary loans
<u>13.5</u>	Cost of school operation per ADA
16	Increase in teacher's minimum salary
16	NDEA funding

## Category 6 (continued)

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Goal</u>
16	Financial aid to science instruction
19	Financial aid to guidance
19	Improved principals' salaries
19	Tuition grants
22.5	Financial aid to mathematics education
22.5	Financial aid to foreign language education
22.5	Percentage of classroom teacher's salary increase
22.5	Improved retirement benefits
25	Estimated value of school property
26	Salary improvement for State Department of Education
27	Local division superintendent's salary
28	Twelve month employment of teachers
29.5	General Assembly financial appropriations
29.5	State financial aid for insurance
31	Revision of financial distribution formula
32	Use of American Management Association Consultants
33	Use of data processing

## Category 7 - Others

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Goal</u>
1	New state <u>Constitution</u>
2	Statewide needs assessment
3	Standards of Quality program

## Category 7 (continued)

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Goal</u>
4	Elementary school accreditation standards
5	Clarification of the role of the State Department of Education
6	Statement of policy for State Department of Education
7	Role of community college
8	Division wide planning
9	Collection of educational data
<u>10</u>	Educational research
11	Pilot studies
12	Expansion of local division improvement programs
13	Strengthening of secondary accreditation
14	Local school boards selected by governing bodies
15	Neighborhood school concept
16	Local division-wide evaluation
17	Reorganization of State Department of Education
18	Technical assistance for school desegregation
19	State Board selection of State Superintendent
20	Licensing of proprietary schools
21	Civil Rights Act compliance
22	Decrease in State Board of Education responsibility for higher education
23	Manpower training programs

The following goals were added by the researcher to the list that was to be a part of the questionnaire: compulsory education laws, percentage of secondary school graduates going to further education, professional negotiations, General Assembly financial appropriations, and revision of the financial distribution formula. Each of these was considered to be significant enough to carry through the validation process. The sixty-nine goals that were selected to use in the questionnaire are found in Appendix F as a part of the information mailed to each participant.

The list of goals was validated with a questionnaire sent to Dr. Wilkerson, five of his closest associates, and twelve representatives of the over-all educational community in Virginia (representatives of the Virginia Education Association, Virginia Congress of Parent-Teachers Association, Virginia School Boards Association, and Virginia Association of School Administration). The questionnaire appears in Appendix F.

Close associates were selected from a list compiled from names presented to the researcher by Mr. Harry L. Smith, Special Assistant for Public Information and Publications (Mr. Smith was the public information officer throughout Dr. Wilkerson's term); Dr. J. G. Blount, former Assistant Superintendent of Administration and Finance and employee of the State Department of Education for more than forty years; Mr. Harry Elmore, former division superintendent and retired Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction; and Dr. Wilkerson. Each was asked to provide a list of five names. These lists were consolidated

to make a total of twenty, and five names were selected at random. The questionnaire was mailed to each of the selected close associates. One questionnaire was also sent to Dr. Wilkerson.

Representatives of the Virginia educational community were selected from the presidents of the Virginia Education Association, the Virginia School Boards Association, the Virginia Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the Virginia Association of School Administrators for the fourteen years of Dr. Wilkerson's term of office. The available presidents were all listed according to the year that they served. The thirteen year span was then divided into three groups--1960-1964, 1965-1969, and 1970-1974--to represent the early, middle, and final years of Dr. Wilkerson's term. One person was selected at random from each of the twelve categories. The questionnaire was mailed to each of these twelve persons. This made a total of eighteen participants whose names and addresses appear in Appendix I.

The selection of the participants was taken from the following groups:

Close Associates of Dr. Wilkerson Suggested by Mr. Harry L. Smith

Harry Elmore, former school division superintendent and retired

Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Davis Y. Paschall, former State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

J. G. Blount, retired Assistant Superintendent of Administration and

Finance and employee of State Department of Education for

more than forty years.

George W. Burton, former local school division superintendent,  
employee of State Department of Education, and retired  
Assistant Superintendent of Administrative Field Services.

Fendall R. Ellis, former local school division superintendent,  
employee of State Department of Education, and retired  
Assistant Superintendent for Program Development.

Close Associates of Dr. Wilkerson Suggested by Dr. J. G. Blount

Harry Elmore, former school division superintendent and retired  
Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Davis Y. Paschall, former State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Hugh K. Cassell, recently retired local division superintendent.

Fred Poteet, retired employee of State Department of Education and  
one-time local division superintendent.

E. B. Pendleton, long-time associate of Dr. Wilkerson and former  
Treasurer of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Close Associates of Dr. Wilkerson Suggested by Mr. Harry R. Elmore

Anne Dobie Peebles, former President of State Board of Education.

Leonard G. Muse, former President of State Board of Education.

O. T. Bonner, former Superintendent of Danville City Schools.

J. G. Blount, retired Assistant Superintendent of Administration and  
Finance and employee of State Department of Education for  
more than forty years.

Fendall R. Ellis, former school division superintendent, employee of State Department of Education, and retired Assistant Superintendent for Program Development.

Close Associates of Dr. Wilkerson Suggested by Dr. Wilkerson

Harry Elmore, former school division superintendent and retired Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Davis Y. Paschall, former State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

J. G. Blount, retired Assistant Superintendent of Administration and Finance and employee of State Department of Education for over forty years.

Walter E. Campbell, Superintendent of Henrico County Schools.

Carter Lowance, Acting Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth of Virginia and Administrative Assistant for several governors.

Names Selected to Use in Questionnaire

J. G. Blount, Jr.

Harry R. Elmore

Davis Y. Paschall

Carter Lowance

George W. Burton

The first three had been names suggested by more than one person and were therefore selected. Fendall R. Ellis' name was not considered because he was listed in the next grouping. The last two



names were chosen by a random selection process using a random number selection.

Virginia Education Association Presidents, 1960-1974

1960	Miss Martha A. Anthony
1961	Dr. Woodrow W. Robinson
1962	Dr. James W. Tyler
1963	Mr. Lewis N. Dalton (deceased)
1964	Mr. Thomas C. McSwain
1965	Mr. John B. Madden
1966	Mrs. Nancy H. Gibbs
1967	Mr. Edwin M. Betts, Jr.
1968	Mr. Charles M. Perdue
1969	Dr. Melton F. Wright
1970	Mr. Joseph N. Berry
1971	Mr. Don R. Rapier
1972	Mr. John R. Graybill
1973	Mr. Richard E. Gordon
1974	Mr. Marvin E. Winters

Virginia Parent-Teachers Association Presidents, 1960-1974

1959-60	Dr. Edgar M. Johnson
1961-62	Mr. Harold T. Jerry
1963-64	Dr. Charles G. Caldwell
1965-66	Mrs. Charles M. Duncan

1967-68 Mr. Fred P. Entler  
 1969-70 Mrs. W. Hamilton Crockford, III  
 1971-72 Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr.  
 1973-74 Dr. Robert Shaver

Virginia School Boards Association Presidents, 1960-1974

1960 Mr. T. Anthony Pollard, Pittsylvania County  
 1961 Dr. Barnard Joy, Arlington County  
 1962 Mr. W. M. Gravatt, Nottoway County  
 1963 Mr. Francis J. Copenhaver, Smyth County  
 1964 Mr. Herbert J. Camden, Amherst County  
 1965 Mrs. Florence Young, Shenandoah County  
 1966 Dr. William Turner, Petersburg City  
 1967 Mr. G. L. Crump, Chesterfield County  
 1968 Mrs. Flora Reid, Orange County  
 1969 Dr. Robert J. Young, Radford City  
 1970 Mr. Hugh A. West, Nansemond County  
 1971 Mr. Evan H. Lacy, Jr., Fluvanna County  
 1972 Mr. William Perlick, Fairfax County  
 1973 Mr. J. P. King, Jr., Franklin City  
 1974 Dr. John F. DeVogt, Lexington City

Virginia Association of School Administration Presidents, 1960-1974

1960 R. L. Lacy, Halifax County  
 1961 Fendall R. Ellis, Charlottesville City  
 1962 J. B. M. Carter, Nelson County

1963	R. P. Reynolds, Carroll County (deceased)
1964	William R. Savage, Jr., Suffolk City
1965	Ray E. Reid, Arlington County
1966	Paul H. Cale, Albemarle County
1967	Malcom F. Fears, Lunenburg County
1968	Edwin L. Lamberth, Norfolk City
1969	Wilber F. Pence, Rockingham County
1970	William D. Richmond, Wise County
1971	Raymond W. Snead, Fredericksburg City
1972	J. H. Combs, Pittsylvania County
1973	Dr. W. E. Campbell, Henrico County
1974	Dr. George McIntosh, Newport News City

#### Composite Grouping of Virginia Educational Community Representation

A stratified random sampling procedure was utilized. Those selected to participate in the selection of goal priority during Dr. Wilkerson's term are underlined. One name from each time block for each organization was selected using a random numbers table.

A listing of those that participated in the questionnaire is found in Appendix I. Eighteen were sent the questionnaire; one did not return it and one returned it unanswered. This was an eighty-nine percent response. The results of the questionnaire are found in Appendix J.

Table 1

## Composite Grouping of Virginia Educational Community Representation

	Virginia Education Association	Virginia Congress of Parent and Teachers	Virginia School Boards Association	Virginia Association of School Administrators
1960	Anthony	<u>Johnson</u>	Pollard	Lacy
1961	Robinson		Joy	<u>Ellis</u>
1962	Tyler	Jerry	Gravatt	Carter
1963	Dalton (deceased)	Caldwell	<u>Copenhaver</u>	Reynolds (deceased)
1964	<u>McSwain</u>		Camden	Savage
1965	Madden	Duncan	Young	Reid
1966	Gibbs		Turner	Cale
1967	Betts	<u>Entler</u>	Crump	Fears
1968	<u>Perdue</u>		<u>Reid</u>	Lamberth
1969	Wright	Crockford	Young	<u>Pence</u>
1970	Berry		<u>West</u>	<u>Richmond</u>
1971	Rapier	Smith	Lacy	Snead
1972	<u>Graybill</u>		Perlick	Combs
1973	Gordon	<u>Shaver</u>	King	Campbell
1974	Winters		DeVogt	McIntosh

Key: Names underlined were selected for the questionnaire.

As a result of this validation procedure and priority selection, the twenty-four goals with the highest priority scores became the objects of further analysis to determine the progress made in education during Dr. Wilkerson's term of office.

Respondents' Ranking of Scores of Virginia Educational Goals, 1960-1973

The top twenty-four goals identified by the ranking process, in order from highest to lowest, include:

<u>Average Score</u>	<u>Goal</u>
3.87	Standards of quality program
3.80	Inservice training for teachers
3.73	Improved teacher preparation programs
3.73	Percentage of teachers holding regular certificates
3.71	Kindergarten education
3.67	Number and percentage of teachers holding college degrees
3.61	The new Virginia state <u>Constitution</u>
3.60	Law and order in the school
3.60	Increase in number of secondary school graduates
3.60	Expansion of vocational education funding
3.60	Special education programs
3.58	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
3.57	Priority financial treatment to less able divisions
3.57	Use of sales tax for education
3.57	Clarification of role of State Department of Education

<u>Average Score</u>	<u>Goal</u>
3.57	General Assembly financial appropriation
3.56	Citizenship education
3.56	Expansion of industrial education
3.56	Improved pupil-teacher ratio
3.53	Drop-out reduction
3.53	Financing of schools based on ADM
3.53	Elementary school accreditation standards
3.53	Increased holding power of schools
3.50	Reduction in number of one-room schools

The highest score possible was that of four.

#### Selected Additional Comments from Questionnaire

The following comments and quotations taken from the questionnaire are noted:

Dr. Wilkerson has taken the lead in seeing that goals were formulated and that programs were developed to advance them.

Tieing (sic) money spent to quality education is his biggest mistake.

The composite goal of Dr. Wilkerson's administration has been the over-all improvement of public education in Virginia with expanded opportunities for every child to receive educational training commensurate with his or her abilities regardless of race, sex, or economic standing.

My one comment would be that there was a lack of leadership at the State level (the State Board of Education and the State Superintendent) and that, in most cases, the initiative was taken by the state and local school boards in accomplishing the educational goals for the State.

(4) The association of a measure of quality with each of the top twenty-four goals. The top twenty-four identified goals were presented to a panel for further analysis. This panel consisted of Dr. M. David Alexander and Dr. A. P. Johnston from the faculty of the College of Education of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. They were asked to select goals for which there might be data available for both Virginia and the nation. Together they arrived at a determination of eleven goals which they considered to be significant for the remainder of the study. These goals were:

1. Standards of quality program
2. Percentage of teachers holding regular certificates
3. Kindergarten education
4. Number and percentage of teachers holding degrees
5. Expansion of vocational education funding
6. Special education programs
7. Priority financial treatment to less able divisions
8. Improved pupil-teacher ratio
9. Drop-out reduction
10. Increased holding power of schools
11. Reduction in number of one-room schools

The panel was also provided a list of the general measures of educational quality listed earlier in this chapter. These were discussed by the panel, and they were asked to associate the measure with the goal where possible. They were allowed to add measures not listed. Not all of the goals listed above matched with a measure of quality. Goals number two and four were eventually combined.

The association of the ten goals with that of the appropriate general measure of education quality included:

Questionnaire Ranking of Goal	Goal	General Measure
1	Standards of quality program	
4	Percentage of teachers holding regular certificates	Teacher endorsement
5	Kindergarten education	Kindergarten education
6	Number and percentage of teachers holding degrees	Number of teachers with masters degrees
10	Expansion of vocational education funding	Vocational education programs
11	Special education programs	Provision for special education
13	Priority financial treatment to less able divisions	Relationship of effort and capacity
19	Improved pupil-teacher ratio	Pupil-teacher ratio
20	Drop-out reduction	
23	Increased holding power of schools	Holding power of schools
24	Reduction in number of one-room schools	

The panel made the following added suggestions concerning certain goals and particularly those goals that were not associated:

Standards of quality programs - They suggested some analysis of what other states were doing in the area of accountability.

Drop-out reduction - They suggested that an attempt be made to look at comparative and compatible state and national studies.



Expansion of Vocational Education Funding - A close look at the state effort was suggested.

In summary, the basis for the matching was goals and general measures of quality that could be compared and for which there might be data available for both Virginia and the nation. Ten comparisons were made; however, they were not the exact top ten goals identified by the goal questionnaire. The comparison of progress in Virginia and the nation for each of these goals is made in Chapter 4 of this study.

(5) Comparison of progress in Virginia toward achieving each of ten goals with progress made in the nation as a whole. A detailed collection of data for the years 1960-1973 in Virginia on each of the ten measures of quality was made. Data for the nation for these same measures of quality for corresponding years were also collected. Virginia and United States data were then compared for those paired measures. Some description and identification was found to be necessary. In some cases conclusive data were not available. The results point out the areas of greatest success and lack of success of Dr. Wilkerson as he provided leadership for the educational program in the Commonwealth. Details of this procedure are found in Chapter 4 of the study.

(6) The determination of a major educational goal during Dr. Wilkerson's term. To add another dimension to this study, the writer conducted an indepth study of one carefully selected specific goal that has had a significant effect on the quality of education in

Virginia during the term of Dr. Wilkerson as State Superintendent. This goal was selected by asking the eighteen people involved in the previously mentioned questionnaire, "Which of these goals do you consider to have been or be the most important goal during Dr. Wilkerson's term?" The responses were:

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Response</u>
1	Listed eleven including standards of quality
2	Elementary accreditation standards and standards of quality
3	Kindergarten education
4	New Virginia <u>Constitution</u>
5	No comment
6	Revision of financial distribution formula
7	Standards of quality program
8	Standards of quality program
9	Improve public education
10	Standards of quality program
11	None given
12	Use sales tax for education
13	None
14	All pertaining to quality education
15	Standards of quality program
16	Listed six including standards of quality

(Two persons did not complete the questionnaire.)

Seven of the respondents to the questionnaire listed the standards of quality program specifically. Therefore, the most important goal during Dr. Wilkerson's term as State Superintendent of Public Instruction chosen by this identification and questionnaire procedure was the goal relating to the standards of quality program.

### Summary

This chapter proposed the six basic questions about Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson as State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Virginia and the progress of education in Virginia during his tenure in office. These questions were: (1) What were the qualifications and biographical background of Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson? (2) How did Dr. Wilkerson and certain other selected associates view the position of State Superintendent of Public Instruction? (3) What is the legal basis of the position of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Virginia? (4) What changes occurred in public education in Virginia during the fourteen years Dr. Wilkerson was in office? (5) What significant issues prevailed during the term of Dr. Wilkerson? (6) What was Dr. Wilkerson's role in one major issue during his term in office?

## Chapter 3

### WOODROW W. WILKERSON: THE MAN AND HIS WORK

#### Introduction

##### Part I. Biographical Background

The basic information for this aspect of the study was secured from structured personal interviews with Dr. Wilkerson and basic biographical reference materials. Any material not footnoted was secured from the series of interviews held with Dr. Wilkerson during the fall and winter of 1974-1975. The questions used in the interview appear in Appendix A.

A series of questions was mailed to former Governor J. Lindsay Almond concerning the appointment of Dr. Wilkerson as State Superintendent of Public Instruction (Appendix C). Because of a busy schedule, Governor Almond made only a few brief statements concerning the appointment and Dr. Wilkerson.

##### Part II. The Position as State Superintendent of Public Instruction

All of this information was secured from the series of interviews with Dr. Wilkerson and from the interviews with six of his associates. A copy of the interview protocol with accompanying letters is found in Appendix B.

##### Part III. The Legal Basis of the Position of State Superintendent of Public Instruction

This information came from the last two Virginia Constitutions, the recent editions of Virginia School Laws, and the Regulations of the

Board of Education of the Commonwealth of Virginia, July, 1973. The complete copies of these appropriate documents are found in Appendix D.

## Part I. Biographical Background

### Early Life

Dr. Woodrow Wilson Wilkerson was born in Prince Edward County, Virginia, on April 29, 1913 (Who's Who in America, 1970-1971:p. 2457). He grew up on a farm near the community of Prospect.

His father was John Henry Wilkerson, a farmer and rural mail carrier. John Wilkerson retired from the postal service in his early sixties and died at the age of sixty-nine in 1946. Woodrow's mother was Betty Maude Young Wilkerson who died at the age of eighty-two in 1962. His only brother, who was older than Woodrow, died in 1964.

His parents apparently had a tremendous influence upon Dr. Wilkerson's life. He recalls stress on good conduct, strong moral values, and a strong secure feeling in the home. His church, Olive Branch Methodist, near his home also had a great influence on his life. He and his family were most active in all aspects of the church life. His parents always emphasized education and the habit of thrift.

### Early Education

The eleven years of Woodrow Wilkerson's public education were in the same school setting at the Prospect Elementary and High School. Two elementary teachers, Mrs. Frank Glenn and Mrs. Alice Straw, had the

greatest influence on him as a boy. Mrs. Frank Glenn (then Miss Watkins) was his first and second grade teacher. Her greatest impact was her personality. She stressed open communication, interest in children, and a real desire to help children. With her a child was made to feel worthy and secure. Mrs. Alice Straw taught him in fourth and seventh grades. Considered an excellent teacher, she had high expectations for her students and was a strong disciplinarian.

There were no school lunch programs for young Woodrow. He remembers the "paper bag" and tin bucket, as well as pot bellied stoves in the older elementary building.

His high school experience was perhaps typical of that for a rural school in the late 1920's. He graduated in a class of thirteen, three boys and ten girls. His curriculum was academic, including four years of English, Latin, and math. He also had courses in general science, biology, and French. There were very few extra curricular activities. The main activity was basketball, coached by the principal who was the only full-time male teacher during Woodrow's high school days. There was no football or organized baseball. There were no clubs except for the 4-H activities which were under the direction of the county extension agent.

### College Education

When the time came to consider college, Woodrow was interested in the College of William and Mary, Randolph-Macon College, and Hampden-Sydney College. His final selection of Hampden-Sydney was based on its academic reputation and its relatively low cost. Hampden-Sydney

was at that time a four-year, all male, liberal arts college with an enrollment of three hundred students. It is located near Farmville, Virginia, twenty-one miles from the Wilkerson home. He lived on campus in the dormitory because his parents thought that this would provide a better educational experience.

Among the courses taken in his undergraduate program were Latin, Greek, French, English, mathematics, history, economics, philosophy, psychology, biology, chemistry, and Bible. An aptitude test indicated that he had an interest and ability in the professional areas of teaching and managerial skills (business). His early plans for the future were based on his interest in these fields. His program for a Bachelor of Arts degree included one professional education course, a course in psychology.

Dr. Wilkerson graduated from Hampden-Sydney in the class of 1934 (membership of seventy) with magna cum laude honors. The class celebrated its fortieth reunion in the fall of 1974, and he was among fifteen members who returned for the event.

During his senior year at Hampden-Sydney Dr. Wilkerson contacted several division superintendents about the possibility of teaching jobs. He also had continued his interest in business and at one point considered going to Richmond to enter business with relatives. Instead he accepted an offer to teach in Lunenburg County about thirty miles from his home. His teaching career began at Victoria High School in September, 1934. His first contract was for eight months at a salary of \$90.00 per month. He taught classes in Latin, English, and general science.

### Early Teaching

Following the interview at Lunenburg County, Dr. Wilkerson met the principal of the high school, Davis Y. Paschall. Thus began a long and very close professional association that continued through his experience in the State Department of Education. Dr. Wilkerson succeeded Dr. Paschall as State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Dr. Paschall is now retired after serving as President of the College of William and Mary. The association had a marked effect upon the career of Dr. Wilkerson.

From his early experiences in public education, Dr. Wilkerson soon sensed the need for further education and enrolled in the Master of Arts degree program at the College of William and Mary. He spent four summers there majoring in philosophy and psychology and minoring in education. His thesis was in psychology and was a careful study of the relationships of special and general abilities, specifically the effect of motor learning on general intelligence. He received his Master of Arts degree in 1938.

At the College of William and Mary, Dr. Wilkerson was again under the direct influence of Dr. Maurice Allan, a former professor of philosophy and psychology at Hampden-Sydney. Dr. Wilkerson remembers Dr. Allan's "fine way of conducting classes" where he carefully analyzed problems in the field of philosophy in a quiet, yet outgoing manner. It was Dr. Allan who had administered the aptitude test at Hampden-Sydney which identified Dr. Wilkerson's interest in working closely with people. He considers Dr. Allan a great influence in his life and his career.



His graduate work plus his early teaching experiences strengthened Dr. Wilkerson's commitment to public education. Dr. Allan's philosophy courses were greatly responsible for this. Especially influential was the course work in the area of values with special attention to the "scaling" of values.

#### Administrative Experiences

In 1936, Dr. Wilkerson accepted a position as principal of Dillwyn High School in Buckingham County for a two-year period in a combined school with grades one through eleven. While serving as principal he taught French and Latin. The reasons given for the change to administration were the desire for self-improvement, the need to make more money, a desire to use his business and managerial skills, and the desire for new and more varied experience. He felt that men who at that time made a career of public education often turned to administration.

In September, 1937, Woodrow Wilkerson married Dorothy Garnett Price of Brookneal whom he met while she attended Farmville College (presently Longwood College). Mrs. Wilkerson never taught full-time but did substitute teaching in Buckingham and King William counties.

During the summer of 1938, Dr. Wilkerson accepted the principalship at King William High School in King William County for a two-year period. It was a larger school than Dillwyn, but he still taught two classes each day.

During this time the State Department of Education sponsored annual conferences for principals on a regional basis at Radford

College, the University of Virginia, and the College of William and Mary. Dr. Wilkerson usually attended the University of Virginia or the College of William and Mary meetings and had close associations with the State Department of Education and with other principals. During the summer of 1940 Dr. Wilkerson returned to the College of William and Mary to work in a State Department of Education workshop for secondary principals that would lead to the preparation of a Manual of Administration, a document widely used by secondary principals for many years. The aspect of the workshop that Dr. Wilkerson most remembers urged principals to engage in planning. This identification and consideration of school needs became a part of the secondary school accreditation program. This interest in planning remained with him throughout his professional career.

In 1940 Dr. Wilkerson accepted the principalship of Marion High School after being interviewed by Dr. Robert F. Williams, Division Superintendent of Smyth County. This was a full-time administrative assignment in a school with grades 8-12 with an enrollment of 375 students. The annual salary was \$2,300, and he stayed in this position for five years.

This experience for Dr. Wilkerson led to a long time professional association with Dr. Robert F. Williams. Dr. Williams left Smyth County in 1943 to become Supervisor of Elementary Education with the State Department of Education. He later went with the Virginia Education Association and was the Executive Secretary of the Association for a number of years, just recently retiring from this position.

Dr. Williams had a great influence on the professional life of Dr. Wilkerson.

Marion High School was not only a new facility but was also an innovative school. It was one of the first schools in the state to set up a full-time guidance position. While Dr. Wilkerson was principal, Miss Marigold Scott filled this position. Miss Scott later joined the State Department of Education and recently retired as an Assistant State Supervisor of Guidance and Testing.

Dr. Wilkerson takes pride in his efforts to stimulate community involvement in the school at Marion. He found the people deeply interested in the school program and had good local support for many programs, including the P.T.A. The new school represented a recent consolidation of several small rural schools, and Dr. Wilkerson was aware of the problems that came with consolidation. He attempted to bridge the gap of hard feelings by visiting in the homes of parents in the rural areas. He would at times ride the school buses to become more familiar with this aspect of education, especially when discipline problems were involved.

During the summer of 1941, Dr. Wilkerson continued his association with the State Department of Education by serving on a committee to draft the Manual of Administration. He considered this a great learning experience. Dr. Wilkerson served as secretary for the group in Charlottesville. Dr. Robert Williams and Dr. Fred Alexander were leaders in this study. It was an excellent opportunity for the exchange of ideas among stimulating personalities. It enabled him

to become more familiar with the total secondary school program of Virginia.

#### Early Career With State Department of Education

Dr. Wilkerson's association with the Manual of Administration had much to do with his move to the State Department of Education. He was contacted by Dr. Dabney Lancaster, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, about a newly formed secondary staff position in Richmond. His first assignment in 1945 was that of Assistant Supervisor of Secondary Education with responsibility in the general secondary area. He was to help establish a new twelve month principal's program in which the state was to pay a portion of the principal's extended contract in order to provide additional secondary school leadership. He was to set up guidelines for these new positions, to visit those principals employed during the summer, and to analyze their professional activities.

Several reorganizations of the State Department of Education took place during the period of 1945 to 1960 before Dr. Wilkerson became State Superintendent. During these years he served in various capacities. From 1947 to 1957 he served as Supervisor of Secondary Education; in 1957 he was named Director of Teacher Education.

In January, 1949, Dr. Wilkerson took a year's leave of absence from the Department to pursue further graduate work at the University of Maryland. This leave was extended, and he returned to Richmond in June, 1950, with his course work and residency completed and three chapters of his dissertation written.

The experience at Maryland fulfilled a long time personal desire for Dr. Wilkerson. It was a real financial commitment for the Wilkersons. He moved his family to Hyattsville for this time. Although he received no financial assistance from the State of Virginia, he did receive a fellowship from the General Education Board of New York for work in the field of educational administration and supervision. His dissertation topic was "The Employment of Principals on a Twelve Month Basis." It related very closely to his work in the Department. Among the influential instructors at Maryland were Dr. Harold Benjamin, Dr. Clarence Newell, Dr. Gladys Wiggins, and Dr. Van Zwoll. He completed the work and was awarded his doctorate in 1952.

Dr. Wilkerson had opportunities to leave the Department after his graduate work was completed. Although he was under no commitment to do so, he made his decision to return.

In 1959 Dr. Wilkerson became Director of Secondary Education. On August 16, 1960, Governor J. Lindsay Almond appointed Dr. Wilkerson as State Superintendent of Public Instruction. He was reappointed to this position by Governors Albertis S. Harrison, Jr.; Mills E. Godwin, Jr.; Linwood Holton; and again by Mills Godwin. His tenure exceeded that of any of his thirteen predecessors.

Governor J. Lindsay Almond's Interview Concerning the Appointment of Dr. Wilkerson

Governor Almond felt that Dr. Paschall, the former Superintendent of Public Instruction, had served effectively in the office of

State Superintendent. When Dr. Paschall was approached concerning the Presidency of the College of William and Mary, his alma mater, it was natural for him to accept the offer.

Governor Almond had observed Dr. Wilkerson's work; and when the time came to appoint a successor to Dr. Paschall, he first considered Dr. Wilkerson and called him for an interview. He said that he really did not consider anyone else for the position. He felt that Dr. Wilkerson's qualifications and experiences directed him to this decision.

Governor Almond felt that his relationships with Dr. Wilkerson were most cordial. He had much respect for his judgment. The former Governor pointed out that he gave no specific direction nor made specific requests of Dr. Wilkerson on his appointment. Dr. Wilkerson was pictured as a "good solid" administrator who did a most effective job as State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Governor Almond stated that he would make the same decision again.

#### General Accomplishments

Dr. Wilkerson achieved recognition in many organizations to which he belonged. These include an honorary life membership in the Virginia Parents and Teachers Association; Executive-Secretary of the Virginia Committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1952-1957; past president of the National Association of Supervisors and Directors of Secondary Education; State Coordinator of the National Association of Secondary School Principals; membership in the Council

of Chief State School Officers; and Commissioner to the Education Commission of the States.

Dr. Wilkerson is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, having received its distinguished Service Award in 1961; Phi Kappa Phi; Omicron Delta Kappa; and Sigma Chi (Who's Who in America, p. 2457). He has served as an ex officio member of the Boards of Visitors of the College of William and Mary, Medical College of Virginia, the University of Virginia, Virginia Military Institute, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Richmond Professional Institute, Old Dominion University, and the Virginia School for the Deaf and Blind (Virginia Lives, 1964:p. 1069). He holds membership in the Virginia Historical Society and the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts. His hobbies include gardening and reading (Who's Who in American Education, 23rd ed., 1967-1968:p. 924).

#### Influence of Wife and Family

Dr. and Mrs. Wilkerson are the parents of two daughters and one son. Dr. Wilkerson readily recognizes the influence that his wife and family have had upon his life and career. His wife always had great understanding and willingness to accept the decisions that seem best. This goes back to early job changes as teacher and principal. Sacrifices were made by the family for Dr. Wilkerson to do graduate work, especially at the doctoral level. He feels that his wife gave him understanding by listening and active support by her comments on matters which concerned him. While she left the basic decisions to

him, she was a part of each one. He feels that his appreciation and compliments to her for her support could never be too great.

### Philosophical Beliefs

Dr. Wilkerson is a man whose philosophy of life is neither new nor unique. He sees people as individuals with individual points of view. He feels that life is a sacred trust, crowded with both opportunities and problems, and feels that one must look to the future with optimism. Throughout life a sense of values comes through for him--values going back to the influence of his home, family, church, education, and early teaching experiences. Woodrow Wilkerson can indeed say, as did Alfred Lord Tennyson, "I am a part of all that I have met."

### Part II. The Position of State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Upon assuming the position of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Woodrow Wilkerson presented the following statement, published in a superintendent's memorandum, concerning his appointment:

It is with a deep sense of humility that I accept the opportunity afforded me to render service in the cause of public education. I am mindful of the confidence reposed in me by the Governor in this appointment, and the grave responsibilities of this high office.

It has been a high privilege and a source of inspiration to serve as a member of Dr. Paschall's staff. His contributions to public education are signal, and I realize that to follow him will be difficult.

Much has been achieved by the State Board of Education's policy on the high school curriculum, new school building regulations, accreditation standards, and the revised teacher certification requirements. It shall be my purpose to implement these programs



and, at the same time, carry forward those studies already begun in elementary education, statutes and regulations pertaining to the curriculum, and formulas for a more equitable distribution of State school funds. On these and other important matters, I shall dedicate my best efforts in working with the local school authorities toward a further strengthening of the public schools of Virginia. (Superintendent of Public Instruction Memo #3867, August 16, 1960)

#### Role of State Department of Education

Dr. Wilkerson viewed the role of the State Department of Education as the central leadership and administrative agency for the public school system and as the staff of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. This role had definite changes during his tenure as State Superintendent.

The most significant change during this time concerned the standards of quality. The program provided by the standards of quality was the result of the new state Constitution, adopted July 1, 1971. A quality education was mandated, and a definition of quality was spelled out by the State Board of Education and approved by the General Assembly. This mandate required new and strong leadership by the Department. The instructional and closely related divisions of the Department were divided into twenty-two working teams to assist the local divisions in getting this new program started. Dr. Wilkerson feels that no program in education received so intense an effort by the Department of Education in Virginia as the implementation of the standards of quality.

A second significant change came about because of new and expanded programs which were paid for in part or in total by the federal

government. This aid affected staffing and the leadership role of the Department. Federal guidelines demanded certain accountability features that affected the relationship between the Department and the local school divisions.

The entire area of accountability in education brought about a third change in the role of the Department. Measurable objectives were established for all concerned, and at certain specific times these objectives were measured. Dr. Wilkerson was quick to point out that all aspects of education are not measurable.

The quickening of the pace at which improvement was being sought no doubt brought about changes. A greater emphasis upon leadership to promote desirable changes was demanded at an accelerated rate.

The process of desegregation of the public school system demanded many changes in the Department. It should be noted that the period of "massive resistance" to school integration had ended prior to Dr. Wilkerson's assumption of the State Superintendency.

Other indications of changes in the Department were noted by Dr. Wilkerson in a speech in 1970. He asked for the following improvements, all of which were implemented to some degree:

1. A special assistant for planning.
2. Separation and expansion of services of elementary and special education.
3. School desegregation through a program of technical assistance.
4. Expansion of educational television.

5. Expansion of the school building service.
6. Expansion of fiscal services.

#### Role of State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Among the many faceted aspects of this position are advising the State Board of Education on issues and current needs; making recommendations for the development and revision of policies and regulations; implementing all policies and regulations approved by the State Board and General Assembly; interpreting and providing data on the needs of public education to the Governors and General Assembly; directing the activities of the State Department of Education; keeping direct and open lines of communication with local division superintendents; and interpreting to the general citizenry the public education program.

In summary, Dr. Wilkerson said that this role should provide enthusiastic leadership for a program geared to the educational needs of Virginia. The State Superintendent has the responsibility to think through problems and programs, to make decisions, to seek to get these ideas accepted by the State Board and/or General Assembly, and to see that they are implemented by the State Department and local school divisions. An example of this procedure was standards of quality, details of which appear in Chapter 5 of this study.

The role of the State Superintendent, according to Dr. Wilkerson, changed in many respects. The increased size of the Department made a difference. He regretted that in recent years he was no longer able to work directly with the various directors and other personnel. A

reorganization was established to include a Deputy Superintendent and several Assistant State Superintendents. He felt that the role of the Deputy Superintendent was not fully utilized to the extent of his original conception.

The expectations of the citizens generally increased throughout his tenure. There were more requests and demands on the State Superintendent and the State Department of Education. Programs such as economic education, environmental education, and drug abuse education were examples. New programs were established in which accountability for results had and will have significant impact.

Certain new functions have grown rapidly, including an expanded planning program, growth in the area of educational research, and an increased need for data processing. Changes in the teacher preparation programs have led to new certification standards. Federally sponsored programs have grown rapidly. These include the expanded vocational education acts, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Manpower Development Training Act, the Emergency School Assistance Act, and various civil defense programs.

A program was established and a staff provided to assist with school desegregation. Mr. Harry Elmore, former Deputy Superintendent, spent much time in assisting local divisions in compliance with the Civil Rights Acts. The new program of technical assistance aided in helping to solve school desegregation problems.

Changes were made in the accreditation procedures and standards during Dr. Wilkerson's tenure. The initiation of a program of elementary accreditation and the strengthening of secondary standards

involved much time and effort. These were incorporated within the program of standards of quality.

The State Superintendent had a responsibility to provide leadership for the newly formed Planning Council composed of the Assistant State Superintendents, the Deputy Superintendent, and the Planning Director. It was not an administrative detail council. It was supposed to reflect the best in strategic planning capabilities.

There were increased demands for the Superintendent to assert greater leadership influence upon the State Board of Education, the members of the General Assembly, the Governor and his staff which now includes a Secretary of Education, and the local division superintendents. The new demands of the position and the expanded role of the office have made the work less personalized. Dr. Wilkerson regrets that he was unable to work on an individual basis with more of the staff members.

The Superintendent's responsibilities for higher education have greatly changed. In 1960, the State Superintendent was required to be involved with the governing board of every state institution of higher learning. Although this was changed, he continued on the State Council of Higher Education and held membership in the following state groups by virtue of his position. They included:

Committee on Employment of the Handicapped (advisory capacity)

Commission on Criminal Justice

Committee on Highway Safety

Developmental Disabilities Planning and Advisory Council

Governor's Task Force on Coordination of Youth Activities

Keep Virginia Beautiful

Pendleton Project Management Board

Service Integration for Deinstitutionalization

Virginia Community Coordinated Child Care Advisory  
Council (4 C's)

Virginia Drug Abuse Advisory Council

Role of State Department of Education and State Superintendent of  
Public Instruction as Viewed by Dr. Wilkerson's Associates

The roles of the State Department of Education and State Superintendent of Public Instruction should be considered as the same according to those associates of Dr. Wilkerson who were interviewed. The theme of the replies centered around the regulatory implementation of Constitutional statutes, the laws of the General Assembly, and the policies and regulations of the State Board of Education. Both the position of the superintendency and the department should provide educational leadership through their total operation, especially in their relationships with the local school divisions. One respondent expressed the opinion that this leadership should be in formulating and initiating policy that will advance the progress of public education in Virginia. Another saw the need for both regulatory and operational leadership, with greater emphasis on operational.

This role has not changed greatly in the past fifteen years with the same basic responsibilities present. One respondent suggested these agencies should hold "firm" to these charges. Another said

the methods of implementation had changed; different personalities had become involved using different philosophies and methods. Still another added that the Department and the State Superintendent had recently been required to respond more to the demand of the members of the State Board of Education who have become actively involved in every aspect of the school program.

All respondents recognized that the total operation of the state school system has become increasingly enlarged and complex in the past fifteen years; this by nature has caused increasing demands on the position and the department.

#### Relationship with State Board of Education

Dr. Wilkerson described his role with the State Board of Education as having many aspects. He and the President of the Board prepared an agenda for each meeting. He had frequent communication with the President by telephone, letter, and conference. Such contacts increased greatly in recent years. He made numerous recommendations concerning programs, regulations, policies, and needs of the school systems to the various committees of the Board. He communicated the actions of the Board to the appropriate people involved. He worked through the staff of the State Department of Education to implement programs, policies, and regulations of the Board.

The Superintendent and his staff, upon the recommendation of the Board, appointed and worked with many advisory committees which provided information and suggestions to the Board (i.e., Title III, ESEA, many federal programs, special education, economic education,

and textbook selection committees). The State Superintendent's appointments to positions at or above the level of supervisor were subject to ratification by the State Board. Any organizational changes had to have State Board approval.

Dr. Wilkerson feels that he always had excellent State Board members. Among those of particular significance serving as president were Leonard G. Muse, Colgate Darden, Mrs. John Galleher, Mosby G. Perrow, Waldo Miles, Anne Dobie Peebles, Lewis F. Powell, and Preston Caruthers.

Present members are now limited to two four-year terms. Dr. Wilkerson feels that there are both advantages and disadvantages of this change. More people are allowed to be involved, but some stability is lost. Some prefer to serve a shorter term while others like a longer time as they are able to contribute more as they grow in understanding.

The activities of the Board increased during Dr. Wilkerson's tenure. The Board size was increased from seven to nine members by the new Constitution. He feels that this increase was needed to give broader representation, thereby better representing the citizens. In the last years of his tenure, Dr. Wilkerson had more day by day contact with the Board members. The agenda were longer and more time consuming than in previous years. New programs, laws and mandates, many dictated by the citizenry, came into being. The public became more interested in the Board meetings themselves. Increasing numbers of people attended and participated in the meetings.



Dr. Wilkerson's Relationships with State Board of Education as Viewed  
by His Associates

Dr. Wilkerson's relationships with the members of the State Board were varied but basically were quite amiable with mutual cordiality and respect. These relationships were perhaps more cordial during the first eight years of Dr. Wilkerson's administration. Recent times brought additional pressures on the State Board members and consequently on Dr. Wilkerson. The recent more frequent changes of State Board members caused some changes in the relationships. Some would say that the changes were not for the good, but others would say that Dr. Wilkerson was given an opportunity to show his leadership powers, which appeared as strong as ever.

The more recent boards, however, were more actively involved with all aspects of education, and Dr. Wilkerson went to them more often for their reaction prior to the establishment of certain policies. Dr. Wilkerson's general reaction with State Board members in the latter years of his tenure may be summarized in one word, "cautious." Some interpreted this mode of operation as a weakness especially when he could not make up his mind on particular issues as quickly as some desired. To others this was a virtue because his more deliberate steps in making decisions aided him in making sound decisions that avoided controversy. This manner of operation did assist him in avoiding confrontation and having to retreat from established practices.

Relationships with Governors

Dr. Wilkerson's relationships with the Governors of Virginia were varied. There were few regularly scheduled meetings as such with

the Governors or other state agency heads. The contacts were on a need basis for both the Governor and State Superintendent. Appointments were usually secured through members of the Governor's staff (Peyton Winfrey for Governor Almond, Carter Lowance for Governor Godwin). In recent years more of the contacts have gone directly to the new cabinet position of Secretary of Education. All state agencies, of course, have to work within the policies of the Governor's office.

The budget making procedure brought about direct contact of the State Superintendent and the Governor's office. The State Superintendent and his staff proposed a budget for the approval of the State Board of Education. State Board members often gave direction for priorities to Dr. Wilkerson for his consideration. The divisions of the State Department of Education came forth with suggested needs and supportive documents. The division needs went through the Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Administration for his reaction and adjustment. This was presented to the Board in a two-day session in which every item was discussed. The Board could make changes but did not often do so.

The State Board budget then went to the Governor for his consideration. The Governor sought the advice of an advisory budget board made up of members of the General Assembly and key business leaders from throughout the State. Since standards of quality came into being, the new proposed standards went along with the State Board budget to the Governor. Appropriations were closely tied to the standards. The Governor's decisions concerning the budget were

made, and thus resulted the Governor's Budget which went to the General Assembly for its reaction. The State Board along with Dr. Wilkerson and members of the State Department were often called upon to assist the General Assembly members as they studied budget requests.

Another area of contact with the Governor's office was the vast amount of correspondence directed to the Governor's office concerning a wide range of educational matters. Dr. Wilkerson and Department members responded to many of the letters. In other instances Dr. Wilkerson prepared replies for the Governor to consider.

The new cabinet position of Secretary of Education brought about changes in the procedure of contact between the State Superintendent and the Governor. The agency heads worked directly with the Secretary. He gathered all the necessary information and then took matters to the Governor. This new role was more clearly spelled out under the present Governor. A General Assembly committee has assisted with clarifying roles of cabinet posts. When in the 1974-1975 year of operation state agencies were asked to reduce expenses five percent and later an additional three percent, the State Department sent its reduction plan to the Secretary of Education who, in turn, sent it to the Governor's office.

The budget procedure was changed somewhat by Governor Mills E. Godwin. Originally the Secretary of Education was not greatly involved in the budget procedure. For the 1976-78 biennium the State Superintendent was asked to present to the Secretary of Education a tentative estimate of costs for major programs. He was to analyze these

requests and react informally to them prior to the final preparation of the budget.

Despite the change in procedure the State Superintendent and Governor still had many opportunities for direct contact. Telephone calls were often initiated by both positions. The Governor's office was notified of appropriate changes in procedures or programs. According to Dr. Wilkerson, his relationship with each Governor was both "viable and flexible."

#### Dr. Wilkerson's Relationships with the Governors as Viewed by his Associates

Dr. Wilkerson's relationships with the various Governors were basically sound. The key to this conclusion is that he was reappointed on four different occasions. This alone was a significant accomplishment.

Some observers expressed more awareness of this over-all relation than others. Dr. Wilkerson's contact, it was noted, with Governor Linwood Holton was sometimes more strained and less cordial than with other governors. While they did not see eye-to-eye on every point, they were in basic agreement on most issues. Basically the contact with the Governors was excellent with frequent opportunities for direct and indirect consultation. Much of the work was carried on through the executive assistants and more recently with the Secretary of Education.

In the earlier days of the Wilkerson administration, especially on crisis issues such as school desegregation, there was almost certain daily direct contact between the Governor and Dr. Wilkerson. Often the executive assistant handled routine matters and gave assistance as to

the appropriate timing for contact with the Governor. The new cabinet organization has and probably will cut down on the frequency of contact directly with the Governor. There are those that expressed concern over the continuation of the position of Secretary of Education. The fact that Governor Godwin has, at this time, chosen to select only an acting Secretary of Education would confirm this concern.

#### Relationship with General Assembly

The relationship of the State Superintendent with members of Virginia's General Assembly was also varied and broad based. Members made many inquiries and requests by telephone and correspondence during the sessions and throughout the year on many topics. These inquiries were for the members' own information as well as requests from their constituents. Dr. Wilkerson considered these requests top priority and personally attempted to answer each one.

During the sessions of the General Assembly, the State Superintendent and the staff of the State Department worked closely with the members, especially the House Education Committee, the House Appropriations Committee, the Senate Committee on Education and Health, and the Senate Finance Committee. Usually the State Superintendent appointed a staff member to study the calendar of the committees and to keep him informed on the progress of legislation. Staff members were secured to speak for or against legislation. Dr. Wilkerson often did this himself, but he did not hesitate to use staff when appropriate. This contact gained more significance with each session of the legislature.

Commissions appointed by the General Assembly were often involved with various aspects of public education. These might have been committees of the Virginia Advisory Legislation Council or separate committees. The State Superintendent and his staff members often met with these groups, provided requested information, and expressed specific views.

The General Assembly often requested that the State Board of Education or the State Department of Education make specific studies. These sometimes involved General Assembly members. A recent study concerning compulsory attendance was made by such a committee, and the chairman of the House Education Committee served as an advisor. These requests were given detailed consideration by members of the State Department staff as well as appropriate lay groups. Recommendations and reports were prepared; and when appropriate, these were approved by the members of the State Board.

A new concept of the State Superintendent's relationship with the General Assembly came into being after the General Assembly session of 1974. The House Appropriations Committee employed a staff to make studies for the committee. They recently studied several aspects of public education as it relates to the new program of standards of quality. The State Superintendent was asked to provide data for this group and to react in writing to the report sent to the Committee.

Another agency was instituted in July, 1974, under the sponsorship of the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission with a staff to evaluate and audit programs of significance to the state. This

group is in the process of providing program audits as well as fiscal audits of educational programs for the House Appropriation Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. This agency, along with the previously mentioned organization, are examples of accountability agencies that the General Assembly is establishing to provide auditing functions.

Dr. Wilkerson's Relationships with Members of the General Assembly as Viewed by his Associates

Basically Dr. Wilkerson had good relationships with most members of the General Assembly. There were many changes in the membership of the General Assembly. Some members came with ideas and expressions that at times would seem critical of the present mode of operating the public schools. These reactions were not always tied to a particular political belief. Often this criticism came from a desire to secure particular legislation or personal recognition.

Through the years the leadership of both houses had profound respect for Dr. Wilkerson. He and members of his staff were called upon frequently, both formally and informally, to react to proposed legislation. When Dr. Wilkerson did make an appearance before the membership of the General Assembly, it was evident, from those who were interviewed, that the members did take due note of his presence. Sometimes it was most difficult for him to defend certain proposed legislation before the appropriate committees. Also, at times Dr. Wilkerson's direct influence was stronger than at others. There were occasions when the legislature wanted quick responses to questions,

especially during the annual sessions. The failure to obtain such response caused frustration for some legislators. Dr. Wilkerson's "cautiousness" worked both to his advantage and disadvantage. Some would contend that he moved too slowly while others would say that this action prevented crisis and conflict.

#### Relationship with Local Division Superintendents

Another aspect of the State Superintendent's responsibility is his relationship with the local school division superintendents. These officials have the direct responsibility for implementing an effective educational program for the varied interests and needs of the people in their areas of the Commonwealth. The superintendents have a variety of experiences, training, assistance, and desires; many have no background in Virginia law. In addition there have been frequent turnovers in local superintendencies recently. The State Superintendent must deal with these problems as he attempts to provide leadership to these important people.

An advisory committee made up of superintendents from throughout the state meets at least quarterly with the State Superintendent. The members are the elected chairmen of the regional study groups of superintendents. Often they meet prior to a session of the State Board. New programs are proposed and reactions are sought on numerous key issues. The regional study groups, which usually meet every month, send reactions and requests to the State Superintendent through the advisory committee. While the regional study groups are not highly structured, they provide a source of communication.



Dr. Wilkerson considered the local division superintendent the key person, the key leader, the key administrator for the local school division as it attempts to carry out the policies, regulations, and laws of education in Virginia. His success in the educational program depended on a close relationship with these individuals. All communication from the State Department of Education goes directly to the division superintendent or his designee. All reports come under the signature of the division superintendent. The reporting system is broad and extensive. There is day by day contact between the State Superintendent, members of the State Department and the local division superintendent and his staff members. This contact is more frequent and varied with each year. The State Board often makes requests directly to division superintendents through the State Superintendent.

The State Department sponsors an annual conference for division superintendents, one example of how the need for communication between the Department and division superintendents is met. The employees of the State Department of Education are continually called upon to interpret programs and services of the Department. A position for an Assistant Superintendent for Administrative Field Services was established as a liaison office between the State Superintendent and local school division superintendents. One of his most frequent contacts is with the professional organization for division superintendents, the Virginia Association of School Administrators.

Relationships with Local Division Superintendents as Viewed by his Associates

One of Dr. Wilkerson's strong points of leadership was in his relationship with the local division superintendents. While there were some exceptions, this relationship was generally considered to be excellent. This strong relationship was one of the major factors that attributed to his long tenure.

Dr. Wilkerson worked very hard to keep this favorable relationship. He was always available to the superintendents, and he continually impressed upon his staff the need to work closely with this group. The superintendents generally felt free to be candid on policies and practices. Their philosophies and backgrounds were varied. Some wanted to do more experimentation than Dr. Wilkerson actually supported. However, he was generally well regarded by the superintendents and has had their real support in most cases.

One problem that he faced was that of relating to all superintendents. Those from the larger, more affluent divisions often wanted to be independent with little regard for the rest of the state or the State Board of Education. Dr. Wilkerson constantly had to be concerned with the problems of the total state and be of assistance to the small divisions as well as the large ones. The less affluent divisions often had the desire to improve education but did not have the financial and personnel resources.

Close Associates Identified by Dr. Wilkerson

Among the people who he felt could best describe his career in education, Dr. Wilkerson chose Davis Y. Paschall, J. G. Blount, Harry Elmore, and Walter E. Campbell, Division Superintendent of Henrico County Schools. Among those who had the greatest influence on his career, in addition to those listed above, were J. Carter Lowance, who served as the Executive Assistant to several governors and is presently Acting Secretary of Education, and the various members of the Superintendent's Advisory Council. Others were consultants who helped formulate the standards of quality, namely Dr. George Holmes and Dr. William Seawell from the University of Virginia and Dr. William J. Ellena, formerly with the American Association of School Administrators.

Needs of Education in Virginia at Present Time

Dr. Wilkerson listed several areas that to him are obvious present needs. They include:

1. The expansion of special education to handicapped children.  
(Out of the 125,000 estimated to need such attention only 65,000 are presently being served.)
2. The expansion of vocational opportunities to reach all youngsters not continuing schooling.
3. Improvement in the competence of students in the basic skill areas of reading and mathematics (he noted in the year 1974-1975 some progress was made).

4. The need for more fully certified teachers in certain specific areas (i.e., special education, physics, and humanities as brought out by the teacher supply studies).
5. The development of broader understanding of the concepts of the standards of quality program by both professional and lay people.
6. Expansion of the program for the gifted and talented.
7. Identification and resolution of human relations and educational problems as a result of school desegregation.
8. Continuous attention to the dropout problem.
9. Continued emphasis on the career education concept which he felt can bring about great results, possibly without the expenditure of large sums of money.

#### Needs of Education in Virginia - Long Range

While Dr. Wilkerson stated that most of the previously mentioned needs can be long range, he would add other long range needs. There is a basic need to improve public confidence in the performance of the public school system. This is tied very closely to the concept of improving the system of accountability in an attempt to report progress to the public. Another need is that of raising the level of public support both financially and morally for education. Disparities are bound to exist. Maximum effort of each community should be encouraged; yet there should be an attempt to improve the state as a whole.

Greatest Needs of Education in Virginia as Identified by Dr. Wilkerson's Associates

The identification of needs of education in Virginia resulted in a combination of long-range and short-range needs. These needs are as follows:

1. A continual desire to move toward quality in education fundamentals as opposed to using the classroom as a "social laboratory" with some newer programs not always properly evaluated.
2. Continual clarification of the position of the standards of quality program to implement it as a tool for change in education. This understanding must be shared by the General Assembly, school board members, local governmental leaders, and the public to implement fully its effectiveness. A moral and a financial commitment should be involved.
3. A redefinition of education as the process by which an individual is made more sensitive to the needs of his society and his environment.
4. More emphasis on vocational and occupational education.
5. A reemphasis on basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics.
6. The concentration on economy and efficiency in the daily operation of the school system.
7. Emphasis on responsible citizenship, the theme of law and order for our society.

8. Emphasis on the teaching of those human attributes that made our nation strong with emphasis on attitudes and character.
9. Reevaluation of the effectiveness of court ordered busing to achieve racial quotas.
10. Greater specific accountability for teacher performance.
11. Closer relationship and better communication between the State Board of Education and the local school boards and local division superintendents. While progress has been made in this area, there is still room for improvement.
12. The return of teaching to a truly professional position in which the teacher is strongly committed to teach children and teacher militancy is not needed.
13. Continued improvement of financial support for education in light of present day economic conditions.
14. Equalization of educational opportunities to all areas of the state.
15. Reduction of the number of school divisions.

#### Areas of Greatest Personal/Professional Accomplishment

Choosing his greatest personal and professional accomplishments presented a problem to Dr. Wilkerson, as he failed to take full credit for those things with which he was most pleased. The first and most outstanding accomplishment was the inauguration and implementation of the standards of quality, a program fashioned with the help of numerous

persons. This was perhaps the best illustration of a concerted effort by Dr. Wilkerson, the State Department of Education, and the State Board to make a marked improvement in education.

The second accomplishment concerned the improvement in the various curriculum areas, including the thrust toward economic education, kindergarten programs, and guides in U.S. history, government, and civic areas.

The third area was in strengthening the effectiveness of the State Department of Education and its leadership capabilities. This effectiveness was implemented by the various reorganization plans and the attracting of outstanding personnel to the Department. The Superintendent of Public Instruction Annual Report for 1960-1961 listed a professional staff of 115 persons while the report for 1972-1973 listed 237 persons on the professional staff. The development and use of the Planning Council is the result of expansion in this area.

The fourth area of accomplishment was in the increased financial support from the government, especially the General Assembly, for public education. State appropriations for public elementary and secondary education listed in the various issues of the Department of Education publication Facing Up were:

1972-1973	\$464,683,040
1971-1972	435,014,370
1970-1971	389,151,405
1969-1970	355,602,235
1968-1969	321,418,900
1967-1968	273,671,345
1966-1967	204,190,765
1965-1966	Not Available
1964-1965	Not Available
1963-1964	142,352,130

1962-1963	133,043,665
1961-1962	121,045,664
1960-1961	105,437,674
1959-1960	92,338,623
1958-1959	76,104,823
1957-1958	67,076,205

(Facing Up, 1965-66 through 1972-73)

Finally, the strong and close relationships between the office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the local division superintendent were extremely important to Dr. Wilkerson. This group of local leaders was credited with giving invaluable support.

In summing up he pointed out that any accomplishment came with the concerted effort to keep people moving toward specific goals were not always clear to all people, yet waiting for the appropriate time to move with emphasis. Dr. Wilkerson felt that the educational process is by nature a slow process.

The areas of greatest disappointment to Dr. Wilkerson were that some programs, especially special education and vocational education, did not move forward as fast as he would have liked. While the General Assembly was generous with the funds available, he wished there had been additional funds to push programs further. The disappointment was expressed of not being able to house the total staff of the State Department of Education under one physical roof in Richmond which he felt was necessary to coordinate better the services of the Department.

Dr. Wilkerson's Areas of Greatest Effectiveness as Viewed by his Associates

It was evident that Dr. Wilkerson's greatest effectiveness was in his day by day favorable relationships with the local division



superintendents. Such a relationship combined with effective communication enabled him to provide leadership to the group. This relationship was built on mutual interest and respect.

His effective relationship and availability with the various people within the educational organization were obvious. Through day by day contact with members of his staff, the members of the State Board, members of the General Assembly, representatives of the State School Board's association, Chambers of Commerce, and business leaders, he easily earned their support and loyalty.

Dr. Wilkerson's personality had much to do with his effectiveness as a leader and his relationships with people. These traits included his friendly, easy-to-meet approach; his ability to avoid losing his temper; his role as the perfect gentleman; his general observation of people; and his ability to remain unruffled in time of crisis. His personality has been described as "humility without cowardice, and faith without arrogance."

His ability to determine and to establish objectives for public education, to work toward the acceptance of these objectives, and to implement and attempt to accomplish these objectives even though long periods of time are involved were highly commendable.

His strong commitment to bring about change and improvement in certain of the basic curriculum areas was also noted. He was considered by some of those interviewed to be perhaps a stronger curriculum leader than an administrator. Dr. Wilkerson himself took great pride in his accomplishments in the curriculum area.

His administrative ability in successfully handling the daily operation of the State Department of Education was noted. He was considered supportive of and supported by his subordinates.

Through the years he had good relationships with the college leadership in the state. This was somewhat changed as he had less direct responsibility for higher education during the last part of his term.

He was nationally recognized by various groups as he held positions of leadership in appropriate regional and national professional organizations. Through the years he held several positions with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and with the national organization, Council of State School Officials.

#### Dr. Wilkerson's Areas of Least Effectiveness as Viewed by his Associates

There were some areas in which Dr. Wilkerson lacked effectiveness. His cautiousness in making decisions drew criticism from people who at certain times wanted quick solutions and answers. Dr. Wilkerson's desire and basic philosophy to move in a deliberate fashion, to gather all the information, and to seek constant advice before making decisions caused him problems at times. Some felt he acted indecisively in some matters that required immediate response.

At times Dr. Wilkerson had difficulty with relationships with members of the news media. During the early part of his administration he "shied" away from the daily contact with reporters. This tended to turn them off to the extent that in the latter years of his tenure

there was concern that adequate coverage was not given to certain important matters.

Another criticism was that he lacked the ability to delegate appropriate responsibility to his subordinates. With the growth and the complexity of the department and its operation he was not always able to handle effectively the delegation of responsibility. While too much delegation might have hurt his position, a better balance was needed. Overall, it is significant that few areas of ineffectiveness have been stated.

An Appraisal by Virginia Association of School Administrators, 1974

The Virginia Association of School Administrators at its annual meeting in November, 1974, approved a series of resolutions of commendation to Dr. Wilkerson. These were printed and made available to the membership of the organization. It points out a number of advances made in education during his tenure of office. They include:

1. Establishment and adoption of the first accreditation standards for elementary schools;
2. Inauguration of a statewide kindergarten program;
3. Greatly increased opportunities for vocational and continuing education;
4. Progressive increases in teachers' compensation and retirement benefits;
5. Increased utilization of school facilities through extension of the school day and year;

6. Strengthened standards for high school accreditation and for teacher certification;
7. Increased emphasis on instruction in citizenship and economics;
8. A revised formula for distributing basic state aid to localities;
9. Expanded programs for exceptional students, including handicapped, retarded, gifted, and talented.
10. The formulation, adoption, and implementation of the first statewide standards of quality;
11. The inauguration of a program of educational accountability;
12. Rearrangement of State Department of Education to increase efficiency and leadership capabilities;
13. The development of a new planning and management program for the State Department of Education (Resolution of the Virginia Association of School Administrators, 1974).

An Appraisal by the Press, 1973

The Richmond-Times Dispatch on August 30, 1973, declared that, "Dr. Wilkerson's tenure has been one of the busiest periods ever in the history of public education. In addition to the historic ending of state enforced racial segregation, the era of change has seen . . ." the following:

The addition of kindergarten education,  
 The first accreditation requirements for elementary schools,  
 The strengthening of secondary accreditation standards,

The first standards of quality which established measurable performance objectives for all public schools,

The revised formula of school aid to the localities,

The new emphasis on instruction in basic economics and citizenship,

The beginning of a limited number of year-round school operation.

#### Dr. Wilkerson's Retirement

In the fall 1974 issue of Public Education in Virginia the announcement of Dr. Wilkerson's retirement was noted in his letter of October 23 to Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr.

After having served in the field of public education some 39 years, including 14 years in my present capacity, I have come to this conclusion (to retire) only after much thought and reflection. I wish to spend more time with my family and to have the opportunity to engage in further study and perhaps some type of consultative work.

It has been a great privilege as superintendent of public instruction, to work with the Governors of Virginia, members of the General Assembly and of the State Board of Education, superintendents, teachers and principals, and local school boards in strengthening public education . . .

Through the concerted and sustained efforts of many people, much has been accomplished for the boys and girls of Virginia. Obviously, much is yet to be done as all concerned seek to insure an educational program of high quality throughout the Commonwealth.

It is my considered judgment that the most effective means provided by the people of Virginia for making substantial advances in education at an accelerated rate is contained in the concept of standards of quality embodied in our Constitution. (Public Education in Virginia, Fall, 1974:p. 1)

Governor Godwin's acceptance of Dr. Wilkerson's letter emphasized his contributions to public education in Virginia and expressed

very sincere regret, which I know is shared by many throughout the state, that you have reached this decision. Your administration has been marked by highly significant improvements in all phases of public instruction and has witnessed unprecedented increase in support from the General Assembly and governing bodies across the state. Your dedication to education and the leadership provided by you and the members of your Board (of Education) have brought implementation of constitutional and statutory changes to the benefit of all those included in the public elementary and secondary schools. (Public Education in Virginia, Fall, 1974:p. 1)

Governor Godwin pointed to curricular improvements, kindergartens, increased teachers' salaries, special education, and more opportunities for teacher training as some of the most important accomplishments of Dr. Wilkerson's tenure. He described these accomplishments as

. . . some of the landmarks leading to adoption of the educational standards of quality which now constitute our guidelines for the future.

The public school system for many years to come will carry the imprint of your service and your personal devotion to seeing that every child has the educational opportunities commensurate with his abilities. On a personal basis, I appreciate the cordial relationship I have enjoyed with you throughout my terms as Governor and the unfailing cooperation you have given me and the members of my administration . . . . (Public Education in Virginia, Fall, 1974:p. 1)

### Part III. Legal Basis of the Position of State Superintendent of Public Instruction

The legal aspects of the position of State Superintendent of Public Instruction are very simple to designate and locate. There were two editions of the Virginia Constitution under which Dr.

Wilkerson served. Appropriate sections of these Constitutions are located in Appendix D. Regulations of the Board of Education of the Commonwealth of Virginia, July, 1973, gives attention to the duties of the State Superintendent and are noted in this chapter. The exact regulations are a part of Appendix D.

#### Constitution of Virginia, 1968

The 1968 Constitution of Virginia, Article IX, Section 131, provides for a Superintendent of Public Instruction who must be an experienced educator, appointed by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly, for a term coincident with that of the Governor. Any vacancy in this office is to be filled for the unexpired term by the Governor. His duties are to be prescribed by the State Board of Education of which he is an exofficio member, and his compensation is fixed by law.

In the January, 1969, copy of Virginia School Laws the following attention was given to the office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction:

Article IX, Section 129, of the Constitution of Virginia provides for the General Assembly to establish and maintain an efficient system of public free schools throughout the State.

Section 22-22 provides for his appointment.

Section 22-23 provides for his salary to be fixed by the General Assembly with provision for travel expenses.

Section 22-24 provides for an oath of office.

Section 22-25 provides for his duties in general. It provides for him to formulate rules and regulations necessary for the proper and uniform enforcement of the provisions of the school law.

Section 22-26 provides for the State Board of Education to prescribe additional duties for the State Superintendent and for the State Board to approve the appointment by the Superintendent of employees of the State Department of Education and fix their salaries.

Section 22-27 designates the Superintendent as the agent for the National School Lunch Act.

Section 22-28 designates the Superintendent as secretary of the State Board.

Section 22-29 relieves the Superintendent of serving as exofficio member on the governing boards of certain educational institutions. This came about in 1966.

Section 22-156 provides for the Superintendent to make periodical surveys of all nonfireproof public school buildings.

Section 22-287-293 provides for the superintendent in certain cases to obtain insurance of school vehicles.

Section 23-159 allows the Superintendent to appoint a consultant to the Board of Visitors of the Virginia School for the Deaf and Blind (Virginia School Laws, 1969).

The Virginia School Laws of 1972 designates the Superintendent to appoint an advisory committee on fire service training and employ additional staff members to strengthen the fire training program and to ensure that no public school building be built without approval by the Superintendent (Virginia School Laws, 1972).



Constitution of Virginia, 1971

Article VIII of the Constitution of Virginia which became effective on July 1, 1971, challenged the General Assembly for the first time to seek to insure that an educational program of high quality is established and continually maintained. The State Board of Education is charged to determine and prescribe standards of quality for the school division. These are subject to revision only by the General Assembly.

The General Assembly is further charged to determine the manner in which funds are to be provided for the cost of maintaining an educational program meeting the prescribed standards of quality, and is to provide for the apportionment of the cost of such program between the Commonwealth and the local systems of government comprising such school divisions. Each system of local government is to provide for its portion of such cost by local taxes or from other available funds (Virginia School Laws, 1972:pp. 15-17).

Article VIII also provides the following sections concerning the State Superintendent of Public Instruction:

A Superintendent of Public Instruction, appointed by the Governor, and the State Board of Education administer the public schools along with division superintendents and school boards. The Superintendent's salary is fixed by the General Assembly. He must take an oath required of all officers of the state. His duties are to assist in proper enforcement of school laws. He is designated as the "state educational agency" for dispersing funds under the National School Lunch Act.

The Superintendent serves as secretary of the State Board. He also serves on the State Council of Higher Education but no longer is required to serve on governing bodies of state educational institutions.

All plans for school buildings must be approved by the State Superintendent. He has the power to close schools which are fire hazards, or to withhold funds from divisions which do not take proper steps to adhere to fire safety codes. He can also withhold funds if a division fails to provide insurance for public school vehicles.

An advisory committee on Fire Service Training is appointed by the Superintendent. This committee advises the Department of Education on fire service training to meet state needs. The Superintendent has the authority to employ additional staff to strengthen the fire training program.

#### State Board of Education Regulation, 1973

The State Board of Education regulation of 1973 provides for the Superintendent of Public Instruction to be the chief executive officer of the public school system with the following duties:

1. Serving as executive officer of the vocational division of the State Department of Education.
2. Preparing forms necessary for making reports to the State Department of Education, and giving information and instruction conducive to the proper organization and conduct of the schools.

3. Requiring of division superintendents detailed annual reports and special reports as he sees fit.
4. Promoting an appreciation of education among the people.
5. Preserving all records relating to educational work in Virginia.
6. Preparing a plan for apportioning the money appropriated by the state for public schools.
7. Providing an official seal for documentation of official documents.
8. Submitting annual reports to the State Board of Education, and offering suggestions to the Board pertaining to the Department of Education (Regulations of the Board of Education, 1973:p. 121).

## Chapter 4

### COMPARISON OF PROGRESS IN VIRGINIA TOWARD ACHIEVING EACH OF TEN GOALS WITH PROGRESS MADE IN THE NATION AS A WHOLE

#### Introduction

As a result of the detailed identification procedure found in Chapter 2, an attempt was made to compare the progress in Virginia toward achieving each of the ten goals with progress made in the nation as a whole. The library services of Radford College and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University were utilized in this study. The division of educational research and statistics of the Virginia Department of Education, especially Charles E. Clear and Howell L. Gruver provided assistance. The Research Division of the National Education Association was contacted concerning the goals of kindergarten education, vocational education, special education, and drop-outs. The ten goals considered were: (1) standards of quality program, (2) percentage of teachers holding regular certificates and number and percentage of teachers holding degrees (these were two goals but were studied as one), (3) kindergarten education, (4) expansion of vocational education funding, (5) special education programs, (6) priority financial treatment to less able divisions, (7) improved pupil-teacher ratio, (8) drop-out reduction, (9) increased holding power of schools, and (10) reduction in number of one-room schools. The following general measures of quality were used for this study: teacher endorsement; kindergarten

education; number of teachers with master's degrees; vocational education programs; provision for special education; relationship of effort and capacity; and holding power of schools. These measures were identified and the procedure described for their use in Chapter 2.

The association of the selected goals with the general measures of educational quality appears in Table 2. This table also indicates goals and measures for which data were found.

The researcher was unable to locate comparative data on the national and Virginia levels for all of the goals. A concerted effort was extended to secure these data. Appropriate information was available in most cases for Virginia. Some comparative data for the nation and Virginia were found. In some cases no national data were found. While this limited somewhat the effectiveness of this aspect of the study, the data that were available provided sufficient evidence to support some tentative propositions about the progress of education in Virginia under Dr. Wilkerson.

For each of the ten goals the appropriate data were given. The researcher presented his conclusions for each of the goals. Each conclusion was supported with data. Some description and elaboration were made. General conclusions closed the chapter.

#### Goal 1: Standards of Quality Program

In a project of the State Educational Accountability Repository (SEAR) based in Madison, Wisconsin, a report entitled The Legislation by the States: Accountability and Assessment in Education noted that

Table 2

## The Availability of Data in Pairing of Educational Goals and General Measures of Educational Quality

Goal	General Measure	Available Data	
		Virginia	Nation
Standards of Quality program		X	X
Percentage of teachers holding regular certificate	Teacher endorsement	X	
Kindergarten education	Kindergarten education	X	
Number and percentage of teachers holding degrees	Number of teachers with Master's degrees	X	
Expansion of vocational education funding	Vocational education programs	X	X
Special education programs	Provision for special education	X	
Priority financial treatment to less able divisions	Relationship of effort and capacity	X	X
Improved pupil-teacher ratio	Pupil-teacher ratio	X	X
Drop-out reduction		X	
Increased holding power of schools	Holding power of students	X	X
Reduction in number of one-room schools		X	

Key - X means data were available; A blank means data were not available.

twenty-seven states had enacted laws up to August, 1973, that featured some aspect of accountability. It also reported that fifteen states had passed laws that required a state testing program or an assessment program of student performance. Thirteen states had legislated the development of a uniform accounting system. Nine states evaluated the performance of their professional employees through legislation, and one state authorized performance contracting by law (Legislation by the States, 1973:p. i).

According to this study, Virginia enacted legislation that would be considered accountability legislation. Virginia legislated a state testing or assessment program but did not legislate the development of a uniform accounting procedure. Virginia established a procedure for evaluating professional employees but did not authorize performance contracting by law (Legislation by the States, 1973:p. xi).

The report further stated that the Virginia Department of Education considered the standards of quality section of the new Virginia Constitution to be a mandate for educational accountability.

In summary, Virginia was among the fifty-four percent of the states that had laws enacted that featured some aspects of accountability. Virginia was among the thirty percent of the states that had laws requiring a state testing program. It was not among the twenty-six percent of the states that had legislated uniform accounting systems. It was among the eleven percent of the states that evaluated professional employees through state legislation. It was among the eleven percent of the states that evaluated professional

employees through legislation and was not among the two percent that had authorized performance contracting by law. According to this study, made in 1973, Virginia under the leadership of Dr. Wilkerson, moved toward greater educational accountability.

Goal 2: Percentage of Teachers Holding Regular Certificates; Number and Percentage of Teachers Holding Degrees

The nature of each goal, percentage of teachers holding regular certificates and percentage of teachers holding degrees, made it difficult to distinguish between the two. Therefore, it was determined to handle both of these goals under the same category. The panel from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University predicted that this would probably be the procedure required.

Information was secured only for Virginia. Table 3 indicates that in the 1961-1962 school year 81.9 percent of the instructional personnel in Virginia held degrees while in 1972-1973, 97 percent of the personnel held degrees. In 1961-62, eighteen percent of the instructional personnel held non-degree certificates and in 1972-1973, this had been reduced to three percent. This table indicates a gradual increase in the percentage of instructional personnel with post-graduate and collegiate professional certificates. There was a gradual decline in the percentage of personnel with non-college degree certificates.

Table 4 indicates that from 1962-1963 school year until the 1973-1974 school year, the number of instructional personnel with master's degrees increased from 5,372 to 14,853 or 362 percent.



Table 3

## Certificates Held by Instructional Personnel in Virginia, 1961-1973

Year	Regular Certificates								Other Certificate		Grand Total
	Post-graduate Professional	Percent of Total	Colle-tiate Profes-sional	Percent of Total	Colle-giate	Percent of Total	Total	Percent of Total	Total	Percent of Total	
1961-62	3,749	10.2	23,944	65.1	2,428	6.6	30,121	81.9	6,638	18.1	36,759
1962-63	4,042	10.4	25,518	66.1	2,596	6.7	32,156	83.4	6,392	16.6	38,548
1963-64	4,551	11.2	27,232	67.2	2,718	6.7	34,501	85.2	5,993	14.8	40,494
1964-65	5,077	12.0	29,064	68.7	2,655	6.2	36,796	87.0	5,498	13.0	42,294
1965-66	5,454	12.1	31,331	70.0	2,788	6.2	39,573	88.5	5,132	11.5	44,705
1966-67	6,069	13.1	32,387	70.2	2,879	6.2	41,335	89.7	4,766	10.3	46,101
1967-68	6,715	13.8	34,433	70.9	3,071	6.3	44,219	91.2	4,281	8.8	48,500
1968-69	7,488	14.6	36,612	71.4	3,350	6.5	47,450	92.6	3,790	7.4	51,240
1969-70	8,396	15.7	38,177	71.3	3,671	6.9	50,244	94.0	3,232	6.0	53,476
1970-71	9,072	16.5	39,694	72.5	3,278	5.9	52,044	95.2	2,651	4.8	54,695
1971-72	10,182	18.1	41,302	73.5	2,569	4.5	54,063	96.2	2,135	3.8	56,186
1972-73	11,360	19.7	42,668	74.1	1,837	3.1	55,865	97.0	1,716	3.0	57,581

Source: Superintendent of Public Instruction Annual Report. Richmond: State Board of Education, 1962-1974.

Table 4

## Number and Percent of Degrees Held by Instructional Personnel in Virginia, 1962-1973

Year	Doctors	Percent of Total	Masters	Percent of Total	Bachelors	Percent of Total	Total
1962-63	39	.10	5,372	16.6	26,883	83.2	32,294
1963-64	42	.10	5,936	17.1	28,670	82.7	34,648
1964-65	43	.10	6,400	17.2	30,699	82.6	37,142
1965-66	34	.08	6,792	17.1	32,841	82.7	39,667
1966-67	30	.07	7,321	17.6	34,051	82.2	41,402
1967-68	36	.08	8,028	18.1	36,211	81.7	44,275
1968-69	45	.09	8,900	18.7	38,542	81.1	47,487
1969-70	51	.10	9,824	19.5	40,406	80.3	50,281
1970-71	67	.12	10,794	20.7	41,184	79.1	52,045
1971-72	85	.15	12,180	22.5	41,788	77.3	54,053
1972-73	96	.17	13,439	24.0	42,331	75.7	55,866
1973-74	122	.20	14,853	25.3	43,698	74.6	58,563

Source: Superintendent of Public Instruction Annual Report. Richmond: State Board of Education, 1962-74.

From the 1962-1963 school year until the 1973-1974 school year the number of instructional personnel with bachelor's degrees increased from 26,883 to 43,698 or 400 percent. While the percentage of instructional personnel with doctorates was not large, those persons with master's degrees increased gradually throughout the time. The conclusion reached was that Virginia made considerable progress in the area of teacher endorsement and teachers with degrees during the tenure of Dr. Wilkerson.

### Goal 3: Kindergarten Education

The researcher was unable to locate comparable data on the enrollment in kindergarten in Virginia and the nation. From the data furnished by the State Department of Education the enrollment in kindergartens from 1964-1965 (7,453) to 1973-1974 (57,982) increased 689.6 percent (See Table 5).

According to statistics made available through the Division of Educational Research and Statistics of the Virginia Department of Education, 8.5 percent of the eligible pupils were enrolled in public kindergarten in the 1960-1961 school year. In the 1973-1974 school year 71.2 percent of eligible pupils were enrolled in kindergarten. This was based on the number of six year olds found in the 1960 and 1970 Virginia school census.

While data were not complete, kindergarten education for the Virginia schools increased during the tenure of Dr. Wilkerson.

Table 5

## Kindergarten Enrollment and Percentage of Increase for Virginia

Year	Enrollment	Percent of Increase
1964-65	7,453	
1965-66	7,879	5.2
1966-67	7,315	-7.1
1967-68	8,558	16.9
1968-69	24,027	180.7
1969-70	27,797	15.6
1970-71	25,365	-8.7
1971-72	28,057	10.6
1972-73	29,645	5.6
1973-74	57,982	95.5
	Total Increase	677.9

Source: Superintendent of Public Instruction Annual Report.  
 Richmond: State Board of Education, 1960-1974.

Goal 4: Expansion of Vocational Educational Funding

According to the report of U. S. Bureau of the Census in its Statistical Abstracts of the United States, Virginia enrollment in vocational education programs that were federally aided from 1961 (106,964) to 1972 (336,000) increased 214.4 percent. In the nation, enrollment from 1961 (3,855,564) to 1972 (11,602,000) increased 200.9 percent (See Table 6).

In an interview with Mr. George L. Orr, Jr., Director, Division of Vocational Education, Virginia Department of Education, Richmond, Virginia, on April 16, 1975, he reported that Virginia ranked fourteenth in total population of the states for the fiscal year 1973. For this same period Virginia ranked thirteenth in expenditure of federal funding for vocational education, seventeenth in the total expenditure for vocational education, eighth in total enrollment in vocational programs, and fourteenth in the enrollment in preparatory type programs in vocational education.

Mr. Orr said that it would appear that Virginia ranked a little above the population rank in enrollment but lower in the dollars expended for vocational education. He also noted that the present biennium (1974-1976) represented a 75.5 percent increase of state funds above the 1972-1974 budget. This increase came as a result of the new distribution formula of state funds under the standards of quality program. He stated that Dr. Wilkerson strongly supported this marked increase in the funding of vocational education programs.

Table 6

Vocational Education Programs, Federally Aided -  
Enrollment - Percentage of Increase

Year	Virginia	Percent of Increase	Nation	Percent of Increase
1961	106,864		3,855,564	
1962	106,459	-3.7	4,072,677	5.6
1963	116,232	9.1	4,217,198	3.5
1964	114,756	12.6	4,566,390	8.2
1966	157,324	37.0	6,070,059	32.9
1968	219,000	39.2	7,530,000	24.0
1969	223,000	18.2	7,979,000	5.9
1970	273,000	22.4	8,794,000	10.2
1971	302,000	10.6	10,495,000	19.3
1972	336,000	11.2	11,602,000	10.5
	Overall Percentage of Increase	214.4	Overall Percentage of Increase	200.9

Source: Statistical Abstracts of the United States. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1960-1973.

The conclusion, though somewhat limited in scope, would indicate that Virginia made progress in the student enrollment in vocational educational programs during the tenure of Dr. Wilkerson. While the state funding had not made great gains, it was noted that with the new distribution formula, sponsored under the leadership of Dr. Wilkerson, Virginia could make further progress in the funding of vocational education.

#### Goal 5: Special Education Programs

The researcher found conclusive data available on special education programs for Virginia. Data were not available on the national level. As indicated in Table 7, the number of children served in special education projects in Virginia from the school year 1960-1961 (20,307) to 1974-1975 (63,230) increased 211.4 percent. Expenditures per pupil increased from 1960-1961(\$41.06) to 1974-1975 (\$337.32), 722 percent. While national data were not available, the researcher concluded that Virginia made progress in providing special education programs during the tenure of Dr. Wilkerson. Dr. Wilkerson, as noted earlier in this study, regretted that more progress had not been made in this area.

#### Goal 6: Priority Financial Treatment to Less Able Divisions

The researcher was unable to locate conclusive data in the area of priority financial treatment to less able divisions. However, upon the advice of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University panel, the researcher looked at the percentage of revenue

Table 7

## Virginia's Appropriation for Special Education, 1960-1974

School Year	Children Served	Percent of Increase	State Appropriation	Percent of Increase	Expenditure Per/Pupil	Percent of Increase
1960-61	20,307		\$ 833,877		\$ 41.06	
1961-62	21,040	3.6	891,875	6.9	42.39	3.2
1962-63	29,715	41.0	1,038,000	15.4	34.93	-17.5
1963-64	25,612	-14.0	1,106,775	6.6	43.21	23.8
1964-65	26,734	4.4	1,182,835	6.8	44.24	2.4
1965-66	27,964	4.6	1,261,260	6.5	45.10	1.9
1966-67	32,653	17.0	3,376,030	167.0	103.39	129.2
1967-68	32,125	1.6	4,250,030	25.8	132.30	27.9
1968-69	35,750	11.2	6,124,245	44.0	171.31	29.4
1969-70	37,846	5.8	6,485,380	5.9	171.36	.03
1970-71	42,702	12.8	7,217,670	11.3	169.02	-1.3
1971-72	45,526	6.6	8,891,420	23.3	195.30	15.5
1972-73	49,720	9.2	11,294,620	27.0	227.16	16.3
1973-74	58,358	17.3	14,865,999	31.6	254.74	12.1
1974-75	63,230	8.3	21,328,675	43.8	337.32	32.4

Source: Virginia Department of Education, Division of Special Education, Richmond.



for public elementary and secondary schools from state governments. The premise was that the higher the percentage of state funding for education, the greater the equalization of funds. According to information secured in the National Education Association publication, Rankings of the States, in 1960-1961 (See Table 8) Virginia was twenty-ninth among the states in the sources of revenue from the states. In 1972-1973 Virginia ranked twenty-sixth. While the ranking has fluctuated during the years, it could be assumed that Virginia made limited progress in meeting the goal of priority financial treatment to the less able divisions during the tenure of Dr. Wilkerson. The new distribution formula which affects the 1974-1975 school year should be considered as a factor.

Goal 7: Improved Pupil-Teacher Ratio

Data secured from the National Education Association publication, Rankings of the States, indicated that in the fall of 1961 Virginia ranked thirtieth among the fifty states in pupils per teacher in public schools (See Table 9). In 1970, this ranking was twenty-eighth. The data secured from the Virginia Department of Education and found in Table 10 indicated that Virginia has made continuous progress in the area of improving pupil-teacher ratio. The researcher concluded that according to this source of information Virginia made progress in the area of improved pupil-teacher ratio during the tenure of Dr. Wilkerson.

Table 8

Estimated Percent of Revenue for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools  
From Local and State Governments

Year	Local Revenue			State Revenue		
	Virginia	Nation	Rank	Virginia	Nation	Rank
1960-61	54.6	56.3	26	36.1	40.1	29
1962-63	53.0	57.0	31	40.9	39.4	24
1963-64	50.0	56.4	31	41.4	40.1	24
1964-65	49.0	56.2	31	43.2	40.0	22
1965-66	49.5	53.1	24	39.4	39.1	31
1966-67	50.0	52.1	27	38.8	39.9	26
1967-68	52.6	52.1	25	37.3	39.3	26
1968-69	52.0	52.7	25	37.0	39.9	27
1969-70	52.5	51.8	26	36.4	40.9	30
1970-71	54.2	52.0	24	35.2	41.1	30
1971-72	54.4	51.8	26	33.8	40.2	31
1972-73	50.0	51.2	23	39.7	41.0	26

Source: Rankings of the State 1957-1972. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1957-72.

Table 9

## Pupils Per Teacher in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools

Date	Virginia	Nation	Rank
Fall 1959	26.5	25.8	33
Fall 1961	25.8	25.6	30
Fall 1962	25.6	25.7	28
Fall 1963	26.0	25.5	32
Fall 1964	25.5	25.1	32
Fall 1965	25.0	24.6	33
Fall 1966	24.1	24.1	30
Fall 1967	24.1	23.7	30
Fall 1968	23.4	23.1	28
Fall 1969	22.9	22.7	28
Fall 1970	22.5	22.3	28

Source: Rankings of the States. Washington, D.C.:  
National Education Association, 1960-1972.

Table 10

## Ratio of Pupils to Classroom Teaching Positions in Virginia

Year	Elementary	Secondary	Total
1959-60	31.9-1	24.8-1	Not available
1960-61	31.3-1	24.8-1	28.9-1
1961-62	30.8-1	21.3-1	27.0-1
1962-63	31.1-1	21.4-1	27.2-1
1963-64	30.1-1	21.1-1	26.4-1
1964-65	26.3-1	19.4-1	23.8-1
1965-66		Not Available	
1966-67	26.8-1	19.4-1	24.1-1
1967-68	26.2-1	19.6-1	23.4-1
1968-69	25.5-1	19.4-1	23.0-1
1969-70	24.5-1	18.8-1	22.1-1
1970-71	24.5-1	18.8-1	22.1-1
1971-72	23.7-1	18.7-1	21.6-1
1972-73	22.5-1	18.2-1	20.6-1
1973-74	22.2-1	17.9-1	20.4-1

Source: Facing Up-Statistics Data on Virginia's Public Schools.  
 Richmond: State Board of Education, 1965-1974.

#### Goal 8: Drop-out Reduction

The researcher could locate data appropriate only for Virginia in the area of drop-outs. The review of the literature revealed considerable attention to the drop-out problem at the national level in the early 1960's. No conclusive data were located since the period of 1964. From the Virginia information, found in Table 11, the researcher would conclude that Virginia made limited progress in the area of reducing the percentage of high school drop-outs during the tenure of Dr. Wilkerson. More progress was made during the early 1970's, and the percentage of drop-outs increased since the 1972-1973 school year.

#### Goal 9: Increased Holding Power of Schools

In studying the holding power of the school, the researcher looked at public school graduates as a percentage of ninth grade enrollment four years earlier. The National Education Association publication, Ranking of the States, indicated that Virginia during the 1962-1963 school year ranked fortieth among the states in the number of high school graduates as a percentage of ninth grade enrollment four years earlier. During the 1971-1972 school year this ranking was thirty-three (See Table 12). This along with other data would indicate that Virginia made limited progress in the holding power of students.

The Division of Educational Research and Statistics of the Virginia Department of Education made some observations concerning the holding power of Virginia schools.

Table 11

## Percentage of High School Dropouts in Virginia (Grades 8-12)

---

---

Year	Percent
1961-62	5.5
1964-65	5.0
1965-66	4.8
1966-67	4.7
1967-68	5.1
1968-69	4.5
1969-70	4.6
1970-71	4.4
1971-72	4.4
1972-73	4.7
1973-74	5.2

---

---

Source: Facing Up-Statistical Data of Virginia's Public Schools,  
Richmond: State Board of Education, 1965-1974.

Table 12

Public High School Graduates as a Percentage of Ninth Grade  
Enrollment Four Years Earlier

Year of Graduation	Ninth Grade Year	Virginia	Nation	Virginia's Rank
1962-63	1959	62.4	72.7	40
1964-65	1961	58.6	73.7	48
1965-66	1962	74.8	77.3	32
1966-67	1963	73.6	77.8	35
1967-68	1964	75.4	78.5	35
1968-69	1965	75.6	78.8	34
1969-70	1966	76.1	79.1	36
1971-72	1968	76.5	78.0	33

Source: Rankings of the States. Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association, 1957-72.

From 1960-1961 to 1973-74 the percentage of eighth grade enrollment compared to the enrollment seven years earlier increased from 79.5 percent to 94.4 percent. From 1960-1961 to 1973-1974 the percentage of twelfth grade enrollment compared to the first grade enrollment twelve years earlier increased from 42.5 percent to 68.2 percent. From 1960-1961 to 1973-1974 the percentage of high school graduates compared to the first grade enrollment twelve years earlier increased from 38.4 percent to 60.8 percent.

#### Goal 10: Reduction in Number of One-Room Schools

The panel at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University suggested that the researcher look at this last listed goal, the reduction in number of one-room schools. Data were not available on the national level. In the 1960-1961 school year there was 185 one-teacher schools in Virginia according to information secured from the Virginia Department of Education (See Table 13). During the 1973-1974 school year the number of one-teacher schools was one. According to this information Virginia made progress in the reduction of one-room schools during the tenure of Dr. Wilkerson.

#### General Conclusions

The researcher reached some general conclusions concerning progress made in Virginia toward achieving the ten measurable identified goals during Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson's tenure as State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The conclusions are



Table 13

## Number of One-Teacher Schools in Virginia

(Based on Report of Number of Elementary Schools According to  
Average Daily Membership and Number of Teaching Positions)

Year	Number of One-Teacher Schools
1960-61	185
1961-62	156
1962-63	129
1963-64	93
1964-65	55
1965-66	28
1966-67	16
1967-68	13
1968-69	6
1969-70	3
1970-71	1
1971-72	0
1972-73	1
1973-74	1

Source: Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.  
Richmond: State Board of Education, 1960-1974.

strictly those of the researcher reached after completion of the study. The lack of complete data for some of these goals could be interpreted as limitations to these conclusions.

Under the educational leadership of Dr. Wilkerson, it appears that Virginia did make some progress in each of the ten goals previously mentioned. More progress was made in the standards of quality program, percentage of teachers holding regular certificates and degrees, kindergarten education, vocational education enrollment, special education programs, and the reduction of one-room schools. Some progress was made in the area of improved pupil-teacher ratio, reduction of drop-outs, and increased holding power of the schools. While little progress was noted in vocational education financing and priority financial treatment to less able divisions, the new financial distribution formula effective July 1, 1974, could make a change in the progress of these goals. Dr. Wilkerson gave evidence of supporting the revised financial distribution formula program throughout his tenure.

In the contacts with Dr. Wilkerson throughout the study he himself expressed specific concern for each of the top measurable goals. This concern was evidence of his leadership capability. In some areas his influence and leadership were more successful than in others. Often his concerns could not bring about the progress that he desired. As stated in the overview of this study, Dr. Wilkerson's accomplishments in providing leadership for progress toward these goals were influenced by the issues of his time, by the personalities of

those responsible for education in Virginia, and by the limitations placed upon him by political and economic situations.

Dr. Wilkerson and his unique personality had a marked effect upon public education in Virginia. The Commonwealth of Virginia made progress toward improvement in the quality of education during the leadership of Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson as State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

## Chapter 5

### MAJOR EDUCATIONAL GOAL DURING DR. WILKERSON'S TERM

#### Introduction

In the questionnaire that was mailed to a representative group of the educational community, as identified in Chapter 2, the question was asked, "Which of these goals (with sixty-nine listed) do you consider to have been/or be the most important goal during Dr. Wilkerson's term?" The most frequently mentioned goal was the standards of quality program. Of the sixteen that responded to the questionnaire, standards of quality was listed seven times as being the most important. This goal received the highest average priority of the sixty-nine goals. Its average was 3.87 out of a possible 4.0 highest possible priority.

Consequently, the goal that will be discussed in some detail is the standards of quality program in Virginia. Because of the nature of the study, all of the details concerning the standards of quality cannot be discussed as one chapter of this study. Only those points that deal directly with the leadership of Dr. Wilkerson and can be tied to his leadership will be discussed.

It is possible that certain important aspects of this program may be overlooked in such a brief analysis; however, this limitation does not preclude the magnitude of this program and the effect that Dr. Wilkerson himself had in starting it on its course of action. His influence was felt in every aspect of the program as it developed.

### Procedure

Dr. Wilkerson at each of his interview sessions frequently referred to the standards of quality program and its effect upon public education in Virginia. References to his reaction from the study itself will be made throughout this chapter.

In one interview, Dr. Wilkerson considered the standards of quality program as the most significant change in education during his tenure as State Superintendent. He stated that the key to this project was that quality education was for the first time mandated with quality being spelled out by the State Board of Education and approved by the General Assembly. He felt that the program gave new and stronger leadership potential to the Department of Education.

In an interview with Dr. Wilkerson on March 5, 1975, he was asked to outline the specific steps that led to the development and implementation of the standards of quality. These steps included:

October, 1965, a statement prepared by his office called "Nine Point Program for Improving Education in Virginia."

August, 1966, the State Board of Education authorized the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to appoint the Committee on Raising the Level of Public Education (Turner Committee).

October, 1966, the State Board of Education approved a document entitled Raising the Level of the Quality of Public Education in Virginia.

April 27, 1968, the Committee on Raising the Level of Public Education in Virginia (the Turner Committee) reported to State Board of Education.

June 1, 1969, the Report of the Commission on Constitutional Revision for the new Constitution of Virginia was presented.

July 1, 1971, the new Constitution of Virginia went into effect.

August 1, 1971, the Standards of Quality for Public Schools in Virginia, 1972-1974, were approved by the State Board of Education.

July 1, 1972, the Standards of Quality of Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia, 1972-1974, were enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia.

July 20, 1973, the Standards of Quality for Public Schools in Virginia, 1974-1976, were adopted by the State Board of Education.

July 1, 1974, the Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia, 1974-1976, were enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia.

Each of these steps will be discussed and the progress and development of specific ideas dealing with each step will be pointed out. Dr. Wilkerson's comments about each of these will be noted.

Interviews were also conducted with Mr. Harry L. Smith, Special Assistant for Public Information and Publications with the State

Department of Education, who served as the public information director throughout Dr. Wilkerson's tenure, and Mr. Fendall R. Ellis, recently retired Assistant State Superintendent for Program Development. Mr. Fendall R. Ellis made tremendous contributions to the development of the standards of quality program. He along with Dr. Wilkerson had great understanding of the full development and implications of this program.

Nine Point Program to Improve Education in Virginia, 1965

The State Board of Education at its meeting in October, 1965, pointed out that it was constantly taking steps to improve the quality of education in Virginia and approved a nine-point program which was to be given special emphasis during the 1966-1968 biennium. These included:

1. Upgrading the minimum qualification requirements for teachers.
2. Upgrading the salary schedule.
3. Providing more teacher scholarships.
4. Expanding the in-service training program (to provide undergraduate and graduate scholarships and courses in specific areas such as economics).
5. Improving library services and materials.
6. Expanding special education.
7. Establishing a uniform reimbursement rate for all state-aid positions.
8. Encouraging extended use of educational television.
9. Implementing the policy of "time to teach."  
(Raising Level of Education in Virginia, 1965:  
pp. 1-4)

This program was used as a basis to bring about some changes in the distribution formula for public funds for education. The program called for a minimum salary schedule for state aid positions based on the formula of one high school position for twenty-three pupils and one elementary teaching position for thirty pupils in average daily attendance. Also, additional funds were based on an allowance for operating costs based on per pupil in ADA. This was supposed to establish a minimum level of operational expenditures.

Dr. Wilkerson and several of his associates expressed the idea that this was actually the first step in the development of the standards of quality. It was one of the first attempts to tie a budget request from the General Assembly to a specific endorsed program.

Raising the Level of the Quality of Public Education in Virginia, 1966

The General Assembly did respond to this request for more funds and made record appropriations for public education for the 1966-1968 biennium. Perhaps the basic aspect of this early program centered around a recognition that supplying an adequate staff of highly trained and dedicated teachers was at that time the most important single element in raising the level of public education in the Commonwealth.

At the direction of the board, Dr. Wilkerson and his staff prepared a statement of the accomplishments made during this first phase of the program. This information was released in a publication, Raising the Level of the Quality of Public Education in Virginia, printed in October, 1966.



The following information is worthy of comment:

1. The State Board had made plans to revise extensively the certification standards for many school personnel.
2. Progress was made in providing state support for salaries for classroom teachers. The basic minimum salary scale was increased \$700.00 over the previous two years.
3. Additional teaching scholarships were increased 2514 over the total number for the 1964-1966 biennium.
4. A carefully planned inservice training program was proposed calling for an increase of over one million dollars for the biennium.
5. Additional funds were made available to improve library services and materials.
6. Special educational services were expanded.
7. A uniform reimbursement rate for all state-aid positions was instituted.
8. Educational television utilization was encouraged.
9. The State Board's Policy on "Time to Teach" was still encouraged and expanded (Raising Level of Education in Virginia, 1966:pp. 1-4).

The next phase of this program was established to provide guidelines for the 1968-1970 biennium. The State Board felt that additional emphasis should be given to accomplish improvements in the localities which were below acceptable standards. The Board authorized Dr. Wilkerson to constitute a committee to accomplish this objective.

This report was to be submitted on January 1, 1967. An additional request was made at this time for Dr. Wilkerson to conduct a study of the qualifications for division superintendents. The committee is referred to as the Turner Committee. Dr. Wilkerson emphasized that the State Board really established this committee because of its great concern about the disparities that existed among the school divisions in the state.

The Turner Committee Report, 1967

The Turner Committee, the Committee on Raising the Level of Public Education in Virginia, chaired by William M. Turner, former President of the Virginia School Boards Association from Petersburg, presented a report of its findings and recommendations to the State Board on April 28, 1967. This information is found in a document Raising the Level of Public Education in Virginia a Report by a Study Committee. Membership of the committee included members of the General Assembly, staff members of the State Department of Education, representatives of the State School Boards Association, representatives of local division superintendents, and locally elected governmental officers. The members of the committee included: J. G. Blount, Jr. and Harry R. Elmore from the State Department of Education; W. D. Richmond, W. R. Savage, Jr., Paul J. Cale, and H. I. Willett representing the school division superintendents; and Sam E. Pope, Dorothy S. McDiarmid, and Lloyd C. Bird representing members of the General Assembly.

The committee was assigned one major task, the development of a plan for accomplishing progress among the various local school

divisions having the greatest educational needs and thereby raising the basic level of education in Virginia to an acceptable position of adequacy. The committee centered its attention on several aspects of what they considered to be components of a quality education program. These aspects were staff and inservice education, curriculum and instruction, instructional aides and services, buildings, financial support, and evaluation. They expressed hope that if progress could be made in each of these areas, an improvement would result in those localities which needed the greatest help.

The committee made more than forty-four recommendations covering a broad range of topics and issues. Only selected recommendations are mentioned here. They include:

An increase in salary and numerical adequacy of the State Department of Education.

Encouragement of local school divisions to develop school board policies.

Additional summer scholarships for teachers.

Consideration for a regional approach to provide certain special education needs.

The development of a program of inservice training for administrative and supervisory personnel.

The raising of requirements for division superintendents and the development of a system of state reimbursement for superintendents.

A closer relationship between the local school board, the division superintendent, and the State Department of Education.

The upgrading of the accreditation standards for secondary schools, especially in the areas of minimum course offerings.

Implementation of the accreditation standards for elementary schools as already planned.

Expansion of special education services.

Addition of special service personnel to the schools (guidance personnel, psychologists, librarians, school nurses, and visiting teachers).

Establishment of public kindergartens in all schools.

Expansion of minimum standards for libraries, visual aides, and equipment.

The establishment of a rental or free textbook system.

Encouragement to use educational television.

Provision of more state funds to assist localities in school construction.

Use of the most current true values of property by the General Assembly in determining financial ability of each locality.

Financial efforts to secure new sources of revenue to support this program of education. (This would require increased effort at both the state and local levels. This would call for a broadened Basic State School Aid Fund and increased state-aid teaching position. The whole idea of school financing should be continually studied.)

Evaluation and expansion of the state testing program.

Closer work by teams from the State Department of Education with those school divisions having the greatest educational needs.

Consideration by the General Assembly of consolidation of certain smaller school divisions.

Clarification and modification by the General Assembly of the responsibility of the State Board of Education to provide a level of educational quality in all schools in Virginia (Raising Level of Public Education in Virginia by a Study Committee, 1967:pp. 1-13).

The committee designated an instrument that was to be utilized by local school divisions in assessing their strengths and needs. The local school boards and division superintendents were to use this and other information to develop plans for school improvement. The report also contained a tremendous amount of statistical data that was used to support the recommendations made.

#### State Board Reaction to Turner Committee Report

The State Board authorized the State Department to act on certain major proposals of the Turner Committee's report which did not require additional appropriations during that first year. These included:

The establishment of an evaluation program for school divisions with the greatest needs in terms of certain prescribed factors.

Inservice training for teachers in divisions with highest concentration of uncertified personnel.

Priority of literary loans to divisions with greatest facility needs.

The approach to special education on a regional basis where appropriate.

Additional state-wide testing in grades 9 and 11.

Upgrading secondary accreditation standards.

Enactment of elementary accreditation standards.

Upgrading the qualifications and salaries of division superintendents.

Promotion of kindergarten education (Superintendent of Public Instruction Annual Report, 1966-67:p. 24).

Report of the Commission on Constitutional Revision, 1969

In 1968, Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr. asked the General Assembly of Virginia to create a Commission on Constitutional Revision to undertake a study of Virginia's Constitution which had been in existence since 1928. The Assembly responded and named an eleven-man commission headed by Albert S. Harrison, Jr., a justice of the Supreme Court of Appeals and a former Governor of Virginia (Report of the Commission on Constitutional Revision:p. 1). Among the persons that served on this significant body were Colgate W. Darden, Jr., Davis Y. Paschall, and Lewis F. Powell, Jr. (Report of Commission on Constitutional Revision:p. 1). Each of these men had served as leaders of public education in Virginia, two serving as members of the

State Board of Education and Dr. Paschall serving as State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Both Dr. Paschall and Dr. Wilkerson attributed the writing of the education portion of the new Constitution to these three men. Dr. Wilkerson did serve as an advisor to the subcommittee on education and, according to Dr. Paschall, had considerable impact on the educational aspects of the new Constitution.

In January, 1969, the Commission submitted its report to the Governor and the General Assembly. A special session of the General Assembly met in February, 1969, and passed the proposed revised Constitution. This proposal went to the next session of the General Assembly and was passed once again in 1970. It was put before the people of Virginia for approval in a referendum held November 3, 1970. It was accepted by the people and went into effect on July 1, 1971.

The education subcommittee of Darden, Paschall, and Powell had previously made recommendations to the total revision committee concerning the education article of the Constitution (Article VIII). Very simple and concise statements were used concerning education. Those aspects of the commission report that related directly to public education and standards of quality included:

Section 1. Public schools of high quality to be maintained.

The General Assembly shall provide for a state-wide system of free public elementary and secondary schools open to all children of school age, and shall ensure that an educational program of high quality is established and maintained.

Section 2. State and local support of public schools, standards of quality.

The General Assembly shall ensure that funds necessary to establish and maintain an educational program of high quality are provided each school division, and it shall take care that the cost of maintaining such programs is divided equitably between the localities, wherein rests the primary responsibility for the public schools, and the Commonwealth. The Standards of Quality shall be determined and prescribed from time to time by the State Board of Education, subject to revision only by the General Assembly. (Commission on Constitutional Revision:p. 61)

These particular sections gave direct emphasis to the standards of quality and served as a basis for further developments in this area. The above wording was changed somewhat by the General Assembly.

In the Commission on Constitutional Revision report there was a commentary that reflected the thinking of the subcommittee on education. The first concern of the education committee was to strengthen the state's commitment to public education. Section one established a goal for the state to strive for rather than a position that could be achieved at a particular time. The standards set were to be a sliding scale to keep the progress forward. They would change from year to year (Commission on Constitutional Revision:p. 255).

A second direction of this section required the General Assembly to ensure that each locality be provided the funds necessary to provide an educational program to meet these goals. This brought about a stronger commitment on the part of the Commonwealth. It called for active participation in school matters on the part of the locality where local autonomy is encouraged and strengthened. It also



required the General Assembly to see that there is equitable financial sharing between the state and local government (Commission on Constitutional Revision:p. 256).

In relation to Section 2 of the Constitution several different commitments were prescribed. These include sections dealing with the duty to support schools, the standards of quality program, the encouragement of local support for schools, and the proportion of state and local financial support (Commission on Constitutional Revision:p. 261).

The language concerning standards of quality was intended to convey the idea that a progressively higher statewide standard, achievable under present conditions, would be advanced in the future as resources and circumstances permit. It would clearly be unworkable to pass a fixed standard in the Constitution and undesirable to leave the standard open to judicial construction (Commission on Constitutional Revision:p. 260); therefore, the State Board of Education was given the authority to revise the standards subject to the revision of the General Assembly.

#### The Virginia Constitution, 1971

The final edition of the education section (Article VIII) of the Constitution was slightly altered as follows:

##### Section 1. Public schools of high quality to be maintained.

The General Assembly shall provide for a system of free public elementary and secondary schools for all children of school age throughout the Commonwealth, and shall seek to ensure that an educational program of high quality is established and continually maintained.

Section 2. Standards of quality; State and local support of public schools.

Standards of quality for the several school divisions shall be determined and prescribed from time to time by the Board of Education, subject to revision only by the General Assembly.

The General Assembly shall determine the manner in which funds are to be provided for the cost of maintaining an educational program meeting the prescribed standards of quality, and shall provide for the apportionment of the cost of such program between the Commonwealth and the local units of government comprising such school divisions. Each unit of local government shall provide its portion of such cost by local taxes or from other available funds. (Constitution of Virginia, 1971: pp. 52-53)

To carry out the mandate of this new Constitution, Dr. Wilkerson appointed a specific committee of twenty-nine members composed of school division superintendents, staff members of the Department of Education, and college personnel to draft initial proposals for the first standards to be presented to the State Board. Dr. Wilkerson and his staff made the final decision as to what the program would be (Superintendent of Public Instruction Annual Report, 1970-71:p. 25).

State Board of Education Standards of Quality, 1971

The State Board of Education responded to the new Constitution of Virginia that became effective July 1, 1971, and on August 7 accepted a report from Dr. Wilkerson on the first proposed set of standards to go before the General Assembly.

These standards were developed by Dr. Wilkerson and the staff of the State Department of Education. Dr. Wilkerson reported that approximately forty division superintendents had input into the

standards. At the annual conference of division superintendents held in April, 1971, in Roanoke, Virginia, all division superintendents had the opportunity to react to the proposed standards and to make suggestions for changes.

In the introduction to the Standards of Quality, 1972-1974, the statement is made that

. . . the standards included in this report are fundamental to the establishment of quality education in any school division. Many of these standards are specific so that the degree to which they are met can be readily determined. They are realistic in that they are within the capability of the state and its political subdivisions to attain. (Standards of Quality, State Board, 1971:p. 1)

It was also pointed out that the goals were considered minimum goals.

These standards contained in the document were addressed to the following areas:

The Purposes of Education

Performance Standards

Personnel Standards

Program Standards

Instructional Materials and Equipment Standards

Planning and Management Standards (Standards of Quality, State Board, 1971:pp. 1-8).

#### General Assembly Standards of Quality and Objectives, 1972

The General Assembly at its session in 1972 revised and enacted the standards of quality and objectives presented to them by the State Board of Education. These new standards went into effect on July 1,

1972, and were designed for a two-year period. The General Assembly directed the State Board to adopt rules and regulations to implement certain objectives of the report.

The sections of these standards and objectives were:

Purposes of Education

Personnel Standards

Program Standards

Planning and Management Standards

Performance Objectives

Planning and Management Objectives (Standards of Quality, General Assembly, 1972:pp. 1-7).

There were some noticeable differences in the document approved by the State Board of Education and that enacted by the General Assembly. The General Assembly enacted a revision in which the personnel standards were to be effected to "an extent proportionate to the funding therefore provided by the General Assembly". (Standards of Quality, General Assembly, 1972:p. 4) The provision for free textbooks for the elementary grades was dropped, and the annual expenditure for instructional materials and equipment was prescribed. The performance standards under the proposed document of the State Board of Education were changed by the General Assembly to be performance objectives. Only a few minor changes were noted in these objectives. The planning and management standards were also changed to objectives. While the nature of this section was changed, the specific items themselves were changed very little (Standards of Quality, General Assembly, 1972:pp. 1-4).

In 1973, guidelines for teacher-administrator-school board relationships were added to the standards at the direction of the General Assembly. These included statements to the effect that the school boards shall adopt prescribed procedures for adjusting grievances and that each school board shall establish a system of communication between the board and school employees.

#### Implementing the Standards of Quality, 1972

Once the General Assembly adopted the standards and objectives for 1972-1974 it directed the State Board of Education to adopt rules and regulations necessary to implement the program. Statewide committees were established to cover the many aspects of the standards. Representatives came from the State Department of Education, the Virginia Education Association, Division Superintendents, representatives of the Virginia School Boards Association, and representatives of the Virginia Congress of Parents and Teachers. Nationally known consultants were asked to work with the various committees. The committee findings were first given to the division superintendents at one of their annual conferences. Sections were edited, refined, and reworked. The final report came out in the form of a published manual, Manual for Implementing Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia 1972-74, published in September, 1972.

The manual contained suggestions and instructions to assist local school divisions in implementing the standards and objectives. It encouraged the State Department of Education and local school divisions to work closely together toward common goals. Copies were

made available to all appropriate individuals and were used widely throughout the state. A filmstrip and sound tape were prepared and made available to many school and citizen groups.

Dr. Wilkerson organized the staff of the State Department of Education into twenty-two teams to work in each of the state planning districts. No attempt had ever been made to involve so many of the Virginia Department of Education's staff in one particular project. Each team worked directly with the local divisions in developing plans for meeting the standards and objectives. The full resources of the Department were utilized, especially during the school year of 1972-1973, to bring improvement to the schools. In some instances as many as twelve to fifteen meetings were held in each district.

The manual contained numerous suggestions and guidelines for developing projects such as division-wide policy manuals, planning capabilities for local divisions, five-year school improvement plans, follow-up studies of former students, evaluation instruments, school handbooks of policies and procedures, measures to insure the effective use of instructional materials and equipment, means of instructional supervision, and ways of implementing the classroom planning and management objectives (Manual for Implementing Standards of Quality, 1972-74:pp. iii-iv).

State Board of Education Standards of Quality, 1974-1976

Once again, according to the mandates of the Constitution, the State Board of Education adopted a set of standards for use during the 1974-1976 biennium. Dr. Wilkerson and his staff again had direct

responsibility to do the ground work. Numbers of people were given the opportunity to make proposals to be considered. The experience of the previous set of standards had some effect on the new standards.

The document approved on July 20, 1973, was presented in the following sections:

Introduction - contained a list of six goals for public education.

Measurable objectives - these had to do with achievement in reading and mathematics, attainment of job entry skills, high school graduate percentage, enrollment of handicapped children, and kindergarten education.

Standards related to personnel (fifty professional instructional personnel per thousand pupils), special education, gifted and talented, vocational education, continuing education, reading and mathematical skill development, kindergarten, accreditation, five-year improvement plan, and policy manual (Standards of Quality, State Board, 1973:pp. 104).

#### General Assembly Standards of Quality and Objectives, 1974-1976

The State Board standards went to the General Assembly session of 1974 and were enacted with some revisions. They were printed under a document called Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia 1974-76 Enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia, 1974.

In the area of standards, the personnel standard was changed from fifty to forty-eight professional personnel for each one thousand pupils. The section of continuing education was dropped. The General Assembly gave this responsibility to the Council of Higher Education

and the State Board of Community Colleges to coordinate with the State Board of Education.

In the area of measurable objectives two were added. These were the assignment of teachers in endorsed areas and the designated percentage of teachers who should hold advanced degrees.

The school division performance objectives were added for the percentage of first grade enrollment who graduate from high school, the performance on standardized math and reading tests, the percentage of teachers holding advanced degrees, and the percentage of attendance of pupils.

The planning and management objectives sections of the former standards were once again made a part of the program. This was not a part of the State Board's original plan (Standards of Quality, General Assembly, 1974-76:pp. 104).

#### Accountability Under Standards of Quality

According to the Code of Virginia, Section 22-19.1, the State Board of Education will submit to the Governor and the General Assembly on November 15 of each year a report on the conditions and needs of public education in the Commonwealth. School divisions and schools who fail to establish and maintain schools meeting the prescribed standards of quality are to be identified.

The first of these reports was made in August, 1972. Additional reports have been made in November, 1973 and November, 1974. Among the areas covered in these reports are enrollment projections, achievement in the fundamental skills, kindergarten education, special education,



Governor's School for the Gifted, vocational education, students completing high school and dropouts, instructional personnel, school construction, desegregation, and financial expenditures (Report on Public Education in Virginia, 1973-74).

Specific divisions were designated as having or not having met the specific personnel standards, program standards, planning and management standards, and performance objective planning, and management objectives. A school division could easily see which of the standards of quality it failed to meet.

The impact of this accountability program is without equal. Dr. Wilkerson, Mr. Harry Smith, and Mr. Fendall Ellis all pointed out that such information concerning accountability gave great assistance to all as they tried to improve the quality of education. The reporting process was considered an integral of the program of standards of quality. The local school division would probably give little attention to the program without this means of assessment.

State Senator Hunter B. Andrews in an interview suggested that those local school divisions that are not meeting the standards should be designated and strongly directed to bring about change. He felt that the State Board of Education and the State Department should be more forceful in the implementation of the standards of quality. He also said that the vast amount of information collected through this program must continually be studied and analyzed in order to bring about improvements in education.

The Report on Public Education in Virginia, 1973-74 contained a summary of progress made in meeting the standards of quality. It

reported that of the 140 school divisions in the state, 99 met all of the standards. Of the remaining, 33 divisions met all but one standard, six met all but two standards, and two met all but three standards. Enrollments in kindergarten, special education, vocational education, and adult education all increased. Progress was made in staffing schools with appropriately required personnel to meet accreditation standards (Report on Public Education 1973-74:pp. 26-27).

Each school division prepared a policy manual which included policies, rules, and regulations for the school system. Each division prepared a five-year plan to give direction to long-range planning for school improvement. Each division also developed, with staff participation, an evaluation procedure handbook.

An accounting was made for each of the ten performance objectives, and the objectives were exceeded in all but one, that dealing with the percentage of high school graduates continuing their education. Six of the eight school planning and management objectives were met by all of the 1,777 public schools in the State (Report on Public Education 1973-74:pp. 26-28).

The report also contained a list of needs for continuing the improvement of public education. These included expanded kindergarten, expanded special education programs, and expanded vocational education programs. A supplemental skill development program, attempts to secure additional qualified personnel, and a specific program for the gifted and talented were suggested (Report on Public Education 1973-74:pp. 28-31).

An Action Program was suggested and provided in the form of a bulletin which would serve as a management tool to help school divisions and the State Department of Education achieve the objectives set for 1974-1976. The program was developed on the planning concepts that involve

. . . expressing specific objectives in measurable terms, when possible, and assigning them top priority; formulating a strategy for achieving each objective; and planning realistic major actions (sub-strategies) and assigning responsibilities for them to designated individuals. (Report on Public Education 1973-74:p. 31)

These concepts provide for a system of planning and accountability that Dr. Wilkerson long supported.

#### Financing the Standards of Quality

Another very broad and interesting aspect of the standards of quality program was the financing of such a program. This program called for a new concept of school financing in Virginia. Dr. Wilkerson, as well as other educational leaders, was aware of the need for changes in school financing. He assumed that the standards of quality would have to be supported by new concepts of school finance.

In October, 1972, Governor Linwood Holton established a Task Force on Financing the Standards of Quality. This august body of fifteen was headed by J. Fred Young, then Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction. William H. Cochran, then Assistant Superintendent for Administration and Finance was also a member. Dr. Wilkerson, Earl J. Shiflett, and Preston C. Caruthers served as exofficio members. Other members came from the General Assembly, the Attorney General's staff, and outstanding financial leaders in the state.

The Task Force was first charged to study, during the fall of 1972, the cost for implementing the standards of quality and objectives, to assess local ability to pay this cost, and to devise a distribution formula for a 1973-74 supplemental state appropriation which would assist localities in meeting the cost (Second Report of the Task Force Financing the Standards of Quality, 1973:p. 5).

In December, 1972, the committee made its first report which recommended funding of this program through a supplemental appropriation

. . . based on a basic cost of \$638 per pupil in average daily membership, plus an allowance for cost increase since 1971-72. The recommended fair share of the cost was determined to be an expenditure of 80-85 cents per \$100 of 1970 true values of real property and public service corporations, plus the income derived from the one cent sales tax for education. (Second Task Force Report: p. 5)

Governor Holton requested from the 1973 General Assembly an appropriation of \$30 million, based on a standard of quality cost of \$640 with mandatory local expenditure rate of 82 cents per \$100 of 1970 true value. The General Assembly appropriated a supplemental budget of \$24.6 million for education, based on cost of \$628 per pupil with a required local expenditure rate of 80 cents per \$100 of 1970 true values (Second Report of Task Force:pp. 6-7).

The Task Force's next charge was to refine possible alternatives for long range financial funding. It made its final report in July, 1973, and included the following recommendations:

- (1) The present basic state school aid formula should be replaced by an appropriation allotted on the basis of the Personnel Standard.

(2) After subtracting the 1 cent sales tax for education, the cost of the basic program should be apportioned between the Commonwealth and school divisions of average capacity to pay on an equal basis - 50 percent State, 50 percent local funds.

(3) The share of the basic cost to be paid by each locality should be determined by local capacity to pay, as measured by a composite index. This composite index should be composed of 50 percent true value of property, 40 percent personal income, and 10 percent taxable retail sales. The division should be weighted two-thirds for ADM and one third for total population.

(4) The State should provide for vocational and special education instructional costs that exceed the basic cost for regular instruction.

(5) Each locality should provide a reading and mathematics skills development program for low-achieving pupils in grades K-6.

(6) Incentive funds should provide a method for encouragement and rewarding school divisions that make an effort greater than that required to meet the Standards of Quality.

(7) Local units of government should be provided with a reasonable period of time to adjust local financial patterns to the recommended program. Any loss in State support per ADM should be prevented, and the amount of increased local expenditures required in any one year should be limited. (Second Report of Task Force: pp. 8-12)

These recommendations were presented to the State Board of Education and were utilized, with some alterations, in its budget for 1974-76. The General Assembly used the basic format for its budget passed in 1974.

This financial influence is another example of the great magnitude of the standards of quality program and the responsible leadership of Dr. Wilkerson. State Senator Hunter B. Andrews stated in his interview concerning Dr. Wilkerson that the accomplishment of

the task force was a significant step in the history of education in Virginia. He said that this was a sincere effort to bring about better equalization of state funding for education. He expressed that Dr. Wilkerson supported the actions of this committee, of which Senator Andrews was a member, from the very beginning. Dr. Wilkerson worked closely with the committee and made the services of the State Department of Education available to the committee. Senator Andrews felt that Dr. Wilkerson and the Department both offered outstanding leadership in this area of financing the standards of quality program.

#### The Standards of Quality Program Discussed by Fendall R. Ellis

An interview was held with Mr. Fendall R. Ellis on April 9, 1975, concerning the standards of quality program and the role that Dr. Wilkerson played in its development and implementation. Mr. Ellis served in the State Department of Education throughout the period covered in this study. At one time he served as Special Assistant for Evaluation and Planning; later he served as Assistant Superintendent for Program Development. He retired from the Department of Education on March 1, 1975. He was asked to react to each of the sections of this chapter of the study, especially as it pertained to Dr. Wilkerson. Information in this section came from the interview.

Dr. Wilkerson had often talked about the need for quality education for Virginia schools. Much of his direction and effort especially during the later 1960's, had terms relating to quality education. The report of the Commission on Constitutional Revision for the new Constitution had a direct reference to the term "standards"

in relation to quality. It was believed that Colgate W. Darden was responsible for the idea of adding the aspect of standards. The idea of standards was to relate to the entire state. It was proposed that these would perhaps help to improve those areas of the state that were inadequate in meeting certain identified areas essential for quality education. Darden had served on the State Board of Education and had always been interested in raising the level of education for all areas of the state. He had expressed concern that a child's education should not be jeopardized by the area of Virginia in which he lived.

Dr. Wilkerson accepted the idea of the use of standards and discussed with Mr. Darden exactly what he meant by this term. Darden pushed for the term standards but was not interested in identifying the particulars of what was to be emphasized. He stated that this was the concern of the State Board of Education.

The Turner Committee report of 1968 did have direct impact on the standards of quality program. In a sense it actually established the first set of standards for Virginia schools. An instrument designed by the committee was used in conducting a system-wide evaluation for twenty-five local divisions mainly located in southwest and southside Virginia. This system-wide evaluation instrument included an appraisal of the community background, educational program, staff, teaching aids and services, school plant, pupil transportation, and summary of needs for each of the divisions. A proposed plan of action to bring about an improved educational program was included. Each of these evaluations was published by the State Department of Education and made available to the locality involved.

The educational program chapter of this survey provided a section on "Quality of Instruction." The factors used in determining the quality of instruction were the relationship of teacher to pupil, provision for individual differences, the use of materials and other resources, the organization for work, the environment for learning, and the evaluation program. These aspects of a quality program became a part of the first standards of quality designed in 1971 under the classroom and management objectives. The experience of this assessment in the twenty-five divisions was utilized later by the entire state.

Prior to the passage of the constitutional mandate effective July 1, 1971, Dr. Wilkerson had appointed a committee of the Department of Education to give attention to establishing the first set of standards. Among those on the coordinating committee were Fendall R. Ellis, Charles E. Clear, George W. Burton, and Alfred Wingo. A committee of twenty-nine local division superintendents met with the coordinating group for a two-day session in the spring of 1971. Additional staff members from the Department of Education also met with the group, including S. P. Johnson, Charles C. Todd, and Robert V. Turner. Dr. William H. Seawell from the University of Virginia served as a consultant to the group. They looked at three particular aspects of a program of quality: (1) the purpose of education, (2) the processes needed for quality education (input), and (3) the outcomes desired from education (output). Fendall Ellis served as chairman of the coordinating committee. The overall committee prepared



the general ideas of what should be included in the first set of standards, but the coordinating committee along with Dr. Wilkerson did the final preparation of the program.

The State Board had been advised of the work of the committee during its deliberation and in August, 1971, accepted the first standards of quality without substantial change from those proposed by Dr. Wilkerson and his staff. The General Assembly changed the wording of two aspects of the first standards. The performance and planning and management areas were changed from standards to objectives. They expressed concern that these two aspects would be more appropriately tied to objectives rather than standards. Standards, according to the members of the General Assembly, would require that each locality be measured to this particular aspect. Objectives were areas that localities should be striving for but could not be measured to the point of guaranteeing their accomplishment. The opinion was expressed that in some cases the school divisions had no absolute control over certain listed items. As an example, a standard could require every school division to have a five-year improvement plan, but an objective for each school division to strive for would be more appropriate in the area on pupil attendance. Dr. Wilkerson and those responsible for developing the program accepted this change by the General Assembly and believed that it strengthened the program.

Once the General Assembly approved the first standards of quality, 1972-74, the department organized the implementation of these standards. This came in the preparation of the Manual for Implementing

Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia, 1972-

74. This report was published in September, 1972. Noted consultants worked on the development of the manual. Dr. William J. Ellena and Dr. George Redfern, both with the American Association of School Administrators, worked with staff evaluation. Dr. Orin B. Graff from the University of Tennessee worked with the five year school improvement plan. Dr. Dewey Stollar from the University of Tennessee worked with the development of local division policy manuals. Dr. Truman Pierce from Auburn University worked with the evaluation of pupil progress. Dr. H. I. Willett from Virginia Commonwealth University worked with the development of local school handbooks. Mr. Royce Chesser from the College of William and Mary worked with individual school improvement plans. Dr. William H. Seawell from the University of Virginia was an over-all consultant.

The consultants, along with the previously mentioned committees made up of a cross section of the Virginia education community, provided a tremendous amount of the material that went into the manual. The manual was used extensively by the local school divisions in meeting the first standards of quality.

The staff of the State Department of Education had more direct input in the development of the standards of quality for 1974-1976. Dr. Wilkerson expressed more direct concern about what these standards would contain and how they should be established. He desired that these standards should be condensed to contain only

those items listed as "standards." The State Board agreed to this, but the General Assembly reinstated objectives and additional standards that had been a part of the first standards. Dr. Wilkerson and perhaps the State Board felt that the objectives as such should be their own concern and not that of the General Assembly. Certain members of the General Assembly expressed a liking for the first standards and felt that they were worthy of attention by the legislation. They felt that this would add to the state image of the entire program.

Mr. Fendall Ellis gave some attention to the future of the standards of quality program in Virginia. He expressed several concerns and needs for the continuation and improvement of the program. He felt that a permanent group should be established to serve as an advisory group with representation from the State Department of Education, State Board of Education, Virginia Education Association, public school groups, institutions of higher learning, and lay groups. They should evaluate the current standards and make projections for future standards. They should look at national trends in education. The results of their findings should be presented to the Superintendent of Public Instruction on a continual basis rather than once every two years.

Another concern of Mr. Ellis was with the broad area of accountability. The public is demanding to know how the schools are doing. They want to know how each child measures in the skill development and other areas. Yet, there is much that is not known about how to assess pupil and school progress. It is difficult to react to the

public achievement areas when there is such a small agreement on the best way to measure the various aspects of achievement. This is a national concern as well as one from Virginia.

In reacting to Dr. Wilkerson's role throughout the standards of quality program, Mr. Ellis felt that Dr. Wilkerson provided both leadership and support of the total operation of this program. Dr. Wilkerson considered it a program of maximum importance. In his earliest communications as State Superintendent of Public Instruction, he talked about programs of quality. These have been somewhat fulfilled in the standards of quality program. Dr. Wilkerson solidly supported the idea that the standards were a means of moving education toward greater improvement. He worked with the program completely, willingly, and enthusiastically. He utilized the staff of the State Department of Education in providing the details of the program. Outside professional consultants were used along with numerous advisory groups made up from the educational community and lay personnel. Every aspect of the standards calls for broad involvement in the development and implementation of the program. While Dr. Wilkerson supported this idea, he did not hesitate to use his leadership position to exert influence when he deemed this necessary. Mr. Ellis did agree that the standards of quality program in Virginia was the most important goal in education in Virginia during Dr. Wilkerson's term as State Superintendent of Public Instruction and that this goal gave Dr. Wilkerson an opportunity to use his full leadership capabilities in the initiation and implementation of the program.

### The Researcher's General Conclusions

One of the purposes of the study was to determine Dr. Wilkerson's role in one major goal during his term. The researcher notes certain conclusions concerning Dr. Wilkerson and his leadership style as identified through the standards of quality program.

The demands for change have affected the thinking of Dr. Wilkerson and the development of standards of quality almost simultaneously. Both have been affected by changes in the national education scene. An example of this might have to do with the development of the planning capability for education. Education has for years emphasized the need for systematic planning. Yet, within the past five years a new dimension of planning has come about. Virginia and Dr. Wilkerson were well aware of this new dimension. Thus, time and effort have been spent on broadening the concept of planning to every aspect of education. Planning has implications for the individual classroom teacher, the individual school, the school division, regional planning, and the state educational agency.

Another aspect of change has come in the realm of school financing. Tremendous research, study, and implementation have affected the total financing of public education. In Virginia, every session of the General Assembly calls for certain changes and modifications of the state distribution of basic school funds. Under the standards of quality a more drastic change in financing has come about. Dr. Wilkerson has also called throughout the years for this type of change. The standards of quality have given Dr. Wilkerson the opportunity to

unify the personnel of the State Department of Education into a common goal. His use of the service of the American Management Association to provide management leadership for the staff of the Department is significant. This agency had a marked effect on the workings of Dr. Wilkerson and the Department. He planned to carry this another step in the involvement of every division superintendent in a briefing on educational leadership during May of 1975, again directed by the American Management Association. This procedure denoted a definite change in the style of operating for Dr. Wilkerson. It pointed out his acceptance of new ideas.

It should also be pointed out that Dr. Wilkerson as well as many of his associates have indicated that the standards of quality have not reached the ultimate in effectiveness, not that they ever could or would. This concept surrounding the program must continually be explained to the professional educators and lay people of the Commonwealth.

Throughout his professional career, Dr. Wilkerson stressed the goal of excellence in education. The standards of quality program gave Dr. Wilkerson and the state agency for education a renewed challenge to provide the best of educational opportunities for the Commonwealth.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Chapter 2

#### General Measures of Quality

Clark, Harold F. Cost and Quality in Public Education. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1963.

Committee on Educational Finance. Interdependence in School Finance: The City, The State, The Nation. Proceedings of the Eleventh National Conference on School Finance. Washington: National Education Association, 1968.

Committee on Educational Finance. Trends in Financing Public Education. Proceedings of the Eighth National Conference on School Finance. Washington: National Education Association, 1965.

Gaureke, Warren E. and Jack R. Childress. (eds.). Theory and Practice of School Finance. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally and Company, 1967.

Hartley, Harry J. Educational Planning-Programming-Budgeting. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

Johns, Roe L., Kern Alexander and K. Forbes Jordan. (eds.). Planning to Finance Education. Gainesville, Florida: National Education Finance Project, 1971.

Johns, Roe L., Kern Alexander and Richard Rossmiller. (eds.). Dimensions of Educational Need. Gainesville, Florida: National Education Finance Project, 1969.

Johns, Roe L., Kern Alexander and Dewey H. Stollar. (eds.). Status and Impact of Educational Finance Projects. Gainesville, Florida: National Education Finance Project, 1971.

Mort, Paul R. The Growing Edge: An Instrument in Measuring the Adaptability of School Systems. New York: Metropolitan School Study Council, 1957.

National Education Finance Project. Future Directions for School Financing. Gainesville, Florida: National School Finance Project, 1971.

Norton, John K. (ed.). Dimensions in School Finance. National Education Association Committee on Educational Finance. Washington: National Education Association, 1965.

References for Virginia Educational Goals

Facing-Up--Statistical Data on Virginia Public Schools. Richmond: State Board of Education, 1967-1974.

Raising the Level of Public Education in Virginia. A Report by a Study Committee. Richmond: State Board of Education, 1967.

Report on the Governor's Conference on Education. Richmond: Commonwealth of Virginia, 1966.

State Board of Education Minutes, Commonwealth of Virginia. Unpublished Official Minutes located in the Superintendent of Public Instruction's Office, Richmond, 1960-1974.

Superintendent of Public Instruction Memorandums. Richmond: Virginia Department of Education, 1960-1974.

Virginia Journal of Education. Official publication of the Virginia Education Association. Richmond, 1960-1974.

Virginia P.T.A. Bulletin. Publication of the Virginia Parent-Teachers Association. Richmond, 1960-1974.

Virginia School Boards Association Newsletter. Publication of the Virginia School Boards Association. Charlottesville, 1960-1974.

Wilkerson, Woodrow W. Speeches delivered to the Annual Conference of Division Superintendents by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Unpublished speeches located in the State Superintendent's Office. Richmond, 1961-1974.

Annotated Bibliography of Certain Data Sources

Facing-Up--Statistical Data on Virginia's Public Schools for the year 1967 through February 1974. This document of the State Department of Education provides selected statistical data and is updated and published each year. The comparative data is for a ten-year period of time and in some instances is compared with national figures. Among the data studied is enrollment, instructional personnel, ratio of pupils to classroom teaching positions, summary of high school dropouts, high school graduates and high school graduates continuing



formal education, a comparison of graduates and ninth grade fall enrollments for the same group of students, basic financial information concerning local school divisions, and percentage of financial support of public schools. Those items that relate to quality measurement were studied. This study also contains an introductory section that attempts to highlight each year's progress. This assisted in determining what statistical information was used. Although much of this information was contained in the Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, its unique contribution was worthy of study.

Superintendent of Public Instruction Memorandums for the years 1960-1973. A review of these numerous and varied reports to the division superintendents indicated areas of interest and concern of the various services of the State Department of Education. Indication of interest and quality measurements were duly noted. Close attention was given to those specific memorandums that were printed under Dr. Wilkerson's name.

State Board of Education Minutes 1962-1973. These official documents were studied to determine the frequency of and the degree to which measures of quality were discussed during the formal proceedings of the State Board of Education. Special attention was given to those proposals initiated by Dr. Wilkerson.

Wilkerson, Woodrow W., Speeches. The printed speeches of Dr. Wilkerson that were used in his annual message to the division superintendents at their annual meeting sponsored by the State Department of Education were analyzed. The highlights of each year's program and projections were a part of these speeches.

#### General Reference

Martin, Roscoe C. and others. Decisions in Syracuse: A Metropolitan Action Study. New York: Greenwood Press, 1961.

Campbell, Roald F., Edwin M. Bridges, John E. Corbally, Jr., Raphael O. Nyshanel and John A. Ramseyer. Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Chapter 3

Constitution of Virginia, July 1, 1971. Richmond: Commonwealth of Virginia, 1972.

Public Education in Virginia--A Magazine of the State Board of Education. Richmond: Fall, 1974.

Regulations of the Board of Education of the Commonwealth of Virginia. Richmond: Board of Education, July 1973.

Virginia Lives--The Old Dominion's Who's Who. Written and Prepared Under the Supervision of Richard L. Morton. Hopkinsville, Kentucky: Historical Records Association, 1964.

Virginia School Laws. Richmond: State Board of Education, 1969.

Virginia School Laws. Richmond: State Board of Education, 1972.

Who's Who in America With World Notebook, Volume 36, 1970-1971. Chicago, Illinois: Marquis, Who's Who Incorporated, 1971.

Who's Who in American Education. Volume I. Hattiesburg, Mississippi: Who's Who in American Education, Inc., 1967-1969.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Chapter 4

Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the Commonwealth of Virginia. Richmond: State Board of Education, 1960-1973.

Facing Up - Statistical Data on Virginia's Public Schools. Richmond: State Department of Education, 1967-1974.

State Educational Accountability Repository. Legislation by the States: Accountability and Assessment in Education. Madison, Wisconsin: Department of Public Instruction, 1973.

Rankings of the States. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1957-1973.

Statistical Abstracts of the United States. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1960-1973.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Chapter 5

- Constitution of Virginia, Effective July 1, 1971. Richmond: Commonwealth of Virginia, 1971.
- Constitution of Virginia, Report of the Commission on Constitutional Revision. Richmond: Commonwealth of Virginia, 1969.
- Manual for Implementing Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia, 1972-1974. Richmond: State Department of Education, 1972.
- Raising the Level of the Quality of Public Education in Virginia, A Pamphlet. Richmond: State Board of Education, 1965.
- Raising the Level of the Quality of Public Education in Virginia, A Pamphlet. Richmond: State Board of Education, 1966.
- Raising the Level of Public Education in Virginia, Report by a Study Committee Presented to the State Board of Education. Richmond: State Board of Education, 1967.
- Report on Public Education in Virginia, 1973-74. Richmond: State Board of Education, 1974.
- Second Report of the Task Force on Financing the Standards of Quality for Virginia Public Schools. A Pamphlet, 1973.
- Standards of Quality for Public Schools in Virginia, A Pamphlet, 1974-76, Adopted by the Board of Education, July 20, 1973.
- Standards of Quality for Public Schools in Virginia, Approved by the State Board of Education. A Pamphlet, August 7, 1971.
- Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia, Enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia. A Pamphlet, 1972.
- Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia, 1974-76, Enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia. A Pamphlet, 1974.
- Superintendent of Public Instruction Annual Report - 1966-67. Richmond: State Board of Education, 1967.
- Superintendent of Public Instruction Annual Report - 1970-71. Richmond: State Board of Education, 1971.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEW WITH DR. WOODROW W. WILKERSON

FALL AND WINTER, 1974-1975

Early Life

Date, place of birth?

Parents?

Places lived in early life?

What influences did your parents have on your life?

What do you remember about early life experiences?

Elementary School

What do you remember about early school experiences?

What was your elementary school like?

What elementary school teachers do you remember? Why?

Which of these influenced you the most? Why?

High School

What was your high school like?

What subjects did you enjoy the most? Why?

What activities were you involved with?

What honors or offices did you hold?

Which teachers influenced you the most? Why?

Undergraduate College

Why did you decide to attend Hampden-Sydney College?

What was your major emphasis of study there?

What professional educational training did you have there?

Do you still keep contact with any friends made? Why?

Early Teaching

Why did you enter the teaching profession?

What do you remember as early teaching experiences?

What subjects did you teach?

Why did you teach at this particular school?

Have you kept contact with any fellow teachers at that time?  
Who?

Administration

What was your curriculum at the College of William and Mary in your master's degree program?

What were your public school administration experiences?

What incidents do you remember most about these administrative experiences?

What people influenced you the most during these early administrative experiences?

Career with State Department of Education

What were the circumstances that brought you to the State Department of Education in 1945?

What positions have you had with the Department?

What was the size of the Department at this time?

What were the general working conditions?

Who were some of your early close associates?

Which of these had the greatest influence upon you? Why?

Under what circumstances did you pursue your doctoral work?

What do you remember about your experiences at the University of Maryland?

What was the title and nature of your dissertation?

Did your graduate work influence your role with the Department?

What criteria were used in the selection of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction?

Role as State Superintendent of Public Instruction

What do you consider the major role of the State Department of Education?

How has this changed since you have been with the Department?

How has the Department become more effective?

What changes do you feel are needed?

What do you consider the major role of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction?

How has this changed during your term of office?

In what areas have you been most effective?

What has been your general relations with the State Board members?

How has this changed during the years?

What about relationships with the Governors?

What about relationships with the members of the General Assembly?

What about relationships with the local division superintendents?

What areas have satisfied you the most in your work as State Superintendent?

What areas have been the greatest disappointments?

What do you feel are the greatest needs of education in Virginia at the present time?

What do you feel are long range needs of public education in Virginia?



General Information

What persons can best describe your personal life?

What persons can best describe your career in public education in Virginia?

What persons have had the greatest influence upon your career as State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Virginia?

What influences have your wife and children had on your professional accomplishments?

What do you consider the areas of greatest personal/professional accomplishment at this time?

What do you consider the outstanding aspects of your philosophy of life at this time?

What do you consider the outstanding aspects of your philosophy of education at this time?

What were the major educational decisions made in Virginia during your term of office?

Rank these in terms of impact on the quality of education in Virginia.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONS AND SAMPLE OF LETTER FOR  
INTERVIEWS WITH PERSONS CONCERNING  
DR. WOODROW W. WILKERSON

How long have you known Dr. Wilkerson?

What are some of your earlier experiences with him?

How often have you had contact with him during the past 14 years?

What do you consider the major role of the State Department of Education?

How has this changed during the past fourteen years?

What do you consider the major role of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction?

How has this changed during Dr. Wilkerson's term of office?

What has been Dr. Wilkerson's relationship with State Board members?

How has this changed during the years?

What has been his relationship with the various Governors?

What has been his relationship with the members of the General Assembly?

What has been his relationship with the local division superintendents?

In what areas has Dr. Wilkerson as State Superintendent of Public Instruction been most effective?

In what areas has he been least effective?

What do you feel are the greatest needs of education in Virginia at the present time?

What do you feel are the long range needs of public education in Virginia?

206 Tenth Street  
Radford, Virginia 24141  
February 12, 1975

I am in the process of writing a dissertation in the doctoral program at VPI&SU on Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson: His Life and Work as State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Virginia 1960-1973. As an employee of the State Department of Education, I have the permission and cooperation of Dr. Wilkerson in this project.

Because of your recognized leadership in education in Virginia and your association with Dr. Wilkerson, I would like your assistance in a brief interview. I am attaching a list of questions that will be answered by you and five other persons. I would like for you to review the questions and then be prepared for me to telephone you to conduct the structured interview in about a week. I will take notes of the interview and then combine all of the answers to use in my study. There will be no direct answers attributed to any one specific person's response. I would hope that your responses will be as candid as possible.

Thank you for your assistance. I look forward to the opportunity of talking with you.

Sincerely,

Emmett G. Shufflebarger

EGS/sw

Associates of Dr. Wilkerson Used in the  
Biographical Interviews

Mr. Harry Elmore  
Retired Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Richmond, Virginia

Dr. Davis Y. Paschall  
Former State Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Williamsburg, Virginia

Dr. J. G. Blount  
Retired Assistant Superintendent for Administration and Finance  
Richmond, Virginia

Dr. George Holmes  
School of Education  
University of Virginia  
Charlottesville, Virginia

Mr. Earl Shiflett  
Former Secretary of Education  
Richmond, Virginia

State Senator Hunter Andrews  
General Assembly of Virginia  
Hampton, Virginia

Of these associates the first three were those mentioned by Dr. Wilkerson. Dr. George Holmes was suggested by more than one of the three who made nominations. The last two names were selected at random from those who were nominated.

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONS AND LETTER FOR INTERVIEW WITH FORMER  
GOVERNOR J. LINDSAY ALMOND

Describe the circumstances under which Dr. Davis Paschall resigned as State Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1960.

What criteria did you establish for the selection of a new State Superintendent?

What characteristics and experiences did you consider at this time?

Describe the reasons for your selection of Dr. Wilkerson.

In what areas has Dr. Wilkerson as State Superintendent of Public Instruction been most effective?

In what areas has he been least effective?

How would you assess Dr. Wilkerson's tenure as State Superintendent of Public Instruction?

206 Tenth Street  
Radford, Virginia 24141  
February 24, 1975

Governor J. Lindsay Almond  
208 Wexleigh Drive  
Richmond, Virginia 23229

Dear Governor Almond:

I am in the process of writing a dissertation in the doctoral program at VPI&SU on Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson: His Life and Work as State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Virginia 1960-73. As an employee of the State Department of Education, I have the permission and cooperation of Dr. Wilkerson in this project.

Because of your recognized leadership in education in Virginia and your association with Dr. Wilkerson, I would like your assistance in a brief interview. I am attaching a list of questions that will be answered by you. I would like for you to review the questions and then be prepared for me to telephone you to conduct the structured interview in about a week. I will take notes of the interview and then combine the answers to use in my study. I would hope that your responses will be as candid as possible.

Thank you for your assistance. I look forward to the opportunity of talking with you.

Sincerely,

Emmett G. Shufflebarger

EGS/sw



APPENDIX D

LEGAL BASIS FOR THE POSITION OF STATE  
SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

The Constitution of Virginia dated 1968, Section 129 provides the following concerning education:

Section 129. Free schools to be maintained. - The General Assembly shall establish and maintain an efficient system of public free schools throughout the State.

Section 131. Superintendent of Public Instruction; appointment; term of office; how elected; duties. - A Superintendent of Public Instruction, who shall be an experienced educator, shall be appointed by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly, for a term coincident with that of each Governor making the appointment; provided, however, that the first appointment under this section, as hereby amended, shall not be made until the expiration of the term of office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, which began February first, nineteen hundred and twenty-six; and provided, further, that the General Assembly shall have power, by statute enacted after January first, nineteen hundred and thirty-two, to provide for the election or appointment of a Superintendent of Public Instruction in such a manner and for such term as may be prescribed by statute. No Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be elected at the general election to be held on the Tuesday succeeding the first Monday in November, nineteen hundred and twenty-nine. The powers and duties of the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be prescribed by law.

In the January 1969 copy of Virginia School Laws the following sections were devoted to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction:

Section 22-22. Appointment and qualification. - The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be appointed by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly, for a term coincident with that of the Governor making the appointment. Any vacancy shall be filled by appointment by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly. The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be an experienced educator.

Section 22-23. Salary and expenses. - His salary shall be fixed by the General Assembly, and he shall be allowed an addition to his salary for his necessary traveling expenses while engaged in the duties of his office, such sum as may be appropriated by law.

Section 22-24. Oath of office. - Before entering upon the discharge of the duties of his office, he shall qualify by taking and subscribing the oath required of all officers of the State.

Section 22-25. Duties in general. - It shall be the duty of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to formulate such rules and regulations, and provide such assistance in his office as shall be necessary for the proper and uniform enforcement of the provisions of the school laws in cooperation with the local school authorities. He shall prepare and furnish such blanks for attendance officers, teachers and other school officials as are required by law.

Section 22-26. Further duties prescribed by Board; approval of appointments. - The State Board shall prescribe the duties of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in addition to those duties otherwise prescribed for him by law, and in its discretion, subject to the provisions of Sections 2-78 and 2-84, approve the appointment by the Superintendent of such employees as may be necessary for doing the work in the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and fix their salaries.

Section 22-27. Administration of "National School Lunch Act". - The Superintendent of Public Instruction is hereby designated as the "State educational agency" for the disbursement of funds received by the Commonwealth of Virginia under the provisions of Public Law 396, 79th Congress, known as the "National School Lunch Act"; and as such is authorized, empowered and directed to exercise powers and perform the duties conferred and imposed by the act of Congress aforesaid.

Section 22-28. Secretary of Board. - The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall, without additional compensation, serve as secretary of the State Board.

Section 22-29. Cessation of ex officio membership on governing bodies of certain educational institutions. - Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Code, the membership, ex officio, of the Superintendent of Public Instruction on the governing bodies of the educational institutions receiving appropriations from the State shall cease on June twenty-seven, nineteen hundred sixty-six. Provided, however, that this section shall not be construed to affect the membership of the Superintendent of Public Instruction on the State Council of Higher Education, as provided for by section 23-9.3.

Section 22-156. Fire precautions. - All public school buildings and additions shall have all halls, doors, stairways, seats, passageways and aisles, and all lighting and heating appliances and apparatus, arranged to facilitate egress in case of fire or accidents, and to afford the requisite and proper accommodations for public protection in such cases. All exit doors in any public schoolhouse of two or more stories in height shall open outwardly. No staircase shall be constructed except with straight runs, changes in direction being made by platforms. No doors shall open immediately upon a flight of stairs, but a landing at least the width of the doors shall be provided between such stairs and such doorway. Every public schoolhouse hereafter erected, of two stories or more, shall be equipped with an adequate number of internal fireproof stairways and with adequate means of exit on a ground level, in accordance with regulations of the State Board.

. . . The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall make periodical surveys of all nonfireproof public school buildings within the State when authorized by the State Board, and shall present his findings to the Board. The State Board shall have the power to close any school that it considers to be a fire hazard, and also shall have the power to enforce such changes in construction, including alterations, erection of fire escapes, additional safety exits, and such other internal or external alterations as in the option of the Superintendent of Public Instruction are necessary to make the building reasonably safe to occupants against fire and panic hazards. For failure on the part of the school board of any county, town or city to comply with the recommendations and requirements of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to make corrections, erect fire escapes, provide safety exits and such alterations as may be deemed necessary for the safety of the occupants concerned, the State Board, in its discretion, may withhold from such county, town or city such part thereof as is required by the Constitution of Virginia to be paid such county, city or town, until the recommendations and requirements of the State Board have been complied with.

Section 22-287. When Superintendent of Public Instruction to obtain insurance. - In every case in which a locality or its school board fails to obtain, or to require vehicles operated under contract with it to be covered by, the requisite insurance, by the first of August of any year, or fails to notify the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the effectuation of requisite insurance on or before the tenth of August,

it shall be the duty of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, on or before the tenth of September, to obtain insurance complying with the requirements of this article on all vehicles to be used, as far as known to or reasonably ascertainable by him, for school pupil and personnel transportation in the ensuing session, and to expend for this purpose the requisite amount out of any State school funds otherwise distributable, or becoming distributable, to the particular locality so in default.

Section 22-293. Distribution of funds when Superintendent effects insurance. - When the Superintendent of Public Instruction effects insurance as required by this article, he shall nevertheless not make any distribution of State school aid funds to the locality or school board so in default until he has been furnished with satisfactory assurances that all vehicles required by this article to be covered by insurance have been duly insured.

For Virginia School for The Deaf and The Blind

Section 23-159. Duties of board. . . . The curricula shall be prepared in such detail as may be prescribed by the State Board of Education, and shall not be amended or changed without the approval of the State Board of Education.

One member of the staff of the State Department of Education shall be designated by the Superintendent of Public Instruction to serve as consultant to the board of visitors, through the Superintendent, on matters pertaining to instruction. It shall be his responsibility to keep the board of visitors informed on requirements for accrediting by the State Board of Education, and he shall make available for the board of visitors such technical services of the State Department of Education as may be deemed desirable to assist in meeting specific instructional needs (Constitution of Virginia, 1968).

ARTICLE VIII of the Constitution of Virginia which became effective on July 1, 1971, provides the following sections concerning the State Superintendent of Public Instruction:

Section 1. Public schools of high quality to be maintained. - The General Assembly shall provide for a system of free public elementary and secondary schools for all children of school age throughout the Commonwealth, and shall seek to ensure that an educational program of high quality is established and continually maintained.

Section 2. Standards of quality; State and local support of public schools. - Standards of quality for the several school divisions shall be determined and prescribed from time to time by the Board of Education, subject to revision only by the General Assembly.

The General Assembly shall determine the manner in which funds are to be provided for the cost of maintaining an educational program meeting the prescribed standards of quality, and shall provide for the apportionment of the cost of such program between the Commonwealth and the local units of government comprising such school divisions. Each unit of local government shall provide its portion of such cost by local taxes or from other available sources.

Section 6. Superintendent of Public Instruction. - A Superintendent of Public Instruction, who shall be an experienced educator, shall be appointed by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly, for a term coincident with that of the Governor making the appointment, but the General Assembly may alter by statute this method of selection and term of office. The powers and duties of the Superintendent shall be prescribed by law.

Section 22-2. Administration of system. - The public free school system shall be administered by a State Board of Education, hereinafter sometimes called the State Board, a Superintendent of Public Instruction, division superintendents of schools, and county and city school boards.

Section 22-22. Appointment and qualification. - The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be appointed by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly, for a term coincident with that of the Governor making the appointment. Any vacancy shall be filled by appointment by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly. The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be an experienced educator.

Section 22-23. Salary and expenses. - His salary shall be fixed by the General Assembly, and he shall be allowed an addition to his salary for his necessary traveling expenses while engaged in the duties of his office, such sum as may be appropriated by law.

Section 22-24. Oath of Office. - Before entering upon the discharge of the duties of his office, he shall

qualify by taking and subscribing the oath required of all officers of the State.

Section 22-25. Duties in general. - It shall be the duty of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to formulate such rules and regulations, and provide such assistance in his office as shall be necessary for the proper and uniform enforcement of the provisions of the school laws in cooperation with the local school authorities. He shall prepare and furnish such blanks for attendance officers, teachers and other school officials as are required by law.

Section 22-26. Further duties prescribed by Board; approval of appointments. - The State Board shall prescribe the duties of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in addition to those duties otherwise prescribed for him by law, and in its discretion, subject to the provisions of Sections 2-78 to 2-84 (Sections 2.1-110 to 2.1-116), approve the appointment by the Superintendent of such employees as may be necessary for doing the work in the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and fix their salaries.

Section 22-27. Administration of "National School Lunch Act". - The Superintendent of Public Instruction is hereby designated as the "State educational agency" for the disbursement of funds received by the Commonwealth of Virginia under the provisions of Public Law 396, 79th Congress, known as the "National School Lunch Act"; and as such is authorized, empowered and directed to exercise the powers and perform the duties conferred and imposed by the act of Congress aforesaid.

Section 22-28. Secretary of Board. - The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall, without additional compensation, serve as secretary of the State Board.

Section 22-29. Cessation of ex officio membership on governing bodies of certain educational institutions. - Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Code, the membership, ex officio, of the Superintendent of Public Instruction on the governing bodies of the educational institutions receiving appropriations from the State shall cease on June twenty-seven, nineteen hundred sixty-six. Provided, however, that this section shall not be construed to affect the membership of the Superintendent of Public Instruction on the State Council of Higher Education, as provided for by Section 23-9.3.

Section 22-152. Plans for buildings to be approved by division superintendent and State Superintendent. - No public schoolhouse shall be contracted for, erected, or added to, until the plans and specifications therefore shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the division superintendent of schools and the plans and specifications for such building or any addition have been approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Section 22-156. Fire precautions. - . . . All public school buildings and additions shall have halls, doors, stairways, seats, passageways and aisles, and all lighting and heating appliances and apparatus, arranged to facilitate egress in case of fire or accidents, and to afford the requisite and proper accommodations for public protection in such cases. All exit doors in any public schoolhouse of two or more stories in height shall open outwardly. No staircase shall be constructed except with straight runs, changes in direction being made by platforms. No doors shall open immediately upon a flight of stairs, but a landing at least the width of the doors shall be provided between such stairs and such doorway. Every public schoolhouse hereafter erected, of two stories or more shall be equipped with an adequate number of internal fireproof stairways and with adequate means of exit on a ground level, in accordance with regulations of the State Board.

In every public school there shall be a fire drill at least once every week during the first month of each school session, and oftener, if necessary, in order that pupils may be thoroughly practiced in such drills. During the remainder of the school session fire drills shall be held at least monthly.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall make periodical surveys of all nonfireproof public school buildings within the State when authorized by the State Board, and shall present his findings to the Board. The State Board shall have the power to close any school that it considers a fire hazard, and also shall have the power to enforce such changes in construction, including alterations, erection of fire escapes, additional safety exits, and such other internal or external alterations as in the opinion of the Superintendent of Public Instruction are necessary to make the building reasonably safe to occupants against fire and panic hazards. For failure to comply with the recommendations and requirements of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to make corrections, erect fire escapes, provide for the safety of the



occupants concerned, the State Board, in its discretion, may withhold from such county, town or city, such State school funds allotted to said county, town or city, until the recommendations and requirements of the State Board have been complied with.

Section 22-287. When Superintendent of Public Instruction to obtain insurance. - In every case in which a locality or its school board fails to obtain, or to require vehicles operated under contract with it to be covered by, the requisite insurance, by the first of August of any year, or fails to notify the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the effectuation of requisite insurance on or before the tenth of August, it shall be the duty of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, on or before the tenth of September, to obtain insurance complying with the requirements of this article on all vehicles to be used, as far as known to or reasonably ascertainable by him, for school pupil and personnel transportation in the ensuing session, and to expend for this purpose the requisite amount out of any State school funds otherwise distributable, or becoming distributable, to the particular locality so in default.

Section 22-293. Distribution of funds when Superintendent affects insurance. - When the Superintendent of Public Instruction effects insurance as required by this article, he shall nevertheless not make any distribution of State aid funds to the locality or school board so in default until he has been furnished with satisfactory assurances that all vehicles required by this article to be covered by insurance have been duly insured.

Section 22-330.12. Appointment of Committee. - An Advisory Committee on Fire Service Training consisting of seven members and hereinafter called "the Committee" shall be appointed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to serve for such a period of time as may be deemed necessary by the State Superintendent.

Section 22-330.13. Committee to confer and advise with Department and Board of Education; meetings. - The Committee shall confer and advise with the Department of Education and the State Board of Education regarding the development and institution of a program of fire service training to meet the needs of the State. The Committee shall meet periodically upon call of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Section 22-330.15. Superintendent of Public Instruction authorized to employ additional staff.

- The Superintendent of Public Instruction may, through funds appropriated under this Chapter, employ additional staff to strengthen the fire training program (Constitution of Virginia, 1971).

The State Board of Education regulations of 1973 provide that the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be the chief executive officer of the public school system, and shall have the following duties:

(a) He shall be the executive officer of the Division of Vocational Education of the State Department of Education.

(b) He shall prepare or have prepared suitable registers, blanks and other forms which may be necessary for making appropriate reports to the State Department of Education. By circulars and otherwise, he shall give information and instruction conducive to the proper organization and conduct of the schools.

(c) He shall require of division superintendents detailed reports annually and special reports from time to time as he may deem proper.

He shall use all proper means to promote an appreciation of education among the people.

(d) He shall preserve in convenient form in his office all papers, documents and records relating to educational work in Virginia and in other states.

(e) He shall prepare, as prescribed by law, a plan for apportioning the money appropriated by the state for public school purposes.

(f) He shall provide for his office a suitable official seal with which official documents may be authenticated.

(g) He shall submit annually to the Board of Education (State) on or before the first day of November a detailed report of his official proceedings for the year ending the thirtieth day of June preceding, including receipts and expenditures for the public schools, a statistical report showing the number of children, male and female, respectively in the state, and in each county and city, compensation paid teachers, the cost of education per pupil, and whatever else may tend to exhibit the real condition of the schools. He shall be at liberty and it shall be his duty to offer suggestions to the Board of Education (State) and to the General Assembly concerning

matters pertaining to his department at any time that the public interest seems to him to require it (Regulations of the Board of Education, 1973:p. 121).

APPENDIX E

THE IDENTIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL GOALS IN VIRGINIA

1960-1973

Educational Goals of Dr. Wilkerson Identified Through Annual Reports  
of Superintendents of Public Instruction and Years  
Such Goals Were Mentioned

Inservice training for teachers - 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966

Summer institutes for teachers - 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964

Financial aid to math instruction - 1961

Financial aid to science instruction - 1961

Financial aid to foreign language instruction - 1961

Financial aid to guidance - 1961

College scholarships and loans - 1961

Increase in staff of State Department of Education - 1961, 1968, 1973

Government course curriculum guide - 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964

Development of statement of policy (for State Department of  
Education - 1961

Written composition curriculum guide - 1961, 1962

Distribution formula study - 1961, 1962, 1964, 1966, 1972, 1973

Eighth and ninth grade science guide - 1961, 1962

Elementary school standards - 1961, 1962, 1964, 1967, 1969, 1970

Teacher preparation program improvement - 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964,  
1966, 1967, 1969

Civil defense - 1961, 1962, 1963

Minimum salary increase - 1962, 1964, 1968, 1969

Educational research - 1962, 1963, 1964, 1971, 1972, 1973

Pilot studies - 1962, 1963, 1964, 1971, 1973

New master of arts program - 1962

Driver education - 1962, 1963, 1966, 1969

Closed circuit television for teacher training - 1962

Guide for using maps and globes - 1962

Guide for elementary geography - 1962

Study of teacher supply - 1962

Primary social studies guide - 1963

Physical fitness testing - 1963

Distributive Education guide - 1963

Vocational Agriculture guide - 1963

Guidance handbook - 1963

Increased collection of educational data - 1963

Industrial education growth - 1963

Appropriations from General Assembly - 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1972, 1973

Manpower training program - 1963, 1964

Local school records examination - 1963

Revision of teachers' registers - 1963

Additional state aid positions - 1964, 1965

Expansion in vocational education funding - 1964, 1969, 1971, 1972

Change in responsibility for higher education - 1964, 1965, 1966

Growth in area vocational/technical school - 1964

Study of dropouts - 1964, 1969

Use of data processing - 1964

Reduction in number of one-room schools - 1965, 1966

Reduction of number of pupils in classes of less than 30 - 1965, 1968

Reduction in number of half-day elementary schools - 1965, 1966

Increase in number of elementary pupils in classes of less than 30 - 1965, 1968

Improved pupil-teacher ratio - 1965, 1966, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1972, 1973

Improved number of counselors devoting one-half day to guidance - 1965  
1966, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1972, 1973

Increased holding power of school - 1965, 1966, 1967, 1969, 1970, 1971,  
1972, 1973

Number of high school graduates - 1965, 1966, 1969, 1973

Increased percentage of graduates going to further education - 1965  
1966, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1972, 1973

Number of elementary schools with libraries and qualified librarians -  
1965

Average classroom teachers salary - 1965, 1966, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1973

Average instructional personnel salary - 1965, 1966, 1969, 1970, 1971  
1973

Established value of school property - 1965, 1966, 1969, 1972, 1973

Cost of operating per pupil ADA - 1965, 1966, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1972,  
1973

Economics education - 1965, 1966

Number of teachers holding degrees - 1965, 1968, 1969, 1971

Increased library services - 1965, 1966, 1972

Civil Rights compliance - 1965

Federal funds, ESEA - 1965, 1966, 1973

Schools offering summer work - 1966, 1968

Special education - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1972

Educational television - 1966, 1968, 1971, 1972

More "time to teach" - 1966

Kindergarten - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1973

Division superintendents' salary - 1966, 1967, 1968

Change in census procedure - 1966



Promotion of free and rental textbooks - 1966

Eleventh grade history guide - 1966

Civics guide - 1966

Special Governor's Conference on Education - 1967

Turner Committee report - 1967, 1968

System wide evaluation - 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970

Priorities to needy countries - 1967

Expansion of testing program - 1967

Stronger secondary accreditation - 1967, 1968, 1969

Changes in superintendents' qualifications - 1967

Compulsory education law - 1968

System wide planning - 1969, 1970

Citizenship education - 1969, 1970

Performance contracting - 1969, 1970

Drug abuse education - 1970, 1971

State wide needs assessment - 1970, 1971

New state constitution - 1971

Elementary guidance program - 1971

Standards of Quality - 1971, 1972, 1973

Year-round schools - 1971, 1973

Review of social studies offerings - 1971

Percentage holding regular certificates - 1972, 1973

Change in admission date of children - 1972

Progress in desegregation - 1972

Career education - 1972

Programs for disadvantaged youth - 1973

Study of reading abilities - 1973

Study of racially fair textbooks - 1973

Study of bus safety - 1973

Study of environmental education - 1973

Use of American Management Association consultants - 1973

Programs for the gifted - 1973

Cost of operating schools based on ADM - 1973

Goals Identified from FACING UP, a Statistical Data on Virginia  
Public Schools, 1966-1973

Regular school enrollment - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972,  
1973

Summer school enrollment - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972  
1973

Adult enrollment - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972

Number of teachers - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Number and percent of teachers with degrees - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969,  
1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Average salary of classroom teacher - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970,  
1971, 1972, 1973

Percentage of increase in salary last ten years - 1966, 1967, 1968  
1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

High school offering - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972

High school dropout - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Holding power - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Percentage continuing formal education - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970,  
1971, 1972, 1973

Number participating in educational television - 1966

Sources of funds (state, federal, local) - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Operating expenditures per child (ADA and ADM) - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Supervisory personnel - 1967

Pupil teacher ratio - 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Guidance counselors - 1967

Male personnel - 1968

Female personnel - 1968

Degrees earned in Virginia - 1968

Years of experience - 1968

Marital status - 1968

Number with advanced degrees - 1968

Type of certificates - 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973

Salary of all instructional personnel - 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Compare ninth grade and twelfth grade enrollment - 1971, 1972, 1973

Goals Added to Original List from FACING UP

Percentage of classroom teachers salary increase

High school offering

Number of male/female instructional personnel

Personnel with advanced degrees

Experience of instructional personnel

Adult education programs

Goals Identified Through Superintendents of Public Instruction's  
Memorandums, 1960-1973 and Years Goals Mentioned

School bus safety - 1960, 1961, 1973

General Education Development program - 1960

Summer institutes - 1960

State testing program - 1960

Elementary statement of policy - 1961

Elementary geography guide - 1961

Educational research - 1962, 1963

Government course guide - 1962, 1963

Vocational education - 1964

Civil defense - 1964, 1966, 1969

Study of dropouts - 1964

Civil rights compliance - 1965, 1972, 1973

ESEA - 1965

Department reorganization - 1965

Educational television - 1966, 1972

Elementary economics guide - 1966

Driver education - 1966

Use of teacher time - 1966

Kindergarten - 1967, 1968

Standards of Quality - 1967, 1971, 1972, 1973

Division superintendents seminar - 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Citizenship education - 1968

Textbook funding - 1969

Teacher aid guidelines - 1969  
 Needs assessment - 1969, 1971  
 Elementary accreditation - 1971  
 Drug abuse education - 1970, 1971  
 Sex education - 1970, 1971  
 Revocation of teacher licenses - 1971, 1972  
 Technical assistance school desegregation - 1971, 1972  
 Instruction in personal and family survival - 1972  
 Textbook adoption - 1972  
 Career education - 1972  
 Inservice training - 1972  
 Sex discrimination - 1973  
 Grievance procedures - 1973

Goals Added to Original List from SUPERINTENDENTS' MEMOS

Guidelines for teacher aids  
 Use of technical assistance for school desegregation

Goals of Dr. Wilkerson Identified Through the Minutes of the Meetings  
 of the State Board of Education 1960-1973 and Years Goals Mentioned

Textbook adoptions - 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1971, 1973  
 New course approval - 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967,  
 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973  
 Secondary accreditation - 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966,  
 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973  
 Literary loan approval - 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966,  
 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Tuition grants (pupil scholarship) - 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Elementary geography guide - 1960, 1961

Qualifications of administrators and supervisors - 1960, 1973

Government course guide - 1960, 1962, 1964

Summer institutes - 1960, 1962

NDEA funding - 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967

Inservice training program - 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1971, 1973

State testing program - 1960, 1962, 1967, 1969, 1971, 1972, 1973

Educational television - 1960, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

School bus safety - 1960, 1961, 1965, 1968, 1972, 1973

Elementary accreditation - 1961, 1967, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Superintendents' qualifications - 1961, 1962, 1963, 1967

Extra curricular activities - 1961, 1962

Civil defense - 1961, 1962, 1963

Library standards and accreditation - 1961, 1964, 1970, 1973

Summer school - 1961, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1971

Funding for math, science, foreign language - 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965

School building approval - 1961, 1962, 1963

Elementary history guide - 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965

Merit pay - 1962, 1963

Pilot studies - 1962, 1963

Driver education - 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1972

Educational research - 1963, 1964, 1966, 1970

Approval of sex education materials - 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Reorganization of department - 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1972

Industrial and/or vocational education - 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Guidance - 1964, 1965

Elementary economics guide - 1964, 1966

Study clerical duties of teachers - 1964, 1966

Desegregation report/civil rights compliance - 1965, 1966, 1967, 1971, 1972

Special education - 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Adult basic education - 1965, 1967, 1973

ESEA - 1965, 1966, 1970

Teacher supply - 1965, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1972, 1973

Kindergarten education - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1971

New sick leave policy - 1966, 1968

Changes - General Education Development program - 1966, 1969, 1971, 1972

Turner Commission report - 1966, 1967

Superintendents summer institute - 1967, 1968, 1970

Standards of Quality - 1967, 1971, 1972, 1973

Citizenship education - 1968, 1969, 1970

Professional negotiation/regulations - 1969, 1971, 1972

Performance contracting - 1970, 1971

Drug abuse education - 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Licensing of proprietary schools - 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Year round schools - 1971, 1972, 1973

Free textbooks - 1970, 1971

Grievance procedures - 1972, 1973

Compensatory education - 1973

Governors school for gifted - 1970

Goals Added to Original List from STATE BOARD MINUTES

Textbook adoptions

New course approval

Use of literacy loans

Tuition grants (pupil scholarships)

School building approval

Merit pay

Approval of sex education materials

Reorganization of State Department of Education

Change in sick leave policy

Summer institutes for division superintendents

Professional negotiations/relations

Licensing of proprietary schools

Grievance procedures

Compensatory education

Goals Identified from VIRGINIA JOURNAL OF EDUCATION,  
Official Publication of the Virginia Education  
Association, 1960-1973 and Years Goals Mentioned

Sales tax - 1960, 1966, 1969

Improved teachers' salary - 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966,  
1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973



Guidance services - 1960, 1961, 1964, 1966, 1967, 1969

Special education - 1960, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968

Pupil-teacher ratio - 1960, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969

Modular scheduling - 1960

Differentiated staffing - 1960, 1969

Research - 1960, 1961, 1962, 1964, 1966, 1967

Gifted - 1960, 1963, 1973

New and better financial formula - 1960, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1970, 1972

Improved retirement benefits - 1960, 1961, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972

Secondary accreditation standards - 1960, 1967

Percentage going to college - 1960, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1967

Need for written board policies - 1960, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969

Reading improvement - 1960, 1966, 1968, 1969

Education television - 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1967, 1968

Teacher endorsement - 1960, 1961, 1962, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967

Programmed learning - 1960, 1962, 1963, 1964

Improved sick leave - 1960, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1972

Men in teaching - 1971

Twelve month employment of teachers - 1961, 1966

Team teaching - 1961, 1963

Drop-outs - 1961, 1962, 1963, 1965, 1966, 1968

Foreign language laboratories - 1961, 1962, 1964

Inservice education - 1961, 1966

Testing program - 1961

Teacher supply - 1961, 1962, 1964, 1970, 1972  
Extended school year - 1962  
Ability grouping - 1962  
Vocational education - 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1970  
Percentage finishing school - 1962, 1965, 1967  
Teacher preparation - 1962, 1967, 1968, 1969  
Library improvement - 1962, 1963  
Community college - 1962  
Independent study - 1962  
Percentage with advanced degrees - 1962, 1963, 1964  
Year round school - 1962, 1964, 1966, 1971, 1973  
Summer school - 1962, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1972  
Reluctant learner - 1962, 1963  
Time to teach - 1963, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969  
Improved principals salary - 1963  
Desegregation - 1963  
Economic education - 1963  
Non-graded elementary schools - 1963  
Longer school day - 1963  
Advanced placement - 1963  
Humanities program - 1963, 1964, 1969, 1971  
Emergency personal leave - 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969  
Elementary science - 1964  
Industrial arts - 1964  
Kindergarten - 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1973

Improved superintendents' qualifications - 1964, 1968

Against tuition grant - 1964, 1965, 1968

Consolidation - 1965, 1967

Appointment of State Superintendent by State Board - 1965, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1972

Compulsory attendance - 1966, 1973

Free lunch - 1966

Use of non-professional aids - 1966, 1967, 1970, 1971

Free textbook - 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969

Elementary accreditation - 1967

Psychological services - 1967

System-wide evaluation - 1967

Sex education - 1967, 1968, 1969

Fair employment practices - 1967

Professional negotiation - 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972

Data processing instruction - 1968

Citizenship education - 1968

Health education - 1968, 1969, 1970

Textbook adoption procedure - 1969, 1971

Drug education - 1969, 1971

Discipline - 1970

Environmental education - 1970

Ethnic studies - 1970

Consumer education - 1970

Performance contracting - 1971, 1972

Middle school - 1971

Accountability - 1971, 1972

Tenure - 1972

Elected school board - 1971, 1972

Goals Added to Original List from VIRGINIA JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

Sales tax

Modular scheduling

Differentiated staffing

Improved retirement benefits

Need for written school board policy

Improved sick leave benefits

Men in teaching

Twelve month employment of teachers

Improved principals' salaries

Opposition to tuition grants

State Board selection of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Fair employment practices

Law and order in schools

Middle school program

Tenure

Goals Identified from the VIRGINIA PARENT-TEACHERS ASSOCIATION  
BULLETIN - 1961-1963, and Years Goals Mentioned

School bus safety - 1961, 1970, 1971, 1973

Character/citizenship education - 1962, 1967, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973

Special education - 1962, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1971, 1973

Gifted programs - 1962, 1969

Dropouts - 1962, 1966, 1973

Kindergarten - 1962, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1970, 1971, 1973

Library services - 1963, 1971, 1973

Elementary guidance - 1965, 1967, 1970, 1971, 1973

Psychological services - 1965, 1967

Sales tax - 1965

Sex education - 1966, 1967, 1969, 1970, 1973

Teachers' salary - 1966, 1967, 1971

Inservice education - 1966

Driver education - 1966, 1973

New and additional finance formula - 1966, 1967, 1970, 1973

Child abuse - 1966, 1967

Financial support for school construction - 1967, 1970, 1971, 1973

Research - 1967, 1970

Against tuition grants - 1967, 1970

Summer school - 1967, 1969, 1970, 1973

Vocational education - 1967, 1970, 1971, 1973

Superintendent of Public Instruction selected by State Board - 1967,  
1970, 1971, 1973

TB examination - 1967

Impact money - 1967

Art program - 1968

Order in classroom - 1969, 1970

Enlarge State Board of Education - 1969

Drug education - 1979, 1970

Use of teacher aids - 1969

Multi-ethnic textbooks - 1969

Reading - 1969, 1971

Civil defense - 1970

Nursery school program - 1970

Funding based on ADM - 1970

School music program - 1970, 1971, 1973

School inspection program - 1970

Free textbooks - 1971, 1973

Improved retirement benefits - 1971

School boards selected by governing bodies - 1971, 1973

Accreditation - 1971

Neighborhood school - 1971, 1973

Year round school - 1971

Environmental education - 1971

Sex discrimination - 1971

Educational television - 1971

Human relation - 1971

Desegregation problems - 1972

Open classroom education - 1972

Teacher endorsement - 1973

Improve teaching training - 1973

Career education - 1973

Pupil-teacher ratio - 1973

Goals Added to Original List from VIRGINIA P.T.A. BULLETINS

Financial support for school construction

Child abuse

TB examination

Federal impact funds

School nurse program

School boards selected by governing bodies

Neighborhood schools

Sex discrimination

Educational Goals Identified from Virginia School Boards Association NEWSLETTER 1960-1973, and Years Goals Mentioned

Inservice education - 1961, 1973

Distribution formula - 1961, 1962, 1964, 1966, 1967, 1972, 1973

Use of media - 1961

Long range planning - 1961

Financial support for school construction - 1961

Sales tax - 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1966

Local control of schools - 1961

Superintendent's qualifications - 1961

Teachers salary - 1961, 1964, 1965, 1966

Federal aid to education - 1961, 1966, 1967, 1973

Teacher competency - 1961

School construction standards - 1961, 1967

Vocational education - 1963, 1973

Educational television - 1963

Summer school - 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966

Community college - 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966

Superintendent's salary increase - 1963, 1964

Kindergarten - 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1970

Need for local school board written policies - 1964

Teacher training improvement - 1964, 1965

Increase number of men teachers - 1964, 1965

NDEA funding - 1964

Urban problems study - 1965

Tuition grants - 1965, 1966, 1967

Retirement benefits - 1965, 1966

State Board selection of State Superintendent - 1965, 1966, 1967

Compulsory attendance - 1965, 1966, 1967

Middle school - 1966

Early childhood education - 1966, 1970

School board members salary benefit - 1966, 1967, 1969, 1972

Use of ADM for funding - 1967

Citizenship education - 1967, 1969

Free textbooks - 1968

Increase State Board of Education membership - 1968

Special education - 1968, 1969, 1973

Sex discrimination in schools - 1968

Private school accreditation - 1969

Environmental education - 1970



Conflict of interest - 1970

Pupil transportation - 1970, 1971

State aid for inservice - 1971

Teacher aides - 1972, 1973

Collective bargaining - 1972, 1973

Driver education - 1973

Differentiated staffing - 1973

Ethnic studies, human relations for teachers - 1973

Reading - 1973

Goals Added to Original List from VIRGINIA SCHOOL  
BOARDS ASSOCIATION NEWSLETTER

Federal aid to education

School construction standards

Community college

Local written school board policies

NDEA funding

Urban problems study

Early childhood education

Free textbooks

State aid for inservice education

Ethnic/human relations studies

Educational Goals Identified from Dr. Wilkerson's Speeches Before  
Annual Meeting of School Superintendents

Decentralized (local) control of education - 1961

Government course guide - 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1968

Time to teach - 1961, 1962

Teacher endorsement strengthened - 1961, 1965, 1970

Team teaching - 1961

Educational television - 1961

Continuing education - 1961, 1965, 1973

Change in distribution formula - 1962, 1964, 1966, 1970, 1972

Inservice education - 1962, 1963, 1964, 1966, 1969

Summer institutes for teachers - 1962

Educational research - 1962, 1963, 1965, 1970, 1972

Class size reduction - 1962, 1967

Reading improvement - 1962, 1964, 1973

Programmed material - 1962

Holding power - 1962

Guidance services - 1963, 1972

Percentage going to college - 1963, 1972

School bus safety - 1963

Library standards improvement - 1963

Teacher salaries - 1963, 1964, 1966, 1972

Expenditure per pupil - 1963

Industrial/vocational education - 1963, 1964, 1965, 1969, 1972

Vocational agriculture - 1963

Economic education - 1964, 1965, 1968  
Dropouts - 1964  
Driver and traffic safety education - 1964  
Civics education guide - 1965, 1969  
U. S. history guide - 1965  
NDEA (National Defense Education Act) - 1965  
Accreditation standard - 1967, 1968  
Superintendents' qualification - 1967  
Kindergarten - 1967, 1968, 1969, 1972  
Length of school day - 1967  
Compulsory attendance - 1968, 1969  
Special education - 1968, 1969, 1972, 1973  
Standards of Quality - 1969, 1972  
Accountability - 1970  
Percentage of endorsed personnel - 1970  
Holding power - 1972  
Sales tax - 1972  
Career education - 1972  
Desegregation - 1972  
Improved skills - 1973  
Gifted programs - 1973  
Environmental education - 1973

Goals Added to Original List From Dr. Wilkerson's Speeches

Decentralized control of schools

Team teaching

Programmed instruction

Length of school day

Compulsory attendance

Amount of desegregation

Goals Identified from State Commission on Public Education 1959-1960  
(Spong Commission Report)

Inservice education expansion

Research/pilot studies

Educational television

Teacher scholarship expansion

Summer institutes for librarians

Elementary librarian positions

Training of handicapped

Expanded school years (longer than 180 days)

Elementary principal qualification strengthened

History, government, and geography curriculum improvement

Teacher qualification improvement

Testing program

Teacher training in reading

Expanded course requirements for secondary school graduation

Salary improvement

Summer school expansion

Teaching of phonics

Expanded library services

Strengthened readiness programs

More clerical assistance for teachers

Goals Added to Original List from Spong Commission Report

Expanded school year (longer than 180 days)

Qualifications of elementary principals

Teacher training in reading

Expanded course requirements for secondary school graduation

Teaching of phonics

Clerical assistance for teachers/administration

Goals Identified from Governor's Conference on Education-1966

College preparatory programs

Vocational training

Expenditures per pupil

Literacy for all students

Expenditure for education

Percentage of male teachers

Holding power

Kindergarten education

Economics education

Educational television

Goals Added to Original List from Governor's  
Conference on Education-1966

Literacy for all students

Goals Identified from Turner Committee's Report-1967

(In August, 1966, the State Board of Education authorized the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to appoint a committee on Raising the Level of Public Education in Virginia)

Salary improvement of State Department of Education

Expanded staff of State Department of Education

Need for local school board written policies

Improve percentage of fully endorsed personnel

Special education expansion

Inservice education for administrators and supervisors

Upgrade division superintendent qualifications

Upgrade division superintendent's salary

Increase secondary school offering

Increase secondary accreditation standards

Elementary school accreditation

Need for reading teachers

Expansion of health and physical education

Expansion of art

Expansion of school nurse program

Expansion of library program

Expansion of visiting teacher program

Expansion of guidance program  
 Expansion of school psychologist services  
 Cooperative planning and sharing by school divisions  
 Kindergarten  
 Pupil-teacher ratio reduction  
 Free or rental textbooks program  
 Educational television financing  
 More funds be made available for school construction  
 Revision of funding formula  
 Testing program expansion  
 Expanded local school improvement program  
 Consolidation of local school division  
 Clarification responsibility of State Board of Education

Goals Added to Original List from Turner Committee Report

Salary improvement for State Department of Education  
 Increased secondary school offering  
 Expansion of art program  
 Expansion of visiting teacher program  
 Expansion of school psychologist program  
 Expansion of local school improvement program (planning)  
 Clarification of role of State Board of Education

Composite Educational Goals in Virginia--1960-1973

1. Inservice training for teachers
2. Summer institutes for teachers
3. Financial aid to mathematics instruction
4. Financial aid to science instruction
5. Financial aid to foreign language instruction
6. Financial aid to guidance
7. Teacher scholarships
8. Expanded staff of State Department of Education
9. Curriculum guide for government courses
10. Statement of policy for State Department of Education
11. Curriculum guide for written composition
12. Revision of financial distribution formula
13. Curriculum guide for eighth and ninth grade science courses
14. Elementary school accreditation standards
15. Improved teacher preparation program
16. Civil defense education
17. Increase in teachers' minimum salary
18. Educational research
19. Pilot studies
20. Master of arts in teaching program
21. Driver and traffic safety education
22. Use of closed circuit television for teacher training
23. Curriculum guide for using maps and globes
24. Curriculum guide for elementary geography



25. Study of teacher demand and supply
26. Curriculum guide for primary social studies
27. Physical fitness testing
28. Curriculum guide for distributive education
29. Curriculum guide for agriculture education
30. Guidance handbook
31. Collection of educational data
32. Expansion of industrial education
33. General Assembly financial appropriations
34. Manpower training program
35. Examination of local school records
36. Revision of teachers' registers
37. Increase state aid staff positions
38. Expansion of vocational education funding
39. Decrease in State Board of Education responsibility for higher education
40. Growth in area vocational/technical schools
41. Reduction of dropouts
42. Use of data processing
43. Reduction in number of one-room schools
44. Reduction in number of pupils in classes of more than 30
45. Reduction in number of half-day elementary classes
46. Increase of number of elementary pupils in classes of less than 30
47. Improved pupil-teacher ratio
48. Increase in number of full-time guidance counselors

49. Increase holding power of school
50. Increase in number of secondary school graduates
51. Increased percentage of secondary school graduates going to further education
52. Increased number of elementary schools with libraries and qualified librarians
53. Average classroom teachers' salaries
54. Average instruction personnel's salaries
55. Estimated value of school property
56. Cost of school operations per ADA
57. Need for economic education
58. Number and percentage of teacher holding college degrees
59. Increased library services
60. Civil Rights Act compliance
61. Federal funding - Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965
62. Schools with summer offerings
63. Special education programs
64. Educational television
65. More "time to teach"
66. Kindergarten
67. Local division superintendents' salaries
68. Change in census procedure
69. Free and/or rental textbooks
70. Curriculum guide for U. S. history courses
71. Curriculum guide for civics
72. Local division wide evaluation

73. Priority financial treatment to less able divisions
74. Expanded testing program
75. Strengthening of secondary accreditation
76. Increase qualifications for division superintendents
77. Compulsory education law
78. Division wide planning
79. Citizenship education
80. Performance contracting
81. Drug abuse education
82. Statewide needs assessment
83. New state Constitution
84. Elementary guidance program
85. Standards of Quality
86. Year-round education
87. Review of social studies offering
88. Percentage of teachers holding regular certificates
89. Earlier admission data for first grades
90. Desegregation
91. Career education
92. Programs for disadvantaged youth
93. Study of reading abilities
94. Study of racially fair textbooks
95. Study of school bus safety
96. Environmental education
97. Use of American Management Association consultants

98. Programs for gifted
99. Financing of schools on basis of ADM
100. Percentage of classroom teachers' salary increases
101. Increased secondary school offering
102. Ratio of male/female instructional personnel
103. Experience of instructional personnel
104. Adult education programs
105. Guidelines for teacher aides
106. Technical assistance for school desegregation
107. Change in textbook adoption procedures
108. New course approval procedures
109. Expanded use of literary loans
110. Tuition grants
111. Approval of sex education materials
112. Reorganization of State Department of Education
113. State approval of school buildings
114. Merit pay
115. Changes in sick leave policy
116. Summer institutes for division superintendents
117. Professional negotiations
118. Licensing of proprietary schools
119. Grievance procedure adoption
120. Compensatory education
121. Use of sales tax for education
122. Modular scheduling

123. Differentiated staffing
124. Improved retirement benefits
125. Men in teaching
126. Twelve month employment of teachers
127. Improved principals salary
128. State Board selection of State Superintendent
129. Fair employment practices
130. Law and order in the schools
131. Middle school organization
132. Tenure for teachers
133. State financial support for school construction
134. Child abuse
135. TB examination
136. Federal impact money
137. School nurse program
138. Local school boards selected by governing teachers
139. Neighborhood school concept
140. Sex discrimination in schools
141. Decentralized control of schools
142. Team teaching
143. Programmed instruction
144. Length of school day
145. Federal aid to education
146. Role of community colleges
147. Need for local school board written policies

148. NDEA funding
149. Urban education problems
150. State financial aid for insurance
151. Ethnic/human relations program
152. Expanded school year (more than 180 days)
153. Improved elementary school principals' qualifications
154. Teacher training in reading
155. Expanded course requirements for secondary school graduates
156. Teaching of phonics
157. Clerical assistance in the schools
158. Literacy
159. Salary improvements for State Department of Education
160. Art education program
161. Visiting teacher program
162. School psychologist program
163. Expansion of local division improvement program
164. Clarification of the role of the State Board of Education

APPENDIX F

THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND ACCOMPANYING LETTER CONCERNING  
EDUCATIONAL GOALS IN VIRGINIA 1960-1973

## QUESTIONNAIRE

## VIRGINIA EDUCATIONAL GOALS, 1960 to 1973

Directions: The following are a list of educational goals for Virginia that have been expressed in a study of the literature during Dr. Wilkerson's tenure in office. Please indicate your reaction to each of the goals as to whether you consider it to be a high, medium or low priority goal or not a goal at all for education in Virginia during Dr. Wilkerson's term.

- Key:
1. Not a goal
  2. A low priority goal
  3. A medium priority goal
  4. A high priority goal
  5. Uncertain

	1	2	3	4	5
Desegregation of school					
Urban education problems					
Kindergarten education					
Study of reading abilities					
Special education programs					
Programs for disadvantaged youth					
Compensatory education					
Literacy level					
Teaching of phonics					
Increased secondary school offerings					
Schools with summer school offerings					
Citizenship education					
Environmental education					
Increased library services					
Curriculum guide for civics					
Expanded course requirements for secondary school graduation					



- Key: 1. Not a goal  
 2. A low priority goal  
 3. A medium priority goal  
 4. A high priority goal  
 5. Uncertain

	1	2	3	4	5
Curriculum guide for primary social studies					
Curriculum guide for written composition					
Curriculum guide for agriculture education					
Expansion of industrial education					
Reduction of drop-outs					
Increased holding power of school					
Increase in the number of secondary school graduates					
Law and order in the schools					
School psychologist program					
Child abuse					
Visiting teaching program					
School nurse program					
Elementary guidance program					
Improved pupil teacher ratio					
Study of teacher supply and demand					
Percentage of teachers holding regular certificates					
Inservice training for teachers					
Improved teacher preparation programs					
Teacher training in reading					
Number and percentage of teachers holding college degrees					
Ratio of male/female instructional personnel					
Summer institutes for teachers					

- Key: 1. Not a goal  
 2. A low priority goal  
 3. A medium priority goal  
 4. A high priority goal  
 5. Uncertain

	1	2	3	4	5
Increased qualifications for division superintendents					
Reduction in number of one-room schools					
Use of sales tax for education					
Priority financial treatment to less able divisions					
Expansion of vocational education funding					
State financial support for school construction					
Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965					
Federal aid to education					
Increased state aid staff positions					
Free and/or rental textbooks					
Average instructional personnel's salaries					
Federal impact money					
Financing on schools on basis of ADM					
Average classroom teachers' salaries					
Expanded use of literary loans					
Cost of school operations per ADA					
The new Virginia State <u>Constitution</u>					
Use and need of statewide needs assessment					
Standards of Quality program					
Elementary school accreditation standards					
Clarification of the role of the State Department of Education					
Statement of policy of the State Department of Education					

- Key: 1. Not a goal  
 2. A low priority goal  
 3. A medium priority goal  
 4. A high priority goal  
 5. Uncertain

	1	2	3	4	5
Role of community colleges					
Need for division-wide planning					
Need for collection of educational data					
Educational research/pilot studies					
Compulsory education law					
Percentage of secondary school graduates going to further education					
Professional negotiations					
General Assembly financial appropriations					
Revision of financial distribution formula					

Which of these goals do you consider to have been/or be the most important goal during Dr. Wilkerson's term? \_\_\_\_\_

206 Tenth Street  
Radford, Virginia 24141  
February 7, 1975

I am in the process of writing a dissertation in the doctoral program at VPI&SU on Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson: His Life and Work as State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Virginia 1960-1973. As an employee of the State Department of Education, I have the permission and cooperation of Dr. Wilkerson in this project.

Because of your recognized leadership in education in Virginia during this period of time, I would like your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire. I am attempting to determine those educational goals that have been the most significant during Dr. Wilkerson's tenure in office. Further study will then be made of those that the questionnaire designates.

Please complete the questionnaire and return it to me in the self-addressed envelope. I would appreciate your immediate response. If you cannot complete the questionnaire, please return it to me.

Thank you for your kind assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Emmett G. Shufflebarger

APPENDIX G

CLASSIFICATION AND RANKING OF  
EDUCATIONAL GOALS

## FIRST CLASSIFICATION PROCEDURES FOR EDUCATIONAL GOALS

The purpose of the validation procedures is to classify and then rank certain identified educational goals. You will find on the attached index cards 164 educational goals that have been determined as significant in the history of education during the period 1960-1973.

In the book, Introduction to Educational Administration by Campbell, Bridges, Corbally, Nystrand and Ramseyer, the operation of an educational program is identified as that of administrative tasks or operational areas of administration. They suggest six categories of tasks which include school-community relationship, curriculum and instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, physical facilities, and finance and business management. For this study we will add the category of "others" to cover areas not included in one of the mentioned tasks. This will provide us with seven categories for consideration. A brief description of each category is also attached.

Please use the following procedure:

1. Classify each goal into one of the seven categories.
2. Place stack of cards in envelopes appropriately labeled.

Thank you for your generous assistance.

---

(The above procedure was given to the panel of experts at Radford College to assist them with the classification of the goals.)

## CATEGORIES (ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS) FOR GOALS

1. School-Community Relationships

Covers the broad picture of the school as creature of the community with numerous opportunities of interchange and contacts.

2. Curriculum and Instruction

Covers those activities of the school to plan, implement, and evaluate an instructional program. Such activities would include the determination of objectives, the development of a program of instruction, the use of instructional procedures, and the appraising of instruction.

3. Pupil Personnel

Covers those activities which provide services to pupils that supplement regular classroom instruction. These would include pupil inventory and organization, pupil accounting, pupil personnel services, control of pupil behavior.

4. Staff Personnel

Covers the activities in relation to the total staff, including teachers, guidance workers, administrators, and non-certified personnel.

5. Physical Facilities

Covers those activities surrounding school buildings, school grounds, and equipment needed in instruction.

6. Finance and Business Management

Covers the operational areas of securing revenues and making expenditures and includes such activities as budget making, securing revenue, and managing expenditures.

7. Other

This covers those areas of the school operation that do not fit into one of the specific categories. If a goal does not fall directly into one of the categories, place it here.

(The above was given to the panel of experts at Radford College to assist them with the classification of goals.)

## NUMBER OF GOALS BY CATEGORIES

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number of Goals</u>
1. School-Community Relations	5
2. Curriculum and Instruction	45
3. Pupil Personnel	18
4. Staff Personnel	25
5. Physical Facilities	3
6. Finance and Business Management	33
7. Others	23
Dropped	<u>12</u>
Total Goals	164



## RANKING PROCEDURES FOR EDUCATIONAL GOALS

You will find on the attached index cards 152 educational goals that have been identified as significant in the history of education in Virginia during the period of years 1960-1973. These have been arranged in seven specific categories.

Please use the following procedure:

1. Rank, by order of significance, from the highest to the lowest for each category.
2. Clip together any goals you think should be considered jointly. Clip at the top those of equal ranking, at the bottom those of equal nature.
3. Place rubber band around each grouping.
4. Place carefully in envelope appropriately labeled.

Thank you for your generous assistance.

(This procedure was given to the panel of experts at Radford College to assist them with the ranking of goals.)

APPENDIX H

GOAL SELECTION PANEL'S RANKINGS OF GOALS BY CATEGORY ON  
SIGNIFICANCE TO EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

## Category 1

## School-Community Relations

GOALS	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3	Total Ranking	Rank
Changes in census procedures	5	5	5	15	5
Compulsory education law	3	4	4	11	4
Desegregation	1	1	3	5	1
Decentralization of control of schools	4	3	1	8	3
Urban education problems	2	2	2	6	2

## Category 2

## Curriculum and Instruction

GOALS	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3	Total Ranking	Rank
Curriculum guide for government course	19	22	16	57	24
Curriculum guide for written composition	19	19	13	51	17
Curriculum guide for 8th & 9th grade science courses	19	20	17	56	23
Civil defense education	29	39	38	106	45
Drivers and traffic safety education	10	31	20	61	29
Curriculum guide for using maps and globes	19	27	19	65	32
Curriculum guide for elementary geography	19	18	18	55	21
Curriculum guide for primary social studies	19	18	14	51	16
Curriculum guide for distributive education	19	24	12	55	21
Curriculum guide for agriculture education	19	23	11	53	17
Expansion of industrial education	6	13	10	29	5
Need for economic education	29	17	8	54	19
Increased library services	9	4	33	46	12
Schools with summer school offerings	8	6	26	40	9

## Category 2 (continued)

GOALS	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3	Total Ranking	Rank
Special education programs	2	11	5	18	3
More "time to teach"	29	5	27	61	29
Educational television	29	14	36	79	38
Kindergarten	1	3	4	8	1
Curriculum guide for U.S. history course	19	15	39	73	36
Curriculum guide for civics	19	15	15	49	14
Citizenship education	29	9	3	41	11
Performance contracting	29	32	37	98	43
Drug abuse education	11	25	23	59	27
Year-round education	29	6	25	60	28
Review of social studies offering	29	15	14	58	25
Career education	29	29	9	67	32
Programs for disadvantaged youth	5	12	5	22	4
Study of reading abilities	7	2	7	16	2
Study of racially fair textbooks	29	34	35	98	42
Environmental education	29	16	1	46	12
Programs for the gifted	29	28	6	63	31
Increased secondary school offering	3	7	30	40	9

## Category 2 (continued)

GOALS	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3	Total Ranking	Rank
Adult education programs	4	30	24	58	25
Change in textbook adoption procedures	29	33	34	96	41
New course approval procedure	29	37	32	98	42
Approval of sex education materials	29	38	21	88	40
Compensatory education	13	12	5	30	6
Modular scheduling	13	35	29	77	37
Middle school organization	13	10	31	54	19
Team teaching	13	26	28	67	33
Programmed instruction	13	36	30	85	39
Expanded course requirement for secondary school graduation	12	8	30	50	14
Teaching of phonics	13	15	7	35	8
Literacy	29	2	2	33	7
Art education programs	29	21	22	72	35

Category 3  
Pupil Personnel

GOALS	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3	Total Ranking	Rank
Physical fitness testing	12	11	5	28	12
Guidance handbook	11	70	14	35	15
Examination of local school records	10	6	17	33	14
Revision of teachers registers	12	15	15	42	18
Reduction of dropouts	1	1	3	5	1
Increase in number of full-time guidance counselors	5	5	13	23	10
Increase holding power of school	1	1	3	5	1
Increase in number of secondary school graduates	1	1	9	11	3
Increase percentage of secondary school going to further education	12	2	10	24	11
Expanded testing program	8	12	16	36	16
Elementary guidance program	6	4	12	22	7
Law and order in the schools	12	3	1	16	4
Child abuse	12	7	2	21	6
TB examination	12	13	4	29	13
School nurse program	9	6	7	22	7

## Category 3 (continued)

GOALS	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3	Total Ranking	Rank
Sex discrimination in schools	12	14	11	37	17
Visiting teacher program	7	9	6	22	7
School psychologist program	4	8	8	20	5



## Category 4

## Staff Personnel

GOALS	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3	Total Ranking	Rank
Inservice training for teachers	12	1	6	19	3
Summer institutes for teachers	12	8	5	25	10
Expanded staff of State Department of Education	11	16	25	52	18
Improved teacher preparation program	12	4	4	20	5
Master of Arts in teaching program	18	13	10	41	15
Study of teacher supply and demand	1	14	2	17	2
Improved pupil-teacher ratio	10	2	1	13	1
Number and percentage of teachers holding college degrees	3	10	9	22	6
Increased qualifications for division superintendent	7	12	12	31	11
Percentage of teachers holding regular certificates	2	9	8	19	3
Ratio of male/female instructional personnel	4	5	14	23	8
Experience of instructional personnel	18	11	3	32	12
Guidelines for teacher aides	12	19	18	49	16
Merit pay	18	20	17	55	21
Changes in sick leave policies	12	21	24	57	23

## Category 4 (continued)

GOALS	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3	Total Ranking	Rank
Summer institutes for division superintendents	18	22	13	53	20
Professional negotiations	18	24	20	62	24
Grievance procedure adoption	18	25	23	66	25
Differentiated staffing	18	18	16	52	18
Men in teaching	4	5	15	24	9
Fair employment practices	18	17	21	56	22
Tenure for teachers	6	23	22	51	17
Improved elementary school principal qualification	8	15	11	34	13
Teacher training in reading	12	3	7	22	6
Clerical assistance in the school	9	7	19	35	14

## Category 5

## Physical Facilities

GOALS	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3	Total Ranking	Rank
Reduction in number of one room schools	1	1	3	5	1
Study of school bus safety	3	2	1	7	2
State approval of school buildings	2	3	2	7	2

## Category 6

## Finance and Business Management

GOALS	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3	Total Ranking	Rank
Financial aid to mathematics education	30	4	14	48	21
Financial aid to science education	26	4	15	45	15
Financial aid to foreign language education	26	4	18	48	21
Financial aid to guidance	26	4	16	46	18
Revision of financial distribution formula	31	2	33	66	31
Increase in teacher's minimum salary	6	14	23	43	15
Increase state aid staff positions	4	13	19	36	7
Expansion of vocational educational facilities	5	3	17	25	3
General Assembly financial appropriation	31	1	32	64	29
Use of data processing	31	12	31	74	33
Average classroom teachers' salaries	6	14	21	41	12
Average instructional personnel's salary	6	14	20	40	9
Estimated value of school property	12	26	11	49	25
Cost of school operation per ADA	12	17	13	42	13

## Category 6 (continued)

GOALS	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3	Total Ranking	Rank
Federal funding - ESEA, 1965	2	18	8	28	5
Local division superintendents' salary	6	22	28	56	27
Free and rental textbooks	5	22	11	38	8
Priority financial treatment to less able divisions	12	2	1	15	2
Use of American Management Associates Consultants	12	29	30	71	32
Financing of schools on basis of ADM	12	16	12	40	9
Percentage of classroom teachers' salary increase	12	14	22	48	21
Expended use of literary loans	12	27	3	42	13
Tuition grants	12	28	6	46	18
Use of sales tax for education	1	8	2	11	1
Improved retirement benefits	12	10	26	48	21
Twelve month employment of teachers	12	24	24	60	28
Improved principals' salaries	6	15	25	46	18
State financial support for school construction	12	9	5	26	4
Federal impact money	12	19	9	40	9

## Category 6 (continued)

GOALS	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3	Total Ranking	Rank
NDEA funding	12	21	10	43	15
State financial aid for inservice	12	25	27	64	29
Federal aid to education	2	20	7	29	6
Salary improvement of State Department of Education	12	11	27	52	26

## Category 7

## Others

GOALS	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3	Total Ranking	Rank
Statement of policy for State Department of Education	10	5	8	23	6
Elementary school accreditation standards	3	8	10	21	4
Educational research	10	16	3	29	10
Pilot studies	10	15	5	30	11
Collection of educational data	10	14	4	28	9
Manpower training program	10	20	23	53	23
Decrease in State Board of Education responsibility for higher education	10	22	19	51	22
Civil Rights Act compliance	10	17	17	44	21
Local division-wide evaluation	10	10	16	36	16
Strengthening of secondary accreditation	4	18	11	33	13
Division-wide planning	5	9	13	27	8
Statewide needs assessment	9	1	1	11	2
New state <u>Constitution</u>	6	2	2	10	1
Standards of Quality	1	3	9	13	3
Technical assistance for school desegregation	10	11	18	39	18

## Category 7 (continued)

GOALS	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3	Total Ranking	Rank
Reorganization of State Department of Education	10	6	22	38	17
Licensing of proprietary schools	10	21	12	43	20
State Board selection of State Superintendents	8	12	21	41	19
Local school board selected by governing bodies	7	13	15	35	14
Neighborhood school concept	10	19	6	35	14
Role of Community Colleges	2	4	20	26	7
Expansion of local division improvement program	10	7	14	31	12
Clarification of the role of the State Board of Education	10	5	7	22	5



APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE PARTICIPANTS

1. Mr. Thomas McSwain  
Division Superintendent  
Staunton City Schools  
Staunton, Virginia 24401  
Virginia Education Association President
2. Mr. Charles M. Perdue, Principal  
Norview High School  
Middleton Place  
Norfolk, Virginia 23513  
Virginia Education Association President
3. Mr. John R. Graybill, Principal  
Patrick Henry High School  
Roanoke, Virginia 24016  
Virginia Education Association President
4. Dr. Edgar M. Johnson  
Route 2  
Farmville, Virginia 23001  
Virginia Parent-Teacher Association President
5. Mr. Fred P. Entler  
504 West Valley Drive  
Bristol, Virginia 24201  
Virginia Parent-Teacher Association President
6. Dr. Robert V. Shaver  
127 Grandin Court  
Danville, Virginia 24541  
Virginia Parent-Teacher Association President
7. Mr. Francis J. Copenhaver  
Marion, Virginia 24354  
School Board Association President
8. Mrs. Flora Reid  
1618 Kenwood Lane  
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902  
School Board Association President
9. Mr. Hugh A. West  
P. O. Box 333  
Suffolk, Virginia 23433  
School Board Association President
10. Mr. Fendall R. Ellis  
Assistant Superintendent for Program Development  
State Department of Education  
Richmond, Virginia 23216  
Superintendents' Association President

11. Mr. Wilbur Pence  
365 Ashley Street  
Dayton, Virginia 22821  
Superintendents' Association President
12. Mr. William D. Richmond  
St. Paul, Virginia 24283  
Superintendents' Association President
13. Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction  
State Department of Education  
Richmond, Virginia 23216
14. Mr. J. G. Blount, Jr.  
8400 Patterson Avenue  
Richmond, Virginia 23229  
Former State Department of Education Employee
15. Dr. Davis Y. Paschall  
Route 1, Box 183-C  
Williamsburg, Virginia 23185  
Former State Superintendent of Public Instruction
16. Mr. Harry R. Elmore  
7301 W. Durwood Crescent  
Richmond, Virginia 23229  
Former State Department of Education Employee
17. Mr. Carter Lowance  
Acting Secretary of Education  
Commonwealth of Virginia  
Richmond, Virginia
18. Mr. George Burton  
Berryville, Virginia  
Former State Department of Education Employee

APPENDIX J

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS OF VIRGINIA EDUCATION GOALS

1960 to 1973

KEY

- 0 - Either not a score, uncertain, or left blank
- 2 - A low priority score
- 3 - A medium priority score
- 4 - A high priority score

GOALS	Individual Reaction																Total Score	Number of Reactions	Average Score
Desegregation of schools	3	4	0	3	3	4	4	2	3	0	4	3	0	4	4	4	46	13	3.46
Urban education problems	3	4	0	4	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	2	48	15	3.20
Kindergarten education	4	0	4	4	4	0	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	52	14	3.71
Study of reading abilities	4	3	4	4	2	0	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	2	51	15	3.4
Special education programs	4	3	4	4	4	0	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	54	15	3.6
Programs for disadvantageded youth	4	3	4	4	4	0	2	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	51	15	3.4
Compensatory education	3	2	0	4	3	4	0	3	3	4	2	4	3	2	3	2	42	14	3.0
Literacy level	2	2	0	4	0	2	3	4	0	3	2	4	3	3	3	4	39	13	3.0
Teaching of phonics	2	3	0	0	3	4	3	3	0	4	3	4	3	2	3	0	37	12	3.08
Increased secondary school offerings	3	4	4	4	3	2	4	2	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	2	52	16	3.25
Schools with summer school offerings	3	4	4	4	3	2	4	2	3	3	3	4	4	2	3	3	52	16	3.25
Citizenship education	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	57	16	3.56
Environmental education	3	3	0	3	3	4	3	2	3	3	3	4	3	2	3	0	42	14	3.0
Increased library services	3	4	4	4	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	53	16	3.31
Curriculum guide for civics	4	3	3	0	3	3	0	2	4	4	3	4	4	2	3	0	42	13	3.23
Expanded course requirements for secondary school graduation	3	3	0	0	2	3	3	2	4	2	3	4	4	2	3	0	38	13	2.92
Curriculum guide for primary social studies	4	3	0	4	2	3	0	2	3	3	2	3	4	2	3	2	40	14	2.85

GOALS	Individual Reaction																Total Score	Number of Reactions	Average Score
Curriculum guide for written composition	3	4	0	4	2	3	0	2	3	2	2	3	4	2	2	2	38	14	2.71
Curriculum guide for agriculture education	3	3	0	4	2	3	0	3	2	3	2	3	4	2	3	2	39	14	2.78
Expansion of industrial education	4	4	4	4	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	57	16	3.56
Reduction of drop-outs	3	4	4	4	3	0	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	53	15	3.53
Increased holding power of school	3	4	4	4	3	0	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	53	15	3.53
Increase in the number of secondary school graduates	2	4	4	4	3	0	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	54	15	3.60
Law and order in the schools	3	4	0	4	3	2	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	54	15	3.60
School psychologist program	3	2	0	0	3	4	3	2	0	2	2	0	4	2	3	0	30	11	2.72
Child abuse	2	2	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	3	3	0	4	4	3	4	31	10	3.10
Visiting teaching program	2	3	0	4	3	3	0	3	2	2	2	3	4	2	3	2	38	14	2.71
School nurse program	3	3	0	0	3	4	2	3	2	2	2	2	4	2	2	2	36	14	2.57
Elementary guidance program	2	3	4	4	2	4	3	2	4	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	45	16	2.81
Improved pupil teacher ratio	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	2	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	57	16	3.56
Study of teacher supply and demand	2	3	0	4	3	4	3	2	3	0	2	4	3	2	3	3	41	14	2.93
Percentage of teachers holding regular certificates	4	4	4	4	3	0	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	56	15	3.73

GOALS	Individual Reaction															Total Score	Number of Reactions	Average Score	
Inservice training for teachers	4	4	4	4	3	0	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	57	15	3.80
Improved teacher preparation programs	4	4	4	4	3	0	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	56	15	3.73
Teacher training in reading	4	4	0	4	3	0	4	3	0	3	3	4	3	3	4	2	44	13	3.38
Number and percentage of teachers holding college degrees	3	4	4	4	4	0	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	55	15	3.67
Ratio of male/female instructional personnel	2	3	0	0	2	2	3	3	2	0	2	4	4	2	2	0	31	12	2.58
Summer institutes for teachers	3	4	4	0	2	4	4	3	2	4	3	4	4	2	4	2	49	15	3.27
Increased qualifications for division superintendents	3	4	4	0	4	2	3	2	3	3	4	4	4	2	4	4	50	15	3.33
Reduction in number of one-room schools	4	4	4	4	4	2	0	4	0	3	3	4	4	3	2	4	49	14	3.50
Use of sales tax for education	3	4	0	4	4	2	4	3	0	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	50	14	3.57
Priority financial treatment to less able divisions	3	3	0	4	4	3	0	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	50	14	3.57
Expansion of vocational education funding	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	0	2	3	4	4	4	4	3	54	15	3.6
State financial support for school construction	4	4	0	0	3	4	3	3	2	2	3	0	4	3	3	3	41	13	3.15



GOALS	Individual Reaction																Total Score	Number of Reactions	Average Score
Elementary school accreditation standards	4	4	3	4	4	0	3	2	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	2	53	15	3.53
Clarification of the role of the State Department of Education	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	57	16	3.57
Statement of policy of the State Department of Education	4	4	3	4	3	2	0	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	52	15	3.47
Role of community colleges	4	3	0	0	4	4	3	3	0	2	2	2	4	4	0	4	39	12	3.25
Need for division-wide planning	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	2	55	16	3.44
Need for collection of educational data	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	54	16	3.38
Educational research/pilot studies	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	2	51	16	3.19
Compulsory education law	2	3	0	4	3	3	3	4	0	0	3	3	4	3	3	4	42	13	3.23
Percentage of secondary school graduates going to further education	3	4	4	4	3	2	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	2	2	52	16	3.25
Professional negotiations	2	2	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	2	0	3	3	0	0	21	8	2.63
General Assembly financial appropriations	2	4	4	4	0	2	0	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	50	14	3.57
Revision of financial distribution formula	3	4	4	4	4	0	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	52	15	3.47

GOALS	Individual Reaction																Total Score	Number of Reactions	Average Score
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965	4	4	0	0	4	3	3	3	0	0	4	3	3	4	4	4	43	12	3.58
Federal aid to education	4	3	0	0	3	3	4	4	0	0	3	2	3	4	2	3	38	12	3.17
Increased state aid staff positions	2	4	4	0	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	4	4	4	3	46	15	3.07
Free and/or rental textbooks	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	2	4	4	3	3	52	16	3.25
Average instructional personnel's salaries	3	4	4	4	4	2	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	54	16	3.38
Federal impact money	3	3	0	0	3	4	3	2	0	0	3	3	3	3	3	2	35	12	2.92
Financing of schools on basis of ADM	3	3	4	4	3	0	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	53	15	3.53
Average classroom teachers' salaries	3	4	4	4	4	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	53	16	3.31
Expanded use of literacy loans	0	4	4	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	3	3	3	2	4	2	32	10	3.20
Cost of school operations per ADA	3	4	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	0	3	2	0	3	2	3	32	11	2.91
The new Virginia State Constitution	4	3	4	4	0	2	0	3	0	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	47	13	3.61
Use and need of statewide needs assessment	4	3	0	0	2	4	0	3	0	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	39	12	3.25
Standards of Quality program	4	4	4	4	4	0	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	58	15	3.83

**The vita has been removed from  
the scanned document**

## EPILOGUE

The selection of persons used in interviews and the questionnaire was done by a procedure of nomination described in Chapter 2 and approved by the University dissertation committee. Once the names were secured, a random selection process was utilized. The procedure was executed as fairly as possible. Any occurrence of bias was unintentional.

DR. WOODROW W. WILKERSON: HIS LIFE AND WORK AS  
STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION  
IN VIRGINIA 1960-74

by

Emmett G. Shufflebarger

(ABSTRACT)

The study concerned Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson who served as State Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Commonwealth of Virginia from August 16, 1960, to April 1, 1975. His length of service exceeded that of any of the thirteen previous superintendents in the 103-year history of public education in Virginia.

The thesis of the study was that the Commonwealth of Virginia made strides toward improvement in the quality of education during the leadership of Dr. Wilkerson. A detailed biographical study of Dr. Wilkerson pointed out his unique personality influenced by all with whom he came in contact; his family, his church, his college professors, his educational associates, and others. The position of State Superintendent of Public Instruction was discussed with Dr. Wilkerson and six of his associates. The relationship of his position with the State Board of Education, the members of the General Assembly, the various governors, and the local division superintendents was presented. This composite description of the past fifteen years in public education in Virginia indicates how the position actually operated. The legal basis of the position of State Superintendent of Public Instruction was described.

A procedure was established to identify and analyze changes which occurred in public education during Dr. Wilkerson's tenure. General measures of educational quality for the nation were identified. Specific educational goals in Virginia from various sources were established. These goals were classified and given priorities by a panel of experienced educators. A questionnaire was sent to eighteen carefully selected representatives of the Virginia educational community who ranked the goals according to their significance. Ten highest ranked goals were associated with measures of educational quality. A panel selected ten goals for which comparative educational data might be available. A collection of data for the years 1960 through 1974 in Virginia and the nation was made. In many cases comparable data were not available. A determination of the degree of success on the ten measures of quality was made.

The questionnaire also indicated that the major educational goal in Virginia during Dr. Wilkerson's tenure was the standards of quality program. Dr. Wilkerson and close associates were interviewed concerning the development and implementation of this important program. Aspects of the program with which Dr. Wilkerson was involved were discussed in detail. An evaluation of the program and its effectiveness was presented.

Dr. Wilkerson's accomplishments were influenced by the many issues of his time, by the personalities that he encountered, and by the limitations placed upon him by various political and economic conditions. Dr. Wilkerson and his unique personality had a marked

effect upon public education in Virginia. The Commonwealth of Virginia made progress in the improvement in the quality of education during the leadership of Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson as State Superintendent of Public Instruction.