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Chapter I: Introduction to the Study
Purpose of the Study

This research is designed to be a case study using historical methodology to investigate specific characteristics of normal school training as exemplified at Virginia's first State Female Normal School located at Farmville, Virginia. It will trace the evolutionary process which occurred over a forty year period (1884-1924) under the administrations of four different presidents of the Farmville Normal School. The purpose of the study is to determine the degree to which the Farmville Normal School showed conformity to the seven characteristics of normal school training as identified by Charles Harper in A Century of Public Teacher Education (1939). As a result of the analytical consideration of these characteristics as exemplified at the Farmville School, it will be possible to specify contributions which this pioneer institution made to the professional preparation of teachers in the state of Virginia.

Justification for the Study

The establishment of a system of public schools in Virginia brought with it the simultaneous problem of securing adequately trained teachers to staff the classrooms. In his
Twelfth Annual Report in 1882 Superintendent Ruffner said that of the problems in public education "perhaps none call more loudly for a remedy than our great need of more professional or trained teachers."¹ Emphasizing that Virginia had failed to make provision to teach teachers, Ruffner stressed the importance of immediately beginning normal school training "and especially do we want a normal school for girls; for to the ladies must Virginia, in the main, look for her future teachers."²

In 1884, a mere two years after Ruffner made this report, he was to become the principal of the state's first normal school for girls. Though a school had begun at Petersburg to train "colored" teachers in 1882, Farmville represented the first school in Virginia devoted exclusively to preparing white females to become teachers. Petersburg continued to operate and a normal course for training men was initiated at William and Mary in 1888; yet for a quarter of a century, the Farmville school remained the only institution in the state to be specifically charged with the single purpose mission of training teachers for the Commonwealth. It was not until the years 1908 when the normal schools at Harrisonburg and Fredericksburg were established and 1910 when Radford was authorized that the
normal school at Farmville had the assistance of any other institutions, dedicated strictly to the preparation of teachers.

The creation of the State Normal School at Farmville in 1884 began what would later make the school an historically significant institution from several perspectives.

1. It is "the fifth oldest educational institution [started] for women in continuous operation in the United States."³

2. It has continuously made teacher preparation of central importance in its educational mission.

3. It functioned exclusively as a normal school for forty years (1884-1924) and then became a State Teachers College.

4. It was the state's only institution solely responsible for training white female teachers until 1908.

5. It selected the founder of Virginia's public school system, William Henry Ruffner, as its first president.

The historical implications alone would seemingly be sufficient justification for studying the early contributions which the Farmville Normal School made to higher education. Even though institutional histories have been written about most of Virginia's state supported four year colleges, none of these has had as its purposes that of
giving any extensive, thorough, or analytical attention to the history of the normal schools per se. Attention to the normal school years has not been neglected but neither has the history of the period been comprehensively researched.

Bruce Emerson, in his 1973 dissertation, did some very thorough research on Virginia's normal schools but, his purpose was neither that of describing a particular normal school experience nor that of tracing historical characteristics in normal school education but rather it was "to describe the relationships between the State of Virginia and its public teacher-training institutions from the time of their creation as individually governed, single-purpose normal schools to their transformation into teachers colleges and their direct control by the State Board of Education."4

Emerson acknowledges the paucity of Virginia educational history in general and further concludes "Recorded histories of the five normal schools of Virginia are few in number and vary greatly in quality, content, and scope."5 Therefore, in the interest of Virginia higher education history in general and normal school history in particular, it seems especially worthwhile to look at the factors leading up to the establishment of normal schools in Virginia, the evolutionary stages of the normal school
during its first forty years as a teacher training institution, and the contributions of normal school training to contemporary teacher preparation.

In conclusion, the study can be justified in terms of the historical contributions to higher education which it shall make in terms of describing the characteristics in teacher education which developed over the forty year period and in terms of imparting a clearer understanding of the contributions which the Farmville school made to teacher preparation.

Background and Significance of the Problem

In 1870 under the mandate of the Underwood Constitution and under the capable leadership of William Henry Ruffner as Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Commonwealth of Virginia initiated a statewide system of free schools open to blacks and whites of both sexes. Owing much to the resolute determination of the man chosen as the State's first superintendent, the system of public education as instituted during the exceedingly difficult days of reconstruction made remarkable progress in spite of much opposition and many obstacles. In time, Virginia would be
looked upon as an educational leader among Southern states and the plans designed by Superintendent Ruffner would receive wide acclaim.

The responsibilities which fell upon the Superintendent demanded great genius in planning and phenomenal operational insight to get the system launched. When Ruffner was elected, he had only thirty days in which to draft a plan for operationalizing the new constitutional provision for a system of public education. The laudable plan which Ruffner submitted was signed into law on July 11, 1870 and immediately superintendents and trustees were appointed, school locations were established, and teachers were secured—all with such astounding rapidity that schools were opened in November, 1870. It is a measure of the feverish labor and remarkable wisdom of the man, Ruffner, that at the close of the school year Virginia had "2900 schools, 3000 teachers, an average attendance of 130,000 pupils."

In order to appreciate the significance of this accomplishment, it must be viewed against the backdrop of the social, political, and economic situations. From the beginning, Virginia followed English traditions in education. According to Buck, Virginia was kept far from the vanguard in education by feelings of "hostility toward the idea of tax-supported schools."

Furthermore, the
planted system in Virginia meant wide population dispersion which made it virtually impossible to establish community schools in rural locations. "Through the agricultural and plantation system, class distinctions developed and became another barrier to the growth of a healthy interest in public education...".8

Meagher says, "the rich planters and the wealthy burghers cared little whether a poor neighbor could educate his children or not, so long as his own sons had imported tutors, or could be sent abroad to school, or could attend the fine academies for which Virginia was later noted."9 Yet, a few schools were established to educate Indians and indigents. In 1643, a law was made requiring overseers and guardians to be responsible for instructing orphans in "Christian religion and in the rudiments of learning."10 The Apprenticeship Act of 1646 also held owners responsible for giving slaves Christian training. Buck points to the Symms (1634) and Eaton Free Schools (1659) in Elizabeth City County of Virginia as early philanthropic attempts to provide schooling for poor children.11

Jefferson, in 1779, proposed that counties provide free elementary schools, academies, and colleges but the plans failed to materialize. Jefferson was the most outspoken and influential voice in the state favoring free
schooling but later Governors Monroe, Cabell, and Tyler called public attention to the error in not providing for public education.\textsuperscript{12} However, in 1810 the Literary Fund was established which represents Virginia's first effort toward providing state funds to finance public schools.\textsuperscript{13} Morrison contends that with the establishment of the Literary Fund as a monetary source, the General Assembly meant to have a system of primary schools begun. However, the difficulties to be faced were real and Dr. J. A. Smith, President of William and Mary, summarized the problem thusly, "how were the primary schools to be superintended, and where were the teachers to come from?"\textsuperscript{14} Furthermore, the system of private education was so deeply ingrained in the aristocratic Virginia background that support for public education was difficult to secure. "Virginia possessed a wealth of private institutions which prior to 1862 probably tended to delay rather than to stimulate the demand for a system of public schools."\textsuperscript{15} Heatwole says that from 1800-1860 approximately two hundred fifty (250) academies were incorporated\textsuperscript{16}.

While attempts at public education were sporadic in Virginia, the New England Colonies had early taken the matter of public education seriously so that all youngsters would receive at least the rudiments of education through payment by parents or by taxation. By 1647, Massachusetts
had already instituted the "Old Deluder Satan" act which "ordered every township in this jurisdiction after the Lord hath increased them to the number of 50 householders, shall [to] appoint one within their town to teach all such children as shall resort to write and read; whose wage shall be paid either by parents or masters of such children..."17.

In 1841, a professor at Washington College, George E. Dabney, published a scathing attack on public education in Virginia in the Literary Messenger.18 In the same year, Dr. Henry Ruffner, President of Washington College, proposed a plan of public instruction at the Education Convention for Northwestern Virginia.19 The plan later submitted by his son as the first State Superintendent of Public Instruction closely resembled this one.

In the intermittent years from 1841-1861, the education issue continued to be debated and free schools did experience some success, especially in the western part of the state. The major concern for counties which wished to have free schools was that of providing "competent teachers for the management of the established schools."20 However, with the approach of the Civil War, issues changed and when the war ended, havoc was everywhere. With divisions, hostilities, and an impoverished aristocratic society, public education was not a matter with which Virginians wished to deal. The idea of public free schools was
particularly objectionable since this meant schooling the recently liberated slave children. However, into this scene came the Underwood Constitution (adopted July 6, 1869) which admitted Virginia into the Union. This constitution established largely by Blacks and Northern radicals forbade Virginia to deprive any United States citizen of an education.\textsuperscript{21}

By a series of events which Jefferson could never have anticipated, his ideas for free schools became law.\textsuperscript{22} According to the constitutional provision, a state superintendent should be chosen by the General Assembly within thirty days and he should within thirty days thereafter submit a plan for free public schools. A State Board of Education, composed of the governor, the state superintendent, and the attorney-general, was also established.\textsuperscript{23} Thus, with the aid of division superintendents and district trustees appointed by the State Board of Education, the public school system in Virginia began in the fall of 1870.\textsuperscript{24}

Ruffner labored unceasingly to improve the quality of teacher preparation in the State. Throughout his superintendency, he was persistent in his support for the establishment of normal schools but the closest he came was providing a few weeks of summer training. In his Eleventh Annual Report, Ruffner stated:\textsuperscript{25}
In my first Report I also formally introduced and argued the vital subject of Normal Schools. The next year, 1872, I again argue and urge attention to the subject. And every year since that time I have pressed the subject....

The Superintendent was successful in getting most of the counties and cities to hold at least one system-wide institute per year by 1880. The 1880 Summer Normal Institutes held at the University of Virginia for white teachers and the one held at Lynchburg for black teachers were hailed as phenomenal successes. The former had four hundred sixty-two (462) enrolled and the latter had two hundred forty (240).26

The problem of adequate teacher training was accentuated for Ruffner because of the demands of the newly created public school system. He was not, however, the first to deal with the problem. In 1830, Washington County requested the Legislature to adopt some mode for providing counties with qualified teachers.27 In 1831, an institute, although short lived, was held at Hampden-Sydney with an eye toward improvement of the common schools.28 In 1839, Randolph-Macon proposed beginning a normal department but the outcomes are unknown.29 In 1842, forty cadets at Virginia Military Institute were allowed free instruction
for a willingness to teach two years in the State.\textsuperscript{30} Similarly in 1850, Emory and Henry was allowed to extend the privilege to sixteen young men.\textsuperscript{31} In 1856, the University of Virginia could offer the same plan to fifty students.\textsuperscript{32}

As early as 1840, Ruffner's father, Henry Ruffner, in conjunction with Francis H. Smith and J. D. Ewing had presented a plan to exchange educational expenses for a commitment to teach for the State for a designated period. In 1841, a committee appointed by the Governor recommended "that either 'a great normal be established' or that departments for instruction in the art of teaching be maintained."\textsuperscript{33} This recommendation also included the idea of state scholarships in exchange for a pledge to teach in Virginia's schools.\textsuperscript{34} These efforts to secure normal instruction were all aimed at male teachers. However, by an incremental process which required decades, the normal school idea evolved. Virginia's Legislature finally saw the need for state supported public teacher training institutions. Thus, the Normal and Collegiate Institute for Blacks was established in 1882. Realizing that it was primarily to the women of the state that teaching responsibilities would fall, the General Assembly on March 7, 1884, officially established the State Female Normal School at Farmville.
Ruffner, who had been replaced as State Superintendent as a result of political power changes in 1882, was the logical choice to head the new normal school. Thus, he was appointed in 1884 to be the principal of the legislature's newly approved school to be located in Farmville, Virginia for training white female teachers for the public schools. As Dr. Ruffner began his work at Farmville, he was actually consummating the final chapter in the execution of the Underwood constitutional provisions for education, which stipulated that "the General Assembly shall establish, as soon as practicable, normal schools".33

At Farmville, Ruffner began immediately to implement his ideas for providing the kind of training which would enable young women to prepare themselves to meet the overwhelming demands which the state system was experiencing. The State needed many more teachers than were available and it needed to have a cadre of teachers who were much better prepared than many of those who were assuming pedagogical roles in the classrooms. Ruffner served as principal of the state's first normal school for white women only three years but in that time he laid the foundation upon which the future of the Farmville School would be secured and upon which other similar normal schools in the State would be built. Farmville remained the only such school for white women for nearly a quarter of a century.
(1884-1908); however the demand for teachers in the State was so great that Farmville could not begin to meet the needs and for this reason, the Legislature, in 1908, authorized the establishment of two other schools—one at Harrisonburg and the other at Fredericksburg. It was not until 1911, however, that the latter was opened. Dormitory space was quickly exhausted at Fredericksburg just as at Harrisonburg. Even when the fourth State Normal School for Women opened at Radford, the demand for teachers remained greater than the supply.

By the early 1900's the State's classrooms were almost entirely under female tutelage and normal schools played a dramatic role in the educational preparation of these young women—all of whom were given free tuition in exchange for a two year commitment to teach in the public schools of Virginia. In time, of course, as the high school programs became more commonplace, there was a decreased need for normal school training and an increased need for credentials from institutions awarding four-year bachelor degrees. Commendably, these four normal schools continued their remarkable leadership in teacher education as they emerged from normal schools into State Teacher's Colleges. Today after decades of being recognized for the high quality of their individual teacher preparation programs, each of these four original State Normal Schools for White Women has
greatly diversified curriculum offerings but none has forsaken its initial mission—the professional preparation of teachers. This normal school legacy is historically significant and composes a rich educational heritage that deserves to be researched and elevated to a place of prominence in Virginia's story of higher education for women. For this reason, it is important to investigate representative characteristics and experiences in normal school education in Virginia. Since the Farmville school has the greatest longevity, it offers the most appropriate subject for this case study.

Conceptual Framework

Charles Harper, author of A Century of Public Teacher Education, noted there were "certain definite trends in teacher education" which characterized the contributions made by state normal schools. Harper identified these seven major characteristics:

1. Teaching was transformed into a profession.
2. Close contact with the public was emphasized.
3. In-service education was viewed as an important mission.
4. Subject matter became more professionalized.
5. Laboratory teaching experiences were considered fundamental.

6. Extra-curricular activities were incorporated into the curriculum.

7. A pragmatic attitude was adopted.

This study will use these seven characteristics as a framework to determine how closely the State Female Normal School at Farmville conformed to these characteristics and to identify the specific contributions which the school made to the field of teacher preparation.

Hypothesis and Research Questions

The normal school, though frequently thought of as a pioneer in teacher preparation, was basically a very conservative institution—more reactive than active in meeting educational challenges. In Virginia, it required more than a decade after the establishment of a public school system for the state to decide something had to be done to secure adequately trained teachers for the classrooms of the common schools. Thus, from its inception, the normal school was a response more than a stimulus. It is believed that Virginia tended to conform in a fairly mechanical way to meet certain expectations and roles thought to be appropriate for normal schools of the late
nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As a result, the school was more what Feimley terms "a perpetuator than a formulator."37 Hence, the Farmville School served primarily as a vehicle of the State to provide the essential training necessary to equip teachers to handle classroom responsibilities. It is believed that the school made some very definite and lasting contributions to the professionalization of teaching even though it remained a very conservative institution. The assumption is made that the State Normal School at Farmville offered a typical normal school experience and in doing so it displayed the characteristics which Harper lists as typical of normal schools at the turn of the century. It is further assumed that being a conservative institution in no wise diminished its effectiveness and therefore the school made very significant contributions to the professional training of teachers.

For the purposes of the study, it is hypothesized that:

The State Normal School at Farmville, Virginia conformed closely to the seven characteristics of normal school training identified by Charles Harper and in the process of doing so it made definite contributions to the professionalization of teaching.
Therefore, using the seven general characteristics of normal school training identified by Charles Harper as a conceptual framework, it will be necessary to answer each of the following questions:

1. How did the administrative and teaching staff help to promote teacher training and give it professional status?

2. What efforts were made to provide close contact and communication between the normal school and the public?

3. What was the nature of the in-service training for public school personnel provided by the normal school?

4. What was the course of study like and how did it change over the years to meet professional needs?

5. How were the needs for practical teaching experiences accommodated?

6. What kinds of extra curricular activities were approved by the normal school and how did these change over the years?

7. What evidence can be found that the normal school at Farmville moved from a rather pragmatic attitude toward the training of teachers to a more academic orientation toward educating teachers during its first forty years as a state-supported institution of higher education?

Definition of Terms

To help the reader better understand this study, the following specific terms are defined:
1. State Normal School

The term State Normal School is used to refer to the school located at Farmville for training white female teachers. The official name of the school was the State Female Normal School at Farmville until 1914. In 1914, the name was changed to State Normal School for Women at Farmville and this name continued until 1924 when it became State Teachers College at Farmville.

2. Normal School

The term normal school is used to designate a state supported institution established for the purpose of training teachers. Though considered higher education, it admitted students with varying degrees of previous education.

3. Normal School Experiences

The term normal school experience is used to refer to both the academic and non-academic factors which were part of the normal school environment.

4. Principal

The term principal is a title carried over from academy terminology. In normal school history, it is used to refer to the chief administrator who later was known as the president, of the school. At Farmville, the head of the school was referred to as the principal until 1893 when the Trustees changed the title to president.

5. Professional Training

The term professional training is used to designate those aspects of the teacher education program which deal with studies uniquely significant to preparation for teaching.

6. Pragmatic Attitude

The term pragmatic attitude is used to refer to the demands for practicality in the professional training of teachers. It is the attitude which Harper describes as a willingness to take from any source those ideas and approaches which might lead to a
resolution of the problem at hand. The term connotes an emphasis upon the functional aspects of education as opposed to purely theoretical or scholarly analyses of problems.

7. Training School
The term training school is used to refer to the provision made by the normal school for exposing students to those practical experiences believed to be essential for successful classroom teaching.

Scope of the Study

Delimitations

This research is to be a case study dealing with only one of the four Virginia normal schools for white females. Thus, it will focus upon the first one of these institutions established by the Commonwealth of Virginia, namely The State Normal School of Virginia at Farmville.

This study will concentrate on the period of time when the Farmville School was actually recognized as a normal school, beginning in the year 1884 when it was established as The State Female Normal School of Virginia at Farmville and going through 1924 when it became The State Teachers College at Farmville.
This study is not intended to be a comprehensive history of the college at Farmville, but only of its normal school years 1884-1924, nor is it intended to be an historical account of any public or private normal school in Virginia other than the one at Farmville.

It is historically clear that the school at Petersburg for training black teachers (1882) and the school at William and Mary (1888) for training white male teachers have both made fundamental and unique contributions to the history of teacher education in Virginia and they, like the school at Farmville, date back to the 1880's in their normal school origins. However, an appreciable discussion of these schools is clearly beyond the scope of this study. Similarly, the state of Virginia added three additional normal schools (Harrisonburg, Fredericksburg, Radford) in rapid succession from 1908 to 1910 and each of these has consistently made major contributions toward the improvement of teacher education in the Commonwealth. Nevertheless, the case study nature of this research prevents little more than cursory attention to these historically valuable institutions.
Limitations

Since many of the earliest documents have been lost to deterioration, careless handling, or a lack of perceptivity concerning the value which time can impart to a seemingly worthless item, there is some fragmentation in the primary data. It is also impossible to include many newspaper accounts which are believed to be germane to the study either because the articles cannot be located or because a newspaper existed for a short time and then closed without leaving a repository from which to locate articles. Nevertheless, extensive primary data have survived and have been reasonably well preserved, hereby the tasks of collection and assimilation have been greatly simplified.

Methodology and Procedures

This study has been conducted as historical research, using qualitative methods to secure information from both primary and secondary sources. The Review of Related Literature has been drawn mainly from professional journals dealing with problems concerning the normal schools during the period 1884-1924, although a number of books discussing the history related to this normal school period.
have also been utilized to look at issues from a broader level. Using Harper's seven major trends as a guide for the selection of the literature to be included in this review, an attempt has been made to cushion the study in an appropriate historical context by reviewing sources which have the most direct relationship to several parts of the conceptual framework as explained earlier in this paper.

Most of the data have been acquired from the following major sources:

1. Longwood College Archives in the Dabney Lancaster Library, Farmville, Virginia.
2. Longwood College Alumni Office, Farmville, Virginia.
6. Personal collections of alumnae, relatives of alumnae, and professors.
7. Personal interviews conducted throughout the state.

Twenty interviews were conducted with graduates of the normal school at Farmville. Initially, plans were made to interview at least one graduate from every class of the period which had a living member. This demanded going back
to 1902 and obviously this became impossible because the debilitating factors of age and nursing home care made the plans unrealistic. Therefore, interviews commenced with an alert ninety-nine year old member of the class of 1908 and concluded with the class of 1924.

Interviews were also conducted with the editor of the Farmville Herald who had attended the training school at the Farmville Normal School, with the only living teacher who taught at the normal school, with the daughter of the last president of the normal school, and with professors who have maintained an active interest in normal school history.

Though numerous other resources were used, the following list presents some of the most valuable sources of information for this study:

1. Reports of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.
2. House and Senate Journals and Documents.
3. Governors’ Papers.
5. Professional journals.
6. Student records, scrapbooks, memorabilia.
7. Student journals, newspapers, and narratives.
8. Personal letters and correspondence from normal school teachers, administrators, students.
9. Yearbooks, photographs, notebooks, diplomas.

10. Alumnae magazines, histories, and correspondence.

11. Logs, reports, and notes kept by teachers.

12. Student and faculty handbooks.


15. Files on Faculty and Presidents.


17. Catalogs from 1884 to 1924.

18. Official minutes of the Board of Trustees, Executive Committee, Faculty, and Student Government.
Organizational Scheme

The study has been organized into four chapters. The first chapter, the Introduction to the Study has presented the problem and such background material as deemed necessary to properly orient the reader to the study. The remainder of the study will be presented according to the following broad classifications:

Chapter Two: A Review of the Literature Related to Normal School Training in the United States from 1884-1924. This chapter will trace the developmental history of the normal school from a national perspective. It will include a discussion of normal school origins, its role and function, and the course of study. This chapter, like each subsequent chapter and/or section will culminate with a summary of events at given points in the study.

Chapter Three: Characteristics of Normal School Training for White Female Teachers in Virginia: Farmville 1884-1924. This chapter will contain the body of the research as related to the characteristics defined by Harper. The comprehensive and sizable nature of the data to be presented demands that the chapter be divided into three sections for feasibility of the study.
Section One: "The Years of Beginning: 1884-1887". This section will describe the organizational years of 1884-1887 under the administration of W. H. Ruffner. Consideration will be given to the need for establishing a normal school and to the manner in which legislative approval was gained. This discussion will be followed by the presentation of available data concerning each of the characteristics as identified by Charles Harper.

Section Two: "The Years of Development: 1887-1901". This section will include the administrations of two separate presidents and will address the same topics as discussed in section two with the exception of the need for establishment and legislative actions. The purpose here, as above, will be to present the available data for each characteristic to determine how closely the Farmville school approximated those descriptions given by Harper.

Section Three: "The Years of Refinement and Change 1901-1924". This section will focus upon the administration of the fourth and final president during the normal school period. The normal school at Farmville had become well established and was generally well-respected throughout the Commonwealth by the turn of the century. This section will cover the same major topics discussed in the two earlier sections of this chapter. By following the development of the Farmville school over four decades, a considerable
amount of data will be available. This should therefore provide substantial evidence from which to draw solid conclusions with reference to how closely the Farmville Normal School approximated the characteristics which Charles Harper has listed as descriptive of the normal school experience provided by teacher training institutions. It will then be possible to specify significant contributions which the State Normal School at Farmville made to the field of teacher education.

Chapter Four: Summative Review. This will be the final chapter of the study and will be used to specify conclusions which have been delineated as a result of the investigation. From the data analyzed and conclusions reached, the last step will be to make recommendations for further study in the area of or in areas related to normal school history.
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Chapter II: Review of the Literature Related to Normal School Training in the United States
DEVELOPMENTAL HISTORY OF NORMAL SCHOOLS

School teaching has not traditionally been a status occupation in the educational history of the United States. In describing the pattern of teacher selection prior to the time of Horace Mann, Jencks and Riesman reported "School teaching was not a prestigious or lucrative profession during the Colonial Era.... Most parents assumed any literate person could teach school...."¹ However, as the Colonial Era ended and the period of American independence began, education became an increasingly important public responsibility.

Early Beginnings of American Public Normal Schools

Although it is difficult to pinpoint the exact time when America first became interested in training teachers, the monitorial system of education gained favor after Dr. Andrew Bell published a monograph in 1797 on how boys could be used as "monitors" to assist the master with the demands of the classroom.² Joseph Lancaster soon opened a school in London where he taught using the same methods advocated by Bell.³ These methods spread rapidly and enjoyed great popularity in America after being introduced.
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in New York in 1806. In 1818, Lancaster himself visited the United States and in 1819, he was "in charge of the model Lancastrian School in Philadelphia" to initiate monitors into the monitorial methods. The monitorial school made a number of positive contributions to education, among which were its economy and its implications for teacher training. As an affordable system of education, it appealed to the practical American business sense. Its system of training monitors to handle class assignments "brought to light some of the advantages to be had from the training of teachers."

Although the idea of giving specific preparation for teaching evolved slowly in the United States, Benjamin Franklin, in 1751, recommended such training as a possibility for his Academy at Philadelphia. By 1785, Samuel McCorkle actually made provision to offer teacher training in his academy in Salisbury, North Carolina. The Massachusetts Magazine of 1789 hinted that teacher training should be a prerequisite for every schoolmaster. It was not, however, until 1823 that a school was established for the exclusive purpose of teacher training. Samuel Read Hall was called to pastor a church in Concord, Vermont in 1822. He accepted the invitation "only on the condition that he would be allowed to conduct a school for the instruction of those in the town who wished to become teachers." Thus,
on March 11, 1823, Hall opened the "Columbian School" in his home. The response was overwhelming and he moved to larger quarters which were also soon outgrown. Finally, in the summer of 1823, the first normal school building, per se, was erected. Thus, Hall is credited with having founded the first normal school in America. In 1829, Hall's book, Lectures in School-Keeping, was printed in what was "the first book on Education ever printed in the United States in English language".

As early as 1816, Demison Olmstead who would later become Professor of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy at Yale, proposed that an institution designed for the explicit purpose of training teachers be established. Although his plans were directed toward the training of young men only, he was vitally concerned about the lack of "practical knowledge of the principles and art of teaching" and the negative effect this deficiency had upon the common schools. His arguments received support in 1823 from a teacher of a New Haven Academy named William Russell who published a pamphlet called "Suggestions for Education". These arguments can be summarized in this quotation from his pamphlet:

The common schools for children are in not a few instances conducted by individuals who do not possess one of the qualifications of an instructor, and in very many cases there is barely knowledge enough to keep the teacher
at a decent distance from his scholars. An excellent suggestion was lately made on a branch of this subject by a writer in a periodical publication. His proposal was that a seminary be founded for the teachers of district schools; that a course of study should be prescribed to persons who are desirous of obtaining the situation of teachers in such schools; and that no individual should be accepted as an instructor who had not received a license from the proposed institution. The effects of such an improvement in education seem almost incalculable. The information, the intelligence, and the refinement which might thus be diffused among the body of the people would increase the prosperity, elevate the character and promote the happiness of the nation to a degree perhaps unequaled in the world.17

In the year 1825, Governor De Witt Clinton in an address to the state legislature of New York "recommended that it concern itself with the problem of securing a supply of competent teachers".18 In that same year the Reverend Thomas H. Gallaudet from Hartford, Connecticut drew up a proposal in which he listed four exhortations which he considered basic to any plan of teacher training. These propositions as presented in his Plan of a Seminary for the Education of the Instructors of Youth are as follows:

(1) Let an institution be established in every state for the express purpose of training the profession of instructors of youth.
(2) Let it be so well endowed by the liberality of the public that it may have professors of talent who should devote their lives to the theory and practice of the education of youth.

(3) Let the institution be furnished with a library—and also with all the apparatus that modern ingenuity has devised to aid in teaching—maps, charts, globes, orreries, etc.

(4) Let there be connected with the institution a school in which the theories of the professors might be reduced to practice. Let the students take their turns in the instruction of the experimental school.19

Shortly after Gallaudet's proposals appeared, James G. Carter, known as the "Father of American Public Normal Schools", began a campaign to make the preparation of teachers a state responsibility. He wrote articles in the Boston Patriot stressing the state's role in training teachers. As a respected member of the Massachusetts Legislature, he used his influence to get a bill passed to establish a State Board of Education. His eventual success led to the creation of such an agency and to Horace Mann's subsequently being made its secretary in 1837.20 Horace Mann, perhaps more than any other single person deserves to be recognized for his contributions to the establishment of a system of state supported public education and to the founding of the first public normal school for the training of teachers in the United States.
A new era in education began when the first state supported normal school in America opened in Lexington, Massachusetts on July 3, 1839. From humble beginnings in a leased building and with only three persons arriving to be examined for admission into the school, the Massachusetts' venture gave birth to what Cyrus Pierce, the principal at Lexington, described in 1840 as "the most interesting educational experiment...on this side of the Atlantic". Indeed as an experiment the normal school effort may be viewed as interesting but in the context of history, the experiment became a movement which must be regarded as an arduous and laborious pilgrimage.

The key to the ultimate success of this type of school can be found in the words of Horace Mann as he commented about the very unpromising commencement which marked the opening day of the nation's first normal school. In his journal record for July 3, 1839, Mann wrote: "What remains but more exertion, more and more, until it must succeed?" These words were very nearly prophetic in their implications of the demands and challenges which normal schools would receive over the developmental years from their 1839 inception until they eventually matured into "the teachers college with full collegiate status and degree-granting power" before or during the second decade of the twentieth century.
While Horace Mann labored in Massachusetts, Henry Barnard showed similar zeal in Connecticut. "Believing that seminaries for training teachers must come...Mr. Barnard at once set about informing the Legislature and the public...concerning the existing state of affairs, especially with regard to the qualifications of teachers, and the necessity for increasing them".24 As Secretary of the Board of Education in Connecticut, Mr. Barnard advocated a "Seminary for Teachers" based on a plan almost identical to that outlined by Gallaudet. After his plans failed to get immediate legislature approval, Barnard, at his own expense, established a class for Hartford County teachers who were overwhelmingly enthusiastic about what they received. Using the results obtained from this experiment, Barnard continued his fight to secure the support of the Connecticut Legislature and used every available opportunity to address public gatherings about the need for a normal school.25 Among the arguments used against Barnard's proposal, the most frequent were:

1. Normal schools had "foreign" connotations.
2. Seminaries, academies, and colleges which were already established could prepare teachers.
3. The training would not pay off because most would not teach long enough to make it worthwhile.
4. It was too costly, required too much time, and would not produce enough teachers.26

Opposition was strong and apathy was so paralyzing that it took Barnard a decade to realize enough success to lay the matter before the Legislature again. Thus, it was 1849 before both Houses gave approval to a bill which provided for the creation of Connecticut's first normal school.

**European Origins of the Normal School**

Normal school training as it developed in the United States became uniquely American in style even though its origins can be directly traced to European beginnings. Norton noted that preliminary to the Massachusetts' pioneer efforts, "similar institutions had long been successful in Prussia, and they had been recently established in France".27

The Prussian School Code of 1763 set forth general regulations for elementary schools and teachers. The code specifically stated "the chief requisite in a good school is a competent and faithful teacher".28 The Silesian School Code of 1765 stated that in order to produce citizens of greater usefulness,
it is ordained that everyone who desires to be employed in schools may have the opportunity for learning all that is needed by a good teacher, we have thought it best to establish here and there certain schools, in which not only the young will have the best instruction, but where adults, also, may be taught how to teach and manage youth.²⁹

Similarly, M. Guizot, as Minister of Public Instruction in France proposed in 1833 "no schoolmaster shall be appointed who has not himself been a pupil of a school which instructs in the art of teaching, and who is not certified, after a strict examination to have profited by the opportunities he has enjoyed".³⁰

Horace Mann visited various schools in Europe during the spring of 1843 and concluded that those of Prussia were the finest. He was much impressed by the Prussian seminaries as teacher training institutions and he was especially complimentary of the selection process, the course of study, and the emphasis placed upon practical experience gained in the model or experimental school. He was so strongly influenced by the Prussian schools that he chose to devote attention to them in the Seventh Annual Report of the Massachusetts State Board of Education. It can therefore be concluded that during its developmental history the normal school in the United States evolved into
a plan which was uniquely American but in its formative stages, it naturally looked to already established European models for guidance.

Harper discussed the contributions of several men other than Horace Mann who were much excited about the Prussian schools. Among the most outstanding were Reverend Charles Brooks and Calvin Stowe. Reverend Brooks, like Mann, was from Massachusetts and he also became an enthusiastic supporter of the normal school idea. He was closely associated with leaders of schools in Germany and France. From his contact with a French educator, M. Victor Cousins, he developed the slogan which would later become a significant feature in his campaign for state supported normal schools. Using the slogan "As is the teacher so is the school", he drew much public attention to the necessity for having special schools to prepare teachers. In a like manner, Calvin Stowe, who was married to the famous Harriet Beecher Stowe, was an ardent laborer for state supported normal schools in Ohio. Harper mentioned that Stowe demonstrated unusual foresight as "he outlined a plan for the curriculum, methods, and management of a teacher-education school which looked far into the future of normal-school developments". Attention to the practical aspects of teaching was slow in coming and even when ideas gleaned from Europe became popular, the dispute
over professional and practical emphasis versus the non-professional and academic stress continued in the United States. However, three major nineteenth century influences upon educational theory, curriculum planning, and teacher training, were Froebel, Pestalozzi, and Herbart.

Froebel deserves to be credited with the honor of making the child, rather than the subject, the central element in the school program. Emphasizing the importance of the child, his nature, and interests, Froebel helped to alleviate much of the classical style of learning with its focus upon drill and repetition. According to Straight, "Froebel's great work was to point out the true significance of Child's play in the education of the human race." Normal schools quickly picked up on Froebel's ideas in an effort to escape the formality and rigidity of presentation which had previously characterized the classroom. Recognized as the originator of the kindergarten, Froebel was especially interested in the development and education of young children. He believed that since play was a natural inclination, it should be made central in the educative process. The kindergarten program was to emphasize self-development, activity and social cooperation. The story, as narrated by the teacher was pivotal—"it permeated all activity."
The Swiss educator, Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, was much impressed by the views of Rousseau, especially as related to the use of nature in the education of children. He believed understanding the child was of central importance but this, he felt, had to be balanced by an insistence upon social progress. Pestalozzi opposed stress on memorization and other types of meaningless learning. Among his greatest contributions to educational theory were his ideas of individual development. Pestalozzi "looked upon the child as a unity made up of separate faculties of moral, physical, and intellectual powers, all of which had to be harmoniously developed by education".

Realizing that without trained teachers education could not be much advanced, Pestalozzi developed methods that demanded a new kind of teacher training. According to Butts, "Pestalozzi made a lasting contribution to the rise of a teaching profession" because he showed that teaching required specialized knowledge of the nature of the child, his development, and how to adjust methods of instruction to meet his needs. Pestalozzi's influence was responsible for drastic changes in the kinds of subject matter taught and in the manner in which lessons were presented. Pestalozzi most affected the curriculum through the
utilization of real objects, sensory impressions, and personal expression. Pestalozzi himself describes his method thusly:

The most essential point from which I start is this: Sense impression of Nature is the only true foundation of human instruction, because it is the only true foundation of human knowledge.

In America, Pestalozzi's methods were modified and made extremely popular through the zeal of Edward A. Sheldon of the Oswego Normal in New York. On a visit to Toronto, Sheldon chanced upon a collection of Pestalozzian objective teaching materials (pictures, cotton balls, blocks, etc.) in a Home and Colonial School Society display. Returning to his own school, he required his teachers to meet with him on Saturday mornings to be instructed in his own adaption of objective teaching. He later secured a Pestalozzian expert from England to teach his teachers. The project was such a success that Sheldon invited educators from across the country to observe this "object teaching" method. Sheldon used object teaching to give a "first hand knowledge of objects" as an extension of the Pestalozzian objective teaching aimed at understanding.

In conjunction with the Oswego Practice School, object lessons were taught with regularity. Real objects were used for instruction and children were given the chance
to work in concrete, manipulative activities. The major criticism of this plan was that in time, students could mechanically execute functions but often could not explain why they did so because they had not obtained fundamental understanding in the process. On the other hand, the movement toward Pestalozzian strategy increased rapidly in normal schools throughout the country. Harper explains this popularity as being the result of the applause given to the "Oswego Methods" after a visit in 1865 from a committee of the National Teachers' Association. The committee disagreed with the formality of the program but "praised the enduring idea that education of the child must start with what the child knows, working from the well-known to the obscurely known and so onward and upward till the learner can enter the fields of science and abstract thought".43

The American Herbartian movement, to which De Garmo of Swarthmore contributed significantly, became the major reform effort of the late nineteenth century. The emphasis here was upon culture history as being the heart of the curriculum. This involved the correlation of subjects especially in the area of literature, history, and nature studies but the most important consideration was the child's interest. Believing the connection between ideas to be
fundamental to learning, Herbart stressed the psychology of associationism so that an "apperceptive mass" of ideas could be formed.\(^4^4\) When this was reduced to the "five formal steps" of preparation, presentation, association, generalization, and application, a lesson plan could easily be frozen into rigidity and dull routine. However, the emphasis upon concentration and correlation, properly used, "led to a vital professionalization of education".\(^4^5\)

The Emergence and Growth of Normal Schools in the United States

After the first public normal school in Lexington, Massachusetts opened in 1839, the movement gradually began to spread and by the end of the century, normal schools were the accepted, though not required, means of teacher preparation. However, as late as 1882, Smith supposed that less than four percent of the teachers recruited annually for the classroom were graduates of normal schools.\(^4^6\) Availability and possession of the most rudimentary skills still composed adequate qualifications for employment in many schools. The demand for teachers far outpaced their formal preparation to teach. It is small wonder that those in charge of the classrooms were often said to have "kept school" rather than to have taught it.
As public schools improved and expanded, the need for a steady source of trained teachers became a pressing issue in many states. According to Jencks and Riesman "...it seemed clear that an adequate supply of cheap teachers would have to depend mainly on women."47 At this point in history, lengthy training would have been considered wasteful since heretofore barely any formal training had been provided for teaching, per se, and requiring lengthy training would have deprived the school of badly needed personnel. The statement also indicates the rapidly spiraling rate at which women were then beginning to seek gainful employment. Thus, as Jencks and Riesman noted, "The need was rather to develop a publicly financed training institution that would recruit women at the end of eight years of elementary school, give them professional training, and send them back to the elementary schools as teachers. This need was met by a new institution: the state normal school."48

Horace Mann set the stage for this preparation in the United States and before the year 1840 ended, Massachusetts had three normal schools—Lexington, Barre, and Bridgewater. Simultaneously, Henry Barnard sought means to establish state supported schools to prepare teachers in Connecticut. Yet growth was not rapid and Cubberley
reported that by 1860, there were only eleven normal schools in eight states with summer courses being offered in fifteen states but Harcleroad et al contended that there were only six public normals before 1850, but by 1860, they reported a total of fifteen in ten states. Beginning in 1870 and continuing into the twentieth century, there was however a period of normal school proliferation—so much so that by 1910, Cubberley said there were at least two hundred in the United States. Harcleroad, Sagen, and Molen report the beginning of normal schools in all forty-eight states by 1910.

In 1913 Felmley wrote, "the normal school is not the exclusive agency for the training of teachers, but it is the state's chief agency." This was a fairly well-accepted idea as long as the preparation for teaching in the elementary schools was the primary concern. However, as the need for high school teachers increased, the role of the normal school became less clear and controversy ensued over whether colleges or normals could best meet the changing demand. Kirk said "some college men desire to prepare all high school teachers....Their equipment for preparing high school teachers is painfully meager, tho they seem not to know it."
The demand for more professionally trained high school teachers represented more of a challenge than it did a crisis for the normal school. It was necessary to broaden the scope and define the mission in such a way as to keep the normal school purposes distant from those of the liberal arts college. Thus, by a process of adaptation to social and economic change, the normal school generally matured into the state teacher college during the first quarter of twentieth century. Harper stated it well: "Although the teachers college seemed a new institution to many people, yet it was an evolution, not a revolution."55

ROLE AND FUNCTION

Though a number of private normal schools, often of questionable quality, sprang up across the country, the state normals became the most widely accepted and respected avenue for preparing teachers for the nation's classrooms. Harper reported that generally "states established the normal schools by legislative acts, determined the number and the locations of the institutions, usually contributed to the erection of the first building, financed additional structures completely, and set up some sort of board of control for their government. For the most part the normal schools relied on direct appropriations from the state legislatures."56" The schools were usually operated very
economically even though resources were few, equipment barely existent, and buildings inadequate. Harper noted "The early buildings were cheap and resembled those of the local high school or academy."\textsuperscript{37} Furthermore, he added "the building or at least the site was often donated by the town as a plume for attracting the school into the area. The tendency to accept these acts of benevolent blessing showed a remarkable lack of foresight and planning; consequently, rapid growth of the schools frequently resulted in crowded conditions and a corresponding limit upon opportunity for building and facility expansion."\textsuperscript{38} Thus, even though normal schools were established by the state government for the purpose of providing teachers for the state, plans were often poorly made and the schools just seemed to evolve without any clear-cut scheme for physical or philosophical operation.

However, public normal schools from their early beginning in Massachusetts until they became teachers colleges in the twentieth century had certain continuing characteristics. Among the most common were the following\textsuperscript{39}

1. They were generally non-collegiate. Until about 1910, very few normal schools demanded a high school diploma for admission therefore, collegiate level work was seldom required before the 1920s.
2. They were generally under state control and consequently prevailing political circumstances had a direct influence upon the location and organization of the institutions. This does not mean, however, that local responsibility was removed. In fact, many communities were intimately involved in the operation and maintenance of the normals.

3. They were generally single-purpose in nature. The normals existed primarily to train teachers to meet the educational needs of society.

4. They were generally not able to devote the curriculum to purely professional work. The lack of adequacy in subject matter background for those who possessed only a common school education forced the normals to devote a considerable amount of study to specific content areas.

D. L. Kiehle, State Superintendent in Minneapolis, Minnesota admitted though there was no agreement upon the place which the normal schools should fill, "They will show a continual tendency to ally themselves with higher education and neglect the elementary; they will aspire to a good name for the higher academic, rather than to the self-sacrificing work of promoting primary instruction by better methods and more thoroughly trained teachers." There was no wavering in Kiehle's opinion that normal schools should be dedicated to offering teachers practical experiences grounded inseparably in theory. This, he said, was the nature of professional work which could be characterized according to two departments. One department
should provide philosophic training to equip "teachers with that masterly comprehension of the entire field that will enable them and dispose them to make new and safe paths, and be ever fresh and inventive." As important as this philosophic training was, the practical side could by no means be overlooked - to do so would "leave the masses uncared for" just as to slight the philosophic would have endangered culture and progress.

The importance of philanthropy in teaching was recognized by Kiehle who disdained those who entered the profession for money and who were willing to serve only so long as they were rewarded financially. A more sacrificial nature and a willingness to teach for the honor of service were among the most desirable of attributes in Kiehle's estimation.

Dr. James M. Green, like Kiehle, recognized that "The place of the normal school in the educational system is and ever has been under discussion." He elaborated upon this statement by explaining that there were at least three views about the function of the normal school:

1. It lacks a well defined role and though it is generally a state supported institution, it is free to do what it needs to do.

2. It is an academic enterprise with territorial responsibilities since many sections are unable to provide the local training to equip teachers.
3. It is strictly preparatory training for teaching and is not to be confused with academic training.

Green held the opinion that none of these was correct but rather the normal school offered the kind of academic training and treatment of subjects peculiar to the needs of teachers. A few years earlier Kiehle recognized the same aim when he proclaimed that normal schools should "comprehend the best scholarship" and combine with it "the most advanced thought upon the philosophy of teaching."65

In 1884, the Committee on Normal Schools in reporting to the National Council made four specific recommendations. Of these two dealt with the professional component and were stated thusly:66

That the work of normal schools should be professional; the academic work mainly incidental and illustrative.

That the professional instruction should be based on a thorough study of man as a physical, intellectual, and moral being.

The committee further defined the meaning of professional education as being instruction in history, methods, and principles of education.
The question of whether the normals should be largely academic or almost entirely professional remained a nagging and unreconciled passion of the schools throughout their history. This can perhaps be attributed to the feeling which was fairly pervasive during the Colonial period that being an expert in a given subject provided sufficient credentials for being a school master. Throughout the intervening years, this position was staunchly maintained by many who felt that instruction in methodology and principles of learning was a simplistic and unnecessary consideration for teaching effectiveness.

Lord, as the president of Moorhead State Normal School in Minnesota, took up the argument of Green and Kiehle. While disclaiming the necessity for professional training, he said, "No professional training not based upon general culture and accurate scholarship can be successful." He gave an even stronger defense of an academic emphasis when he, in unveiled terms, suggested that academic training should be a substantial part of the preparation for those who expected to teach beyond the fifth grade although he hastened to add that he was not "minifying the value of those subjects which are known as professional."
In contrast to Lord's opinion stood that of Aspenwall, Supervisor of the Normal College in Albany, New York. He wrote "an argument against the professional training of teachers is hardly worth discussing." Contrary to the old expression "teachers are born not made", Aspenwall purported that technical skills were not a part of nature's process and even for those who may possess some instructive ability "without a systematic training and a proper development, it is of little avail in reaching a high degree of perfection in teaching; and for the many who do not possess this natural intuitive faculty of teaching, a course in professional pedagogical training is absolutely indispensable to the gaining of prominence in the profession."

Smith, in a series of articles beginning in 1909-1914, discussed various problems which were of significance to the normal school but a common thread throughout was his emphasis upon the need for the practice school to be the focus of the entire training program. In March and November 1909, he pointed out the need for combining knowledge of subject and of the child with mastery of method in the practice school. He concluded that subject matter expertise was vitally important but could best begin through observation in the practical context. In September 1912, he contended that only as the practice
school was made the center of the normal school work would it be possible to avoid segmenting learning. The practice school, according to Smith's philosophy would help to correlate, integrate, and reinforce relationships rather than stringing ideas together in perfunctory superficial manner, completely lacking in unity. Thus, in May 1914, he warned of the dangers of becoming what he termed a "pedagogical junkshop." While advocating the need for stability in educational practice, he condemned the "narrowness of our practical applications of pedagogical principles outside of practice teaching". He felt the main features of the normal course should continue to be mastery of courses to be taught, professional study and practice teaching but the program should be extended to include needs dictated by changing times (i.e. rural schools vs. city schools).

Hard fought as the battles were to secure and maintain state supported normal schools, their entire history spanned less than a century. By 1903, Julian Abernethy was writing in Education—a journal devoted to the Science, Art, Philosophy, and Literature of Education, "The old-fashion normal school is on the road to oblivion, and every earnest educator wishes for it a speedy end of the journey." He purported that the march of new educational ideas had made the normal school obsolete. This charge in
no way undermined the valuable role which the normal training provided in those days "when teachers received no systematic training for the profession, when, indeed, teaching was hardly recognized as a profession at all; when any detachable member of society...was permitted to assume the obligation of a teacher..."). Abernethy was of the opinion that teachers were for the most part "narrow and utilitarian." However, he perceived this as a characteristic which was very likely to change with better preparation via a more comprehensive collegial experience. He cited the Teachers College at Columbia as the model of professional preparation which deserved emulation.

Even though he felt college was the best place for teacher training, Abernethy admitted the normal school was likely to be resistant to being uprooted; particularly so since the political connections were heavy, not only in terms of monetary attachments but also in terms of status conveyed to those who attended, and in terms of the quick teachers manufactured. As each of these is examined in turn, it becomes apparent that salaried positions, community resources, short training periods, and increased teacher supply could hardly be taken lightly. Yet, Abernethy concluded that "A normal school with the rank and quality of a high school cannot, in any proper sense, be regarded as a professional school"...
A rebuttal to Abernethy was not long in waiting. In the April 1903 issue of Education, W. G. Chambers of the State Normal School at Moorhead, Minnesota, replied "that normal schools, like all other institutions, are bound to undergo continuous adaptation and modifications in order to fulfill their mission...but that their doom is foretold in such adaptation we can never concur." Chambers supported a "more finished product" than that provided by the normal school in areas where this was practical but he refused to accept Abernethy's extinction idea just as he refused to accept his charge that normal schools were guilty of providing "ready made and stereotyped practice" rather than truly professional training. Chambers acknowledged that initially this was indeed necessary but as the schools evolved, they became less superficial. He believed that this evolutionary process would continue as the normal school continued to raise standards and became truly professional. This, he said, represented change but it did not represent the passing of the normal school.

The rise of the public school to a place of prominence and ready accessibility further confused the role and function of the normal schools. Seerley, of Iowa State Teachers College, defended the ability of the normal school to adjust its program to meet the needs of specialization required by the secondary programs. He asserted:
There is no good reason why the training of the high school teacher is not the proper function of a state normal school. The state normal schools have the environment and the training facilities to the highest degree, they have experience in training students to be teachers that is notable, and they are so affiliated with the public schools of the communities where they are located that the work to be done is never subordinated.

Even though no restrictions were placed upon the kinds of teachers normal schools should prepare, the advent of the high school did force many changes. It was necessary to broaden scholarship expectations and increase the breadth of the curriculum. Thus, early in the twentieth century, many normal schools began to consider offering college, rather than normal level preparation. Harper reported that at the beginning of the century there were at least four normals that had already developed into teachers colleges and "By the end of the third decade of this century there were close to one hundred and fifty recognized degree-conferring state teachers colleges in the United States, and in addition some of these teachers colleges were offering graduate work."\textsuperscript{83} Bolton, in a similar manner, described the normal schools' attempts to make adjustments to accommodate changing needs. Thus, "extra courses were added, laboratories were extended and library facilities
expanded, until now they maintain a full college course of four years and also encourage college graduates to attend."84

Harper credited Kirk, Seerley, and Felmley, as being outstanding presidents who helped to save the teachers colleges from having the rights they had earned as normal schools wrestled from them. As shown by discussions in The Proceedings of the National Education Association, the period from 1900-1926 saw a heated battle staged over "the relative merits of the normal schools and colleges as centers for the preparation of high school teachers."85

In summary it can be said that the role and function of the normal schools was never clear. They sprang up without design or plan in a desperate attempt to meet the need for professionally trained teachers. Yet, the training received was not totally professional because deficiencies in the educational backgrounds of most students prevented the offering of purely collegiate level work. These single-purpose, state controlled institutions debated their identity, the subject matter to be taught, and their status—whether academic or preparatory.
THE COURSE OF STUDY

Standards for Admission

William W. Parsons gave a very comprehensive definition of a course of study as follows:

A course of study is a means to an end. It presupposes on one hand certain existing conditions, and on the other a prescribed object to be accomplished. The curriculum is determined by two factors—the degree of maturity, the ability, the attainments of those presenting themselves for admission, and the special end it is designed to bring about or promote.

He noted that in Indiana in 1890 about sixty to sixty-five percent of those enrolling in the normal schools were graduates of graded schools only. Though they were described as conscientious and appreciative of the schooling opportunity, Parsons said, "that so long as the normal school is obliged to admit as its students persons having only meager attainments, its course of study must be adapted to the needs of this class." Thus, he concluded the purpose of the normal school was not "general education, training, and culture for their own sake" but rather it was to convey the professional ability to successfully practice as a teacher. This was not intended to excuse a
lack of academic knowledge but rather added to it the ability to use reflective and introspective thinking which according to Parsons was the most important qualification for admission to the normal school.

Judd reported that the Carnegie Foundation 1914 study, "sought and secured an invitation from the state of Missouri to examine the five normal schools of that state as typical of the normal schools of the country." The findings suggest that students were allowed to enter without any specific qualifications or credentials and were then given little assistance in establishing their course of study. Frequently, they were placed in classrooms where their classmates were from widely differing backgrounds of prior preparation and where record keeping and credit awarding were poorly handled. Even "graduation was permitted on wholly arbitrary grounds." It was well into the twentieth century before high school graduation became a prerequisite for admission to normal school. Jencks and Riesman explained that the need for "schoolmarms" in the mid-1800's became so great that public institutions were desperately needed to "recruit women at the end of eight years of elementary school, give them some professional training, and send them back to the elementary schools as teachers." However, by the turn of the century, the demand for secondary teachers was on the increase and
according to Cressman and Benda, normal schools generally began to expect those desiring admission to have at least the equivalent of two years of high school work. In some of the states which had established teacher training institutions very early, a longer period of high schooling was required. For example, Chambers suggested that four years should be required for entrance as soon as feasible even though at that time (1902) "Massachusetts seems to be the only state thus far demanding such qualifications of its students."

Additional considerations for admission, according to Chambers should include a "year each of physics, chemistry, biology; two years of English and a sufficient knowledge of general history, algebra and geometry." Thinking these areas composed sufficient intellectual criteria, Chambers then suggested that the candidate must also be able to pass thorough physical examination and be free personally (and in immediate ancestry) from known physical and mental illnesses.

Harper reported finding basically the same kind of expectations. "The entrance requirements among the earlier schools were generally: good health, minimum age of sixteen to eighteen years, certificate of good moral character, and an examination on the common branches taught in the district schools." He pointed out that whereas, this might suggest
that those who possessed at least the equivalent of an elementary school education were being admitted to normal schools, "the district school of the sixties and seventies throughout most of the United States was not equivalent to our modern elementary school."97

As late as 1913, Black at Missouri Valley College noted that frequently "there are no requirements for admission to the normal schools"98 and the president, rather than faculty made decisions for the institutions about entrance, qualifications for graduation, and other matters of educational concern.99

Joseph M. Gwinn in the Department of Education at Tulane University made a study of the catalogs of fifty normal schools in thirty of the thirty-five states which had normal schools in 1895. Catalogs for 1895 and 1905 were analyzed for the purpose of ascertaining the entrance requirements representative of the United States as a whole. He concluded from his study that not only were requirements unclear, it appeared that they were intentionally written with vagueness. Thirty-five of the fifty schools were reported to have made no change in entrance requirements over the ten year period. Various reasons were given for the failure to raise entrance levels but the most frequent dealt with the lack of high school training and the persistent need to prepare teachers for the rural schools.100
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Gwinn affirmed his support of entrance requirements equal to high school graduation but also exhibited a proclivity for allowing those who have been denied such attainment to be allowed to enroll in the normal school. He said, "Since scholarship is essential in fitting one to teach, if the normal school finds it lacking in the entering student, it becomes clearly a necessary part of the work of the normal school to supply the needed scholarship."  

Since the normals were established for the purpose of serving the state, Harper conjectured that they could hardly refuse those whose "formal education did not exceed the school district." Furthermore, with the intensity of demand, it was easily possible for those who desired to become teachers to go directly into the classroom without the benefit of normal schools. Harper pointed out, however, that entrance examinations were given in the normal schools and in most cases they were "far from mere formality and were increased in difficulty as the general level of education rose." Correspondingly, as the general level of education climbed in the public programs, the normal school programs also tended to increase in length.

As early as 1894, a "Committee on the Relation of Normal Schools to Universities" chaired by Charles De Garmo and composed of D. L. Kiehle, G. Stanley Hall, Richard Boone, Nicholas Murray Butler, and J. M. Green as
members, reported thirty-two percent of those who matriculated at normal schools had the equivalent of a high school preparation and furthermore the normal school graduates were considered quite capable of successfully undertaking university level work if they so desired.¹⁰⁴ According to De Garmo, "the normal school is or should be an institution of higher instruction [and] after three years of earnest study...those who choose to continue their education at the university should be allowed to do so."¹⁰⁵

At the NEA session two years earlier, De Garmo (1892) had delivered a paper in which he discussed the lack of co-ordination between the normal school and the university. He addressed the elementary and general nature of the training provided by the normal schools, noting that the normal school trained the student to apply well what he knew but that graduates tended to lack a broad outlook and specialized knowledge. Thus, he said that the university could better take care of the latter "but the probability is that in making him a biologist or economist it would unmake him as a teacher.¹⁰⁶ However, De Garmo went on to argue that universities needed more pedagogical work and normal school diplomas needed to be elevated to a level of university acceptance. He recognized the desires to build an unbroken line from primary school to the university but
he lamented that "we seem thus far to have thought little about any correlation of effort between normal schools and universities...".  

According to Marion Brown, principal of a New Orleans normal school, the conditions for entering a normal school really must be established by the state rather than by the school faculty. Thus, admission might be based upon high school graduation or upon license requirements as set by the law. "They take it that a legal teacher ought by right to be able to enter a teacher's professional school and get the instruction he needs to prepare him to do better and more remunerative work." In spite of some individual state and local expectations to the contrary, nation-wide, the trend from 1860 onward was "toward requiring high school graduation for admission."

The Curriculum

Our normal schools and pedagogical departments must train teachers and superintendents...that to train up a child in the way he should go is the noblest and most worthy work to which God can call any human being.

This statement, according to H. H. Straight, presented the mission of the normal schools. His philosophy was that schools in general must make the three R's
fundamental but must simultaneously focus upon industry education: "the entire work of the school must be reconstructed upon the basis of an enlarged conception of the word industry" without which the result is certain to be a fourth R--namely, rascaldom. If teachers were to be even reasonably adequately prepared to handle these primary functions of the elementary schools, more than academics were required for assuming the added responsibilities which teachers were expected to assume.

As early as 1850, Henry Barnard in his Fifth Annual Report as State Superintendent of the Connecticut Schools described the normal school as 'applying to teaching the same preparatory study and practice which the common judgment of this world demands of every other profession and art'. Men, like Barnard and Horace Mann sought ways to help teachers gain new social and scientific insight into their work; however, the emphasis upon formal discipline and mental training persisted long after 1850.

A great deal of conflict existed over the subject matter which should justifiably be included in the normal school program and in the end, it was apparently based upon the general background of the students entering the school. Chambers suggested that the non-professional studies should have a triple purpose, namely that of:
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(1) extending the knowledge and culture of the students

(2) insuring in them the permanence of studious habits and

(3) giving light and significance to their teaching, through the clearer analyses and deeper meaning brought to the subjects of instruction.

In a carefully designed diagram, Chambers presented the order and progression of a three year (three terms per year) course of study. In the professional area, he suggested that the central focus for each year be as follows:116

First Year
- psychology
- child study
- observation of teaching

Second Year
- general methods
- history of education
- special methods

Third Year
- professional reading
- ethics
- philosophy

Overall, the course of study as recommended by Chambers would be composed of three-fifths professional studies and two-fifths non-professional.117
Generally speaking, this course of study did not differ greatly in composition from the one recommended by Ruediger at Teachers' College, Columbia for a two year (two terms per year) program.\textsuperscript{118}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>history of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>child study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ethics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th>methods of observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School management, School Law and School Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methods and Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Harper noted that by 1899, Michigan State Normal had five different curricula from which students could choose, ranging from a general to a specialized two year degree; a general to a specialized four year diploma; and a fifth option was a one year course available to college graduates. These choices enabled teachers to prepare for:\textsuperscript{119}

1. rural, ungraded, and village schools.
2. public and private kindergartens.
3. primary work and the lower grades of the elementary schools.
4. upper grades of the graded schools.
5. general grade work.
6. special subjects and departments.
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7. supervision of particular branches such as music and drawing.

8. general supervision and administration.

H. A. Brown of the State Normal School, Oshkosh, Wisconsin pointed out that it was necessary to first consider the characteristics of a trained teacher before trying to specify what constituted desirable elements in curricula. He concluded there were four vital considerations:

1. The teacher must have adequate scholarship in the area that he taught and in other related areas.

2. The teacher must be well schooled in mental growth and development of children.

3. The teacher must be trained in the most up-to-date methods.

4. The teacher must be knowledgeable of school organization and management.

To prepare teachers to have these qualifications, Brown recommended differentiated curricula for primary grades, intermediate grades, upper grammar grades and principal training. For all three programs, the first year was basically the same—music, drawing, arithmetic, history, English. The purpose of the first year was to provide "a broad foundation of scholarship and appreciation." Brown
emphasized that oral and written fundamental skills in English were a very important part of the first semester for all students.\textsuperscript{122}

Mary Master Needham concurred with Brown that this was a very justifiable requirement. Needham, as a university graduate, accepted the position as a normal school instructor with reservation but was hardly prepared for the near illiterate status of many of her pupils—a number of whom were practicing teachers. She used multiple cases to show how some of the teachers had scarcely ever read a book, had grave difficulty with spoken English, and were not prepared to do anything that called for real intellectual exercise. She lamented that normal schools were vocational schools concerned with little more than "methods" and "lesson plans." With indignation, she posed the question "Don't you know that in these normal schools we are simply perpetuating a vicious circle? We send out untrained, frequently illiterate students without the ability to spell or speak correctly, and we send them into the public schools to teach."\textsuperscript{123} Furthermore, the vicious cycle was fueled by the fact that most teachers, according to Burk, had never had exposure to educational ideas outside of the normal school. Add to this the factor of in-breeding common to normal school faculties and it becomes clear what Burk meant when he cited this problem as "significant
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explanation for the vigorous survival in modern times of the temporary expedients, purposes, and methods of early pioneer work."\textsuperscript{124} Rather than continuing to perpetuate traditions which were innovative ideas in Horace Mann's day, Burk sought to elevate the normal school to a position where teachers of the normal schools were scholars and the pedagogy they espoused could characterize the schools as places of educational leadership.\textsuperscript{125}

By 1888, the enrollment in normal schools in Massachusetts began to decrease. This drop was caused in large part over the controversy concerning the best method of training teachers. On one hand, those who supported the college view felt that knowledge of subject matter should receive primary consideration, whereas, those who supported the professional view felt that training in methods of teaching should be the top priority.\textsuperscript{126}

With the exception of psychology, history of education, and methods of instruction, Burk charged the normal schools in Massachusetts of failing to introduce students to any new knowledge. In his view, the normal schools had stagnated and done little to modify the programs inaugurated fifty years earlier. Instead of establishing programs to attract "the better class of minds," the normal
school had allowed young women of the lower mental capacity into places where they can easily earn a living at public expense.\textsuperscript{127}

Black's observations tended to be the same as Burk's and Needham's. He found the curricular expectations of the normal school appallingly low and disgustingly inappropriate. He expressed a sense of frustration over the utilitarian nature of the normal school curriculum which was prone to mix undemanding academic study with professional work even though "the field in which the teacher works is more important and further reaching than medicine or law."\textsuperscript{128}

According to Seerley, President of Iowa State Teachers College in Cedar Falls, Iowa, the General Assemblies of the various states set up normal schools and "define their purpose as specifically vocational, that of preparing students for the service of teaching public schools in the said several states."\textsuperscript{129} Thus, the course of study was largely determined by public demands and by the fact that "students and teachers of a normal school [were] seeking the solution of specific definite problems in civilization rather than investigating an interpretation of a philosophy of living and thinking."\textsuperscript{130}
In a study conducted by Professor MacDonald at Buffalo State Normal School "involving nineteen representative normal schools located, with one exception, outside of the State of New York," widely differing practices and expectations were discovered. He concluded that no uniformity of courses existed from one school to another in terms of either the nature or amounts of subject requirements.

Brown made reference to the view held by some superintendents that normal schools were prone to make teaching more a trade than a profession through attempts "to instruct students in the mechanism of management and teaching before they are prepared in scholarship, age, or experience in life to view educational ideas and methods from the true and proper standpoint." Green also noted the limited academic scope in the normal schools but attributed this to the academic boundaries set forth by the secondary schools. Similarly, Ruediger reported that the kind of preparation afforded by the high schools was certain to place restraints upon the course of study offered by the normal school.

In an 1898 report dealing with "Normal Schools from Iowa to Colorado", Brown agreed with Chambers and Ruediger that a professional course of study could be more readily agreed upon than the non-professional. However, most
schools from Iowa to Colorado did offer, in addition to courses in language (Latin and English), science, and history, courses in vocal music, drawing, physical training, and literature.\textsuperscript{136} This indicates a broadening curriculum, involving more than the very basic subject matter previously found in the earliest schools but it does not clearly indicate the place, if any, held by elective subjects. Harper stated that "By 1900 there existed a wide offering of electives in most normal schools by means of which a student might prepare himself for teaching in special subjects or types of positions."\textsuperscript{137} However, by 1906 Ruediger, even though he felt electives should be widely available, reported just the opposite to be the case. "The professional work is elected when the student chooses to prepare for teaching and cannot be made further elective, except perhaps in a few details...to suit different tastes and conditions."\textsuperscript{138}

In addition to the nature of the prescribed preparation, the inadequacy of the teaching force seemed to offer yet another hindrance to the course of study in general and to the elective programs in particular. De Garmo compared the student-to-teacher ratio at the university level with that at the normal school and reported that whereas,\textsuperscript{139}
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A good college or university has on the average one teacher for each ten students; normal schools usually have one teacher for each forty or fifty students, a fact that compels them to have classes ranging from forty to eighty students.

In spite of being overloaded with students, normal school faculty appeared to be very productive scholars and herein they were able to greatly enrich the course of study. Bonser at the State Normal School, Macomb, Illinois, observed that in past decades normal school teachers were at times lacking in both scholarship and professional training but twentieth century teachers were usually well prepared in both areas. In a survey involving "fifty-nine of the most representative state normal schools from all parts of the United States" he found only eight with no publications, thirty which had published books, twenty reported pamphlets of outlines, special studies, and problems, and thirty-five had contributed multiple numbers of articles to educational journals. This report suggests that many problems were being addressed, methodologies were being described, and issues were being dealt with as the teachers constantly added to the kind of information needed for the professional training of teachers.

In analyzing the curriculum, Payne referred to the normal school as a social institution which studied the social structure and adjusted its course of study.
accordingly. Unlike most institutions which remained bound to traditional courses, the normal school "has had the courage to abandon subjects that had only remote and historical bearing on present needs" in favor of those courses which provide usefulness as well as culture and discipline. Thus, the normal school graduate was given a broader, more integrated view of education than the college graduate who specialized in an area without reference to pedagogical technique.

Payne cited four elements which he considered to be essential to a profession:

1. a general knowledge such as any educated man ought to have
2. a special knowledge of his own subject
3. a body of professional subject matter
4. a special technique or method of procedure.

Of these, he said the normal schools met all four; whereas colleges, as a rule, met only the first two.

"Normal Schools have reformed teaching in our country; they have not reformed education." With these words, Smith admitted that normal schools had many attributes of which those who held a negative view needed to be mindful. For example, she said normal schools dramatically changed the repetitious, dull, non-personal...
approach which was the modus operandi of Henry Ward Beecher's day and of which he lamented 'We were read and spelled twice a day.' Normal schools brought additions to the curriculum and creativity to general methodology and as a consequence they brought improvement in classroom behavior.

Extra-Curriculum to Curriculum

While colleges tended to remain with the classical curriculum, the land-grant colleges, according to Rudolph, searched for a rationale to settle the controversy between the classicists and those "who would provide only practical technical education." However, Payne said, it was the normal schools which most readily ignored the scorn of academicians and "faced their task with supreme courage and unequaled honesty, daring to teach cooking and sewing to women teachers, manual training and drawing to men."

Since the essence of teaching is understanding the mental life of the student, pedagogical psychology quickly gained a place of major importance in the normal school curriculum and with it the rise of general methodology came into vogue. The emphasis upon practicality in the classroom soon directed the course of study to consider a great variety of areas which colleges had primarily dealt with
through the extra-curriculum. The normal school explored various branches of the curriculum and set up special methods in areas such as literature, art, music, drama, etc. For example, the school literature movement, as described by C. C. Van Liew "is destined to become one of the most significant and wholesome phases in the development of the modern curriculum. [It] seeks to supply in a large measure to the modern common school course of study, those elements which older curricula sought in the so-called humanities."\textsuperscript{150}

The focus upon child-study in the curriculum made literature (especially children's literature) a logical inclusion as the course of study broadened. The major issues dealt with the way it should be taught (i.e., read, narrated, presented, etc.) and with the purpose for teaching (ethical, appreciation, repetition, etc.). In other words, methodology more than subject matter was the concern.

Child study and character building found that drama, like literature, provided fertile opportunities. Christabel Abbott of the State Normal School, Geneseo, New York stressed the importance of dramatic studies in helping students overcome timidity, indifference, haughtiness, etc. Also he suggested drama could be used as a means of broadening experiences and improving discipline in the schools. Like Van Liew, Abbott saw literature as an
important field with drama being a key for unlatching the literary secrets. However, he noted that even though normal schools were moving in the direction of more dramatic training, many teachers in the public schools "have never had any training in the use of dramatization."131

Curtis, in discussing the incorporation of physical education into the normal school program, maintained that unless a student acquired some interest in a physical activity which he could participate in after he finished school, he could scarcely be considered educated. "We should select such activities for the normal schools as will be carried from the school into life, so as to meet the need of exercise and fresh air of later years as well as the years of training."132 This kind of program would include activities such as: games for little children, basketball, tennis, croquet, bowling, swimming, skating, curling, volleyball, indoor baseball, walking, camping, and folk dancing.133

The duties and expectations of the normal school expanded rapidly during the latter part of the nineteenth century in order to keep up with the increased amount of time devoted to public education and the expanded public school curriculum. Felmley explained the situation, thusly:134

82
In its early days the normal school confined its attention chiefly to the common branches, for little else was taught in the common schools. But the public school has a much larger task than fifty, thirty, or even ten years ago. The lengthening of the school year, the careful grading of schools, the introduction of music, art, literature, and science into the school program, the development and enrichment of the high school course, the new demands for vocational training, the new directions for physical education, the new interest in moral and social instruction—all impose new duties upon the school. The training of teachers means more than it ever did before, and the normal school must accept the larger responsibility, and the larger opportunity.

Kirk from the normal school in Kirksville, Missouri, said "the normal school should ever be free to keep constantly adapting itself to the purposes and needs of the community creating and supporting it." Among those personal experiences which his schools offered students to help them prepare for meeting community needs were the following club activities: Music, Fine Arts, Athletics, Political Equality, History, Rural Sociology, Latin, German, Browning, Shakespeare, Science, Mathematics, Y.M.C.A., Student Publications, Debate, and Literary.

John Dewey believed that the school must serve as an agent of social reform. He was highly supportive of the inclusion of any activity in the curriculum which would promote democratic interaction. While serving as head of the Department of Education at the University of Chicago,
Dewey started what was to become a very controversial laboratory school. It had none of the routine traditionalism but sought instead "to train children in cooperative and mutually useful living". Problem-solving via reflective thinking or acts-of-thought was foundational. This process involved five essential components: activity, problem, data, hypothesis, and testing.

The Progressive Education Movement in the two decades from 1918 on embraced many of Dewey's ideas, although there were fundamental differences. Social needs became a major focus of the curriculum, especially during the war. Normal school curricula became increasingly filled with war issues and how to deal with the aftermath. There was an openness to new ideas and approaches to curriculum building, much of which was perhaps attributable to Dewey's influence.

THE TRAINING DEPARTMENT

The training school became the pivotal point for the normal schools. Here as theory was translated into practice, prospective teachers met the crucial test. The length of the testing period varied greatly from school to school and in some cases even from student to student.
Almost without exception, normal schools provided a laboratory experience where both observation and practice teaching could be done. Brown in reporting on "Normal Schools from Iowa to Colorado" stated that "The limits are from sixteen weeks to two years practice, according to opportunity and necessity." With respect to opportunity, Hillyer suggested that normal schools needed to rotate schedules in such a way as to avoid having several pupil teachers descend upon a class at one period and then having to subdivide the group into too many parts to adequately test teaching ability. Hillyer further noted that when normal schools failed to have some type of alternating schedule, many periods during the day passed with no pupil teachers being able to practice in the model school while other periods had a deluge.

The amount of teaching done in the normal school, according to Cook would vary in relationship to the pupil teacher's needs and previous experience. Wilkinson suggested giving more practice in areas of greatest need rather than have an inflexible schedule and lack of adaptability. Since some students had actually served as teachers before entering the normal school, they might require less practice time but Wilkinson warned "others will need, in order to break their bad habits, more training than those who have never taught."
A fair amount of controversy was evident concerning the nature, function, and administration of the normal training school. President Z. X. Snyder of the State Normal School in Greeley, Colorado suggested that ideally a training school would have both a model and a practice department. The model school should represent the epitome of efficiency in management and teaching, whereas, the practice school "is where the pupil teachers are to do their work under proper criticism and supervision, and where they will all aim to realize the ideals formed in the model." The model classes would use only the most expert teachers and provide the best in observation experience for the students.

Cook, in Illinois, reported that the public schools provided forty percent of the practice situations but more often the training school was a part of the normal school. With this being the case, the model school was expected to exhibit the best in technique and manner. Hillyer said, "The model school should be a constant source of information and inspiration to visiting superintendents, principals, teachers and boards of education." However, he also mentioned that there were frequent cases in which parents became disgruntled because they felt their children were not being properly handled and taught by practice teachers.
The duties of practice teachers basically included observing, teaching, lesson planning, and attending meetings. The amount of observation and teaching depended largely upon circumstances. Typically, however, the pupil teacher was responsible for at least one class each day for a given period of time, after which other classes might be added, and eventually some full time teaching responsibilities would be expected. Cook said of those normal schools reporting to the National Council, "The time spent in practice work varies from twelve weeks of one recitation a day to the entire charge of the room for twenty weeks."167 On the other hand, Synder felt that the practice teacher should "have charge of an entire room for a sufficient length of time to prove her ability to manage a school."168

In terms of planning, Wilkinson and Hillyer agreed that the practice-teacher was expected to be organized but not so structured that no room was allowed for spontaneity. In the words of Hillyer:169

Teaching plans as they are often required to be written from day to day are so elaborate, require so much effort and so much morbid pedagogical significance is attached to them, that they sap up uselessly the time and vitality of the practice teachers and blind them to their chief duty,—the effective teaching and control of children.
Regarding planning, Needham phrased it thusly:  

They might--they did--get through on poor or mediocre work in history or geography or any of the other academic 'pests'--but if they couldn't make out their lesson plans according to 'Hoyle', look out for the rapids ahead!

Though teachers meetings were not always as stimulating as was desirable, they composed a vital part of the practice-teacher's experience. Cook agreed with Hillyer that general corrections of the student would usually be made in teachers' meetings and then supplemented by personal conferences and discussions. Synder explained the nature of such discussion generally included critic work in the areas of management, preparation, recitation, utilization of principles. He also carefully characterized what the critic teacher who was responsible for these discussions should be like. She should be a scholar, student of children, lover of nature, art, and literature but above all she should have the "power to give severe criticism and have the pupil teacher receive it in the student spirit, to have her feel that it is a great privilege to have the opportunity to have the critic present."

Payne believed normal schools were unusually successful in this kind of teacher preparation. Unlike college graduates who were allowed to teach by blundering
their way through, the normal school graduate was taught the
"process of stirring up, drawing out, and interchanging
opinions, and thrashing out notions."174 Whereas, the
college graduate knew many things, the normal school
graduate knew "infinitely more of what he is going to use
and knows it better."175

George E. Walk, Lecturer on Education, at New York
University, conducted a study of sixty representative normal
schools located throughout the country to determine "the
evolution of certain tendencies." He discovered that normal
schools consistently offered practice teaching by one means
or another. By 1917 most had training schools of their own
but as many as twenty-five percent still used public
facilities--at least until such time as an institutional
model school could become a reality. Even though model
schools were accused of having a too select group of
students, they were generally preferred because they
permitted better supervision and coordination of theory and
practice.176 Walk suggested, "Its prime purpose is to
provide opportunities for application of theory in terms of
method, management, and government...."177 In order to
accomplish this goal, a two hundred (200) hour minimum was
felt to be necessary. Walk advocated two hours daily for a
twenty week block--"one period daily for practice teaching
will not suffice."178
Walk's study also revealed the tendency for normal schools to require their students to have some practical experiences in observation and teaching at each of the grade levels included in the model school. A few of the best schools also afforded one critic teacher per class but most had at least two grades per critic teacher. Critic teachers were generally responsible on the average for forty-two pupils in 1905 but the number decreased to thirty-five by 1915.\textsuperscript{179}

Supervision of the practice school, according to Walk's study occasionally fell to the principal of the normal school but generally it became the duty of the principal of the training department rather than of the school. With the expansion of the curriculum, supervision showed a slight tendency to be parceled out to departments or to the teacher of pedagogy or psychology.\textsuperscript{180}

In addition, to the great amount of variation in the practice requirements and in the supervision responsibilities, Walk found differences about the best place and time to schedule the observation experiences. Practice teaching alone seemed clearly to have its place standardized—almost, without exception, it was in the last year. Having discovered so much diversity in the professional teaching, Walk concluded his study with this question:\textsuperscript{181}
Is it not desirable to evolve out of the chaos of conflicting practices some clear-cut, sharply defined norms and criteria such as will make it possible to give to the professional training of teachers the same scientific worth and dignity as attached, for instance, to the preparation of lawyers, physicians, or ministers?

Brown, in reporting on the work at Oshkosh, noted that administratively the program there was organized so that a director was made responsible for practice teaching. It then became his job to direct the training school and to work with critic teachers to set up a plan of supervision for the student-teachers. The critic teachers were responsible for teaching the students how to teach. As more scientific study of teaching emerged, old traditionalism would logically be expected to prove insufficient for the normal school. Brown, therefore, set forth four principles which he saw as being important to professional studies:182

1. Specific and definite instruction in theory and methods of teaching were to be given.

2. Methods of teaching could be taught most economically only in connection with practice.

3. The theory of teaching should be taught in one course rather than in a considerable number of special methods courses.
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4. Teachers of elementary education in a normal school must be expert teachers themselves in grades with reference to which they teach theory of education.

With reference to the training school, in particular, Brown prescribed two basic principles:\textsuperscript{183}

1. Practice teaching should begin early in the course with individuals and small groups, and throughout the course should alternate with observation of teaching which is correct in principle and excellently executed.

2. There should be a liberal supply of critic teachers and supervisors.

As Brown presented it, the first year of pedagogical work should include \textit{apprentice work} where the student aided in the classroom but did not teach, \textit{observation} whereby the student could see the relation between theory and practice, \textit{apprentice teaching} wherein the student began to work with students needing special help, and \textit{elementary education} which allowed the student to assimilate principles and methods of instruction.\textsuperscript{184} Brown supported the idea that the practice school should be the focus of the normal program.

In his proposal for supervised teaching, Brown closely approximated the findings of Walk's study. Practice teaching was to take place during the second year for a
period of eighteen weeks with half day responsibilities. Brown's plans at Oshkosh thus divided the senior class in half and one portion did practice teaching while the other studied each semester. This plan was thought to be superior to that of requiring "normal school students to do practice teaching for short periods each day and carry a considerable load of studies at the same time."\textsuperscript{185} This also permitted the students to teach one half day and have a half day free to prepare, to go to the library, to consult with the normal-school teacher, etc. Furthermore, close supervision of the practice work enabled student teachers who were weak to get immediate help with problems.

The kind of program described by Brown seems to be far better coordinated than was typically the case in 1918. In interviews with thirty-seven representatives from twenty-two normal schools, very little relationship between theory and practice was thought to exist. Little attempt was made to relate a year and a half of study to the practice and observation experiences. The following data were collected from interviews about theory and practice relationships.\textsuperscript{186}

1. Forty percent did not use demonstration lessons and theory teachers seldom demonstrated the theories.

2. Observation experiences were either not provided or were of greatly varying durations.
3. Observations in fifty-five percent of the cases did not permit the inclusion of methods taught in theory classes.

4. Theory teachers were not regularly consulted in helping the student plan for teaching nor did they regularly work with critic teachers in an effort to coordinate theory and practice.

The plans for practice teaching differed greatly in structure, time requirements and expectations from one normal school to another. About the only idea upon which consensus could be reached was that of the significance of the practical experience. Almost without exception student teaching was looked upon as fundamental and extremely important for every would-be-teacher.

**TRAINING FOR RURAL TEACHERS**

The literature reveals a continuous concern about the problems of rural education. As early as 1883, Kiehle lamented that the State of Minnesota with three normal schools still found it difficult to get young teachers to accept the challenge and lower esteem of teaching in rural schools—"feeling that to teach a country school would be humiliating...".107 This aloofness communicated itself to the Minnesota Legislature to such an extent that the normal schools were ultimately placed on a probationary status.
until they could better define their mission. Hence, a massive campaign began and, in Kiehle's words, "We stumped the State."

Every effort was made to take the normal school program and teachers to the rural areas. This resulted in a great vote of confidence from the people and it proved to the normal schools that "The University professor may have his chair, and from it satisfy well-established demands; but the normal-school professor must be in his saddle in the field and on the march." Greenwood proclaimed "The country school is the great problem to be solved by the educator and statesman." Being of the same opinion as Greenwood, Seerley charged normal schools with the responsibility of preparing not only elementary but also high school teachers to meet the growing demands in village and country areas.

Fishpaw of Emory, Virginia wrote "It is a fact beyond dispute that more than one-half the entire school population of our country is rural and that an amazingly low percentage of the teachers of these children have had any professional training." She cited Michigan and Wisconsin as being leaders worthy of emulation in the rural school movement. There were also other schools scattered throughout the country which were attempting to handle rural education problems. Parrish described the Georgia State
Normal School as experiencing great success in preparing teachers, the majority of whom returned to the country to teach. The practice school was established on the principle that the theories taught should have immediate application which could be adapted to local situations and used throughout the state. Miss Lucy L. Davis from the training school at William and Mary College was invited to become the principal at the Georgia training school. In cooperation with the Georgia staff, she helped draw up plans whereby

the practice school might do something to make daily work a joy instead of a burden; that it might hasten the time when men and women would find their pleasure in their work instead of in its pauses....

In the Georgia practice school, the children had "cooking, sewing, weaving, gardening, drawing, clay-modeling, basketry, and woodwork." Through these fundamental industries, they learned language, arithmetic, history, and science skills which were carefully correlated into each activity.

However, the Georgia efforts to prepare teachers for rural schools hardly seem typical. Loomis referred to a refusal by normal school authorities to try experimentation even though "Principals report that their graduates prefer
city positions, often flatly refusing to accept positions in rural schools even at the expenses of being without a position."196 Likewise, the Education Bulletin of 1918, in commenting on the educational system of South Dakota, acknowledged that the normal schools of that state lacked the necessary facilities and equipment for manual and shop training. "The most urgent need...is rural practice school facilities."197 Where demonstration rural schools were not possible, normal schools often used rural schools for practice if feasible. Burnham supposed that "Inadequate funds, undeveloped appreciation of what is being attempted and an apparent assumption that the whole enterprise is to succeed on a low level of investment of money and of talent in human agents are obstacles just beginning to be cleared away."198

Normal schools maintained a genuine concern for rural education throughout their history. Addressing the needs of the rural school system was a major concern for the departments of educations within each state system. Thus, some normal schools offered special programs in training teachers for rural school work. Summer sessions became important features of the normal school and normal institutes lasting several weeks became popular in some states even before the establishment of a state normal
school, per se. According to Ruffner, normal institutes were a new feature in teacher training and were largely confined to the Southern States.\textsuperscript{199}

The in-service summer programs were often supplemented by the offerings of non-school agencies. Two very important movements, involving such agencies, were the lyceum and the Chautauqua movements. The lyceum movement was started by Josiah Holbrook of Massachusetts in 1826. What began as local discussion groups grew into a lecture circuit, featuring outstanding orators. By 1834, lyceums were common in over three thousand rural and urban communities.\textsuperscript{200} Program offerings expanded to include an array of cultural and academic choices. Similarly, local Chautauquas became very popular in the 1870s. The movement originated at Chautauqua Lake, New York under the sponsorship of the Methodist Chautauqua Assembly to provide "a summer training course for religious workers".\textsuperscript{201} A four-year reading course in various social, scientific, religious, and literary studies was offered by the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle in 1817.\textsuperscript{202} From the religious zeal in adult and youth education, organizations such as the Young Women's Christian Association was born.\textsuperscript{203}
Summary

The survey of the literature has been used to impart a national perspective on normal school education, its history, and function. The foremost concern of faculty members and administrative personnel who were writing in the period 1884-1924 seems to be that of the evolving curriculum. Originally, the normal school was primarily responsible for preparing teachers for elementary classrooms but as a high school education became more customary, the situation created some problems and challenges for the normal school. Not only did the normal school receive students with widely varying educational backgrounds, it also had to prepare teachers to teach in school systems which held vastly different expectations. Thus, the course of study, beginning with the admission process, became a very controversial issue. It generally became necessary for dual programs to be offered— one for those needing high school instruction and a more advanced course for those who had already had secondary work.

Beyond the necessity for providing a somewhat individualized program to accommodate the unevenness of earlier preparation, normal schools were caught up in a tremendous controversy over the role of academic studies in relationship to the role of practical and professional
studies. By some, the normal school was accused of being little more than a trade school while simultaneously it suffered rebuke from those who felt the school should leave "learning for learning's sake" to the university and devote itself almost exclusively to the pedagogical aspects of the curriculum.

The training school requirements showed tremendous differences in expectations from one state institution to another. No agreement seems to have existed concerning either the length of the student-teaching experience or the nature of it. Similarly, the location and coordination procedures depended almost entirely upon local situations. Often the normal school would have its own model school but frequently, public schools were also used for laboratory experiences.

In large measure, each normal school determined its own direction based upon local and state circumstances. This was especially true with training for rural education. Some states made diligent attempts to provide programs to prepare and encourage teachers to go into the rural areas to teach. Emphasis upon rural needs was one of the factors which led to a broadening of the curriculum. Whereas, drama, music, and physical education were among the early curricular incorporations, vocational training was also given very strong attention.
From its infant beginnings in Massachusetts, public normal school education spread across the entire country. It became the primary vehicle for preparing teachers to accept responsibilities in the public school classrooms throughout the country. For this reason, the success of the American public school is in large measure attributable to the contributions made by the normal school. As the evolutionary process of normal training is reviewed, it is apparent that the single-purpose mission and pragmatic orientation of the normal school provided a solid foundation upon which the later teacher preparation programs could build with confidence.
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Chapter III: Normal School Training
For White Female Teachers
Farmville 1884-1924
Introduction

The steady growth of public school education throughout the nineteenth century created a demand for teachers that could not be readily met by the limited number of men who were prepared, available, and willing to assume instructional responsibilities. The need for teachers escalated rapidly with "the spread of education at the lower levels" and women became the logical source from which to recruit. During the 1800s, women had limited employment opportunities, could be secured less expensively than men, and were judged by some, including Francis Wayland at Brown University, to "have a greater natural adaptation to the work of instruction than men." The problem, however, was deciding how to best prepare these female teachers. The liberal arts colleges were generally attended only by men, were sectarian in nature, and required more than elementary school preparation for admission. Furthermore lengthy preparation hardly seemed necessary to equip one to teach school at a time when minimal ability to read, write, and to figure was judged entirely sufficient to qualify one to become a school marm. "The need was rather to develop a publicly financed training institution that would recruit
women at the end of eight years of elementary school, give them some professional training, and send them back to the elementary schools as teachers." From such necessitating circumstances, the public normal school was born in Lexington, Massachusetts in 1839 and by the turn of the century, it had spread across the country so that almost every state had at least one such school.

The first public normal school in the United States began in Massachusetts in 1839 and was largely the result of the determination of one man, Horace Mann. The first public normal school exclusively for training female teachers in Virginia began in a small rural town known as Farmville in the year 1884 and resulted in large measure from the persistent efforts of one man, William Henry Ruffner. In fact, Ruffner's work in Virginia so nearly paralleled that of Mann in Massachusetts, he has been referred to as the "Horace Mann of Virginia"."
Section I. The Years of Beginning
(1884–1887)
William Henry Ruffner became Virginia's first State Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1870. Upon acceptance of the position, he was charged with the task of literally designing a system of free public education for the state. According to the mandates of the 1869 Underwood Constitution, the State Superintendent would "be given thirty days in which to prepare a report to the General Assembly" with recommendations for beginning a public school system in Virginia. The remarkable outline presented by Ruffner "included a thoroughly thought out plan for a state system of education which is the basic conception from which the present system was developed."

Ruffner had a clear vision of the prejudices and political resistance which he would encounter as he began the pioneer work in Virginia's public education, "however, the most overwhelming problem with which he had to deal was the lack of properly trained teachers." Constitutional provision for teacher training had been made simultaneous with the provision for "a uniform system of public free schools." Section five of the 1869 Constitution stated: "The general assembly shall establish, as soon as practicable, normal schools...."
Ruffner was very concerned about this provision and he used his annual reports as a vehicle for keeping the importance of teacher training before the public. In the Second Annual Report, he discussed the vital role of the teacher and he also presented extensive information about the history of normal education, what a teacher should know and ought to be, and the effects that training institutes could have. He described the training program of a normal school (including provision for a model school) and a plan for normal instruction. From the beginning of his administration, Superintendent Ruffner was determined to implement the constitutional specification for the establishment of normal schools. His First Annual Report made a strong case for establishing a normal school and it also contained a proposal for teacher training (which resulted in a Senate bill that was never introduced) calling for a $15,000 annual appropriation "for the training and improvement of teachers" and "$5,000 might be employed for the establishment and maintenance of a normal school." According to the Ninth Annual Report, the superintendent was convinced that it was "best to have all normal training conducted in separate institutions where the whole cast and spirit tend to one object."
Ruffner was very persistent about the need for normal training. He emphasized the critical danger in permitting untrained teachers to enter the classrooms; "To leave teachers to learn their business by experimenting on the children, is the most costly of all systems of teacher-training."17 In his fourth report, Ruffner, noting the failure of the state to make any provision for teacher preparation stated adamantly:18

We are in our fifth year of the school system, and yet not a dollar of public funds has been spent on the teachers. The constitution requires that normal schools shall be established as soon as practicable. It has been practicable to do something in this direction from the beginning. Had even a few thousand dollars of the school money been spent every year in that direction, we would by this time have been reaping benefits far greater than we have received from the same amount of money spent as it has been in unskillful teaching. We have been working with dull tools in order to save the cost of a grindstone!

In each of my reports I have discussed this subject, and urged the establishment of at least one normal school, and asked that counties be allowed to use one or two hundred dollars a year for securing the services of competent instructors for their teachers. The Senate committee on public institutions has twice reported a good bill on the subject, and last winter the House committee on schools and colleges reported an amendment, allowing each county to use the small sum of one hundred dollars for this purpose, but these bills were never acted upon, owing no doubt to the want of effective public sentiment in this direction.
Though Ruffner repeatedly tried to convince the Legislature to establish normal schools, the closest he came to success was with summer institutes lasting for several weeks and held in various parts of the State. In 1879, however, the Senate requested that Ruffner study what other states and countries were doing in the way of female education. Consequently, the superintendent's "report in 1880 was an epoch making event in the educational history of the State." He said, "I am still as earnest as ever in my convictions, often expressed, as to the importance of at least making a beginning toward the preparation of teachers for their work...." He continued his report to discuss the need for separate higher education for women and in the opinion of Buck, Walmsley and Simkins, this recommendation provided the seed from which the first State Female Normal School would develop.

THE PATH TO LEGISLATIVE APPROVAL

County institutes financed by the Peabody Fund, continued to enable the State to make gradual progress in teacher training. In 1880, a state institute for white teachers was held at the University of Virginia and "one at Lynchburg for colored". These were highly regarded both
because they were longer and because they offered better instruction than had been provided by the earlier county institutes. However, a great void still existed in the professional preparation of teachers. "Defects which formerly were crowded out of sight by more pressing matters, now came prominently to the front; and perhaps none call more loudly for remedy than our great need of more professional or trained teachers." R. R. Farr, Ruffner's successor to the superintendency, stressed the need for two normal schools to accommodate both sexes but if two could not be made possible, then "especially do we want a normal school for girls; for to the ladies must Virginia, in the main, look for her future teachers". Farr's obvious concern was about normal training for white teachers because the Legislature had already passed a bill in March, 1882 to establish the Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute for Colored Persons. The evidence of Farr's interest in professional teacher training was apparent from the beginning of his term.

Dr. Jabez L. Monroe Curry, Field Agent for the Peabody Fund, showed continual interest in normal school training in Virginia, as can be concluded from the aid received by summer institutes in the state. It was Dr. Curry who drafted the legislation establishing a State Female Normal School in Virginia. According to the
historical notes kept by Miss Helen Draper, a former teacher at the State Female Normal School, Dr. Curry wished to be remembered for this accomplishment above all of his other many achievements in life. Dr. Curry addressed the student body of the School in 1903 shortly before he died and said: 'I desire no greater honor than to have inscribed on my tombstone that I wrote the bill which provided for the establishment of the State Female Normal School for the young women of the Commonwealth.'

In 1884 Dr. Curry appeared before the Legislature and worked hard to secure the passage of a bill which would provide normal school training for white teachers. On February 2, 1884, Senate Bill No. 364 "entitled an act for the establishment of a state female normal school." was presented. On March 7, 1884, the Senate signed the bill officially establishing 'a state female normal school.'
Characteristic 1. Administration and Faculty (1884-1887).

Under the influence of presidents and faculty (with trustee support), normal schools transformed teaching into a profession. (Harper p. 113.)

TRUSTEES

As Superintendent of Public Instruction from 1870-1882, William H. Ruffner consistently emphasized the State's obligation as specified by Article VIII, Section 5 of Virginia's 1869 constitution to provide professional training for teachers via the establishment of normal schools. His Second Annual Report underscored the costly danger of having an untrained teacher learn by experimentation.33 In his Fourth Annual Report, Ruffner stated "It is high time that something were [done] by the State...."36 Questioning, how long the State would continue to deny the school children of good teaching, he concluded "it is not schools we are after, but education".37 During his final years in office, there was a lament that "up to the present time Virginia has made no provision for teaching the teachers".38

Two years after William Henry Ruffner's final term as state superintendent, the Legislature passed an act establishing a normal school at Farmville to train and educate white female teachers. Neither Ruffner nor
J. L. M. Curry, who drafted the original bill ever intended for the school to be devoted solely to the preparation of female teachers.39 Ruffner was concerned about the professional training of teachers and his efforts were dedicated to this end for all teachers. Curry, as agent of the Peabody Fund, had labored diligently to provide aid to the South where illiteracy was rampant and where at the close of the Civil War "not a single Southern State had a system of free public schools".40 Curry, adopted as his personal motto that which would later become the motto of the Farmville Normal School "Education for all".41 Ruffner and Curry saw fulfillment of a major goal, professional training for teachers, when the 1884 General Assembly established the Female Normal School. They were disappointed however at the meager financial provision ($5,000 for establishing and $10,000 annually) and at the stipulation of females only.42 So strong were the feelings regarding the matter that the following paragraph appeared in the 1884 Virginia School Reports.43

It is due to the promoters of this enterprise to state that the original bill, as drafted by the Hon. J. L. M. Curry and presented to the legislature for its sanction, provided for a normal school in the broadest sense of the term and had no purpose of restricting its benefits to the 'females' only of the State; but after the wisdom of the Legislature had done with the bill its progenitor was hardly able to recognize it.
but we are deeply thankful for even the little that was done, and hope, by improving that, to make good our claims for more.

By the 1884 Acts of the General Assembly which established the school for white females, the school was placed under a board of trustees responsible for the "Supervision, management, and government", for making necessary rules, and regulations, and for hiring and paying teachers. The board was composed of W. H. Ruffner, J. L. M. Curry, John B. Minor, R. M. Manly, L. R. Holland, John L. Buchanan, L. A. Michie, F. N. Watkins, S. C. Armstrong, W. B. Taliaferro, George O. Conrad, W. E. Gaines, and W. W. Herbert.

Of this board, Armstrong resigned on June 10, 1884; Ruffner was elected principal of the normal school on April 9, 1884, and subsequently resigned as a trustee on October 15, 1884, and Curry was selected as president of the board, a position he held until October 1, 1885.

The determination of this board to have the normal school become a reality can be observed by its promptness in meeting for organizational purposes. The school was approved by the Legislature on March 7, 1884, and the board held its first meeting on April 9, 1884. At this meeting William Henry Ruffner was chosen as the principal and given authority to appoint a vice-principal. The date for the
opening of the school was recommended for the autumn of 1884 and a resolution was made to inquire about the expediency of beginning a model school in connection with the normal school.8

The board was undeterred from the accomplishment of its responsibilities even when confronted with seemingly insurmountable problems. The first major obstacle encountered was securing the funds approved by the Legislative when the normal school was established. When the board held its first meeting on April 9, 1884, the treasurer was ordered to collect the funds prescribed.51 According to Article VIII, section 7, an annual appropriation of ten thousand dollars should "be paid out of the public free school fund".52 However, a question of constitutionality was raised and by opinion of the Attorney General and subsequently by an adverse decision of the Court of Appeals on July 24, 1884, the section was declared void.53 The trustees were thus "without means of carrying out the purpose of the said Act".54 On July 30, 1884, the board resolved to ask the Legislature to make provision to fund the opening of the normal school through a special session of the General Assembly.55 This resolution resulted in an amendment to section 7 on August 23, 1884 whereby funding would be taken from the State Treasury.56
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By order of the trustees on September 17, 1884, the normal school opened on October 30, 1884, slightly over two months after funds were approved. In December, the trustees inspected the entire school including instruction, physical plant, and the boarding facilities. "They visited all classes, inspected the building, including the rooms of the girls, and then had tea with them...". According to vice-principal Bush, "They praised the school and seemed to be more than satisfied, really astonished at the settled and organized work."

In describing the dedication of the trustees to the work of the school, the 1909 Yearbook spoke of one member, General William Booth Taliaferro, thusly:

It was his proudest boast that he never missed a meeting of the board. The last time he attended, he was so feeble as to need an attendant, but his affection for the institution was undiminished by his failing strength, and his great faith in her future undimmed.

The respect was a reciprocal affair and "nothing was more valued by the school than...its trustees, patrons, and local friends." The trustees came for two or three days at a time and were regarded as "guardian angels".
PRINCIPAL

William Henry Ruffner was well suited to serve as the principal of Virginia's first state normal school. He had served for twelve years as the first State Superintendent of Public Instruction. In this capacity, he drafted a plan of school law which was widely emulated by other Southern States and even by other countries. As Superintendent, he called public attention to the necessity for immediately establishing state normal schools to provide professional training for teachers. He had traveled about the state frequently and he knew the needs of the schools because "He had founded them, studied them, and worked for them as had no other man in the state. He know the needs of the teacher and how to meet them."64

The principalship of the normal school was neither desired nor expected by Ruffner who had chosen to withdraw from public life after political changes forced him out of the Superintendent's office when R. R. Farr was selected as his replacement. Thus, no one "was more surprised than Dr. Ruffner" when, at an April 9, 1884 meeting of the Trustees, Superintendent Farr nominated him as the principal for the normal school. He at first refused to accept the position in spite of the unanimous ballot but was convinced to do so at the urging of J. L. M. Curry who "made it clear
that my acceptance would be greatly to the pecuniary interest of the school as to its current income from the beginning, and as to the prospects for a large endowment at no distant day".67

Recognizing that the "organization of a normal school is one of the most difficult tasks known in the educational world, and should be entered upon with deliberation, study, and prudence",68 Dr. Ruffner began on April 28, 1884 to visit some of the best normal schools in the country, compare different systems, and familiarize himself with the intricacies of operating a normal school.69

Having been authorized by the board on April 9, 1884 to appoint a vice-principal,70 he presented the name of Celeste E. Bush to the board on October 15, 1884.71 Miss Bush gives this account of how she was selected.72

The writer recalls vividly a time in her old normal school in Connecticut when a heavily built, reticent gentleman visited her classroom through several recitations. At the close of the second day he told her how Virginia had voted to establish a training school for her teachers; that he had been appointed principal; that he was seeking a vice-principal who could manage the working details, of which he had no knowledge, while he would 'manage the vice-principal'; and ended by offering her the position.
The principal's job of finding suitable teachers for nomination to the board was challenging and difficult. "He had to find those who knew more of the improved science of teaching than do our home female teachers, for the instructors in a normal school must have been specifically trained for their work."

To find teachers with the training needed, Dr. Ruffner "traveled north and south from Tennessee to Connecticut, getting one from New York, two from Connecticut, one from Nashville, one from Massachusetts, one from North Carolina, one from Richmond, and one from Farmville." Each teacher was personally selected by the principal and of those receiving positions not one "sought the position". The enormous task of staffing the school had to be accomplished within a matter of a few weeks.

On September 17th, the trustees ordered the Normal to be open October 30— in about six weeks. All that we had was a principal, an appropriation, a rough scheme, and an old academy building. Not a teacher, nor a book, nor a piece of furniture or apparatus; and more things to be done than any human mind could foresee. But we had a good "board of trustees", a good executive committee, efficient help from Superintendent Farr in printing and distributing notices and blanks, prompt action by County Superintendents, and what could be called 'a good run of luck' generally.
As noted in addition to searching for teachers, Dr. Ruffner was also given responsibility for preparing circulars to be distributed as advertisement of the school's opening. He was instructed by the board on September 17, 1884 to prepare the notices and on September 23, 1884, circular No. 383 was issued. This communication was directed primarily to public school superintendents and gave information about the time of the school's opening, who was eligible for attendance, cost, course of study, admission requirements, and the importance of the school to teachers, superintendents, parents, and the State in terms of providing "professional fitness for teaching." The principal's ability to move the school from a mere plan on September 17, 1884 to an actual school with a faculty, one-hundred-eleven students, and a course of study by October 30, 1884 gave testimony to his "wide knowledge of the history of education and its practice in advanced schools; a thorough knowledge of State conditions, and excellent judgment in making the most of our resources".

This influence which Dr. Ruffner had throughout the State was a major factor in the success of the school. As state superintendent he had worked to have the normal school idea accepted and as principal of the State Normal School, he was determined to make the idea work.
The prestige of his name gave it the respect which, as an innovation it could not otherwise have commanded; his sound educational philosophy shaped and gave tone to its professional instruction, and with quiet but steadfast courage he guarded it from dangers which might otherwise have overwhelmed it.80

Ruffner was philosophically committed to the normal school, calling it the "most important part of our system".81 In the Normal School at Farmville, he dedicated himself to providing professional training, confident that this was in his own words the 'only sure means of securing good teachers for primary and secondary schools'.82

FACULTY

Dr. Ruffner was elected principal of the State Normal School by acclamation of the Trustees at the board's first meeting on April 9, 1884. At this same organizational meeting, he was given permission to select a vice-principal and "to nominate to the board the other members of the faculty."83 Miss Celeste Bush from Connecticut State Normal School was secured to serve as vice-president. Her appointment, at an annual salary of $1200 plus board, was announced to the board on October 15, 1884.84 She was described as being "among the best known of New England teachers, both as a normal instructor and an author".85
Following Legislative approval of funds on August 23, 1884 for opening the school, the Trustees met on September 17, 1884. Much of this meeting was devoted to matters dealing with faculty. It was announced by J. L. M. Curry that $2,000 had been sent to the State Superintendent from the Peabody Fund to be used exclusively to pay salaries. The faculty were also accorded the traditional authority over admissions, course of study, and student expectations. Faculty were given the right to refuse admission to those "deemed too advanced in age", to decide "order, arrangement, and mode of teaching", to determine fees to be charged "for studies outside of the prescribed courses", and to prescribe textbooks. Faculty were also made responsible for setting up necessary rules for the school and the female teachers, under the supervision of the vice-principal, were made responsible for boarders living near them. Boarders on and off the school property were put under faculty regulation. Added to the usual academic and student-related responsibilities was a clearly stated expectation that the faculty members should continue professional responsibilities beyond the regular session as needed:

At the end of the school session of eight months, or as soon thereafter as practical, the members of the faculty may be required to spend not less than one month nor more than
six weeks; in giving instruction without extra compensation to teachers already in the field.

Dr. Ruffner in reporting to the State in 1884 about plans for the school said "The authorities of every normal school seek diligently for the best teachers, and when they find them they usually pay whatever may be necessary to secure their services". However, Virginia had not been overly generous in appropriating funds for the normal school so the board had to be concerned about salaries and about locating teachers who would come at a time of the year when most of them had already been employed for the upcoming school session.

The principal visited normal schools over the country to find instructors who had been trained in normal schools and where possible to secure those who had experience as normal school teachers in order to make the Farmville school "equal to any similar school, north or south".

For the first session, eight teachers were employed for the normal school and the 1884-85 catalog listed these credentials:

The Teacher of the Model School was taken from the front ranks of Richmond's corps of public-school teachers. One of the normal teachers has had a liberal education in one of our best Virginia female colleges, and a full course in the excellent Tennessee Normal
School; and has since been teaching. In each of these spheres she won the highest distinctions. Two other of our instructors have had the special advantage, not only of normal training, but of successful teaching for years in the Connecticut State Normal School; from which they came directly to us. We have lately added to our corps a graduate of Hampden Sydney College, who comes with high testimonials; and...a teacher of vocal music who has had the Boston training. The piano music is in the charge of a highly valued young lady of Farmville.

When the school opened for its second session on October 1, 1885, the trustees approved the appointment of an instructor holding the A.M. from Vanderbilt. She was a distinguished graduate at Nashville, going "through the whole course, the only female student among 500 men." She was hired as replacement instructor for the Natural Science position. In the same year, the work of the model school and the work of the preparatory school were separated. The teacher who had been responsible for the model school was moved to preparatory work designed especially to ready students lacking the prerequisite skills for entrance to the normal school proper. This increased the faculty to nine full-time instructors, including the principal. A student at the normal school was also chosen to serve as an assistant teacher in arithmetic, algebra, and calisthenics, hereby allowing the catalogue for 1885-86 to list ten instructors for the session.
The earliest Faculty Minutes begin on October 3, 1885 and thereafter are frequently undated, being marked simply 1st, 2nd, 3rd meeting, etc. The minutes often provide a simple listing of faculty responsibilities, including the duty of locking windows and doors plus having to take care of fires and lamps. However, most of the attention is directly related to instruction:

- arranging the order of classes
- seeking an assistant teacher for the normal school
- deciding to admit students in October and February
- determining qualifications for admission
- making provision for the library
- handling academic problems of individual students
- establishing holidays
- analyzing grades of students
- evaluating the course of study
- recommending useful instructional aids (black-boards, texts, papyrograph)
- examining student achievement
- selecting essays to be delivered by students at graduation.
In addition to concerns about the course of study, an analysis of the Faculty Minutes reveals persistent concerns for adequate preparation of students, the need for better utilization of study time, fairness in class expectations to prevent overworking students, and appropriate evaluation schemes. Though the recorded minutes of the faculty focused primarily upon topics clearly related to instruction, periodically questions about matters such as student absences, cheating, and personal misconduct were considered.

The Minutes of the Faculty show no evidence of friction within the faculty or of problems with administration. For this information, it is necessary to study the Minutes of the Trustees. A clash of power resulted some time prior to the close of 1886-87 session. In reporting to the board on June 22, 1887, Ruffner related that he had delegated some of his teaching responsibility to another instructor in order to have more time for supervision of teachers. Miss Bush, the vice-principal, then declared she had met her classes eighteen times each week for forty-five minutes each. She explained her duties had been executed with difficulty and little personal satisfaction because her responsibilities had never been
clearly defined. They were instead dependent upon the attitude of the Principal—"a faction liable to variableness". As a result of this conflict, three faculty members and Miss Bush submitted their resignations. Ruffner also resigned at the end of the 1887 session.

In summary, it can be noted that the administrative and teaching staff of the State Normal School was necessarily small in size during the early years. There were, however, fourteen trustees, including the State Superintendent as an ex-officio member. The school was headed by a principal and assisted by a vice-principal, both of whom served as teachers in the normal school. From eight teachers in the 1884-85 session, the school grew to ten by the 1886-87 session. The smallness of the staff combined with a relatively small number of students allowed a close knit relationship to develop within the academic community; however, the mission of the school—to provide professional training for teachers—was at all times kept in the forefront.

Working under severely handicapping conditions, the trustees refused to be delayed in making the March 7, 1884 enabling legislation operational. At a time when
funding seemed questionable, they forged ahead with plans for moving the school into reality. William Henry Ruffner was chosen to head the school but "being first president of the State Female Normal School was not his most important life-time achievement". However, it did represent the "capstone of his dreams for public education".

Ruffner had become an influential figure throughout the state as the creator of the State's first system of public education and as the first State Superintendent. Similarly, J. L. M. Curry, first president of the Board of Trustees, was the much respected field agent of the Peabody Fund and the original framer of the normal school bill. Having the names of these two men attached to the State Normal School gave the institution the professional credibility necessary to attract students and public support.

A close working relationship was established with the State Board of Education from the beginning and the State Superintendent's Office functioned as an effective instrument for printing and distributing advertisements. Without this cooperation, it would have been impossible to secure students for an autumn 1884 admission. Both Ruffner and Superintendent Farr put political battles behind them and united to fight for the cause of preparing teachers.
Ruffner's dedication to public education compelled him to accept the arduous task of organizing the normal school and where he may have at times lacked expertise personally, he knew how to find it. Thus, he traveled extensively to obtain the kind of faculty who, by virtue of their own professional training and experience, would be able to conduct the school in a manner designed to produce competent teachers for the state's classrooms. His success in locating such teachers was attested to by their credentials, the reputation which the school gained in a short time (i.e. "The school is attracting deserved attention all over the state"),¹⁰⁴ and the annual increase in enrollment.

A study of the Minutes of the Faculty reveals a paramount interest in the instructional aspects of the school. Whereas personnel problems did arise toward the end of Ruffner's administration, they were not in any ways reflected in the proceedings of faculty business. Only the Trustee's records show the magnitude of a problem involving professional rivalry so powerful that it threatened to undermine the school. However, Dr. Ruffner, at the end of his administration as at the beginning of it, refused to allow any obstacle to obstruct progress in training the teachers who were so desperately needed throughout the state. He cast aside political differences and refused to
allow sectional differences following the Civil War to interfere with the procurement of the best faculty, whether from the North or the South. He wanted faculty who had the expertise and desire to see that Virginia's normal school provided the kind of training necessary for truly making teaching a profession. Nevertheless, it was not the efforts of one man but the combined labors of the trustees, principal, and instructors which enabled the newly founded school to quickly gain respect as an institution for professional teacher training.
Characteristic 2.  School-Community (1884-1887).

Normal schools were closely related to the public schools and to the public at large. (Harper p. 115.)

According to the 1884 enactment of the General Assembly of Virginia, the mission of the newly created normal school was defined as being expressly that of educating and training teachers to supply the public schools of the state. Furthermore, admission to the school was to be open only to white females. The act also established a Board of Trustees and empowered them to make such rules as were needed, to employ teachers for the school, to set examination and specify entrance requirements. This 1884 normal school legislation instructed the trustees to begin the school "at Farmville, in the County of Prince Edward: provided said town shall cause to be conveyed to the State of Virginia by proper deed, the property in said town known as the Farmville Female College...".

The property designated for occupancy by the State Female Normal School was first chartered as a school in 1839. Though a Farmville Female Seminary was known to have existed as early as 1833 and though some factors suggest the
1839 school was merely a continuation of the earlier 1833 seminary training, it has not been possible to establish this as a factual connection. However, a cornerstone inscription still serves as proof of the 1839 existence. It reads:

Farmville Female
Academy
Built by Joint Stock
Company, A.D. 1839

The Farmville Female Seminary Association was also incorporated by the Legislature on March 5, 1839. The main building was completed in 1842 and Meade Shackelford stated "the building was described by the principal a decade later as being 'spacious and comfortable and for beauty of situation surpassed by few in the Country'." By 1860, both the town of Farmville and the Farmville Female Seminary were experiencing a period of prosperity and growth. The school expanded its curriculum and changed its name to Farmville Female College. Incorporation of the Seminary as a College led the institution to become "the oldest college for women in Virginia, as well as one of the oldest in the nation". Meade Shackelford, who dated the institution from its 1839 establishment as the Farmville Female Seminary Association,
reported the school to be "the fifth oldest educational institution for women in continuous operation in the United States."\textsuperscript{113}

The prosperity of the town and college were greatly hampered by the Civil War and the post-war depression forced the stockholders to sell the property to pay debts. However, in 1875, the Methodist Conference assumed sponsorship of the school which was then incorporated under the name "Farmville College". Farmville was primarily a tobacco town and prices were at the bottom level.\textsuperscript{114} The poverty-stricken condition of the area and the fact that educating women was definitely not considered a necessity made operation of the school very difficult. Recognizing that the expanding free public schools were creating a demand for more trained teachers and being aware of attempts to secure legislative approval of a normal school for educating female teachers, "a group of public-spirited citizens of Farmville made a concerted effort to get the state to locate a proposed normal school for the preparation of public school teachers in Farmville."\textsuperscript{115}

This offer from the town of Farmville was fairly typical of what happened with many normal school locations across the country. Communities were often willing to donate non-profit-making property to the State in hopes of becoming a successful bidder for the location of a normal
school. Seminary and Academy buildings were often inherited with the property but they generally were not well-constructed and tended to look like the academy structures common to the day.\textsuperscript{116}

Farmville, however, was described as a very advantageous location for a school. It reportedly had among its assets such positive factors as "the scenery a pleasant variety of hill and dale--the health proverbial--the town equally distant from the Blue Ridge and tidewater--accessible from all parts of the Country (in a few hours travel) by swift and comfortable trains".\textsuperscript{117}

The community attempted to make the most of its assets in order to attract and hold the normal school within the town. This is in agreement with Harper's notation that normal schools were typically closely related to towns of which they were a geographical part and that they were also intimately associated with the public schools in general.\textsuperscript{118} The latter relationship was fostered by the very manner in which the state of Virginia established the State Normal School at Farmville. The legislation establishing the institution prescribed that enrollment be so arranged that "Each city of five thousand inhabitants, and each county in the State, shall be entitled to one pupil, and one for each additional representative in the House of Delegates above one, who shall receive gratuitous instruction."\textsuperscript{119}
Furthermore, each student so selected was expected to state her intention to become a public school teacher for at least two years after leaving the normal school.\textsuperscript{120} A newspaper article of the period stated: "This school is for one thing only, namely that of training teachers for the public schools of the state of Virginia."\textsuperscript{121}

Although few early records exist concerning the relationship of the town and school, a portion of an article from a local paper indicates there was a sense of real community pride in the institution:

>This school is one in which every citizen should be interested and of which he may justly feel proud. Situated in a healthful and refined community, surrounded by a most wholesome moral atmosphere..., it is doing a work which is far reaching in its results..."\textsuperscript{122}

At a more individual level, the association of the community with the school can be seen in personal letters written to relatives. Both Miss Celeste Bush,\textsuperscript{123} vice-principal of the newly created normal school, and Jean, a student,\textsuperscript{124} in writing their folks mentioned church attendance and church activities as being important during 1884 and 1885. The latter discussed attending the Methodist "Christmas tree" even though not a member of that church. She continued to relate that her roommate received two gifts from acquaintances she had made in Farmville.\textsuperscript{125} Miss Bush
described the initial opening of the school as time of excitement when furniture, girls, and visitors arrived simultaneously.\textsuperscript{126} With reference to the guests, she had this to say: "I had to receive each new arrival in a dignified way and to meet no end of gentlemen... Dr. R. [Ruffner] and other gentlemen who are interested wish me to take pains to please each visitor and sometimes when there are several to take them to tea with us."\textsuperscript{127}

In a letter written home a month later, Miss Bush gave the details of the newly furnished parlors and told of the excitement of receiving special callers on one particular Friday evening. The turnout was large and consisted of "All the best people in town and there were at least 200".\textsuperscript{128} Twenty-five years afterwards in her "Reminiscences", Miss Bush wrote "Nothing was so valued by the school as the unremitting attention of its trustees, patrons, and local friends."\textsuperscript{129} The school and town were closely related from the time of its establishment as is evident from Miss Bush's explanation of the role Farmville played in the school's success.\textsuperscript{130}

In casting about for causes that made for the success of the school, too much weight cannot be given to the people of Farmville themselves. From the outset their loyalty was a fortress and a strong tower. If you belonged to the school, you belonged to them and they fought and fended for you. Volumes would be needed to tell you of all their acts of kindliness and courtesy, of friendly calls
and invitations, the endless offering of fruit and flowers and delicacies, the carriages sent with invitations to send the students for week-end visits. The school was in their charge and they guarded their trust.

The respect accorded the school and its mission was not confined to the local Farmville community. The Staunton Vindicator, while acknowledging the school to be the Farmvillians' pet, stated: "The school is attracting deserved attention all over the State." This could be attested to by the immediate response shown by the State to quick opening of the school.

The school was created by an act of the Legislature on March 7, 1884. The Board of Trustees met in Richmond on April 9, 1884 and agreed to open the school in the autumn of 1884. Before the Executive Committee met on April 16, 1884, the town had already deeded the property to the State and the Treasurer was ordered to negotiate with the principal of the Farmville Female College about assuming occupancy. On September 17, 1884, the Board of Trustees resolved that the school should be opened on Thursday, October 30, 1884 at 10:00 A.M. and end in mid-June, 1885. Resolutions were made to the effect that 1) the principal of the normal school should be responsible for preparing circulars to be distributed to public school officials and other interested persons, 2) the superintendents of the
county schools should be requested to provide names of possible candidates for admission as state students, and 3) the principal of the normal school should communicate to the State Board of Education the desire to have a close working relationship between the normal school and the public school system.\textsuperscript{135}

With these resolutions, word that the State Normal School would open in approximately six weeks traveled across the state. On the specified date of October 30, 1884, "the girls came rushing in upon us with their laughing faces".\textsuperscript{136} There were one hundred eleven (111) names on the roll, ninety-eight of which were in the normal school proper. The total enrollment of students shortly increased to one hundred twenty-one (121), with representation from thirty-nine counties and cities throughout the state.\textsuperscript{137} (see Appendix A for the number of state students to which each county and city was entitled.) The enrollment for the session ending June 2, 1886 showed a total of 172 students with ninety-seven in the normal school, thirty-six in the preparatory school, and thirty-nine in the model school.\textsuperscript{138}

By the second year of operation, the trustees had arranged with the School Board of Farmville to contribute $30.00 per month in exchange for which Farmville children
under eight (8) years of age would receive free teaching in the model school. The training or model school provided normal school students with practical classroom experiences.

School superintendents across the state were reported to be very eager to employ trained teachers. Some counties, however, had not yet sent the students to which they were entitled. An appeal was made for these counties to secure some representation, even though their distant location might somewhat increase the expenses involved. In his 1885 report to the president of the Normal School Board, William H. Ruffner, principal of the State Normal School, said "Our first desire is to secure trained teachers for our public schools, and in this view we appeal to every school officer, to every parent, yea, to every patriot, to lift his voice in behalf of this school".

In conclusion, it can be noted that the Farmville school from 1884-1887 was definitely "close to the needs of the public schools and the public at large". An examination of the early years of the State Normal School at Farmville reveals a public interest in and respect for the school as an 'organic part of the modern system of popular education'. The interdependence of the normal school and
the public school is made evident by methods of publication chosen by the trustees of the normal school. The widespread acceptance of the normal school is apparent both from the number of students enrolling within such a short period of time (only six-weeks) and also by the representation of such a considerable number (39) of different systems.

A picture of the public acceptance of the normal school idea would be incomplete without a look at those who knew the institution best—the Farmvillians. The response from the local community was enthusiastic from the moment the state accepted the property of the former Methodist Female College as the site for the state's first normal school for white students. Accounts from students, teachers, and newspapers clearly illustrate the high esteem which the town had for the school and the benevolent spirit it bestowed upon those who enrolled in the institution for the single-purpose of becoming teachers in Virginia's Public School System. However, the extraordinary receptiveness of the normal school by the town and surrounding counties by no means indicated the normal school was simply a provincial training program. On the contrary, as the only school for preparing white teachers, its influence was strongly felt and genuinely welcomed throughout the Commonwealth.
Characteristic 3 - In-service Education (1884-1887)

The teacher institutes became a valuable agency for in-service training and their early history is the story of normal school training. (Harper, pp. 116-117.)

At the urging of Superintendent Ruffner, teacher institutes were begun early in his administration in an effort to improve schools and to offer at least a minuscule amount of professional training. Summer institutes were generally held in the local school divisions until 1880 when the first Normal Institute for white teachers was conducted at the University of Virginia. In the absence of a state normal school, these institutes served as temporary measures until such a school was established. However, the creation of state normal schools did not mark the demise of summer institutes. In fact, such institutes under the sponsorship of the state, continued to be held throughout the normal school era in Virginia. They served as a means of offering professional training to in-service teachers who could attend school only in the summer. Though these summer programs were not a part of the normal school, it became increasingly popular for them to be conducted at such sites and normal school instructors were, of course, in much demand as teachers in these institutes wherever they were held.
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In-service education actually preceded any formal normal school preparation of teachers in Virginia. Superintendent of Public Instruction, William Henry Ruffner from his First Annual Report forward waged a continuous campaign for the training of teachers. He called for utilization of Teachers Institutes as one means of providing teachers with much needed professional assistance. In his Second Annual Report, Ruffner characterized teachers institutes as being made up "of the whole body of public school teachers in a given area". These could be held on a local, district, or state level but the county level seemed to be the most common. The institutes were described as lasting one to two weeks and were geared directly toward "practical improvement in the art of teaching".

The superintendent's second report extolled the benefits, purposes, and effects of the teacher institutes. It encouraged the state to make appropriations and "authorize counties to contribute...for defraying the expenses" in order to secure the realization of some sort of professional training for those serving as teachers in Virginia's public schools. Ruffner viewed institutes, publicly-supported, as a very important means of providing professional help for in-service teachers but he never meant for such assistance to be viewed as sufficient preparation. Thus, in closing the discussion on teacher institutes, he
said, "they have demonstrated their value but...the most potent and finished means of teacher-training is the normal school".\textsuperscript{148}

Although the state supported teacher institutes in theory, it was less supportive monetarily. According to the Acts of the Assembly in 1869-1870, Section 38:\textsuperscript{149}

\begin{quote}
The board of education shall have power, at its discretion, to invite and encourage meetings of teachers at convenient places, and to procure addresses to be made before such meetings, touching the processes of school organization, discipline, and instruction; provided that no public money shall be expended for purpose of this section.
\end{quote}

The Board of Education in 1871 passed a resolution whereby county school superintendents were required to have at least one institute before August 31, 1872. Ruffner was determined to see this was done by every division and the Educational Journal of Virginia, as well as his annual reports, were used as reminders of the importance of these meetings.\textsuperscript{150}

By 1880, Ruffner was able to report county institutes were being held regularly with positive results. He also pointed with great pride to summer normal institutes held at the University of Virginia for white teachers and at Lynchburg for "colored" teachers. These state institutes were made possible by the Peabody Fund and the
Superintendent's personal resourcefulness in planning. A total of four hundred sixty-seven (467) teachers were able to benefit from these two institutes.\textsuperscript{131}

In 1881, summer institutes were held at Hampton, Abington, and Front Royal. Such normal institutes were highly regarded by others interested in the professional training of teachers. According to Ruffner, they were a new feature in school work in Virginia.\textsuperscript{132} They attracted the attention of the United States Commissioner of Education who decided to publish the proceedings of these institutes.\textsuperscript{133} However, Ruffner, who thoroughly appreciated the benefits derived from these professional meetings, realized they were only "imperfect and temporary substitutes for the true and complete Normal School with its course of two or three years".\textsuperscript{134}

Even after the establishment of the State Normal School, the normal institutes continued to take responsibility for most of the professional support of teachers. The 1887 principal's report to the State Superintendent noted that over the four years of its existence, the State Normal School had an average of ninety-seven enrolled in its Normal Department. These included both state students and public school teachers.\textsuperscript{135} (See Appendix B for an analysis by years.) Farr, in his
report as state superintendent in 1883, pointed out that across the state of Virginia "nearly four thousand people expected to make teaching their profession". The gap between what the normal school could accommodate and the needs of the state left obvious training deficits which had to be handled largely by a continuation of the summer institutes. The State Normal School catalog for the 1885-86 session stated that the demand for teachers at all levels, including instructors for "Institutes", could be expected to last for many years.

From its beginning, the State Normal School showed an interest in helping the public school teacher gain professional expertise. The Minutes of an Executive Committee dated September 17, 1884 resolved: "that teachers, already in the field, who may wish to improve their own culture and methods are invited to avail themselves of the benefits of the Normal School". Furthermore, the faculty members of the State Normal School were expected to provide instruction in the summer for a period of four to six weeks for teachers already in the field. Such summer sessions quickly became a regular part of the normal school program. On June 23, 1885, the trustees resolved to begin holding summer sessions lasting for six weeks, starting on the third Wednesday in June. By action of the board on October 1, 1885, it was resolved
that the summer session would be held at Farmville unless otherwise instructed by the State Superintendent or Agent of the Peabody Fund." The faculty met on February 17, 1886 and made decisions about who would teach summer school and what subjects should be taught.

In briefly reviewing in-service education from 1884-87, it is apparent that William Henry Ruffner had long been a strong advocate of in-service training for teachers in Virginia. He established patterns of training for teachers by promoting local, district, and state opportunities to provide professional assistance for those who taught in the public schools of the state. Thus, it is inconceivable that the State Normal School, under his principalship would not be involved with a continuation of such training. Even though available information is scant, evidence does exist to show that the State Normal School encouraged public school teachers to attend and required its own instructors to participate in annual summer sessions, the first of which was held in June 1886.
Characteristic 4 - Course of Study (1884-87)

The concept of professionalized subject matter for teachers developed in normal schools. (Harper, p. 117.)

The Trustees, meeting for organizational purposes on September 17, 1884, set forth certain resolutions dealing with instruction, among which were the following:\(^163\)

1. The Committee on organization would determine the course of study for the State Normal School at Farmville but the faculty would be entrusted with the responsibility for the 'order, arrangement, and mode of teaching.'

2. Instruction would be offered in those areas which were commonly taught in Female Academies.

3. Text Books should be chosen by the faculty but the primary texts used should be on the list adopted by the State Board of Education.

Before examining the implications of these guidelines; consideration should be given to the kinds of students who would be admitted to study.

Admission

Each city of five thousand inhabitants, and each county in the state shall be entitled to one pupil, and one for each additional representative in the house of delegates above one, who shall receive gratuitous instruction. The trustees shall prescribe rules for the selection of such pupils and
for their examination, and shall require each pupil selected to give satisfactory evidence of an intention to teach in the public schools of the state for at least two years after leaving the said normal school.164
(See Appendix A.)

Such were the admission requirements set up by the State. Upon the decision of a county or city not to send its specified number of students, it became the privilege of the faculty of the normal school to select qualified students from throughout the state to fill the existing vacancies.165 Furthermore, the trustees determined that superintendents of various state school divisions should be given the right to recommend persons as suitable candidates for admission, but the final decision on admission would be reserved to the faculty.166 According to the Minutes of 1884, "the ultimate question, of admission [was] reserved and referred to the faculty. The examination and recommendations to be made according to instructions from the principal".167

Ruffner, in an undated circular entitled "What are Normal Schools In Fact?", described the conditions of admission to normal schools. He suggested the usual age of entrance to be sixteen to seventeen. The candidate for admission should be well-grounded in the six major subject areas, have soundness of character, possess good health, and hold a desire to teach in the state schools. Generally,
Ruffner felt it was best for the student to have a recommendation from public school officials but this should not be obligatory in all cases.\textsuperscript{168}

Following these suggestions set forth by Ruffner, the catalog for the State Normal School's first session stated:\textsuperscript{169}

The conditions of admission are that the applicant should be at least sixteen years of age in all ordinary cases, and should be able to stand a good examination on the six studies required by law to be taught in public schools, viz: Orthography, Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, English Grammar, and Geography. She should also be possessed of a vigorous constitution, good natural capacity and, of course, a blameless moral character.

These standards for admission remained basically the same throughout W. H. Ruffner's administration as principal of the school. The catalog for the 1884-85 session specified that four classes of students were to be granted entrance to the institution, three of whom would be "admitted only when vacancies remain after all the regular State Students have been received".\textsuperscript{170} The state students were actually the ones for whom the school was established. They were expected to teach a minimum of two years immediately after their normal school education and they were required to so pledge themselves at the time of their entrance. In return for this pledge, state students were
exempt from all tuition and fees for the regular instruction. Should these have elected to take work in extra branches, outside of the regular course of instruction, the expense for such additional instruction became the student's responsibility.\textsuperscript{171}

The state students were recognized as the first class while the second class was composed of those referred to as substitutes. These were those chosen without reference to locality to fill existing vacancies occurring when counties and cities failed to fill their quota.\textsuperscript{172} The third class was composed of individuals already teaching but who wished to be better prepared professionally to continue their work in the public schools. They, too, were exempt from tuition charges.\textsuperscript{173} Only the fourth class of students were charged tuition for normal school instruction. These were students who felt an interest in teaching but who chose not to sign a pledge of obligation.\textsuperscript{174}

State students were granted preferential admission and generally came with the recommendation of their county or city superintendent of schools who was responsible for administering a preliminary examination.\textsuperscript{175} However, each applicant was also examined upon arrival at the normal school "not only to decide whether or not she is prepared to enter but also to determine the classes to which she shall be assigned".\textsuperscript{176} The 1884 report of the Superintendent of
Public Instruction called the institutional examination the "crucial test". However, recognition was given to the general inadequacy which could be expected in the background preparation of most students. Thus, the standard of proficiency had to be set in relationship to that of the average public school.\textsuperscript{177} This assumed a gradual increase in standards and an expectation that the standards would improve rapidly when "the applicants for admission exceed the capacity of the school".\textsuperscript{178}

County and city superintendents were encouraged to seek out the best students and to look for those who had adequate mastery of the six public school branches. The mode of examination, however, was left largely to their own discretion.\textsuperscript{179} The Superintendent of Public Instruction issued a form to be filled out by the recommending superintendent and also one to be filled out by the applicant. The superintendent's form contained the following general information.\textsuperscript{180}

1. Name and Address
2. Age and Marital Status
3. Intention to Teach
4. Place of Birth
5. Character and Manners
6. Health
7. Natural Strength of Mind
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8. General Intelligence
9. Proficiency in Six Branches
10. Method of Examination
11. Previous Education
12. Previous Experience.

The applicant's form requested virtually the same information as the superintendent's form but in addition it asked for a listing of textbooks previously used by the individual.¹⁸¹

Academic requirements for admission were minimal. The vice-principal of the normal school for 1884-85 reported that the principal held reservations about any kind of formal entrance examinations because of the possibility they "would frighten all of our girls home again. As a concession to their timidity, therefore, they were only asked to write their names, ages, and places of residence on slips of paper and from these,—really only age and penmanship,—we made a tentative classification."¹⁸²

The principal himself in referring to the questions used by local superintendents said "our examinations are not rigid".¹⁸³ However, this lack of rigidity did not result in high scores on the tests administered in the various school
localities. The majority made an average of less than five on a ten-point scale and in fact, it was not uncommon for some students to be admitted with an average of three.\textsuperscript{184} Although admitting this was somewhat embarrassing, the principal contended that sending away those with inadequate preparation would cause the normal school to become unpopular and under enrolled. Furthermore, nothing would be done to enhance the cause of education in the school divisions from which the students came. On the other hand, he argued, keeping the students "until we can prepare them in the primary branches under a style of teaching such as they never knew, and then carry them through the professional training, we will thus supply their counties with a few specimens of what a teacher ought to be."\textsuperscript{185} By the 1885-86 session, it became necessary to add a preparatory department to address the lack of proficiency among those desiring to enter the normal school. In defense of this action, the catalog for the second session stated, "we must first do for them this primary work. If we take them into the Normal School, they are an injury to the classes, and the double work...disheartens them..."\textsuperscript{186} It was further stated that those having deficiencies would be received and placed in a preparatory school and kept there for a half or whole session.\textsuperscript{187} It was acknowledged that
"There may be a little magic in the name of having been to a Normal School but the name without the virtue is mere imposition".188

Curriculum

According to the Minutes of the Trustees, the course of study was drawn up by the Committee on Organization189 and was accepted in substance by the faculty with some modifications in the order and arrangement of studies.190 The 1884-85 catalog for the first session of the State Normal School however, described subject matter to be taught with brevity and scant detail. The Elementary Course was said to be fully taught and to be designed "to prepare teachers for the primary schools, not only by review and drill in the studies taught in these lower schools, but by instruction in the best methods of teaching these branches".191 These methods were described as being both theoretical and practical. The subject matter fell into six general areas: language, mathematics, natural science, history, the arts, and didactics. Language included Latin, English classics, rhetoric, and elocution. Mathematics dealt with "mental combinations", arithmetic, algebra, and geometry. Geography (which included map-drawing), physiology, physics, chemistry, zoology, botany, geology,
and mineralogy made up the natural sciences. The purpose of these studies was "to widen the scope of the student's mind, to cultivate the habit of observation, to inspire a love of nature, and specially to prepare for giving object-lessons in the schools". General history was introduced along with a more thorough study of United States History, vocal music, book-keeping, calisthenics, were taught "carefully though simply" and drawing was taught thoroughly. Didactics consisted of "elementary psychology, the leading principles of education, the methods of teaching particular branches, school management, and the school law of Virginia".

The vice-principal was made responsible for instruction in morals and manners. Hygiene and social culture were also given attention. Literary societies, made entirely the responsibility of students, were also important, as was religion. Religious observance was highly valued but the individual was permitted at all times to follow the dictates of conscience.

Ruffner, in describing the aims and purposes of normal schools, said the Farmville school made extensive use of the oral method. There was no uniform system of textbooks from which lessons were routinely assigned and recited. Instead, books were used primarily for reference and "in teaching the elementary principles of any study, no
use whatever is made of a book." A complete description of the oral method, as given by the principal is presented in Appendix C.

A visitor to the State Normal School in 1886, noted that the mathematics teacher taught the students in customary fashion used by college professors but would periodically call upon one of the students to teach. Every girl could be expected to have her turn and at the completion of her presentation, the "teacher and class criticize and correct any mistakes". The mental arithmetic class was noted to have many complicated oral problems which the students answered immediately upon cessation of the teacher. "This kind of exercise, with many variations is a daily thing in the school and much valued".

The geography class observed in 1886 was taught by demonstration as the teacher shaped terrain - mountains, valleys, plateaus, and continents - from damp earth. "The young ladies...had to talk it off fast, without textbook or reference." To this, Ruffner added, "When, by the combined efforts of teacher and students, the desired statement is put in due form, it is written on the blackboard, and copied into the note-books, and subsequently recited upon".
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In music class, the students were given a piece of music with which they were unfamiliar and they were expected to be able to read and sing it. "This class is so thoroughly taught now, that any one of them can teach vocal music...".200

In her "Reminiscences" twenty-five years after the normal school began, the vice-principal spoke in a complimentary way of the school's program of studies. She remarked that "So far as professional methods were concerned, Farmville could start at the most advanced point then gained by older normal schools".201 However, Ruffner, who felt the school offered "a good education at small expense",202 acknowledged that some outsiders believed the course of study was too elementary and lacked breadth of coverage. To this accusation, he replied, "We go for quality rather than quantity. We believe in knowledge, yea, in erudition, but we do not mean to attempt more than can be done thoroughly".203

A preparatory program was commenced during the very first session of the school's existence204 to help students acquire proficiency in foundational subjects preliminary to and essential for undertaking the professional course.205 However, the course of instruction, as originally planned was divided into an elementary course and an advanced course. "The scale of the two reaches from the primary
studies to the top of an ordinary high school course; and nearly everything is taught by normal methods. Besides which, a full course of strictly professional studies runs through the entire period of study."

As laid out during the 1884-85 session, the course of instruction was very simple and included the following list of studies:

**COURSES OF INSTRUCTION.**

**ELEMENTARY COURSE.**

1. *Language*—Orthography; Reading and Elocution; English Grammar; Composition; Outlines of Rhetoric and English Classics; Elements of Latin.

2. *Mathematics*—Mental Arithmetic, Written Arithmetic; Algebra; Geometry.

3. *Natural Science*—Political Geography; Elements of mathematical and Physical Geography; Physiology; Lessons in Natural Science.


5. *The Arts*—Penmanship; Drawing; Vocal Music; Book-Keeping; Calisthenics.

6. *Teaching*—School Economy; Method of Instruction; Lectures on Education; Practice of Teaching.
ADVANCED COURSE.

1. Language—as in Elementary Course; Rhetoric; English Composition; English Literature; Analysis of English Classics; Latin.
2. Mathematics—as in Elementary Course; Higher Algebra; Trigonometry; Analytical Geometry.
3. Natural Science—as in Elementary Course; Geology; Chemistry; Physics; Zoology; Botany.
4. History—as in Elementary Course; General History; History of Virginia.
5. The Arts—as in Elementary Course.
6. Teaching—as in Elementary Course; Mental Philosophy; Moral Philosophy; Logic; Lectures on the History of Education and the Philosophy of Education; Observation and Practice in Teaching.

By means of these two curricular patterns, it was intended that two courses of instruction would be offered, covering two years. The elementary curriculum would have prepared teachers for lower schools and the advanced course for higher levels of schooling. A lack of funds made it impossible to offer both courses and therefore only the elementary course was taught. Furthermore, the lack of adequate preparation caused the proposed time for course completion frequently to extend to three years and in some cases to four years.

The 1885-86 catalog carried a statement of lament for the lack of preparation of those seeking entrance into the school. Recognizing that for many students, there was
no place near their homes where they could achieve the needed educational acquirements, the catalog stated: "We therefore will receive such as may be sent; and if found to be deficient, they will be placed in the Preparatory School and kept there a half, or if need be, a whole session before they are put under regular professional training".209 On the other hand, those who came prepared were immediately assigned to appropriate study.

There were four classes known as the A, B, C, D classes with A being the highest and D the lowest. Each new student entering the school was placed in the D class for at least a half a year. Students could enter in October or February thus allowing C classes to form at the beginning or middle session. As a result, students could graduate in February even though they would not receive their diplomas until June.210 Students were in many cases advised to repeat a term. A lack of preparation did not bar entrance to the school but without adequacy of attainment, the students were not allowed to graduate. "Nothing but thorough work all through wins the diploma".211

The academic progress and difficulties of students were considered on an individual basis and decisions about each were made by the entire faculty. During the opening session of 1885-86, the Faculty Minutes were replete with
references to specific students who were or were not granted permission to drop courses, especially Latin and Geometry.\textsuperscript{212}

The catalog for 1885 reported there were three departments: the normal or professional department, the model school and preparatory school.\textsuperscript{213} For the term beginning in February 1886, "no pupils were admitted to the Normal from the Preparatory School because they had not studied all the subjects in Arithmetic and Grammar which the faculty considered necessary for their admittance".\textsuperscript{214} It was also decided that since the school operated on "terms passed", a student could fail one subject and be promoted on the condition that the subject failed be made up or else the student would not be allowed to graduate.\textsuperscript{215}

This was a matter of grave concern for the faculty and in the fall of 1887, a Committee on Class Work was appointed to study the amount of time spent by students in preparing for class. The result of the time study showed that "class C might well be counseled to put more time and energy on their school duties".\textsuperscript{216} However, it was discovered that A and B classes were being overstrained and therefore needed to have some of their recitations suspended. It was recommended that two additional study periods be provided for the A class and three for the B class.\textsuperscript{217} Furthermore, the time study showed that
psychology was claiming much of the study time for the B class and that mathematics and English required large proportions of time throughout. Nevertheless, it was felt that mathematics and English well deserved to have more study time because of the "practice work and collateral reading and meagerness of preparation of most of the pupils". The Committee recommended that if students in A and B classes continued to have difficulty after schedules were lightened, they should be advised to split their courses. For the school as a whole the Committee recommended following an earlier suggestion given by the vice-principal, namely, "an entire release from harness for a day or an afternoon at judicious intervals".

In conclusion, it can be stated that the requirements for admission to the State Normal School from 1884-87 were minimal. A candidate needed scarcely more than to have the blessings of her local school division and to be able to write legibly. It was desirable for the candidate to have thorough preparation in the elementary subjects but when this was found lacking, remediation and supplementation tended to be preferred to denial of admission. The justification for admitting students with inadequate preparation in part was defensive behavior to prevent the
normal school from remaining small in size and from becoming unpopular with the public. On the other hand, admission of students who were not highly qualified was accepted as a challenge for the normal school as it attempted to address the deficiencies and prepare the students to return to their school divisions ready to accept professional responsibility. The foremost concern was always that of admitting students who were willing to commit themselves to teaching in the public schools upon completion of the normal school program. The creation of a preparatory unit within the school recognized the needs of the student and the gaps which existed between their prior preparation and where they should be in order to successfully undertake normal school work. This clearly seems to mark a movement toward preparing students to undertake more professionalized subject matter in the normal school proper.

The course of study at the State Normal School at Farmville as originally established by the Committee on Organization was accepted by the faculty with few modifications. However, the academic deficiencies of the students admitted were so extensive that the working curriculum materialized in a fashion to accommodate need rather than specification. Before the end of the first academic year, a preparatory course was begun to provide
remediation and supplementation opportunities for those who needed such instruction prior to entering the professional program.

Addressing academic problems before the student began professional studies allowed the normal school to offer a Normal Course built upon sound foundations in subject matter and thoroughness in practical experiences. Students were required to give oral and written evidence of the mastery of material in addition to which they were required to practice the art of teaching before their peers.

The course of study was directly based upon the subjects traditionally taught in the public schools. There is every reason to perceive the normal school course of study to have been well designed in terms of preparing students to assume positions of elementary teachers in the public school classrooms. William Ruffner, the principal, had been in close contact with schools throughout the state during his twelve-year tenure as Superintendent of Public Instruction. He knew the needs and what should be done to improve public education perhaps better than anyone else in the state. Likewise the vice-principal, Celeste Bush, had been actively associated with the normal schools of New Britian, Connecticut and had first hand knowledge of what was being taught in professional courses at one of the oldest normal schools in the country. The faculty also had
extensive normal school background which permitted instruction in a new institution to be handled by experienced personnel. Although the students were poorly prepared for entering the school, the faculty and administration were well prepared.

The course of study gave special attention to the primary branches but with much attention to oral presentations, recitations, reading, music, drawing, and literary accomplishments. Thus a liberal studies program was combined with a methodological emphasis to produce teachers who possessed both scholarship and professional awareness of the best means for securing instructional effectiveness.
Characteristic 5 - Model School (1884-1887).

There was a tendency to emphasize laboratory experiences in model schools or practice schools. (Harper, p. 118.)

Ruffner, in an article describing what a normal school should be like, explained that students pursuing the elementary course in normal schools generally should be expected to observe initially and then to assume teaching roles during their second or senior year. For this to be done efficiently, it was recommended that a primary school be attached to the normal school. Such a school was generally referred to as a model school or "an example worthy of imitation".

At the first meeting of the Trustees, it was resolved that the normal school should open in the autumn of 1884 and it was further resolved that the board should inquire into the expediency of beginning a model school to be taught in connection with the normal school. The Committee on the Organization of the State Normal School specified its desire to see the model school included as a fundamental part of the school program from the beginning of the institution. The committee called for "a Model School attached to the Normal School and under its authorities,
designed for illustration, and ultimately, for practice in teaching by the normal seniors. In this should be taught the primary branches chiefly".225

According to the catalog for the first session, although the model school did operate from the time the normal school commenced and although it was well taught, it did not immediately attract the number of young children desired.226 For this reason, it did not offer "the full field we hoped to have for putting into operation the improved methods of primary instruction".227 The model school was hampered both by a lack of young children and by the fact that it became necessary during the first session to use the model school to help remove the deficiencies of some students who had come to be trained in the normal school.228 By the second year of operation, a preparatory school was begun to offer specific help for those with inadequate backgrounds for normal school work.229

From the onset of operation, the teaching in the model school was specified to be of the highest character and to exhibit the best in methods.230 The school was set up to include young children as part of the model school training. It was considered important to have children just beginning their educational experience and who would take their subsequent studies there also.231
It is difficult to determine how many young children enrolled in the model school during the first session. There were twenty-five students enrolled in the model school but since normal school students needing additional preparation were listed along with others enrolled in the model school, it becomes impossible to separate the two. However, by the second session, the preparatory department had commenced and only young children (less than ten years old), of which there were thirty-nine, were in the model school.\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)

According to a report in the *Staunton Vindicator*, the model school students in 1886 were "pretty little girls, some of them not over 5 years of age".\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^3\) These girls came from the local neighborhoods surrounding the normal school and were taught gratuitously "by the most approved modern methods".\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^4\) The purpose of the model school was to allow the normal school seniors to observe and practice teaching. It was expected that students from the normal school would be present in the model school to observe and to take notes as the model school teacher illustrated proper teaching methods. After a demonstration lesson, the student-teachers were expected to teach the class in accordance with the procedure observed. After school was dismissed and the
children had left for the day, the teacher of the model school held "criticism" sessions with the student teachers about their performance.\textsuperscript{235}

Seniors had to coordinate their model school teaching with their course work in the normal school. A student, writing to her "homefolks" in February, 1886, described the system this way.

We are to begin our teaching in the Model School to-morrow. The A's are to go in there in groups of three each and remain one week. My turn will come to-morrow week. We will then miss the lessons in the Normal School and will have to make-up the work out of school-time, also get notes from those who are in the Model School when our turn is past. It will keep us quite busy, leaving us very little spare time.\textsuperscript{236}

Ruffner proposed that a model school "should be as nearly as possible a perfect school, and this cannot be unless taught exclusively by the best teachers".\textsuperscript{237} According to the Staunton Vindicator, in 1886 Miss Clara Minor from New York City fit this description. "She was taken from the famous training school of 1,000 children there, and was represented to Dr. Ruffner as the best teacher in it".\textsuperscript{238}
In summation, it must be noted that the model school was viewed as essential to the success of the normal school. Only by wedding practice to theory was it deemed possible to prepare teachers for public school classrooms. Thus, Ruffner advocated that a model school be established as a necessary component of any normal school program. Hence, a model school was opened in conjunction with the normal school at the very first session. It could not have been declared an unconditional success, however. Many of the students admitted to the normal school actually needed model school instruction to compensate for existing educational deficiencies. Furthermore, the normal school was opened so quickly after receiving final legislative clearance and funding that little time was available for securing young children for enrollment in the model school.

The primary purpose of the model school was to provide a simulation-type experience in which members of the Senior class could observe, teach, and receive immediate critiques. The model school teacher was considered to be an extremely important contributor to the normal school program and for this reason her credentials were very important. She was responsible both for the education of the five to ten year old children and also for the seniors who need practical situations in which to learn how theory worked in reality.
The available information on the early model school is limited to a few sources but these sources show complete agreement concerning the importance of the model school as an integral part of teacher training. It was considered absolutely essential to have a place for observation and practice. Basically, the model schools served for the normal school "largely the purpose of clinics in a Medical School".239
Characteristic 6 - Extra-Curriculum (1884-1887).

Activities formerly considered extra-curricular came to be considered important as part of the teacher preparation program. (Harper, p. 119.)

Charles Harper noted that normal schools during the last two decades of the nineteenth century moved toward a curricularization of what had previously been considered extra-curricular activities. Speech and music were among those activities which were put into the curriculum to enhance the teacher's professional value. Being able to "direct plays, lead singing, play a musical instrument, and the like" greatly enriched the teacher's credentials.

Beginning with its first session, the Farmville school required study in the Arts as a part of the regular course of study. Included in the Arts were lessons in penmanship, drawing, vocal-music, book-keeping, and calisthenics. The Fourteenth Annual Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction explained the importance of including in the normal course of study "something more than the items in the primary curriculum. Primary English should be continued somewhat into etymological, rhetorical, and literary branches." Special
attention should be given to vocal culture, oral reading, recitation, singing, and composition. With writing and figuring should be associated linear drawing and book-keeping by single entry".242 Physiology and hygiene were designated as areas which should be extended to include calisthenics or "light gymnastics".243 Elocution was in the curriculum as a part of language study.

A newspaper correspondent of 1886 observed the teaching of vocal and instrumental music. He believed the students were so well and thoroughly taught "that anyone of them [could] teach vocal music, and when they are scattered all over the State, they will be invaluable as teachers and leaders in church and other choirs.244 Instrumental music was offered to the normal school students but according to the 1885 Faculty Minutes it had "no direct connection with the Normal Course of Study but opportunity for it is offered and any pupil undertaking it must give it a fair share of her time and attention".245

Literary societies were in existence during the year 1884-85 but little information is given about them or about the nature of their activities. The Faculty Minutes of 1884-85 offer a suggestion that the societies unite and adopt a new name.246 There were two societies at that time, referred to simply as the R.C. and W.L.247 At a later
meeting of the faculty, it was decided that the name selected for the new society should be submitted to the faculty for approval.\textsuperscript{248}

Composition and public speaking were highly esteemed by faculty and students alike. This is evident by the careful deliberation given by the faculty to selection of those students whose essays were of the caliber to be presented at the graduation exercises.\textsuperscript{249} In 1886, the faculty chose Misses Blanton, Carruthers, Anderson, and Mapp to present their essays in the order listed.\textsuperscript{250}

One of the students so named wrote to her folks about the event in the following words.\textsuperscript{251}

As you know only four of the essays could be read. At a faculty meeting, it was decided that Misses Anderson, Blanton, Carruthers [Jean] and Mapp should read. Each one is to go to some one teacher for suggestions and practise [sic]. Since mine lays in Dr. Ruffner's subject I have to take mine to him. They will have to be added to and remodeled in many ways. It will require much extra work and long tedious practise [sic]. I will have to work like a major to keep up in my classes everyday, do this extra work, and study for the examinations.
It can be concluded that the extra-curriculum at the State Normal School at Farmville showed evidence of the same kind of curricularization referred to by Charles Harper. Vocal music, drawing, and calisthenics were considered part of the curriculum from the founding of the school. On the other hand, oral reading for graduation presentations, instrumental music, and literary affairs attracted considerable attention and support from both faculty and students even though they remained in the domain of the extra-curriculum.
Characteristic 7. Pragmatic Attitude (1884-1887).

Normal schools were established to meet certain public needs and they used the most expedient methods for meeting the challenges. (Harper p. 120.)

Charles Harper suggested that normal schools in order to meet the demands of teacher preparation took "from any source any method or material which had a direct bearing on their problem". This eclectic approach at the State Normal School began with the acquisition of a faculty gathered from as far away as Connecticut and as close by as Farmville itself. The faculty included both male and female instructors with widely diversified backgrounds.

A pragmatic attitude compelled the State to accept the donation of an old academy building as the site for the new State Normal School. A lack of sufficient residential accommodations extended the school into the homes of community in order to find sufficient boarding facilities for the students. The needs of the State demanded that the school quickly get into the business of preparing teachers. Consequently, being pragmatic led the principal to waste no time in issuing the call for applicants for the newly created school. Receipt of these applications led to an immediate pragmatic attempt to decide how the greatly
diversified educational backgrounds could be handled most expediently. Thus, it became necessary to allow some of the students to enter the model school during the first session to remediate educational deficiencies. By the second session, however, the normal school accepted the educational inadequacies and instituted a preparatory school specifically to address the matter. It also became apparent that some students would need a lengthened period of study in order to be prepared for teaching. The extended time was encouraged when needed for "good economy" and better preparation for the classroom.

The pragmatic nature of the school can be found best in the course of study. As previously described, the normal school curriculum was designed to prepare teachers in the six elementary branches prescribed by law for the public schools. The purposes of the normal school program were explained thusly:

first, to make sure of mastery of ordinary branches of knowledge; second to develop the philosophical principles underlying the facts, rules, and definitions of each of these studies; third, along with the first and second, to expound and illustrate the best way of teaching each study, and every part of each study; and fourth, to require the students themselves to prepare teaching exercises, and exhibit them in the actual instruction of their own classes.
The Fourteenth Annual Report of the State Superintendent noted that professional instruction should be given in the "daily work of the school"\textsuperscript{258} and methods of teaching as well as practice teaching should be included in the program of instruction.\textsuperscript{259} The instructors in the normal school exemplified practical methods of instruction in their demonstration lessons. For example, the vice-principal was observed teaching a geography lesson in 1886, "as I never saw it taught before, having on an elevated and inclined table a lot of damp earth out of which, with her white hands, she was shaping mountains, molding valleys, pleateaux and divisions of the earth and smashing up the continents generally".\textsuperscript{260}

The prospective teachers were taught different methods of teaching for each of different branches of the curriculum. They were also taught about the physical apparatus to use for illustrative purposes, rules and policies, the organization of a school, the management of a school, dealing with parents and school authorities, arrangement of school buildings and grounds. "In all of these we have the science and the art of teaching; or theory and practice."\textsuperscript{261} According to Ruffner, didactics should be the primary focus of the normal school program.\textsuperscript{262}

Textbooks presented another area in which the State Normal School assumed a pragmatic attitude.\textsuperscript{263}
The question of textbooks is always a vexatious one, but less so in a normal school than in ordinary schools, for here the teaching is by subjects largely, and with most of the elementary branches any good text-book will answer, and a plurality of books is to be preferred. In respect to these branches the students may bring such books as they happen to have.

The model school clearly showed the pragmatic nature of the normal school. Here the local children were educated by the latest methods and under the influence of the model school teacher and the normal school seniors. Practice teaching gave the students an opportunity to implement theory under the guidance of a proven critic teacher.264

As a school for the preparation of teachers, the State Normal School at Farmville was built upon the philosophy that "Knowledge is its material, philosophy its guide, and practical skill its outcome— the What, the Why, and the How."265

It can be concluded that the State Normal School at Farmville exhibited a pragmatic attitude from the date of its founding. Being pragmatic in its philosophy, the normal school adapted to less than ideal conditions in housing, in textbooks, in composition of the student body, and in the course of study. The normal school program was revised and
extended in accordance with the needs of the entering students. In addition to the general course requirements, each senior had to spend time observing, teaching, and being evaluated on the basis of her classroom performance.

The fact that the school at Farmville was created to train white female teachers for the tremendous demand of staffing the public school classrooms in the state forced the institution to be pragmatic. There was neither time nor funds to be otherwise. The challenge of providing sufficient education to equip previously ill-prepared students to accept teaching responsibilities required a great deal of attention to professional courses designed to permit teaching in the elementary school. The instruction was at times narrow but programming and classification according to need enabled the normal school to prolong courses and individual compensatory plans. However, in order to graduate, a student was required to undertake the ultimate in pragmatic studies—that capstone experience of being a student teacher. It was here that a student was judged to be ready or not to be ready for entering the profession.
Section II: The Years of Development
(1887-1901)
Characteristic 1. Administration and Faculty (1887-1901)

Under the influence of presidents and faculty (with trustee support), normal schools transformed teaching into a profession. (Harper, p. 113.)

PRESIDENTS

Ruffner declined re-election to the presidency of the State Normal School and only three of the nine teachers who had been previously connected with the institution chose to return for the 1887-88 session. Conflict between Dr. Ruffner and the vice-principal had been evident during the 1886-87 session. This controversy filtered down into the faculty and caused serious problems. At the end of the session, several members of the faculty resigned. In one of the letters of resignation, the following statement was used: "The course of injustice and misrepresentation pursued by certain members of this faculty has made it impossible for us to work in the same institution". Recognizing the severity of the situation, the trustees appointed a committee to mediate the matter. However, the committee decided that the problem was too deep to be settled by mediation. The committee announced "the differences and estrangements existing in the faculty are irreconcilable. They are of a nature to destroy the
efficiency of the school". Thus, the resignations of three faculty members and the vice-principal were accepted.

On July 20, 1887, the Board of Trustees read the testimonials of those who applied for the vacancy created by Dr. Ruffner when he resigned as head of the State Normal School. John Atkinson Cunningham was selected to fill the position.

Cunningham had done his undergraduate work at the University of Virginia where he graduated in Chemistry, Latin, Moral Philosophy, Nature Philosophy, Pure Mathematics, and French. He received the Master's degree from the University of Nashville and the honorary Ll.D. from Hampden-Sydney in 1898. He served in administrative and professional roles at the University of Tennessee. In 1877, he became principal of Madison School in Richmond. Thus, he was experienced at the collegiate level and in public school administration before accepting his post in Farmville.

Professor Cunningham seemed from the first to fully understand and appreciate the condition of public education in Virginia and to foresee that to the women of the state should be committed the main task of teaching her children in the public school and to have framed an ideal of what the normal school should be in which these teachers should be trained for the work.
Administratively, *The Farmville Herald* noted that under his management the normal school has grown in number and in improvements to the physical plant.\(^{273}\) According to the *Richmond Times*, Cunningham was an efficient principal who discharged his duties with fidelity and simplicity.\(^{274}\)

During the administration of Dr. Cunningham, the school made progress in enrollment, in physical facilities, and in significantly changing the course of study to meet the evolving needs of the institution.\(^{275}\) In 1894, Cunningham reported to the Board of Trustees the need for some rather drastic changes in the course of studies. (See Characteristic Four.) He reported:\(^{276}\)

> The organization and course of study of the college is a survival of a past age. The present times need different subject matter and methods and it is believed that the educational interests of our people will be better served by gradually extending the work along lines already laid out.

It can be seen from the chart in Appendix D that the number of faculty and students also increased steadily growing from 93 to 250 pupils in the normal school proper, and from 9 to 14 faculty over the ten year period of Cunningham's administration.
Cunningham worked slowly at the beginning and hence during his first year, he made few changes, "only such as is hoped will materially add to the efficiency of the school in the direction of purely normal work". However, by his second year in office, Cunningham had led his faculty to make changes in the course of study, admission process, and the mode of teaching. The creation of an entirely new program of studies spoke more clearly than anything else that Cunningham was moving the normal school toward a definite professionalization of teaching. His reflective, scholarly nature in combination with his human concern earned Cunningham himself the reputation of being one who "was constantly leading and thinking, trying to put the school upon broader lines, but it was always the personal contact he insisted upon". The normal school under his leadership, drew accolades from Dr. A. D. Mayo, who was a representative of the Peabody Fund, and a frequent visitor at the institution. According to a report from Dr. Mayo, "this was the best Normal School in the South, though several far outstripped it in numbers and material equipment." In a similar testimony, a member of the class of 1894 wrote:

Dr. Cunningham arranged and mapped out the courses as he thought best to carry out the purpose of the school--that of training teachers. The State Female Normal School was at that time the most progressive educational
institution in Virginia (due to the progressive ideas of Dr. Cunningham). Among his other duties as president of the school, he taught Psychology, which at that time was such a new science that even the men's colleges of the state did not have a chair of Psychology.

Dr. Cunningham died in October, 1897 after ten years as head of the State Normal School. The Board of Trustees designated Miss Virginia Reynolds, who was the senior member of the faculty, "to conduct the Academic Department of the school" until a President was elected. Although no major occurrences took place during this interim period, it is noteworthy that the affairs of the school were not interrupted. According to the Faculty Minutes, adjustments were immediately made to cover the duties of the deceased President. He had left the school thoroughly organized and instruction in every department was carried on "without injury to the school." However, in December of 1897, the board elected Robert Frazer to be the third president of the State Normal School. He assumed his duties on February 1, 1897.

Early in his life, Frazer had felt a strong attraction to teaching but at the insistence of his father, he took up the study of law under Professor Minor at the University of Virginia. However, in February, 1864, he was offered the chair of Latin and French in the Florida
Military Institute which he accepted. In 1865, he returned to Virginia and began a school for boys. From 1871 to 1882, he operated Fauquier Institute for girls at Warrenton, Virginia. From 1882 to 1886, he served as president of Judson Institute at Marion, Virginia. During his administration at Judson, the number of boarding students increased from forty-three (43) to one hundred twenty-five (125), buildings were repaired and a new building was erected. Because of ill-health, Frazer did not assume another position until 1891 when he became President of the Industrial Institute and College of Mississippi at Columbus. He was there seven sessions and in that time, he allegedly made "the school the pride of the State". However, the most specific information related to this generalization merely stated that attendance doubled, courses were made stronger, and a normal school was begun. Frazer was President of the Farmville school from 1897-1901. Under his leadership, this school also grew. From two hundred fifty-two (252) in the normal school when he took office, the enrollment had increased to three hundred six (306) in 1901. This enrollment was "the largest the school [had] ever reached". Among his other contributions, Frazer also recommended that regular curricular offerings be extended by the addition of instrumental music. He also proposed that a gymnasium be
built and that a Department of Physical Education be commenced. Frazer was likewise responsible for the establishment of a separate Department of Education which helped to identify teaching as a special area of academic concentration. This was a positive step toward the professionalization of teaching with an emphasis upon educating rather than merely training for the role.

Dr. Frazer sought "to provide the best possible advantages for the students" and this included a recommendation that all students buy their own textbooks and that the faculty should devote their time openly to the school. He reminded the Board that "the whole working time of the teachers employed belongs to the School." In reference to this action, the following explanation is offered in the 1909 Virginian.

As far as his own decisions could make it possible, it was his distinct policy to set a strong and faithful faculty ahead of all other aims; and so he was never willing to apply to things material what should or could be used in exacting the character of instruction.

Dr. Frazer resigned on October 31, 1901 admitting there had been a lack of harmony with the Trustees as well as a conflict over the authority and responsibilities. Hence, Frazer, like Ruffner, ended his tenure on a rather unhappy note. While the Board minutes have nothing to say
about Ruffner's resignation, it seems probably that the internal faculty turmoil and jealously precipitated his retirement. Dr. Frazer, on the other hand, insisted that the reason for his resignation be recorded in the minutes. The explanation for his leaving the position after only a four year stay had to do with a conflict of authority. When extra money was found in the treasury, the Steward, not the President, was allowed to decide how it would be spent. He also was allowed to revise an original list of improvements suggested by the President without consultation. Yet, the President was considered to be fully accountable for all interests of the normal school. Frazer protested being given this responsibility without the corresponding authority; whereupon the Board resolved that all employees should be under the direction of the President. The Board's tardiness in designating to the President proper powers merely brought to a climax a steadily mounting series of disagreements which are clearly inferentially present although not specific in statement.

TRUSTEES

Among the Trustees serving the State Normal School from 1887-1901 were found individuals possessing not only prestige but also for the most part, very thorough
educational backgrounds. In 1901, the Board was headed by Robert Turnbull from Lawrenceville, Virginia who was a lawyer, a former State senator, and a member of the Constitutional Convention of Virginia for 1901. He had taken the Bachelor of Law after attending the University of Virginia. Dr. James Nelson was an original member of the Board. He held the M.A. and D.D. degrees from Columbia University in Washington, D.C. He had served as a pastor and as president of the Woman's College in Richmond, Virginia. Judge Asa Watkins had been a member of the House and the Senate in Virginia. He served on the Board of Trustees of Hampden-Sydney and on the Board of Visitors of the Negro Normal and Industrial Institute at Petersburg. Joseph D. Eggleston was a graduate of Hampden-Sydney and had served as a teacher, principal, and superintendent. Thornton S. Wilson served as President of Cluster Springs Academy. W. L. Wilson was president of Washington and Lee University.\(^2\)\(^9\)\(^8\)

These men were among those who served on the Board during the administrations of Cunningham and Frazer. Their own personal association with schools, colleges, and governmental affairs provided them with insight and knowledge about the future directions for the normal school.
Under the Board's leadership, the Legislature provided additional dormitory space,299 a new science building, a heating plant,300 and a gymnasium.301 With reference to the completion of the projects, Dr. Frazer noted in his annual report, "the school will be well equipped with modern educational appliances. This will be notably true as to the gymnasium and laboratories of chemistry, physics, biology and psychology."302

Likewise, the Board was supportive of changes in the course of study. In 1895, it approved the following:

insertion of an additional optional term at the end of the compulsory academic course and before the beginning of the professional department, thus enabling those who show special aptitude in the departments named to pursue them further without having to go elsewhere or to break in on academic work by the pursuit of that in pedagogic training.303

In 1895, the Board approved the creation of a Department of Modern Languages and also accepted the President's recommendation to have each student pay $3.00 annually for the use of books (one dollar of which was refundable).304 Two years later in 1897, approval was given for a complete rearrangement of the course of study into three separate tracks—English, Scientific, and Classical.305
FACULTY

Internal discord caused acute problems for the faculty at the close of the 1886-87 session. Miss Celesta Parrish, a graduate of the Farmville School, was appointed to an instructional position for the 1885-86 term. Dr. Ruffner depended upon her as a competent teacher and a willing assistant. Her increased responsibilities and favor with Dr. Ruffner caused tension with the vice-principal and created some academic jealousy among other members of the faculty. Subsequently, the principal, vice-principal, and three teachers resigned in the spring of 1887. The office of vice-principal was abolished and only three teachers who had been previously connected with the normal school were on the scene when John Cunningham became president. On July 20, 1887, the Board appointed three teachers, a principal for the preparatory school, a principal for the model school, and an assistant for the model school.

In the next several years the faculty changed gradually and in the incidental kinds of ways which could be expected for reasons of health, personal reasons, and new opportunities. Miss Parrish, for example, resigned in 1893. The reason according to James M. Grainger was that:

She became so well inducted into the new science underlying the progressive education of the day that when Randolph-Macon Woman's
College was established in 1893 she was called as a member of its first faculty to teach psychology and to set up the first psychological laboratory in the South. Later called to the State Teachers College at Athens, Georgia, her services to the cause of education became so distinguished that she was formally honored by act of the legislature as the South's leading woman and educator.

Miss Parrish must have gained many of her ideas for establishing and conducting practice schools from her years at the Farmville Normal. She was especially supportive of rural education and this was clearly a need to which she had been exposed. In her own words she stated, "one of the most necessary factors was a practice school in connection with the pedagogical work of the State Normal School, the practice school to be itself an example of the working of the forces which were needed in the country schools".310 She also insisted upon art, music, literature, history, elementary science, industrial education, and gardening. All of these were a part of the Farmville institution. The school had made provisions for the first four from its beginning, industrial education was begun after Dr. Cunningham assumed the presidency311 and pictures of the gardens kept by the practice school give evidence that this was an early part of the program at Farmville.312
Though Miss Parrish's resignation was a loss to the normal school, the Board of Trustees chose its teachers carefully and "showed no embargo on foresight. The Harvard Annex-Vassar, Oswego and the Peabody College at Nashville and our very own Virginia Schools have each been called upon to furnish teachers". The result was a faculty which had experiences drawn from various schools in the north, west, and south. In the year 1893 alone, one teacher was from the Harvard Annex, one had done graduate studies at the University of Virginia, one was from Cambridge, Massachusetts, and two were from the State Normal School.

It was not uncommon for teachers to resign in order to pursue further studies or travel abroad. In 1893, the teacher of physics and chemistry continued her study furlough to do scientific work in Boston. In 1896, the drawing teacher was given a year to study in the North. In June, 1897, the Board granted a leave of absence for another to study in accordance with the "habit for some years". One faculty member who had returned from studying at Cornell suggested to other faculty members a method of helping students with planned review which she had learned and which was believed to aid retention.

The faculty maintained an ongoing interest in student progress and a meeting was seldom held in which student progress was not a matter of primary concern. Cases
were handled on an individual basis before the entire faculty. Students were advised to drop courses in order to spend more time in other areas, to repeat certain courses, to take only professional work, etc. The faculty met on February 7, 1894 and "the entire time of this meeting was occupied in the consideration of special cases and assignment of work for them." Meeting again on February 19, 1894, the faculty considered the effect of class size on instruction. The C class had fifty-one members and was determined to be too large to be handled effectively; therefore, it was divided for mathematics, object drawing, science, and history.

A member of the class of 1890 referred to the faculty as "grand teachers" and a 1894 graduate declared, "Our faculty was an outstanding one". She described Miss Parrish in particular as "a wizard at a math" who knew the ability of each of her students and expected them to fulfill their potential. While these may have been nostalgic reminiscences, Miss Parrish did indeed prove herself to be an outstanding teacher in Virginia and beyond. Similarly, Miss Gaines who came to the normal school in 1889 from Vassar built for herself a remarkable reputation as a scholar. She taught in Farmville three years before going to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to study for two years. She then became the chair of the Department of
Biology at Adelphi College in Brooklyn. She remained at Adelphi twenty-two years and spent her summers studying at the Universities of Chicago, Cornell, and Columbia.\textsuperscript{328} She established an enviable reputation as a scholar, teacher, and lecturer.\textsuperscript{329}

It can be concluded that during the years from 1884-1887, much time and effort were directed toward attracting students, getting the mechanics of operation in place, and dealing with the growing pains which accompanied the establishment years. The controversy which erupted between Ruffner and the faculty created a life-threatening situation for the institution when the Trustees accepted the resignation of the vice-principal, three faculty members, and eventually that of the principal himself. It was, therefore, a challenge for the Board of Trustees to find an administrator who could enter the turbulence and bring a cessation of factionalism but who could also move the school forward in its mission as a teacher training institution. For this task, John Atkinson Cunningham was a wise choice as his ten year tenure proved. He had a vision of what the institution even in its small beginning could become. He worked as a scholar and as a caring administrator to see the vision become a reality. The enrollment grew gradually,
the faculty gained an element of stability, and the course of study was extended. Perhaps, his greatest single contribution was his ability to see that the course of study which was inaugurated with the school had rapidly become obsolete. He was able to outline a program for the school, secure the support of his faculty and the Board, and then implement it. In this way, Dr. Cunningham showed his concern for equipping the school's graduates for the public needs which they were to meet. He was determined to see teaching become a genuine profession. "To make this School, worthy of the patronage of the people of Virginia, and the School in which their daughters could be educated as teachers was the desire and aim of his life."330

Dr. Robert Frazer was also dedicated to the idea of professionalization but his approach was more direct and his style was less collegial than Cunningham's. He established policies and moved headlong toward their accomplishment. In carrying out these policies, "he found it necessary to take a stand which might be misunderstood"331 but he was willing to do so rather than "to seek the easy path when a matter so vital as the proper training of young people was at stake".332 However, under his leadership, the enrollment increased and the faculty enlarged. New departments were created and new facilities were built. He did not gain the
popularity which Dr. Cunningham had enjoyed with the Board, the faculty, or the students. He served as President for a term of only four years from February, 1898 until January, 1902 but he did assist the school in moving dramatically toward a more professionalized mode by additions to the curriculum and especially by the creation of a Department of Education. The faculty gave evidence of interest in travel and of considerable desire to continually further their own professional knowledge. Some evidence exists that the normal school employed its own most able graduates as assistants or ultimately as teachers. There is also evidence that teachers were attracted to the normal school from several of the most prestigious universities in the country. However, little information is available concerning the actual faculty qualifications in terms of degrees, prior experience, and the nature of their individual educational preparation.

The personal interest of the faculty in self-improvement and their unflattering interest in the student gives credence to the idea that they were serious in their attempts to professionalize teaching.
Characteristic 2. School-Community (1887-1901)

Normal schools were closely related to the public schools and to the public at large. (Harper, p. 115.)

The catalogs for the State Normal School, beginning in 1884 and continuing to the turn of century, consistently carried introductory remarks concerning the March 1884 legislation which established the State Female Normal School at Farmville for the express purpose of training white female teachers. "Nothing was more fully demonstrated than that...some provision must be made for a reliable source of supply for teachers fitted by education and training for their work." Public concern and support were shown for the school's purposes by means of state appropriations and contributions from the Peabody Fund.

In less than sixteen years after its establishment, more than two thousand students had matriculated and approximately four hundred had graduated from the teacher training program. Those who graduated as well as those who left before graduation "carried to the different sections of the State some knowledge of the methods and aims of the School. There is hardly a county or city in the State where one of its graduates may not be found, and no
section where its influence is not felt. From all quarters come the most gratifying assurances of the excellence of the work, and of the high esteem in which it is held."

In its public notices, the normal school was careful to point out its accountability to public education. The main objective was specified as fitting students to teach by emphases upon the following aims:

1. provide thorough knowledge in the common school branches
2. instruct in the knowledge of processes involved in learning
3. afford methodology a place of primary importance
4. offer opportunities for students to observe and to teach
5. insist upon the highest qualities of character and personal integrity.

By virtue of the legislative stipulations which accompanied the establishment of the school, students were accepted in the interest of the public welfare. Those coming as representatives selected to fill the quotas of the various school divisions were entered on State account, meaning they paid no tuition or other school fees. They were required, however, to give a pledge to teach two years in the State. Yet, the demand for teachers remained far above what the normal school was able to supply. The
president reported in 1893 that even though every section of
the state had students enrolled at the school, some counties
had not sent any representatives. Nevertheless, the
school was reported to be making a real impact upon public
education in the Commonwealth. "The influence of the school
is beginning to be felt in every corner of the state."340

In the Biennial Report (1897-1899), fifty-eight
counties and nine cities were represented, forty-two
counties and nine cities were not represented for the
'97-'98 session. For '98-'99 session, representation had
increased to sixty-seven counties and ten cities.341 This
continued confidence in the school was shown by a steady
increase in enrollment throughout the developmental period.
Attendance in the normal school increased from slightly over
one hundred in 1884 to slightly more than three hundred in
1901. The practice school enrollment went from fourteen to
one hundred plus in the same time period. Similarly, the
Legislature showed the same confidence by making
appropriations which permitted property purchases and
allowed for physical expansion, renovation, and
maintenance, as well as the acquisition of laboratory
apparatus and library improvements.342

212

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The General Assembly had designated fifteen thousand dollars for building in 1888, the annual appropriation for 1892 was twelve thousand dollars, and for 1894, it was fifteen thousand dollars.\textsuperscript{344} This represented substantial state support considering the fact that the original annual appropriation for the establishment of school in 1884 had only been ten thousand dollars. The generosity of the Legislature and the aid of one to two thousand dollars annually from the Peabody Fund allowed the institution to increase curricular offerings, extend laboratory sciences, purchase equipment, and form respectable-size library holdings. As a result of the liberality in funds, the school was able to do "work comparable to that of the leading progressive normal schools of the country".\textsuperscript{345} In 1896, the president reported, "With enlarged courses, increased facilities, and large increase in the number in attendance, the school is now doing an excellent work for the State".\textsuperscript{346} The annual report for 1900 stated that the school had become so highly esteemed throughout the State that it was receiving far more applications for teachers than it was able to accommodate.\textsuperscript{347} According to the Virginia School Report, "public school superintendents in every section of Virginia bear willing testimony to the eminently satisfactory work of the graduates of this institution in our public schools; and many of the best
private schools in the State are employing the graduates of the State Female Normal School to give instruction, especially in the elementary and primary grades".  

The 1898-99 Normal School Catalog solicited the cooperation of superintendents not only in filling their state quotas but also in recommending only fully qualified persons for admission to the normal training program. The president in turn offered his services and encouraged superintendents to contact him regarding special needs for good teachers. He used a type of placement service called the Virginia Normal League organized for the purpose of promoting "the efficiency of the public schools in Virginia". There were two major arms of this organization. The Aid Fund was responsible for handling contributions given to provide loans, without interest, to worthy students who wanted to teach. The Education Bureau served as the communication vehicle between students and schools needing teachers. It aimed "to recommend only such as were believed to be thoroughly qualified for the work contemplated and in all respects trustworthy". County superintendents and others needing good teachers were encouraged to apply.
Lucy Wright Jones, who graduated from the State Normal School in 1899 credited Mrs. Emma Richardson Geddy, an '87 graduate of the institution, as being an excellent teacher who "influenced and prepared me for the Normal School".352 Trustees, like teachers, helped to create good will and close relations between the school and the public at large. Lucy Irvine, who entered the normal school in 1890 explained that Dr. Nelson (a member of the Board of Trustees) visited the high school which she attended and "told us of a State School in Farmville...especially for those who desired to teach."353

The president of the normal school had a major influence upon the relationship between the public and the institution. Dr. Cunningham, as the chief administrator of the school, earned a great deal of personal respect for himself and also the State Normal School. Dr. Richard McIlwaine, President of Hampden-Sydney, said, "The Faculty of Hampden-Sydney College entertained the highest opinions of President John A. Cunningham. His success in the conduct of the Normal School at Farmville has been phenomenal..."354
In a resolution by the town council, Dr. Cunningham was acknowledged as "a business man always ready, and most willing to aid in the advancement of the material welfare of the town...no man could have become more thoroughly identified with our people". He was declared to have few equals in the execution of his responsibilities as the president of a normal school. "Under his management the State Female Normal School was destined to become the equal of any institution founded for the purpose of giving practical and useful education to women, and to train them as teachers of public schools."

The close association between the State and school can also be seen in an incident recollected by Mary Fitzhugh. "When Governor McKinney arrived in Farmville in 1894, Dr. Cunningham took the faculty and entire student body to the theater and when he entered, we arose and gave the school cheer three times as a tribute to him. He stood a moment, and then said, 'I am too full to speak,' and sat down." The emotion of this occasion serves to illustrate the mutual respect which existed between the State, its representatives and the normal school.
In summary, it can be noted that more than two thousand students matriculated during the first decade and a half of the normal school operation. Many of these came for brief periods of instruction and left without graduating. However, the knowledge gained from the professional exposure of whatever length was soon carried to virtually every part of the State. Since most students pledged themselves to teach in exchange for free tuition, Virginia had a reasonably reliable, if not adequate, source of professionally trained teachers. The quota system permitted students to be drawn proportionally from all parts of the State. They would subsequently likewise return as teachers to all parts of the State. During the developmental years from 1887-1901, the influence of the normal school spread and more counties and cities began to send their quota of students to the institution. Within the years from 1884-1901, the normal school enrollment tripled, the practice school enrollment went from only fourteen to more than a hundred, property was purchased, and physical facilities and equipment were enlarged. Support from the State, as well as from the Peabody Fund, made it possible to increase curricular offerings and provide improvements in various instructionally related aspects of the school's program.
The State and the normal school worked cooperatively to enroll the best qualified students and to meet the demands of public school superintendents in securing good teachers for special needs. To assist with this objective, the normal school utilized the Virginia Normal League as a communication vehicle to aid with efficiency in teacher placement.

The institutional image which the public held of the State Female Normal School was cultivated primarily by informal methods and personal contacts. Graduates of the school influenced other students to attend, while Trustees worked to publicize the school's advantages. Dr. Cunningham was an especially well respected administrator who used his influence to attract public attention. Even the Governor, as the State's most important representative, maintained intimate contact with the normal school.

The relationship between the normal school and the State resulted in very little autonomy for the normal school. By public decree, its sole purpose for existence was to train teachers. Furthermore, the school had little to say about who would be admitted––this was largely determined by the quota system. The school was not in a position to decide upon instructional fees because this was primarily handled by State provision for free tuition as a barter arrangement for two years of public service as a
teacher. However, the legislative quota system worked effectively in terms of drawing students from all parts of the state and subsequently returning trained teachers to supply the public education demands. Though the normal school was unable to meet the demand for the number of qualified teachers needed, it did build a reputation for itself which was felt throughout Virginia and even beyond.

As the normal school proved itself and began to gain more public favor, the Legislature became more willing to provide the necessary funds for programs and facilities. As a result, the school was able to provide more thorough training. The more thoroughly trained teachers became an asset in the extension of public trust and in the influence they had on pupils. Teachers, trained at the normal school, served as publicity agents via example.

Representatives of the school, whether the association was the result of graduation, administration, governance, or in other capacities, had a great deal of effect upon public opinion at both the local and state level. The normal school in this way remained close to the public. It drew students from the public schools, trained them to teach, and then returned them to their community with the commission that they were not only to teach but to improve the general quality of public life.
Characteristic 3. In-Service Education (1887-1901)

The teacher institutes became a valuable agency for in-service training....(Harper p. 116-117.)

William Henry Ruffner encouraged summer normal institutes from his earliest days as State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Rockbridge County hosted several such summer programs during the 1870's. In 1880, summer training for white teachers was held at the University of Virginia and for black teachers at Lynchburg. The 1880 sessions are notable because of the emphasis upon training teachers in the best methods for teaching those branches of instruction significant to public schools.358 The 1880 sessions are looked upon as landmark events because, they represented "the first organized state-wide effort to give an opportunity for training the teachers for the public schools".359

During the 1890's under John E. Massey as State Superintendent, teacher training in summer institutes was heavily emphasized. From 1890 to 1894, the institutes were financed by the Peabody Fund, local appropriations, and in a few cases by tuition charges.360 However, a legislative act of 1894 made the establishment and maintenance of summer normal schools a state obligation. As approved, the summer normals were to do the following:
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receive state funding
familiarize teachers with advanced methods
and provide other academic training
be under the management of the board of
education
last a minimum of four weeks
go into effect immediately.\textsuperscript{361}

This acceptance of responsibility for summer
training was significant because it gave recognition to the
need for public responsibility toward the vast number of
teachers who were employed without collegiate, normal, or
other professional preparation for the task. It was also an
important step because it created an organized link between
the summer institutes and the public school system. To
further this connection, a graded course of instruction and
a prescribed course in reading were formulated.\textsuperscript{362} To avoid
the tendency for schools to become bogged down in
theoretical discussions without full practical implications,
the State Superintendent attempted to create uniformity in
the summer normals, thus:

Each school was divided into sections and
regular class recitations were made a leading
feature. Correct methods of teaching were
exemplified in the work of the instructors.
It was suggested that evening lectures on
educational topics be made a feature of each
school. These lectures were designed to
awaken in the community an interest in public
education, and to give teachers a glimpse of that broader culture so essential to the highest success in teaching.363

An outline of the course of instruction to be included in the summer normals was presented in the Report of the State Superintendent for 1894-95 and included reading, language, arithmetic, geography, United States History, physiology, spelling and diction, drawing, theory and practice of teaching.364 A schedule was also given for the program of work.365 (See Appendix E.)

The normals were considered to be advantageous in permitting opportunities for teachers to come together for professional sharing and learning; in promoting professional pride through exposure to new ideas and people; and in providing a chance for improvement and growth.366

A summer institute was held at the State Normal School in 1886. This was noted in the Faculty Minutes of that year and a copy of the daily schedule was also attached. After this 1886 session, there is no other available information about the State Normal School having any further connection with summer institutes until 1889. According to Minutes of the Executive Committee for 1890, the 1889-90 session had been very successful both because of increased enrollment and better prepared students.367 These improvements were attributed primarily to the fact that four
of the normal school teachers had taught in three different locations (Lynchburg, Winchester and Floyd Courthouse) during the summer. Thus, it was reported:

Working in widely-separated sections of the State, the school through its representatives, became more generally known. Another cause of the increased attendance was the fact that personal letters were addressed to each county and city superintendent of schools, urging their cooperation in obtaining students and in making the methods and objects of the school known. For the first time in history of the school it was systematically advertised in the press.368

In 1893, it was noted that during the past two summers, nearly all of the normal school faculty had attended the Peabody Institutes.369 On April 18, 1895, the Executive Committee agreed to permit the classrooms and assembly hall to be opened "for four weeks beginning July 9 for the use of a Teacher's Institute".370 Records indicate that such an institute was held at Farmville during the Summer of 1895 with two hundred white teachers enrolled371 and again in 1896 with one hundred sixty-five enrolled.372

The 1896 school was conducted by the President of the State Normal School, John A. Cunningham. In addition to Dr. Cunningham who taught theory and practice of teaching, a graduate of the State Normal School taught language and reading, an assistant teacher at the normal school taught U. S. History and arithmetic and one of the school's regular
teachers taught drawing. The only person teaching in the institute who was not associated with the State Normal School was the teacher of geography and physiology, a Dr. D. M. Brown who was Superintendent of Petersburg City Schools.373

Roll call was carefully attended to on a daily basis but many visitors were reported who were "heartily welcomed" though not enrolled. Prior housing arrangements were made for those who requested enrollment so that they could be given boarding accommodations very near the school.374

The daily program followed a format outlined by the State Superintendent with slight modification in sectioning and time. There were three sections and the day began at eight o'clock in the morning and closed at one o'clock in the afternoon. By beginning thirty minutes early, it was possible to avoid some of the afternoon heat.375 On the evening of the first day, a welcome was delivered from a representative for the town of Farmville and subsequently lectures were given on 'Samuel Johnson and his Time' and on "hypnotism and kindred phenomena". The Attorney General was scheduled to speak but was not able to do so. The Farmville brass band entertained weekly as a measure of social attention from the town.376
Instruction was reported as follows:\textsuperscript{377}

Geography and Physiology—strictly the topics outlined in the course of study.

U. S. History—Civil War through the administration of Benjamin Harrison.

Arithmetic—least common multiple, greatest common divisor, common and decimal fractions, percentages, ratio and proportion, mental work and analysis.

Drawing—form work developed from type solids, cutting and making type solids, perspective.

Spelling—topical work, dictionary work, rules, vocabulary.

Language—followed course of study strictly.

Reading—practical primary work with model lessons.

Theory and Practice of Teaching—Three weeks work in psychology and one week in school organization and discipline.

The classes were designed to meet everyday needs and included daily recitations. The teachers were described as earnest and intelligent; the professional improvements were reported as significant.\textsuperscript{378}

The Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (1897-1899) bears testimony to a normal institute held at Farmville from July 5 to July 29, 1898.
According to the report, the school was divided into a Junior and Senior section. The classes were taught by a staff of eight teachers including the conductor. Approximately sixty school divisions were represented and were reported to be faithful and attentive—"seventy-five of them attended every lecture of the course, and more than one hundred and twenty-five were present at nearly every lecture". The courses taught included arithmetic, reading, English and literature (newly introduced to normal institutes), physiology, geography, history, drawing, theory and practice of teaching.

The entire purpose of the summer normals was to render special service to those teachers who were already staffing the public schools. The Farmville school participated regularly in these summer programs in recognition of the fact that the normal school had a mission to prepare professional teachers. This mission went beyond the campus and the regular academic year. It called for normal school instructors to be willing either to stay at home or to go elsewhere in order to provide training of a type which could only be offered in summer sessions.
It can be concluded that during the 1887-1901 period, teacher-institutes provided a valuable means for increasing professional competency. They gave teachers, who were often isolated from each other, an opportunity to assemble for study and professional exchange. Summer school was held at the State Normal School in 1886 but in 1889, some members of the faculty were invited to teach in institutes held in different parts of the State. Normal schools afforded a valuable source of expertise for summer institutes.

Although little information exists about the 1895 summer session, the 1896 and 1898 institutes held at the State Normal School were comprehensively described in the Reports of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. These reports show that the course of study, as designed by the State, was geared toward the subjects required in public schools. Practical application and improved methods were matters of prime concern. Lectures and general culture were not neglected but care was exercised to be sure the sessions did not become mere discourse, unrelated to the realities of classroom instructional needs.
Characteristic 4. Course of Study (1887-1901)

The concept of professionalized subject matter for teachers developed in normal schools. (Harper, p. 117.)

Admission to Study

The major aim of the normal school was to provide human resources for the benefit of society and not to simply assist the student in achieving personal goals or potential. The purpose was to make culture and learning available "not for the benefit of the student, but that it may be used in the education of the masses." Thus, students continued to be admitted to the State Normal School at Farmville as state students enrolled free of tuition on a pledge to teach a minimum of two years in the state schools. For those who chose the option, it was possible to come without being on State account; in which case, a fee of thirty dollars for the nine months session was charged. Minister's daughters and state students were not charged but they and all others seeking admission had to take the entrance examination. In 1887, the entrance examinations were routinely given in the local school divisions under the supervision of the county or city superintendent. Upon recommendation of the superintendent, the perspective
student was also examined after arriving in Farmville. This examination was given at the normal school to determine how well prepared the student was and to assign her to the proper class.385

There were two classes in the normal school proper in 1887. Candidates who wished to enter the first or Junior Class had to be examined in English grammar, arithmetic, (exclusive of cube roots and metric system), geography, and history of the United States. Furthermore, each applicant had to write a letter or a two-to-three page composition upon a topic assigned. Students, who wished to be admitted to a more advanced class had to pass the regular examination for the Junior Class and had to be tested on all subjects ordinarily studied in the Junior year. For students who had graduated from a school considered acceptable by the normal school faculty, probationary admission to the professional year without examination was allowed.386 It was not until 1910, that the State Board was requested to make up a list of approved high schools.387

Examinations were given on the first two days of the first term and on the two days immediately preceding the commencement of the second term. Those candidates not earning scores sufficiently high for admission to the regular normal school classes were allowed to enter preparatory classes in the School of Practice.388
By the 1889-90 session, the minimum literary qualifications for being admitted to the Junior Class were the following:

The ability to read fluently, to write a fair hand, to spell correctly, and to express thoughts in grammatical English, to solve problems of moderate difficulty under all the ordinary rules of arithmetic, and to demonstrate any ordinary arithmetical principle; to locate the principal cities, rivers, and mountains of the world, and to give the boundaries of any specified State of the Union; to analyze any ordinary English sentence and to correct ungrammatical English; to describe the leading events in the history of the United States.389

To secure uniformity in examinations, the principal was instructed to prepare questions and send them to the State Superintendent who would then send them to the county and city superintendents to be administered.390 Sample questions appeared in the catalog from 1889-1894.391 (See Appendix F.) In 1895, the catalog notified prospective students that for those desiring to do so, examinations in the above areas could be taken before leaving home and administered by the local superintendents.392 This was perhaps a move to lessen some of the anxiety associated with the examinations. Mary Louise Gayle of the Class of 1894 remembered the "entrance examination was a formidable experience for the 'new' girls."393
As presented in the catalogs, the only other requirements for admission dealt with age, character, and general ability. The minimum age for entrance was sixteen until the 1894-95 session when it was dropped to fifteen.\textsuperscript{394} There were also exceptions which could be made to the age requirement "in cases of precocity of mind, of unusual attainments, or of two sisters applying, one over, and the other a little under the standard age".\textsuperscript{395} The principal also had the privilege of refusing admission to "persons deemed too advanced in age."\textsuperscript{396} In addition to meeting the age requirement, applicants were to be in good health, have vigorous intellect and constitution, and be of strong personal character.\textsuperscript{397} These qualifications were established with the opening of the school in 1884 and continued throughout the developmental period (1887-1901).

The faculty had direct responsibility for giving examinations\textsuperscript{398} establishing passing scores\textsuperscript{399} determining the necessity of continuing to require entrance examinations,\textsuperscript{400} and deciding each term upon proper placement of students based upon the examinations.\textsuperscript{401} In 1897, the faculty began to consider the possibility of abolishing the preparatory professional class\textsuperscript{402} and decided in 1898 that Junior A class should be discontinued\textsuperscript{403}
For the 1898-99 session, students were admitted from fifty-eight counties and nine cities and in the session prior, seven out-of-state students were admitted. They came from Alabama, Mississippi, North Carolina, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania. Although the bill establishing the State Normal School only provided for a one hundred thirty state scholarships, more than two hundred were received free of tuition in 1898. The report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction stated: "It is now the policy of the institution to grant free tuition to all promising applicants who agree to teach in the public schools of the State."  

Of those who applied for admission to the 1896-97 session, Cunningham told the trustees he had advised some to go elsewhere because "it was evident that they were seeking a cheap school, and had no special aim in view such as those who are educated here by the state." However, those who were deemed worthy or who gave promise for becoming useful teachers were never turned away--"so as a rule, there are few pay students, the number receiving free tuition being considerably more than two hundred."  

The gradual increase in the admission requirements represented a move toward the professionalization of teaching. The preliminary testing and the refusal to accept
everyone who applied shows the normal school was interested in only allowing those who were able and serious about teaching to enter the profession.

Curriculum

The course of study as structured during the years 1884-1887 was quite simplistically designed around the common branches required by law for the public schools. The list of studies included language, mathematics, natural science, history, the arts, and teaching. Although an advanced course was planned in 1884, "the income of the school was not sufficient to make provision for more studies than those embraced in the elementary course". 408 Two years was the amount of time intended for program completion but a lack of preparation necessitated a longer stay for many students. Students could be admitted at the opening of the school year or in February. This meant there were two entering and two graduating classes each academic year. The lowest class was the D class, the next was the C class, then the B class, and the highest was the A class. 409
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Cunningham was elected principal of the school in July, 1887. For the first year of his administration, he proposed very few changes, "only such as it is hoped will materially add to the efficiency of the school in the direction of purely normal work". Though the course of study remained a two year program, the order and arrangement of some studies were changed to conserve labor. The work was "more evenly distributed and a definite fixed amount of work on each subject assigned to each term". The major change was in relationship to the School of Practice. Every class was required to take Methods and to observe or to teach. In previous years, observation and teaching had been required only of the A class but under the new plans, the D and C classes were required to observe the teaching done by the B and A classes. (See Appendix G.)

Under this plan, those who lacked the necessary proficiency for the normal department could receive needed instruction in the preparatory department at the upper levels of the School of Practice. The School of Practice contained the preparatory and the model schools. This 1887 scheme received the commendation of the United States Commissioner of Education who "described the school as divided into three departments: the normal or professional department; a well-taught primary and grammar school; and a
model school in which members of the senior class could observe and teach under the criticisms of an expert model school teacher.\textsuperscript{414}

The course of study of the School of Practice was described as being that of the "usual graded school" but modified as the "exigencies of the case require".\textsuperscript{415} The courses taught in the practice school were those required by law plus drawing and vocal music.

Students who were at least nineteen years old and who had already had teaching experience were allowed to take elective courses as advised by the principal. Those taking this "Special Courses" program could receive a Certificate of Proficiency in the studies undertaken but only those who completed the regular course could receive the degree "Licentiate of Teaching".\textsuperscript{416}

The faculty records state that "Somewhat radical changes connected with the School course were discussed"\textsuperscript{417} at a meeting on April 23, 1888. The changes involved dividing the classes into three divisions, Junior, Middle, Senior. Subject matter was to be the focus of the first two years and the senior year would be a professional year related primarily to methods and teaching.\textsuperscript{418} The Trustees' Minutes confirm that changes were made and by the 1889-90 session the course of study was extended to cover a period of three and one half years, the professional work being
assigned to a year of its own and all of the academic work including the preparatory department assigned to five terms of four and a half months each."

Based upon the sound pedagogical reasoning that teaching a lesson to children was more realistic than to teach adults who never have more than "a very unsuccessful play at being children", work in the practice school replaced the teaching exercise used in Dr. Ruffner's day. The 1888-89 session also allowed students to enter into any class for which they were prepared, whereas, previously everyone was required to enter the D class. This provision was given as an advantage for teachers with experience but who also wished to become more proficient. The Special Course was especially suited to their needs. Furthermore, those desiring to enter the professional course and who possessed the appropriate credentials of graduation from high school or "schools of high grade" could be exempt from the entrance examination. This was also an effort to establish "closer connection with the city school systems".

The regular course of study for 1888-89 was set up to cover a three year term but the lack of background on the part of many students held them there for more than three years. The plan as outlined devoted the first two years to subject matter. The first term of the third year was
devoted to methods (arithmetic, grammar, geography, reading), history and science of education, school economy, and school laws. The second term of the senior year was devoted to practice. The entire day was spent in the practice school. The sole emphasis was upon teaching and carefully conducted "critical discussion of the organization, instruction, and discipline of a school." Having the students spend the whole day in the practice school alleviated the interruption of academic classes which was necessary when only a few hours were spent each day in the practicum setting (see Appendix H).

The annual report for 1889 indicated the curriculum as outlined the previous years was being followed with a few modifications for those classes which were in the process of transition to the new three year program. The academic work of the first two years was comparable to that done in the best secondary school. In the senior year, students were presenting lessons on a daily basis, usually by repeating lessons which they had observed from their teachers.

The only change of consequence for the academic course in 1889-90 was the extension of the planned program to seven terms instead of six. The first term spent in the normal department was referred to as the E class. The Junior year was made up of two terms, as were the so called
Middle year and Senior year.\textsuperscript{426} It should be noted that the E class resulted from abolishing the preparatory department and moving it to the normal department.\textsuperscript{427} This was reported to have had good moral effect on the students.\textsuperscript{428} The course work for the last three years remained unchanged and that of the E class included:

1. A five month's rapid review of
   - English Grammar
   - Arithmetic
   - United State History
   - Geography

2. Instruction in
   - Free hand drawing
   - Vocal Music
   - Elementary Physics

The complete course of study for the E class and the regular three years of work were laid out in a tabular arrangement.\textsuperscript{429} Verbal descriptions of each course were given as well as the names of textbooks when they were required for courses. Textbooks were rented at a charge of two dollars per year.\textsuperscript{430}

The 1890 annual report acknowledged advances made in the course of study but admitted that "we have not reached a point where we can offer to the young women of the State such a course of instruction as is offered by the best
Normal schools in the North and West\textsuperscript{431}. The course in Latin was said to be inadequate and there were no courses in German or French.

Scholarship was reported to have reached a stage of more satisfactory assessment via short written tests "given at intervals of several weeks\textsuperscript{432}" rather than by intermediate and final examination. The tests were generally unannounced to avoid cramming and also to reduce anxiety. The students were less nervous as they became aware that "no single test was decisive of promotion\textsuperscript{433}". An examination of the catalogs reveals that the course of study stayed fairly unchanged during 1891-92 but German was recommended as an optional course in addition to the Latin\textsuperscript{434}. Programs in industrial work which included dress-making, stenography, and typing were also added\textsuperscript{435} as a result of a recommendation from the Committee on Instruction. The need to have such instruction incorporated and to do so without impairing the existing course of study was strongly emphasized. Emphasis was placed upon "the necessity of thorough training in the subjects which constitute the fundamental elements of education\textsuperscript{436}". The industrial course was listed in the 1893-94 catalog as a requirement in the Junior year and then it became one of three possible electives (Latin or German or industrial work) during the Middle Year\textsuperscript{437} (See Appendix I\textsuperscript{438}).
In a statement from the Board of Trustees in 1893, it was established that no further additions would be made to the course of study until the teaching force could be enlarged. However, the following adjustments in the curriculum were made:

1. A Department of Mathematics would be so designated.

2. Different classes in arithmetic would be distributed among the teachers in order to be sure students received thorough and accurate instruction.

3. Astronomy would become a part of the Physics Department.

4. Physical Culture would be substituted for elocution for all classes beyond the E level and become a part of the Department of Music.

By the 1894-95 session, industrial work was included in the course of study as part of the first, second, and Junior years. The first year, formerly the E class, focused upon dress making only, the second year, formerly the middle year, on shorthand, the the third year, formerly the Junior year, allowed for instruction in both shorthand and typewriting. The course of study by 1893-94 had become extensive enough to require "an academic course covering three years and a professional course of one year." It was still possible for students to stay for a period much shorter than four years. Students were enrolled in the
class which most nearly complemented their previous background of studies. The annual report for 1894 described the entrance process thusly:

A number review the studies of the common schools in the first year course; a larger number enter the second half of that year's work, beginning with algebra, Latin, etc.; a few enter still further on in the academic course and graduates of high schools in many cases begin with the fourth year or professional work, graduating in one year.

The admission of students to the professional year upon high school graduation proved to be very satisfactory. A statement from the Board of Trustees said, "The result of opening to graduates of high schools admission to the senior year has been in every way favorable beyond expectation." The 1895-96 session maintained the same course of study as followed in the previous session. (See Appendix J.) In March, 1895, the faculty considered the question of "whether the course should remain a curriculum one or be elective. It was decided to continue the present course and insert a new class of elective academic work". This recommendation was accepted by the Board in June, 1895. The course of study was arranged to permit additional work for those desiring it in mathematics, physics, chemistry, history, and Latin. This was to be activated by the following plan:
insertion of an additional optional term at the end of the compulsory academic course and before the beginning of the Professional Department, thus enabling those who show special aptitudes in the department named to pursue them further without having to go elsewhere or to break in on academic work by the pursuit of that in pedagogic training.

On February 22, 1897, the faculty decided that because proper time could not be allowed in the then existing curriculum for thorough study of any given area, it would be wise to have the course of study rearranged on a classical, scientific, and normal basis. To implement the plan, change would begin with the Second A class in the first term of 1897-98.

The revised course of study still required only three years for the normal course but it extended to four years the amount of time required for the completion of either the classical or the scientific course. The new guidelines allotted forty-five minutes per recitation period and suggested that the preparation time spent outside the class average about fifteen hours per week. A three-choice course of study, including the number of recitations per week, was recommended by Dr. Cunningham but his death in 1897 left the actual implementation of the
program to his successor, Dr. Frazer. The course of study which remained unchanged throughout Frazer's administration is given in Appendix K.450

Based upon the curricular revisions suggested by the faculty on February 22, 1897 for the course of study to include a classical, scientific, and normal provision, it was further recommended that the diploma, Licentiate of Teaching, no longer be granted. In its place would be four separate diploma programs, including one for those who entered in the professional program. Thus, on March 15, 1897, the faculty voted to have a normal, a scientific, a classical, and a professional diploma.451 The professional diploma was to be given to those finishing the Normal program and to those high school graduates who met the professional requirements and special course requirements. Those completing the scientific or classical program would receive the full graduate diploma. Both of these diplomas allowed exemption from examination at the hands of the county or city superintendent and licensed the individual without re-examination for five and seven years respectively. In spite of the advantages of the revised program of studies, convincing students of the necessity for devoting another year to study was not easy. Fannie Talbot Littleton, an instructor, wrote an article for the 1901 Yearbook describing the course of study and the
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contributions which it could make toward the professionalization of teaching. An excerpt from her description may be found in Appendix L.

Grading and Testing

The matter of testing was a continuous issue from the beginning of the normal school in 1884 throughout the developmental period 1887-1901. Dr. Cunningham used his 1889 annual report as an opportunity to discuss his views on examinations. He admitted their value for review but he purported that they should "be conducted in a way less burdensome, less tedious, and more just and satisfactory than heretofore." He further suggested that the school should be following the methods used at Oswego and Vassar. Cunningham reiterated the words used by the Committee on Instruction when the school opened in 1884:

Time will be saved in our schools in the matter of intermediate and final examinations, the principal believing that these protracted and exhausting examinations are unnecessary and injurious. If after daily meetings for a term or a session we have not ascertained the scholarship and conduct of a girl, we certainly will not find it out by putting her on a rack for a week or two and torturing her body and soul for six to ten hours in the examination-room.
In November, 1890, the faculty agreed that "any teacher wishing to give a test to any class should first notify all teachers having that class that day in order that no class have more than one test a day."\textsuperscript{436}

In 1890, the principal met with the faculty to hear their views about how tests were handled the past term. It was concluded that tests should be valued at no more than one-half of the term's work.\textsuperscript{437} The marking criteria were established as:\textsuperscript{438}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
Excellent & 90 and above \\
Good & 80 to 90 \\
Passable & 75 to 80 \\
Bad & 60 and below \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

This was replaced in 1892, by the following guide for final grading:\textsuperscript{439}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
99% - the very best work \\
85% - a work justifying future omission under all circumstances \\
80% - a good average \\
75% - showing sufficient ability to do work of next grade \\
60% - showing unquestioned inability to do more advanced work \\
50% and under - utter and complete unfitness for work of next higher grade \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
It was further determined in 1894 that seventy-five was the lowest acceptable overall average for promotion or graduation and sixty-five in any one study would demand repetition of that subject even if the general average for the term should be seventy-five percent. Grades were reported to the pupils four times during the term plus the final grade at the end of the term.

Students frequently complained of being overworked as is shown by frequent mention in the faculty minutes. By October, 1894, having a regularly scheduled test day for each class had become the accepted mode of handling tests. In December, 1894, faculty were asked not to increase tests and written work over the weekends or during the last month of the term. Likewise, on April 8, 1895, the principal "urged a minimum of tests from now until the end of the year." Perhaps as a measure of combating too many tests, the faculty were informed that they would not be given paper for tests more than once a month.
Though tests were a much debated subject, the faculty was firm in its commitment to high standards. For the 1895-96 sessions, the following plan was agreed to:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
90 - 100 & \text{Very good} \\
80 - 90 & \text{Good} \\
75 - 80 & \text{Fair} \\
65 - 75 & \text{Poor} \\
60 \text{ and below} & \text{Unsatisfactory}
\end{array}
\]

By agreement of the faculty "no person showing ignorance of subject matter shall be given a pass mark." Each student had to maintain a minimum average of at least seventy-five in each subject except art where sixty-five was determined to be the passing mark. Students were informed at the end of each month about their status in all classes and each teacher was expected to return written work to the students with errors marked.

There was a tremendous amount of concern over penmanship, spelling, and English. A committee was established to develop a plan for correcting bad penmanship because of a faculty decision of 1895 which stated: "A diploma will not be granted to anyone whose penmanship is not good." Special classes were designed to offer such remedial work as was necessary in penmanship and later a decision was made in 1899 to offer other remedial classes.
in spelling and English. Students were graded in English in every class and had to make an overall grade of seventy-five. It was also deemed wise to have seniors serve as tutors for the first year students who were experiencing academic difficulty.

Seniors also had academic problems. A faculty decision made in 1899, which stated that pupils who failed examinations would not be allowed to retake them and would therefore have to repeat, prompted the Seniors to ask for permission to have lights turned on by six o'clock each morning. They also petitioned the faculty to lighten their loads. A Committee on Senior Work was appointed and it was decided that some accommodations in schedule should be made. This was done by dropping a meeting or two of specified classes during the week.

President Frazer asked the faculty not to use the lecture system unless absolutely necessary and to also be discreet in the amount of research required. He requested the work load expected of students be kept within limits.
The State Normal School had a library from its first year of operation. In 1884, it was basically a reference room to which publishing houses donated books. In 1887, the director of the Reading Room reported she had secured the materials deemed necessary and had six dollars remaining with which she would purchase pictures for the Reading Room. The Reading Room received daily and weekly papers, plus twenty leading American and English scientific and literary magazines. Educational journals were given due prominence and students were required to make themselves familiar with the professional literature of the day.

The library rules for 1891 were as follows:

1. The bookcases shall be kept locked.
2. The person serving as librarian shall spend at least thirty minutes daily giving books to those desiring them.
3. Name of person taking books shall be recorded.
4. A book shall be kept no longer than a week.
5. Memorandum book to be recorded in ink and left in the bookcase.
6. Each teacher shall serve as librarian for a week at a time and she shall be responsible for accounting for all books.
7. Newspapers and magazines shall not be taken out of the library.
The catalog of 1896-97 stated that the library was not large but was growing. It was highly valued by all departments but especially by literature classes which regularly prescribed library work. It had a rather large holding of material about American history and was continuously adding books and magazines in other areas as well. In 1887, the library subscribed to thirty professional magazines and papers.

In addition to what the library could provide, students were required to bring a personal dictionary with them when they entered school. They were also expected to rent the necessary textbooks for a fee of two dollars per academic year. (see Appendix M.) Those who had books at home were encouraged to bring them with them to school. Many students, however, had very few books. For this reason, the library came to be a prized resource as is evident by the regular library section included in each issue of the Normal Record. In 1897, there was much excitement about enlarging the library facilities and moving into less crowded space. In 1898, the war was the all-absorbing issue and the library was more widely used than ever before. "The daily papers are worn to frazzles, and there is a mad rush to the reading room every
among suggested reading sources at that time ever The Nation, Public Opinion, The Pathfinder, The Outlook, Harper's Weekly and Scribners. In summary, it can be noted that the requirements of age, character, health, general intellect, and personal integrity were established with the school and remained constant throughout the years 1887-1901. Academic requirements for admission, however, became more rigorous. Dr. Ruffner had been fearful of frightening students away by testing. They were therefore required to do little more than a bit of penmanship in order to gain entrance. This began to change when Dr. Cunningham became principal. Students had to be examined in subject matter in order to be allowed to enter either the Junior or Senior years. Those not being proficient enough were placed in preparatory classes. Those who were high school graduates were exempt from the examinations but they were permitted to enter a class on probationary status only. Admission was in the hands of the faculty in large part but with prohibitions since the State had already determined the process for state accounts and since it was at the discretion of the principal, to waive requirements as he deemed necessary. Students were admitted free even in excess of the number.
allotted by the state because the demand for trained teachers outdistanced supply. Out-of-state students were also received at the normal school for the 1897-98 session.

At the beginning of Cunningham's administration, the curriculum as designed gave basic instruction in those subjects required by law to be taught in the public schools. There were two classes entering each academic year, although completion time from admission to graduation depended upon the stage of preparedness at the time of entrance.

Curriculum was one of Cunningham's major professional concerns. He immediately secured an extension of the amount of observation and practice time required in the School of Practice. By 1888, the entire program had been radically altered. Three class divisions were used and subject matter became the primary consideration for the first two years while methods and instruction directly related to teaching, and actual work in the classroom became the focus of the senior or professional year. By 1889, the preparatory department was abolished and the normal school offered seven terms of work.

Scholarship in the normal school continued to improve as high schools of good quality became a more regular part of the public school program. Graduates of approved high schools were able to take only the professional year if they proved themselves sufficiently
able to handle its demands. However, a lack of an adequate number of faculty members hampered both the quality of instruction and adequacy of course offerings.

By 1895, the faculty, under Cunningham's leadership, began considering drastic revisions in the course of study. Initially, provision was made for optional work by those who desired to take more academic work in a given field. However, by 1897, the faculty agreed that the course of instruction needed diversification and thus classical, scientific and normal curricula were designed. This plan as implemented by President Frazer in 1897, remained unaltered during his term of office.

Testing remained an unsettled issue throughout the period from 1886-1901. Various plans were attempted in an effort not to overwork students but still to be able to assess their performance adequately and insure professional competency. Though some compromise was made, the faculty maintained a staunch and unchanging attitude about the quality of work. The final word was simply that passing marks must be earned before a diploma could be granted and that passing marks would only be given for meritorious performance. This imposed professional standards upon the curriculum.
The normal school established a library in 1884. It was considered a working asset and was continually enlarged by the addition of magazines and books. Students were expected to read professional journals regularly, as well as to use the library as a professional resource for all areas of study.
Characteristic 5: Model School (1887-1901)

There was a tendency to emphasize laboratory experiences in model or practice schools. (Harper, p. 118.)

The model school was an integral part of the State Normal School from the date of the institution's establishment. It was considered by the faculty, students, and administration to be essential to a thorough teacher education program. Because of a lack of sufficient prior educational background, some of the students enrolled at the State Normal School were put into the model school program during its first year of operation (1884-85). For this reason the upper level of the model school came to be called the preparatory school. It was preparatory in the sense that those completing its requirements would then be eligible for admission into the normal training program proper. However, the purpose of the model school was intended to be that of providing a place for members of the Senior class to observe and practice teaching skills. Therefore, the preparatory nature of the school somewhat hindered the original plan. Yet, the lower grades were populated primarily by local children and this provided some limited experience in actually working with young children during the first two sessions.
The Ruffner administration succeeded in getting the model school established on a cooperative basis with the town of Farmville. When Cunningham was chosen as principal in 1887, the preparatory school was made a part of the regular normal school. At that time the model school contained only Farmville children under ten years of age. Under Cunningham, both the preparatory and model school were housed with the normal school proper.494

The normal school organizational scheme was described in a circular of 1887 as having three departments—the "Normal or professional department, proper; the Preparatory school which is simply a well-taught primary and grammar school; and a model school, which is a school of children under ten years, who are instructed and trained by an expert Model School Teacher."495

Cunningham proposed that the model school should be a place which exhibited "the most approved methods of teaching, for the special benefit of the Senior class of the Normal department. The students of this class should attend school in sections, and there observe and teach, and receive practice instruction and criticism from the Principal of the School."496 By action of the Executive Committee, the term Practice School began to be used in 1887.497 It was determined that there should be two major objectives for this practice school; one being that which Cunningham had
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stated for the model school and the other being that of providing the preparation needed to enable those with deficiencies to become adequately equipped for admission into the normal department. Thus, the preparatory school which had been separated from the model school was united with it to form the School of Practice.498

During Cunningham's first year as principal of the school, course work was reviewed and the School of Practice was formed "in an endeavor to more sharply define academic and professional work. Pupil teachers were required to do large amounts of teaching and the Organization was made more nearly to resemble that of teaching normal schools in the North and West."499 The arrangement of the school into primary and grammar grades gave the normal school students an opportunity to observe at the six different grade levels. It also permitted those who could not pass the entrance examination to make-up their deficiencies through preparatory work; hence, they could become eligible for later admission to the regular normal department.500

Cunningham believed strongly in the idea behind the Practice School. He felt normal school students should be required to observe and teach on a continuous basis as they progressed through the program. During Ruffner's administration, only second term seniors had been required
to teach but this was changed to include first term students as well. Students were thus required to observe almost daily but only to teach every five weeks.\textsuperscript{301}

Students were expected to teach those courses regularly taught in public schools. The course of study for the practice school was listed in 1889 simply as:\textsuperscript{302}

- Arithmetic (completed)
- Penmanship
- Geography (completed)
- United States History
- Language
- Grammar
- Reading
- Drawing
- Vocal Music

The work done by the normal school student prior to her Senior year corresponded "to the work done in the best secondary schools."\textsuperscript{303} However, in the senior year methods of teaching the primary and elementary subjects were taught and students were required to give actual lessons. The development of mental faculties in reference to each subject was heavily emphasized. Psychology as related to teaching and the history of education were also given high priority during the senior year.\textsuperscript{304}

Cunningham in his annual report for 1890-91, explained how the Model School was used.

The classes of the model school are taught entirely by members of the Senior class, under the direction of competent critic
teachers and the Principal of the Model School, who are responsible for the planning and preparation of lessons given by the normal students as well as for the general order of the classes. The normal students in their work as teachers are freely criticized, advised and encouraged.505

The faculty at regular meetings discussed the performance of individual students with reference to both course work and professional performance in the model school. Students judged unable to teach or inadequately prepared were either given additional work or not permitted to graduate, depending upon potential as judged by the faculty. Those possessing strengths were encouraged and some were advised to take more advanced work.506

An example of the type of encouragement given to a young pupil-teacher has been recorded by an 1899 graduate. She recalled what she felt was a very feeble attempt at teaching the scales to a group of the model school children. Her clear recollections of the music supervisor's comments are summed up in these words.507

I'll never forget what that little piece of paper said. It read 'Lucy, I wish to commend the excellent way in which you are presenting the scales to these young people.'

This experience, she claimed, gave her professional confidence for the rest of her life so that she was never again unwilling to try to do anything that was reasonable.
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The normal school deemed intense supervision of pupil teachers to be a matter of extreme importance, recognizing that "without close and intelligent supervision much harm might be done to the children taught in the school of practice".\textsuperscript{308} Noting the success of schools in the North and West, Cunningham felt that under proper administration that the school of practice afforded the best and soundest pedagogical strategy for normal school utilization.

There was little apparent apprehension on the part of those in the Farmville community about sending their children to be taught by the pupil-teachers. The annual report of October 1, 1892 noted that the number in the practice department was only ninety but "it might have been increased because urgent requests were made to have an additional grade formed."\textsuperscript{309} Subsequently, the catalog for the 1892-93 session showed forty-six students enrolled in the preparatory department (grades 7-12) and fifty-five in the model school (grades 1-6) making a total of one hundred one students in the practice school.\textsuperscript{310} Both boys and girls were allowed to attend the model school but no boys were allowed to enroll in the upper division course since this was considered to be a preparatory division for the female normal school.\textsuperscript{311}
After Fraser became president of the normal school in 1897, he established a Department of Education and the chairman of the department was also made the director of the practice school.\textsuperscript{512} During the period 1897-1901, the character of the work in the practice school became more clearly delineated. The usual subjects required by law to be taught in public schools were described, in addition to which were given the names of text books used and materials needed.\textsuperscript{513} Beyond, the legal course requirements, the practice school also had classes in vocal music, drawing, and physics.\textsuperscript{514}

The normal school catalog for 1897-98 described the work of practice teaching as "the most valuable term in the entire course".\textsuperscript{515} The seniors were afforded the chance "to put into practice the principles and methods they had learned, and to manifest their natural aptitude to teach".\textsuperscript{516}

In review, it is noteworthy that the State Normal School at Farmville made provision for having a laboratory school from its beginning in 1884. This was intended to provide experiences in which the normal school students could observe model lessons being taught to primary and grammar school students and also where they could practice
their own teaching skills. However, a great number of the students who entered the normal school were unable to undertake the regular normal course of instruction because of a low level of prior preparation. The laboratory school, therefore, became a dual purpose agency serving as a preparatory school and a model school where students could have an opportunity to teach as well as to observe.

In order to give thorough preparation for teaching in the public schools, the practice school in its course of study carried all of the courses required by law for a public school plus some extra studies such as drawing and music. Normal school students were given little more than a high school education before the Senior year. In the final or professional year, attention was directed toward methodology, psychology, history of education, and classroom experience.

Supervision was closely given to students during their practice-teaching experiences. Lessons were routinely critiqued to provide encouragement, as well as suggestions. The practice experience was regarded as the most valuable part of the normal school preparation and care was taken to see that the students in the practice school were well taught and that normal school students taught well. The practice school served as a professional proving ground.
where students had an opportunity to implement what they had learned while simultaneously having recourse to professional support and assistance as needed.
Characteristic 6. Extra-Curriculum (1887-1901)

Activities formerly considered extra-curricular came to be considered important as part of the teacher preparation program. (Harper, p. 119.)

From its opening in 1884, the normal school considered drawing and vocal music important parts of the curriculum. In addition to the subjects demanded by law, these were required "in order that pupil-teachers may have some practice in teaching these subjects also." By 1885-86, provision was made for those desiring to take individual piano lessons at a charge of thirty dollars per session to do so. An addition to the catalog had this to say about instrumental music in 1890, "For this study, no provision is made in the curriculum of the School." This was changed to read, For this study, "no provision is made in the school, nor are students allowed to pursue it and at the same time undertake the full work of their classes." In June, 1899, the president recommended that the Board establish a department of instrumental music. However, this was not done and as late as 1921, the catalog carried the statement: "No instrumental music is taught in the school."
With reference to physical education, the Committee on Grounds and Buildings suggested in 1888 that a gymnasium and playground be added to the school as soon as possible. In the meantime, it was recommended that calisthenics be insisted upon. These exercises were described as "not too violent and are always attractive if suitably taught". By 1890, the catalog stated calisthenics should be "taught to the whole student ten months, each day" and instructions were also given for appropriate dress. A blouse-waist which would allow freedom of movement was to be worn.

By 1893, the course of study included physical culture. Classes were scheduled to meet three times a week for bodily exercises intended to develop grace, "produce symmetrical growth", and to correct physical defects caused by the inaction by poor digestion, or weak nerves. Over time, physical training had become a recognized part of the curriculum and in 1899, the Board adopted a recommendation from the president to pursue plans to erect a gymnasium. A graduate of the class of 1899 recalled her athletic opportunities related mainly to calisthenics, poor tennis courts, and a place to play croquet. The yearbooks for 1898 and 1899 make reference to both tennis clubs and bicycle clubs.
Attention continued to be directed toward literary and speaking opportunities which were extra-curricular in nature. An early attempt was made to have some type of school literary publication. The Faculty Minutes of 1896 mention the "Greeting" as a Daughters of Virginia Society paper which was to be replaced by the Normal Record, a magazine issued quarterly and edited by the faculty. This became a cooperative endeavor involving graduates of the school, pupils, and faculty.

A student in the nineties remembered the school paper and the literary societies well. "Friday nights were usually given over to the two rival literary societies. Students were called upon to read original short stories and the audience would judge the merits. She recollected one which she had written in Edgar Allan Poe style that was judged meritorious. "It was published in the school paper [Normal Record]. I was very proud to see my name in print." Among the most outstanding events at the normal school from 1896-99 were the school paper, the first annual, the beginning of the YWCA, and the founding of three sororities. The annual began in 1898 and was known as the Normal Light. It was not intended just to be a "picture book" and therefore it permitted student contributions, class histories, biographies of important figures associated with the normal school, etc.
As an outgrowth of the emphasis upon elocution as prescribed in the course of study, students were regularly called upon for delivering "Quotations" in the assembly hall before students and faculty. These were practiced thoroughly before presentation and failure to practice resulted in a reprimand from the president.336 Likewise debating societies staged regular performances on current events, historical issues and special subjects to give students an opportunity to gain confidence before an audience.337 The selection of essays for rendition at Commencement was a big annual event. Faculty selected the essays to be presented and then assisted with practice for delivery.338

Penmanship was included in the curriculum as a part of regular requirements but because of continued poor performance by students, remedial work became a part of the extra-curriculum, under the title "Supplementary Class in Art".339 The faculty made a decision that "a diploma will not be granted to anyone whose penmanship is not good".340 Pupils were to be given extra sessions in the special class designed for the purpose and they were also to spend time practicing on the blackboard.341

The heretofore extra curricular activities were designed primarily to improve the instructional expertise of those planning to teach. However, of the five major aims of
the school carried in the institutional catalogs throughout the developmental period 1887-1901, four related to instructional preparation specifically but the fifth dealt with character and integrity. No extra curricular program was more geared to this aim than the Young Women's Christian Association. This organization quickly became the most popular organization of the school. It was started in May, 1896 and by 1899, about one hundred students were already members.\textsuperscript{542} The YWCA encouraged Bible study, Christian work, prayer meeting attendance, and social gatherings of the students. The catalog for the 1897-98 session explained the importance of the Young Women's Christian Association thusly.\textsuperscript{543}

The departments of Christian work are encouraged because it is believed the best teaching demands in the teacher the development of a high type of Christian womanhood. The School endeavors to hold up in its teaching and discipline a high moral standard, and to create an atmosphere of earnestness; for it is esteemed to be not the least important mission of the institution to send out young women equipped with the steady purpose to perform well and faithfully all the duties that lie before them—a holy purpose to make the most of themselves that they may do most for others.
In a brief review, it can be noted that from 1887-1901 vocal music was considered very important for elementary teachers. Therefore, it was included in the course of study at the normal school from the beginning. Music instruction was extended to include instrumental music as part of the curriculum by the end of the nineteenth century.

Students were also encouraged to exercise daily. This emphasis evolved into a planned exercise program and eventually into the inclusion of physical culture as part of the course of study. Athletic participation, though not discouraged, was not a major part of the extra-curricular program during the years 1887-1901.

Since reading, writing, and speaking were essential to the teacher preparation program, the normal school used every available opportunity for students to practice these skills before an audience. Assembly programs, commencement exercises, debate societies, and oral reading presentations were among the usual avenues for providing challenges in these areas. Similarly, journalism was encouraged by means of student publications, such as a school paper and an annual. Attention to correctness of writing was also a matter of grave concern. Thus, practice and remedial
sessions became a part of the extra-curricular attempt to address deficiencies which could threaten graduation or lessen professional competency.

No organization or activity at the normal school was as highly esteemed as the YWCA which offered character enhancement, moral development, and spiritual direction believed essential for one who would become a teacher.
Characteristic 7. Pragmatic Attitude (1887-1901)

Normal schools were established to meet certain public needs and they used the most expedient methods for meeting the challenges. (Harper, p. 120.)

The organizational efforts involved in getting the school started, dealing with inadequately prepared students, and battling administrative and faculty conflicts limited what could be done during the early years. By 1888, Cunningham, as head of the school, had come to grips with these issues and moved the school toward a more professionalized approach to teaching. In the annual report for 1888, Cunningham noted that it was no longer practical to continue the teaching exercise as used during the Ruffner administration. Once the practice school was firmly established, it was considered more important to give work in a setting involving children than to practice on adults.344

Alpheus Crosby, principal of the Salem Normal School, in noting the pragmatic posture typically adopted by normal schools said, "The particular course which was glory day before yesterday and wisdom yesterday, may be folly today, while it will be ruin tomorrow."345 This is well indicated by the example of the teaching exercise. The
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Staunton Vindicator in 1886 had lauded it as a superior means of allowing students an opportunity to practice their ability to teach.\textsuperscript{346} The catalog of 1884-85 said

the effect is almost magical, in rousing the faculties, in securing thoroughness of study, clearness of apprehension and of statement, and dignified manner. Every institution might introduce something of this sort with advantage to the scholarship and deportment of the students.\textsuperscript{347}

By 1888, however, Cunningham had determined that the teaching exercise "occupied too large a part of the time of the class, and became a serious obstacle to the progress of the class in the study of subject matter".\textsuperscript{348} This was a subject of debate among the faculty but it was concluded that it was not realistic for students "to assume the point of view of the teacher in a subject of which they have so far gotten an incomplete view only".\textsuperscript{349}

Originally, the normal school addressed the usual public school branches of study plus general attention to the actual process of teaching. In his first report to the state, Cunningham announced that practical preparation for the classroom necessitated more time being spent in the School of Practice and also more courses in methodology. He stated that "A complete course in methods is laid out, providing instruction in that subject for every class, and
every pupil is required at each stage of advancement either to observe or teach in the School of Practice and Observation".330 Heretofore, only second semester seniors had been required to observe or teach but when the preparatory and model schools were united every student was expected to teach and/or observe in the primary and grammar grades.331 In 1887 students were furnished with notebooks and required to record their classroom observations.332

In 1884, the catalog stressed that textbook use was minimized and oral lessons were given priority.333 "Books are used only for reference. In teaching the elementary principles of any study, no use whatsoever is made of a book".334 The 1889 annual report stated that the academic work of the first two years was done "by development, by lecture, and by use of textbooks. During the professional year, methods were taught primarily by lecture, but were supplemented by textbooks".335 President Frazer purported every student should own her own textbook.

The special courses were a totally pragmatic means for helping those unable to attend for a longer period to receive the essential professional studies to equip them to handle professional classroom responsibilities. These eclectic courses were designed especially to help those already having classroom experience.336 However, students were admitted to the normal school on a case-by-case
decision and were assigned to the appropriate class based upon what was known about earlier experiences and preparation.\textsuperscript{557} Thus, rather than following a strictly sequential program, the faculty made on-going decisions about what was best for each student. A few examples may be used to illustrate this. In January, 1895, the faculty decided to excuse from practice school teaching two students who had taught for a while in order to allow them more time to pursue studies in English.\textsuperscript{558} In January, one year previous, the faculty had decided to promote a student, who missed the cut off mark in her overall average by one point, "because of her age and the general excellence and faithfulness of her character."\textsuperscript{559} Another student was excused from part of the normally required work and allowed to take the work of two terms in one fall term during 1895.\textsuperscript{560} However, at the beginning of the next term, January, 1896, the faculty agreed that "no other students should hereafter" be permitted to take the work of two classes in one term.\textsuperscript{561}

Beginning in 1889, students who entered the normal school following high school graduation could be admitted directly into professional study. This generally was a one year program in pedagogical studies, certain common and higher branches studies, professional literature, and work in the model school.\textsuperscript{562}
The addition of particular courses to the curriculum also represented an awareness of public need and normal school adaptability. In 1892, physical geography was omitted in order to be able to enlarge courses in physics and chemistry,\textsuperscript{563} elocution was replaced by physical culture in 1893,\textsuperscript{564} and a course in industrial work including stenography, typing, and dressmaking was included in 1892-93.\textsuperscript{565} This course was established for the specific purpose of enabling the normal school "graduates to begin manual training in the schools under their charge".\textsuperscript{566} In a like manner, the normal school president in 1899 made a case for the commencement of a department of instrumental music by stressing its practical and cultural value. He called attention to the merits of such a program from a standpoint of both allowing teachers to supplement salaries and permitting country communities to have a trained professional who would otherwise not be available.\textsuperscript{567}

Changes in the length of training also reflected the pragmatic disposition of the normal school. In 1888, the faculty decided that for most students three, rather than the two years originally planned, would be needed for course completion in order to provide a sufficient balance of academic and professional instruction.\textsuperscript{568} Likewise, the practical demands for increased exposure to curricula other
than the normal studies, per se, led the faculty in 1897 to propose, under Dr. Cunningham's leadership, courses of study arranged on a classical, scientific and normal basis.  

With this increase in curricula also came four different diplomas—one for each of the three areas mentioned plus a professional diploma for those taking only the professional year. This lead to recognition by the State Board of Education and in August, 1890, the State Superintendent issued an announcement that "Graduates of the State Female Normal School are not Required to Pass an Examination for License to Teach". This made it unnecessary for local superintendents to examine those desiring certification if they had graduated from the State Normal School. This meant those graduates who completed the regular normal program would receive a professional diploma and a five year license while those who additionally completed either the scientific or classical program would receive a full graduate diploma and a seven year certificate. This provision helped to "extend the influence of the school and to increase its efficiency as a factor in the state system of public education."
It can be concluded that the normal school was a very adaptable institution. It quickly disposed of any idea or program which no longer served its purposes. The teaching exercise which was highly lauded in 1884 was dropped four years later because it was considered inefficient, obsolete, and unrealistic. In the 1884-1887 period, the public school branches received the major consideration but by 1884, practical preparation in teaching and methodology received first priority. Similarly, textbook use was minimized in 1884. By 1889, textbooks were considered to be an important part of the instructional process and within another ten years, Frazer advocated that textbooks were so fundamental that each student should purchase her own textbooks.

Special courses were another pragmatic feature of the normal school. These courses were designed to enable those already employed as teachers to enroll in the school for a brief time to receive at least minimal professional training. Individual programs were often handled on a case-by-case basis rather than by uniform standards. Since students entering the normal school often had very dissimilar backgrounds, the programs had to be kept flexible. This meant that the amount of time which each student remained at the normal school depended largely upon her previous educational experience.
Being the pragmatic institution that it was, the normal school maintained an alertness to public school needs, trends, and changes. Thus, as courses became less needful, they were replaced. As new areas gained popularity, they were incorporated into the curriculum. As academic exposure became more essential, the curriculum was broadened and differentiated diplomas were awarded. This willingness to do whatever was necessary to prepare students to take their places as competent teachers caused the State Normal School credentials to become highly regarded throughout the Commonwealth. Hence in 1890, its graduates could enter directly into professional roles without having to stand examination in order to be certified to teach.
Section III: The Years of Refinement and Change (1901 - 1924).
Characteristic 1. Administration and Faculty (1901–1924).

Under the influence of presidents and faculty (with trustee support), normal schools transformed teaching into a profession. (Harper, p. 113.)

The normal school at Farmville, like teacher-training institutions elsewhere, was basically a very isolated institution. It had no sister institutions until 1908 and very little opportunity to form professional contacts. It fit the almost universal pattern described by Richardson who said early teacher training institutions tended to be scattered, designed for special needs, and to have virtually no opportunity to share ideas and experiences. This, however began to change during the early 1900s as more public support was given to normal schools and as professional values became more internalized. Professional attitudes were fostered by the creation of state and national teachers organizations and by the publication of educational journals. Thus, teachers with professional training and professional affiliations quickly gained a pervasive influence.

Much of the credit for the professionalization of teaching belongs to the state normal schools. According to Charles Harper, normal schools transformed teaching into a profession largely through the efforts of presidents and
faculties who dedicated themselves to this end. Harper contends that normals created departments of education and produced much professional literature⁵⁷⁹ in an attempt to elevate teaching to what was believed to be its rightful place. At times this caused normal schools to glorify themselves and their own diversified ways of responding to local problems.⁵⁸⁰ The justification for this was summed up by William C. Bagley of Columbia, thusly:

It is in the ability of the individual to adapt himself to the community that he serves that the normal school graduate is superior to the college graduate, and that superiority is due...to the attitude of professionalism which the atmosphere of the normal school engenders, and to which every detail of its organization must contribute.⁵⁸¹

Presidents, faculties, and to a lesser extent the Trustees were obviously very important to the fostering of this professional attitude.

Joseph Leonard Jarman became the fourth president of the State Normal School at Farmville and continued to serve in that capacity until well after the school gave up its normal school status to become a full-fledged State Teachers College. In October, 1901, Robert Frazer turned in
his resignation, effective at the end of January, 1902. On January 7, 1902, the Board elected J. L. Jarman President of the normal school. \(^{582}\) Jarman assumed the official duties as president on February 1, 1902. \(^{583}\)

According to George Jeffers' diary of events for the 1901-02 session, Dr. Frazer relinquished the reins of presidential leadership with these words to the neophyte Jarman: "Young man, I am turning over to you a finished school—you have nothing to do." \(^{584}\) Jarman, however, was to see things a bit differently during his forty-four year tenure. Under his leadership the school expanded into a four-year accredited degree conferring college, the enrollment again nearly tripled, the physical plant expanded dramatically, and the program of studies became greatly diversified. \(^{585}\) Jarman saw his task" to be that of training wives and mothers but above all else he kept the institution "devoted to the task of training teachers". \(^{586}\)

When Jarman arrived in Farmville in 1902, he was thirty-four years old. He had attended public school in Charlottesville until he became orphaned at the age of fourteen. Subsequently, he went to the Miller Manual Training School in 1881 for five years. There it was his good fortune to win the Miller Scholarship which enabled him to enroll at the University of Virginia in 1886. At the
University, he studied natural and physical science. Upon completion of his program, he returned to Miller's to teach for one year before becoming chair of the Department of Natural Science at Emory and Henry. He held this position for twelve years (1890-1902) and left it to assume the presidency of Virginia's only school dedicated exclusively to teacher training, the State Normal School at Farmville. While at Farmville, a number of professional honors were bestowed upon him. Hampden-Sydney conferred upon him the honorary LL.D. degree in 1906; he served as a member of the State Board of Education from 1910-1928; and was later asked by the Governor to become State Superintendent of Public Instruction. He refused this position because of his dedication to the Farmville school. The institution to which Jarman was called in 1902 was small. It had only thirteen faculty members and the school offered only three years of academic or high school work plus one year of professional study. However, according to the Farmville Herald under Jarman's administration, "the college became one of the most outstanding teacher-training institutions in the nation". 
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Jarman was interested in his school, community, and state. He was extremely popular with the citizens of Farmville. He was made an "ex-officio member of the town council because he appeared so often to ask aid in the physical building of his college plant." As a community leader, he was very active in the Methodist Church; he was a leader in organizing plans to secure both a community hospital and a hotel for a town of Farmville; and he labored to support the War Fund, Red Cross, and Victory Bonds. He also worked diligently with other educators to organize Community Leagues (later Parent Teacher Associations) which sought to develop "the whole community around the school system."

At the state level, Dr. Jarman was accorded equal respect. He served not only as a member of the State Board of Education but also as president of the State Teachers Association (1917). He was admired for "the quality of his mind" and for "his remarkably sound judgment." Upon the occasion of his retirement, editors of both the Richmond Times Dispatch and the Richmond News Leader paid tribute to him. The latter had this to say:

Among those of us who have studied for many years the stirring and fascinating advance of public education in this Commonwealth, it became almost standard practice to ask in some hour of decision, "What does Jarman say?" No Virginia president of a State institution of higher education ever was
consulted more frequently by successive Superintendents of Public Instruction. They might differ in policy; they were consistent and unanimous in their recourse to this remarkable man."594

The Dispatch saluted Jarman this way:

In his pioneering task, Dr. Jarman evidenced judgment, vision, and a sound sense of values. He was acutely aware of the need for better trained school teachers in the State, and his work at Farmville brought that objective measurably nearer despite the lamentable dearth of funds in those early years, and the lack of widespread recognition of the vital necessity for adequate instruction in the schools.595

While in the prime of his presidency, his own school paid him a similar compliment. The Normal School Weekly said, "The history of the educational renaissance in Virginia which has taken place in the last thirty years is the history of the work of wise and courageous leaders, among whom Dr. Jarman ranks near the top."596

The first few years of his administration Jarman spent in learning about the institution, familiarizing himself with his job, and planning his work. A study of the Faculty Minutes and an analysis of the Trustee Minutes show evidence of little that was noteworthy other than the routine "hiring, retiring, leave-of-absence and promotion".597 However, the "May Campaign" of 1905 did much
to encourage Jarman and he gained influence as he and other prominent men went through the state addressing the need for educational improvements in Virginia.698 This agitation for the improvement of public schools led the Farmville school to "revise its course of study and increase its equipment and general facilities for teacher training."699 By the 1906-07 session, Dr. Jarman had thirty-six full time teachers600 almost triple the number of four years earlier.

Dr. Jarman was described as practical in his educational perspective. "He tolerated modern educational theories without doing much about them. He [was] distinguished for his educational philosophy, but he never let indulgence in theory lead to other than a critical attitude toward innovation."601 Furthermore, he was very much interested in what went on in the classrooms. "To him the problems of teaching were always practical, concrete, definite, and human—a constant check on the merely theoretical or philosophical."602

Dr. Jarman spread the reputation of the normal school throughout the state. He did more to give the school visibility through his public appearance than by writing. The Virginia Journal of Education records frequent attendance at meetings such as the National Education Association, Southern Education Association, the State Education Association, and conferences on Rural Education.
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Other activities in which Dr. Jarman engaged and which helped to elevate the professional recognition of the institution with which he was associated included:

State Director of the National Education Association.

Member of Board of Directors of the Southern Education Association.

Member of the Commission for the Management, Maintenance and Improvement of State Institutions.

Member of the State Board of Education for eight years.

President of the Normal Section of the Southern Education Association.

Member of the Education Commission of Virginia for four years.

Vice-President of the National Council of Normal School Presidents.

Acting President of the Association of Schools and Colleges for girls.603

According to George Jeffers, Dr. Jarman was very concerned about his school and about the state of Virginia. Jeffers said, "He really built a reputation for the school. Every principal felt if he could get one of Jarman's trainees, he would be in good shape. The normal school was "it" during the Jarman years."604 William N. Neff, of the State Board of Education, recalled the modest campus,
cramped facilities, limited curriculum and small student body which welcomed the thirty-four-year-old Jarman when he accepted the presidency.

Dr. Jarman brought to his new position the resources of his personality and the energy of his early manhood. He set about the task of building up the school both in its physical plant and equipment, and educational advantages. His success is evidenced by the size and quality of the institution which he left.... Building after building was erected and beauty and grace came to adorn its halls and colonnades. His charm and persuasiveness won the favor of successive groups of legislators before whom he appeared or who visited his school when preparing appropriations budgets. They gave him affectionate hearing and he received from them, not all that he wanted for his school, but a steady flow of funds which he used for continuous growth and improvement. The members of many finance and budget committees, including our present Governor, can bear witness to his pleasant persuasiveness.605

When Jarman arrived in January of the 1901-02 session, the State Normal School had a training program for students in the elementary school and a four year normal course. However, three of those four years were actually only the equivalent of secondary work. Although by 1916, the school was authorized as a four-year degree granting institution, there was only one year of education which represented actual college level study when Jarman became president.606 The development of the normal school under
Dr. Jarman was described as an "all-sided one". According to the school paper in 1920, the growth was rapid and steady.

In 1902 there were thirteen members of the Faculty, there are now forty, exclusive of student assistants; the enrollment was four hundred and forty-two, for the present session we have up to this time enrolled six hundred and forty-eight, then there are still the January entries to come in; the buildings have been remodeled and enlarged until practically nothing remains of the original; the Training School has grown to such an extent that it has been moved three times into larger quarters, and is now on a thoroughly up-to-date footing, with a director and supervisor for each grade; the Faculty has been reorganized on the Department System; the course of study has been improved and strengthened until it stands on a par with those of the best Normal Schools of the country; and the College Course has been added, which gives the Degree of Bachelor of Science in Education.607

Trustees

During the Jarman administration, the Board of Trustees devoted much attention to securing legislative support for the "purchase of additional buildings and other betterments."608 The betterments included the expansion of facilities, faculty, and staff. In June, 1904, they gave approval to the hiring of a secretary for the president.609 The person named to this position was Miss Jennie Tabb, the daughter of the poet-minister, Father John Bannister Tabb.
Miss Tabb would continue to serve in this position and also to assume the duties of registrar for the next thirty years.\textsuperscript{610}

The trustees dealt with a great number of matters related to the curriculum. In 1904, the professional course was extended by one year\textsuperscript{611} and changes were made in the course of study by combining the departments of English and reading, making geography one course and natural and biological sciences another.\textsuperscript{612} In that same year, kindergarten was established as a regular part of the training school program.\textsuperscript{613} In June 1906, a Department of Domestic Science was created\textsuperscript{614} and an additional year of study was recommended as an elective one for those desiring to teach high school. A committee was also set up to study the needs in rural education.\textsuperscript{615}

By 1907, the Board was giving more attention to extra-curricular activities and in June final approval was given to putting property into shape for an athletic field.\textsuperscript{616} Recognizing a need for larger cultural experiences for the students, the Board accepted a recommendation to create a fund for lyceum entertainment.\textsuperscript{617}
June, 1909 marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of the school and the president reported to the Board that "the school was in more flourishing condition than ever" and offered the following courses: academic, professional I, professional II, kindergarten, and elementary.

The health conditions at the school were always of major concern to the president who faithfully reported all epidemic situations to the Board. After several bouts of serious illnesses, the Board decided to secure a woman physician who would live in the dormitory, have some teaching duties, and "give her entire time to the students". In his next annual report to the Board, the president was able to report that she "has more than fulfilled our expectations".

The Board accepted routine responsibility for the hiring of faculty and the approval of salaries. It likewise accepted the president's reports on enrollment, graduates, and residential circumstances. From the commencement of the Jarman administration forward, the Board maintained an open, receptive manner of working with the president. The minutes indicate the Board showed little inclination to disagree with the recommendations made by President Jarman.

It is evident that over the years from 1884-1914, the Board became more interested in the curriculum as it related to the essential mission of the school, (see
Characteristic 4, Course of Study) and less involved with the details of daily operation. Prior to the May, 1913 meeting, the Board "ordered that as soon as practicable a course be outlined with reference to the preparation of teachers for high school". The Board received the proposed work for this preparation at the close of 1912-13 session. In January, 1914 the Board authorized a bill to go before the Legislature which would add "two years to the Course of study and change the name of the institution from State Female Normal School to State Normal College for Women". It was the intent of this bill to secure the right for the school to offer "four years of college work and confer degrees". The bill passed the Senate easily and was referred to the House but was never reported out of committee. Although, the school did become known as The State Normal School for Women at Farmville, it was not able to confer degrees until 1916.

The Board of Trustees of the State Female Normal School met for the last time on June 5, 1914. At that time, President Jarman said "The Board of Trustees deserves high praise for the manner in which they have administered the school for it has taken expert management to accomplish so much with the funds which have been supplied."
As a result of the heightened interest in public education, which resulted in large part from the May campaign of 1905, more public attention was focused on "the need for additional facilities for the training of teachers."\(^{628}\) The agreement on the need for additional normal schools resulted in an immediate disagreement on the best locations for them. "The locations actually selected, and the manner in which these selections were made constituted an excellent example of the social and political forces combining to generate educational policy in Virginia.\(^{629}\) However, after much political maneuvering, the Legislature selected Harrisonburg and Fredericksburg on March 14, 1908 as sites for new normal schools.\(^{630}\) Two years later on March 10, 1910, another school was approved to be located at Radford.\(^{631}\)

Each of the four normals was originally administered by its own Board of Trustees. However, the presence of four schools for the training of white female teachers soon made it necessary to centralize for purposes of economy and efficiency. Thus, in 1914 the Legislature abolished the four different boards of trustees and established instead the Virginia Normal School Board.\(^{632}\) The terms of the act as approved by the Governor in 1914, can be found in Appendix N.\(^{633}\)
The new board began its work on July 10, 1914 by meeting with the Governor for organizational purposes. The members of the first board, as appointed by the Governor, included Honorable Otto S. Mears, Merit T. Cooke, W. Clyde Locker, O. M. Shoemaker, Brock T. White, John W. Price, Alfred G. Preston, R. Shackleford, B. Davis, Wyatt King, R. C. Sternes (Superintendent of Public Instruction as an ex-officio member). Women were later appointed to the board, with Miss Belle Webb being the first in 1916.  

This Board held its organization meeting at the call of Governor Stuart in the office of the governor on July 10, 1914. The Board was organized according to a committee system. Committees of the members were appointed to be responsible for the various aspects of the administration of schools. Until this organization could be perfected the presidents of the institutions were authorized to discharge the administrative functions of the institutions. This was the beginning of a policy of freedom for the presidents in the administration of the schools. 

The Normal School Board held annual executive meetings in each of the four normal schools when the board made its customary visit. The president of the particular school being visited was always expected to be present in order to assist the Board in analyzing the needs of his particular school. The president of the institutions
also prepared an annual report to the Board in which he reported upon enrollment, health conditions, school improvements, personnel, and changes in the course of study.

According to the available minutes of the State Normal School Board, the centralized board spent much time dealing with financial considerations. In 1919, the state accountant was directed to "help the Presidents in the preparation of a budget...and to check up the accounts of the Normal Schools for the information of the Board."

The Board also approved any increase in fees for board, laundry, insurance premiums, etc. "There was considerable discussion of the Budget" in January, 1920, and it was decided that the president of each school should prepare a statement of needs and that these be put before the Legislature.

Faculty salaries were a major issue for the Normal School at Farmville. On May 20, 1919, a committee was created to prepare a report to the Virginia Normal School Board concerning the inadequacy of salaries and the subsequent professional effects. Dr. Jarman, in his annual report to the Virginia Normal School Board in 1919, noted that the present salaries made it impossible to maintain the high standards of training and experience in
the faculty that had existed heretofore. This matter, with a complete report from the committee, was also presented to the full Board at its July 22, 1919 meeting. On April 16, 1920, Dr. Jarman "outlined his plan for increase of salaries made possible by the increase granted by the Legislature above the amount provided in the Budget. He stated he was increasing the salaries of Heads of Departments 25% and that of the Supervisors, 12 1/2%".

As the authority moved from the local schools to a centralized board, the discussion became less focused on the specific problems of day-to-day operation and less concerned about individual school problems. An element of competition also began to surface soon after the creation of additional normal schools, as can be seen in a letter written by Harry F. Byrd to Governor Henry C. Stuart. Byrd felt individual Boards would have done more to lessen this jealousy than a general board could. Thus, Byrd wrote:

I deplore the jealousies and antagonisms now existing between some of the normal schools and a nearly complete lack of harmony and co-operation so necessary for the fullest measure of success, also the inclination on the part of some of the officials, not to advance for sane and conservative reasons of educational requirements but to endeavor to secure appropriations from the State more for
the pecuniary benefit of the communities in which the schools are located than to fill legitimate educational needs.⁶⁴⁸

Although the movement from the local board to the State Normal Board did make the trustees more impersonal, it did not divert attention from professionalization and upgrading of the individual institutions. In 1916, the Virginia Normal School Board secured legislative sanction which permitted each of the four schools to confer the Bachelor of Science degree. In 1924, the Executive Committee of the Virginia Normal School Board requested that the General Assembly change the names of the four state normal schools to State Teachers Colleges. They "cited the fact that the Normal Schools were already colleges in character of work done and in admission requirements; the B.S. degree was already being conferred by these schools...not only would more students be attracted, but they would be superior students, which would provide better staffs of instructors and raise the professional and social standards...".⁶⁴⁹
Faculty

Charles Harper notes that "much professional literature poured from presidents and faculties" of normal schools as they sought to develop a professional attitude. This was indeed true of those individuals who served at the Farmville school during the period 1901-1924. President Jarman wrote articles in The Virginia Journal of Education in an attempt to inform teachers about the State Educational Association. He also regularly wrote about the activities of the Farmville school in the "News Among the Colleges" column of the Journal. One of the best articles written by Jarman exemplifying the professional educator's views appeared in the May, 1919 issue of the Journal. In this article, Dr. Jarman pointed to the tremendous role played by the teacher in our country. Because his own faculty was being robbed of valuable people by those who could afford to pay better salaries and give them better positions, Jarman was especially concerned about the generally poor pay scales which plagued school divisions throughout the state. This condition, he reasoned, was largely due to the lack of training possessed by most of the teachers in the State. Being untrained, the majority of the teachers, said Jarman, "do not regard their work as a
profession, and consequently do not create in their communities a proper public sentiment with regard to the public school."

It was the normal school teachers, however, who really used their pens with effectiveness to give professional identity to teaching. A comprehensive but not exhaustive list of articles prepared by the Farmville faculty from 1908-1924 for publication in The Virginia Journal of Education can be found in Appendix O. There was also a considerable amount of publication in other sources in addition to the State journal. James M. Grainger published "A Refreshing Summer School", The Journal of Educational Method in January, 1922. W. F. Tidyman wrote "Reorganization of Courses in Education in the Normal School", Journal of Educational Method, March, 1922. W. F. Tidyman also wrote "Do Elementary School Pupils Know When They Make Mistakes in Spelling?" in School and Society, September 13, 1924.

Dr. Tidyman was an extensive writer and among his publications were two books on spelling. The Teaching of Spelling was "recognized as one of the best books, if not the best, on the subject". He also wrote Supervised Study Speller. Dr. W. C. Stone, whose dissertation, entitled "Arithmetical Abilities and Some Factors Determining Them" had been directed by E. L. Thorndike, was
also a prolific writer. Over his lifetime, he wrote many books and articles but his major contribution while at the normal school was directing the preparation of the Training School Course of Study. According to Boyd Coyner, this publication "was considered so significant by supervisors and other workers in education that copies were requested from every state in the nation. A number of times, Dr. Jarman remarked that this piece of work 'put the Normal School on the map'."636

Dr. Stone, a Thorndike student and a John Dewey disciple, was reported to be a brilliant man.657 His background and his accomplishments with the Training School Course of Study gave him wide recognition "as a national figure in Education".658 Stone continued to write extensively even after leaving Farmville.659

John Peter Wynne who joined the faculty late in the normal school period was a constant writer.660 During the normal school years, he wrote Syllabus in Education and General Psychology: Topics and Questions With Reading References for Guidance of Study and Discussion, Syllabus in the Principles of Educational Methods, Syllabus in the Principles of Educational Organization, Principles of Education for Beginning Teachers.661
The State Normal School at Farmville periodically issued *The Bulletin of the State Normal School for Women, Farmville, Virginia* to address special educational problems, questions, or needs. The first one issued was entitled *Educative Seat Work* by Fannie Dunn. It was followed by the cooperative efforts of the school staff to produce the following: *The Training School Course of Study: Spelling, I; Theory of Spelling Instruction, II; Types of Spelling Lessons; English in the Elementary Grades, I; A Course in English for the Grades II; Typical Lessons and Suggestions; English in the High School; and Principles of Supervision.*

According to James M. Grainger, Dr. Jarman deserved credit for seeking out and securing the "intelligent cooperation of a highly efficient and devoted faculty".562 Grainger lists the following among the truly outstanding teachers who taught at the normal school: J. Franklin Messenger, E. E. Jones, Fannie Littleton Cline, Dr. F. A. Millidge, Lula O. Andrews, C. W. Stone, Fannie Dunn, Raymond V. Long, Mary D. Pierce, J. Merritt Lear, Myrtle Grenels, W. F. Tidyman, Carrie Sutherlin, Bessie Randolph, Thomas Eason, and Samuel Duke.663 These names, Grainger said, were "sufficient guarantee of the finest type of educational service and the maintaining of the highest standards".664
The Farmville Herald also acknowledged the high caliber faculty which Jarman selected and repeated many of the same names listed by Grainger but also included others. Referring to Dr. Jarman, the editor of The Farmville Herald who had been closely associated with Jarman and his school said:

Under his administration the college became one of the outstanding teacher-training institutions in the nation. His faculty, small in number, was brilliant. Miss Lula Andrews, Miss Minnie Rice, Mr. Grainger, Miss Haliburton, Miss Fannie Wyche Dunn, Miss Mary D. Pierce, Miss Woodruff, Dr. Millidge are some of the names which linger in our memory.\textsuperscript{665}  

Helen Draper recalled that Estelle Smithey, a teacher of foreign language was "much in advance of her time, probably the first to establish the oral method in her State and among the first in her country. Her old cylinder recordings and direct method are the ancestors of today's modern laboratory".\textsuperscript{666} Miss Smithey was the first and for many years the only woman to complete the requirement for a degree from Randolph Macon College. She was an excellent student and while she was there she was chosen for Phi Beta Kappa.\textsuperscript{667}  

The faculty were extremely busy from 1908-1924 in providing services for local school divisions, attending state and national conferences, and serving as instructors
in summer schools. Though in service training and summer schools will be discussed later, a consideration of how teaching was being transformed into a profession also demands a look at the nature of some of the most important professional activities in which the teachers were engaged. Thus, on November 10, 1903, the normal school faculty agreed to join the State Teachers Association as they did annually in the years thereafter. By 1908, nearly one-third of the faculty subscribed to the Virginia Journal of Education. The faculty also routinely elected someone to represent them as a delegate to the State Education Association. They were also requested to join the National Education Association as well as the State Association. The teachers were encouraged by President Jarman to do all they possibly could to grow professionally. He provided numerous opportunities "for independent development and the exercise of free initiative on the part of the Faculty". This resulted in frequent requests for leaves-of-absence to study or to gain new educational experiences. For example, Martha Coulling who joined the Farmville faculty in 1886 as an art teacher and who would remain for six decades "attended no less than ten different schools" during her tenure. She also taught at other institutions during the summer.
The purpose of these educational excursions was to get the necessary experiences for meeting the expanding art needs of the college at Farmville. So a very elementary course in public school drawing with which Miss Coulling began in 1886 was, in the years following supplemented by the offering of some thirty courses covering almost every field of art practice and appreciation useful to the public school teacher.\(^{674}\)

The Trustee's Minutes and the School News in *The Virginia Journal* carried regular statements concerning leaves and study opportunities. The July, 1912 issue of *The Journal* said, "The members of the Faculty are broadly scattered...many will work in the Summer Schools and others will take courses themselves".\(^{675}\) They were listed as being in places throughout the state, the South, Indiana, and New York. Among the most often chosen institutions for additional study were Columbia, Peabody, and Cornell.

The normal school faculty traveled rather widely during the Jarman administration. In 1909, Dr. Stone, Director of the Training School, visited a normal school in the Middle West where he learned how to better coordinate work between the Head of the Department and Supervisors.\(^{676}\) In a similar visit made in 1916 by S. P. Duke, Director of the Training School, to schools at Terra Haute, Indiana; Charleston, Illinois; Normal, Illinois; and the University of Chicago, suggestions were sought for the new four year course of study that was being formulated at Farmville.
Duke declared "the character of the work done in the Farmville Normal School compares very favorably with that of the large and wealthy normal schools of the Middle West." Teachers in the various disciplines also availed themselves of opportunities to add to their subject or departmental expertise. The English Department sent faculty to the National Council of the Teachers of English, Art to the Eastern Arts Association, the Rural Department to the Rural Education Conferences, and the Modern Languages to The Association of Modern Language Teachers of the Central West and South. Miss Smithey was elected vice-president of this organization in 1921.

Dr. Jarman was very regular in his attendance at meetings of the Southern Educational Association and the National Educational Association. At these he was usually accompanied by one or more of the faculty. He also attended the National Council of Normal School Presidents each year. In 1918, he returned to his faculty to tell them the Council had determined that normal school teachers should be expected to give forty-four, sixty minute hours per week to the institution. This council was very interested in curriculum matters and in 1920, it analyzed the work being done in geography in the various normal schools throughout the country. "Thirty-four schools submitted syllabi of their courses for the preparation of teachers of geography,
and the first place was awarded the school at Wayne, Nebraska; while the second was given to Farmville, Virginia.  

The state had established three additional normals between the years 1908-1910. According to a resolution honoring Dr. Jarman, the State Board of Education noted:

As President of the only State-supported institution of higher learning for women he encouraged the establishment of other State institutions for the education of women; and as a member of the State Board of Education at a time when the public expressed little interest in the support of public education he was always among those who sought to promote the welfare of the State through the improvement of public schools.

Since the Farmville school had been in existence for nearly twenty-five years before the new schools were added, it was looked to as the leader and "became a model for the new ones." President E. H. Russell of Fredericksburg and his business manager made a two day visit to the school in 1912 in order to study conditions in every department.

The quality of the faculty steadily improved under Dr. Jarman until its instructors became widely respected throughout the state and beyond. When Jarman assumed the presidency in 1902, there were only two instructors holding doctorates: L. W. Kline had a Ph.D. from Clark and B. W. Arnold had a Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins. Edith Cheatam had an
A.M. from Randolph-Macon Woman's College and Fannie Littleton had a B.S. from Cornell. Jarman himself only held a bachelors degree from the University of Virginia. The remaining seven were without degrees, although Miss Smithey had completed her studies for the bachelors from Randolph Macon.688

By 1908 when other normal schools were beginning to be added to the state system, the Farmville faculty had grown from thirteen to thirty-seven. There were five earned doctorates held by Stone, Messenger, Millidge, Kerlin, and Kite who was an M.D. from the University of Virginia and served as an instructor in Biology. Stone's doctorate was from Columbia, Messenger's from Columbia, Millidge's from Leipsic and Kerlin's from Yale. Jarman held a LL.D. from Hampden-Sydney. There were two master's degrees and six bachelors. The other two-thirds of faculty were without degrees.689 During the 1923-24 session, which was the last in the normal school era, there was only one earned doctorate held by Tidyman who was the Director of the Training School. There were ten master's degrees, fourteen bachelors, and seventeen with no degree.690

Prior to Jarman's administration, having more than a normal school Licentiate of Teaching was hardly considered necessary. However, as public schools advanced, as high schools became more common, and as colleges became more
widely sought, the importance of a degree increased. The addition of other normal schools to the state system had a paradoxical effect. The need for better prepared normal instructors was intensified but simultaneously the competition made it harder to secure and maintain such personnel. This matter was made worse by the fact that salaries were very low. The Farmville faculty addressed the salary issue in a letter to the Virginia Normal School Board in 1919. The letter expressed lament for the loss of able instructors who had left the normal school to assume more lucrative offers. The following paragraph from the letter summarizes the situation.  

There was genuine regret on the part of the President and their colleagues at the loss of the men and women ..., for we felt that the children of Virginia should be trained by as competent instructors as those of any state. And because we realize the importance to the state of the work being done here it seems to us very unfortunate and unfair that other state institutions are able to select those they wish from our faculty because of their ability to pay better salaries.

Grainger remarked that to be a member of the faculty at Farmville was "equivalent to being trained for educational leadership." Boyd Coyner's listing of some of the outstanding attainments which were later secured by those who had served at the Farmville school gives validity to this statement.
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Bessie Carter Randolph, associate professor of history 1916-20, became president of Hollins College; Samuel Page Duke, head of department of education 1914-18, became president of Madison College, Virginia; Carrie Sutherlin became president of both Arlington Hall Junior College, Virginia and Chevy Chase Junior College, Maryland. Others left to become deans, department heads, and faculty members elsewhere, and mention will be made of a few of them and where they went: Miss Celestia Parrish, one of the early professors of mathematics, went to Randolph-Macon Woman's College and later Adelphia College; Dr. Elmer E. Jones, professor of education, went to Indiana University and later to Northwestern where he was director of the school of education; Dr. C. W. Stone, head of the education department, went to the State College of Washington; Miss Lula O. Andrews, head of the English department, went to George Peabody College for Teachers; Dr. J. Franklin Messenger, instructor in education and psychology, became dean of the schools of education at both the University of Vermont and the University of Idaho; Dr. Thomas E. Eason, professor of biology, took a position with the State Department of Education; Dr. W. F. Tidyman, head of the education department, went to Fresno State College, California; Dr. Raymond V. Long, professor of education, went to the State Department of Education; Dr. Fannie Wyche Dunn, supervisor in the training school and later head of the rural education department, went to Columbia University; Mr. J. M. Lear, head of the history department, went to the University of North Carolina; and Dr. Thomas R. Garth, assistant professor of education, went to the University of Texas and later to the University of Denver. President Jarman often remarked that he would train good teachers and then another institution would offer them a higher salary and away they would go.693
In summary, it can be noted that J. L. Jarman came to the State Normal School at Farmville as a well grounded academician. Though he possessed only a single degree until the honorary doctorate was conferred upon him by Hampden-Sydney College in 1906, he had served as a professor at Emory and Henry for twelve years. He had a vision for the normal school which led him to achieve advances in the course of study, increase enrollment, and expand facilities. His dignity of manner, resourceful planning, and determination to hold standards high caused him to become a respected leader of his school, community, and state. His pragmatic approach to education left him unruffled by the shifts in educational philosophies. His primary concern was that of preparing students academically and personally to meet professional responsibilities and to become worthy members of a democratic society.

When Jarman became president of the normal school in January of 1902, the school was under the authority of its own local board. This board maintained a close working relationship with the school and especially with the president. There was a great deal of interest in changes in the course of study, in local needs, and in extra curricular activities. However, as other schools were added to the state normal school system, it became necessary to abolish the local boards and to institute a state board. This
board, of necessity, was caught up in the more pervasive problems of funding, efficiency and economy of operation. Nevertheless, it was concerned about advancing professionalization and saw to it that the four schools were allowed to grant a bachelors' degree and that they ultimately were recognized as colleges rather than normals.

The members of the faculty at Farmville were professionally very active from the 1901-02 session through 1923-24. They were spending much of their energy in writing and working directly with the public schools. With the encouragement of their president, they became associated with national, regional, state, and local professional associations. They won statewide acclaim for themselves, their work and their institutions. In some cases, the work done at Farmville was outstanding enough to draw attention from a national perspective.

The coming of additional normal schools to the state allowed the Farmville school to serve as an established and worthy model. However, market competition for able faculty tended to rob the Farmville school of many of its truly superior instructors.
Characteristic 2. School Community (1901-1924)

Normal schools were closely related to the public schools and to the public at large. (Harper, p. 115.)

In briefly tracing the purpose of the school from its beginning to 1932, President Jarman said, "Our aim is to send out our young teachers, not only with a good college education, but with a realization of the fact that they are to count for something in the communities to which they go and that they are responsible for more than the textbook in their classroom". In order to foster this attitude, the normal school emphasized the need for students to acquire skills which would make them valuable as leaders in their schools and in their larger communities. Thus, activities were designed to provide for the physical, moral and spiritual preparation as well as the intellectual. Hence, the president wrote:

Courses are offered for the training of Sunday school teachers and leaders in community life; students are impressed with the idea that they owe something to the community in which they teach, as well as to the children in the schoolroom, and that they are to live wisely and prudently with due regard to the people with whom they work, so they can have their sympathy and co-operation in any enterprise and interest the teacher may wish to foster in the community.
Relationship with the State

The course of study at Farmville gave consideration to community needs and to the influence which a teacher might exert in the community. The effect upon the community was listed as a major reason for requiring student teachers to be trained in how to manage a library.

To know how to organize, equip, and maintain a library in a public school will give any teacher a prestige and influence in the community for good which it would be difficult to get in any other way. Wholesome books going from the school to the home and being read by the fireside at night give a silent, yet potent influence over the community for righteousness which nothing else can.696

Jarman used this idea as justification for separating out work to be exclusively reserved to a specially trained librarian who would give her full time and attention to the library of the normal school. The president said that it was important that this work be emphasized in order that "all graduates take with them into the public schools of the State somewhat of the library spirit".697

The course of study at the normal school remained consistently open to the needs of the state and how the public schools could best address these needs. It was
strongly felt that a normal school should be the 'heart of the public school system' and that it should therefore "anticipate its needs and its work should be that of preparing teachers to meet these needs". 698

This conviction that the normal school had a direct obligation to the public school led Jarman to state in his first annual report that it would be necessary for the curriculum to include instruction in manual training and domestic science. Since the public schools were showing tendencies toward the introduction of such courses, Jarman felt "the State should be preparing teachers to take up this work. It is easy to see that there is going to be a demand for teachers thus qualified". 699

Such provision was made and by 1904, the president reported the normal school was able to adequately equip teachers to handle any subjects presently or soon to be taught in the public schools. This he noted, was particularly important because it made it totally unnecessary for a person to have to leave Virginia to secure the preparation needed for professional adequacy. 700

Following the emphasis upon manual training and domestic science came the focus upon agriculture. As will be observed from the discussion in Characteristic Four, rural education received a great deal of attention in the second decade of the 1900s. This made agriculture a major
consideration. During the 1912-13 session, the normal school combined forces with Prince Edward County to hire a person to act as both a demonstrator for the county and an agriculture instructor for the school. In this way the work in the school was brought "in vital touch with the work in the country".

The contact with the local school divisions was considered one of the most professionally essential responsibilities of the normal school instructors. They provided numerous in-service programs (see Characteristic Three) and were constantly "in the saddle" representing the school to the public and offering help with local instructional needs. By 1908, the students were beginning to consider themselves to be "unfortunate in having a very popular faculty. Some of that august body...have been in demand as lecturers at other schools and educational meetings. We are afraid for them to go too much, for some of those who hear their lectures may wish to steal them from us".

In a similar manner, it was judged equally as important for the students at the normal school to have exposure to those who held positions of educational leadership in the state. Therefore, in 1911, the Education Department made the following recommendation:
that the prospective teachers be brought into as close contact as possible with those in the State who are leaders in the educational system, that they may know these leaders personally and go into their work with a clear conception of the problems which confront them.  

As a concerted effort to accomplish this, guest speakers were brought in and a series of lectures were staged "on the various topics that are vital to the young teacher".  

The normal school had a great deal of pride in its students and believed they were the best advertisement for the institution. There was a real affinity between the school and its graduates as can be seen by letters from former students appearing in student publications and by the traditional provision in these publications for "News from Our Alumnae". The school catalogs carried a complete listing of all graduates from 1884-1920 and even when it dropped the listing of alumnae, it continued to show the names of currently enrolled students. By the time the school had reached its twenty-fifth anniversary, in 1909, there were "over eight hundred graduates...and over two thousand matriculates". For the 1923-24 session, 2,623 graduates and 7,731 matriculates were reported for the thirty-eight years that the school had been in existence.  
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a large number (beside those who have been graduated) have carried to the different sections of the State some knowledge of the methods and aims of the school".710

The normal school was in close relationship with county superintendents, especially in the matter of seeing that each county recommended only fully qualified applicants711 and also in supplying the kind of teachers needed by the various school divisions.712 The counties were encouraged to be in contact with the normal school for any assistance it could provide. "Do not hesitate to call upon the President of the school for any service he can render."713 Essentially the same statements of cooperative desire persisted throughout the normal school era.714 As expressed by Jennie Tabb, secretary of the school, "The whole aim of the institution is to render to the State the greatest possible service in the training of teachers for the public elementary and high schools."715 This goal at times made it necessary to deal with matters on an individualized basis. In 1917, the faculty was asked to consider three letters, one each from a superintendent, principal, and state high school inspector. These letters regarded a student who had been denied graduation from the normal school because of poor practice teaching and a "condition" in education. She was subsequently employed as a teacher and had performed with such extreme success that
the letters were sent to the faculty as testimonials to her competency. The faculty voted to graduate her but only if she "passed off the condition in education".\textsuperscript{716}

Because of its single purpose mission and the increasing acceptance of public schools, the institution was from time to time visited by dignitaries of considerable importance. The year 1905 was the occasion of such a visit:

Congressman Stanley of Kentucky and ex-Congressman Allen of Tennessee, accompanied by Dr. W. E. Anderson of the board of Trustees, Mayor W. F. Blanton, and Councilman W. T. Doyne of Farmville visited the different departments of the Normal School.\textsuperscript{717}

In February, 1922 former Governor Stuart appeared on the chapel program at the school.\textsuperscript{718} Governor Trinkle, Mrs. Trinkle, and Colonel Leroy Harris, Chairman of Budget Committee visited in November 1923.\textsuperscript{719}

The school gained publicity throughout the state in planned and in incidental ways. In 1914, a faculty publicity committee was formed to give more public attention to the school.\textsuperscript{720} The faculty also decided to issue a bulletin entitled "How to Study for High School".\textsuperscript{721} By invitation in 1923, the school participated in "College Week" held in Eastern Virginia. The student representing the normal school "had a real part in giving Higher Education a bigger place in Eastern Virginia".\textsuperscript{722}
Relationship with the Local Community

While the normal school tried to serve the state, be responsive to its needs, and appreciative of its attention, it was also closely connected to its own local community made up of the Farmvillians. A very intimate relationship characterized the town and school from the institution's earliest days. This alliance intensified during the Jarman administration. Dr. Jarman saw community involvement as adjunctive work. He was himself "a community leader, lay leader in the Methodist church, organizer, fund-raiser and first president of the Southside Community Hospital; organizer of the Farmville Lions Club; Chairman of the stock sales for the Weyanoke Hotel, perennial chairman of the Red Cross Drives, Victory Bond Sales, etc.".723 He also worked very hard to organize Community Leagues (superseded by Parent-Teachers Association) to give broader community perspective to the public schools.724

Dr. Jarman encouraged both the faculty and the students to take an active part in community affairs. He felt every teacher ought to be a community leader and he wanted his school to set the example. Dr. Jarman, himself, was named Farmville's first citizen and he was able "to secure such cooperation of town and gown as few colleges seem to enjoy".725 This was in large part due to the
president's frequent reminders to the students that they must represent the normal school and Farmville well at all times.\textsuperscript{726} The fact that all of the teachers lived in the Farmville area led them to become prominent community leaders.\textsuperscript{727} Large numbers of students also lived in homes of town residents and this gave them a chance to know many town people.\textsuperscript{728} Thus, there were no real separations between the school and community.\textsuperscript{729}

The town was always very cooperative with the school.\textsuperscript{730} The town would rope off the streets to allow the normal school to have May Day programs and dances.\textsuperscript{731} The town council offered to pave sidewalks for the schools in 1907 but the board chose not to have it done, although "the interest manifested by the council in the welfare of the school" was greatly appreciated.\textsuperscript{732}

The town folks were often invited to attend events held at the normal school and they especially enjoyed the May Day activities.\textsuperscript{733} In return, the town offered the school use of its community facilities, and also treated the students to regular performances by the town band. In warm weather, the band would play on the school lawn one evening per week.\textsuperscript{734} Farmville also included the school in the Virginia Historical Pageant held in Richmond in 1923. According to the \textit{Rotunda} this was considered important "Not
only because Farmville was the first Normal in the State (founded in 1884), but because it is Farmville, we want to have it represented well". Similarly, the Prince Edward Farm and School Fair Parade of 1921 was led by a group from the normal school and students were reported to have actively participated in a variety of the fair's activities.

Churches continued, throughout the entire normal school period, to keep in close touch with the school life. The students regularly attended services and were often instructed in Sunday School by one of the normal school instructors. The YWCA was a major religious organization at the school which often held special observances at Thanksgiving, Christmas, and Easter, as well as at other times. In the 1923-24 school year, the town churches joined the normal school in observing special days set aside for prayer.

The YWCA was also involved in the community with off-campus activities. Work was done with the Negro Extension Service, with the County Poor House, and with the county nurse. At Thanksgiving, a community family was fed and throughout the year "a little girl who lived near the school" was clothed. Additionally, the YWCA had a Rural Life Committee which sought to help parents and their children recognize the needs of their community.

321
committee worked with rural schools in the community and its activities including securing additional library facilities and maps for the classrooms. Bible study classes were held in the schools and bulbs were provided for school beautification.  

There was perhaps never a project which so unified the town and the school as did the Student Building. Dr. Jarman wanted the students to have a spacious and attractive building for their meetings and other extra-curricular activities. He saw the fund raising aspect of this project as one which fostered school spirit and a sense of cooperation, demanding help from students, alumnae, townspeople, friends of the school, and the State. The fund became tremendously popular and ultimately demonstrated a gargantuan lesson in what can be done when an endeavor is truly pursued cooperatively.

The Farmville Chamber of Commerce solicited money from the townspeople, and the students and alumnae set up many projects to raise funds for the building. The State of Virginia appropriated $50,000 for the building; interested individuals and organizations contributed over $100,000. In 1923 just before the building was completed, the campaign for money reached a climax as everyone was caught in its spirit. One of the social sororities on the campus offered dancing lessons to the members of the faculty to raise funds. Money came from unusual sources indeed—in chapel on March 7, 1923, members of the local Ku Klux Klan presented a small box containing five $25 gold pieces to Dr. Jarman to show their interest in the
project. The Eaco Theatre gave several benefit performances, the proceeds of which went to the Student Building Fund.\textsuperscript{741}

Just before the Student Building received the final strokes of completion, fire struck the school. "The Dining Hall burned in a fire which destroyed the South Wing of the College, which included approximately forty bedrooms, the dining room, kitchen, pantry, storerooms, and carpenters' shops".\textsuperscript{742} It was at this time that "the big heart of Farmville" responded.\textsuperscript{743} The citizens literally saved the school by doing everything in their power to assist.\textsuperscript{744}

They worked as men work to save their own. It was not just State property they were saving; it was "The School"--Farmville's school--the institution that had grown up in their midst and become a part of their town.\textsuperscript{745}

While the men fought the fire the rest of the town rallied around the students to comfort them and to prevent additional disaster. One of the normal school teachers, Miss Lila London, described the tremendous sense of community which bound the heart of Farmville with the heart of the normal school this way:

Some fought the fire; others moved furniture; some wired to neighboring towns for help; others opened and heated the churches. Enough breakfasts were prepared in Farmville that morning to have fed a student body of double the size. Later, when it was known that the ladies were preparing dinner at the
Presbyterian Church, the merchants vied with one another in donating supplies. The men in charge of the pump house saw to it that the water supply was sufficient; the Home Guard for days and nights protected the property; before it was known that the girls were going home, all of the churches had offered their Sunday School rooms, and homes were being thrown open to the girls faster than they could be received and listed. The hotels offered their services to full capacity. The telephone and telegraph people worked at unusual speed and for unusual stretches of time, and in spite of fatigue were always patient and accommodating. And so it went. No list of the deeds done could be complete, and even if such were possible, it would still fall short for the spirit that prompted the deeds--the heart of Farmville--was the big and beautiful thing.746

It can be concluded that the Farmville Normal School remained closely related to the local community and to the State as a whole throughout the normal school period. Although three other normal schools were started during this period, there is no information available which indicates that the Farmville school felt threatened or that the opening of these schools had any negative effect upon the influence of the school.

The school maintained a very open association with the public schools which were encouraged to communicate freely. The instructors at the normal school were busily
engaged in working with the public school system both by personal contact and by publications. Likewise, state leadership was brought to the normal school.

The course of study was constantly being extended to guarantee that those trained at the normal school would be prepared to handle the expanding branches of the public schools. The rural education program was designed specifically to meet local as well as larger community needs.

The normal school related to the state system of public schools well and therefore maintained a place of esteem in the larger statewide community. It was in Farmville, however, that the school's influence was most pronounced. The Farmvillians were very proud of the school. Some of its finest community leaders were members of the normal school community. The school and the town cooperated in an almost friction-free environment. Goals were shared, efforts were united, and a spirit of cooperation prevailed. The closeness of the community-school relationship was clearly illustrated during the disaster of 1923 when the school physical plant was ravished by a fire which served only to increase school spirit and community support.

The normal school never forgot that it was created to serve the State. Its mission remained single-fold throughout the normal school era--namely, teacher
preparation. In fulfilling this mission, the school sought to anticipate public education needs, offer in-service assistance to schools and maintain a close relationship with those who served the State in varying capacities. The relationship with the local community was also extremely close. The faculty were active in the community and the community supported the school programs, projects, and students. The normal school and town coordinated their efforts so closely that they existed as one community with mutual responsibilities.
Characteristic 3. In-Service Training (1901-1924)

The teachers institutes became a valuable agency for in-service training and their early history is the story of normal school activity. (Harper, pp. 116-117.)

According to Harper, normal schools maintained unusually close contact with teachers in the public schools and "rendered them many services".747 The in-service and follow up work of normal schools was judged to be so important that Homer Seerley said, "The institution that does not recognize that its mission is not confined to its campus hardly deserves to be classified as a factor in modern educational endeavor."748

The rise of the Virginia Cooperative Education Association in the early 1900s resulted in what has been referred to as a renaissance in the state's public education. Community interest was aroused in nearly every locality throughout the state as educators and civic leaders banded together to raise a strong voice for educational improvements. A common thread running through the crusade was a cry for better prepared teachers. This attention ultimately fostered campaigns to secure legislative approval for additional normal schools. The eventual political
recognition of the problems and subsequent support of efforts to improve education in the state gave birth to schools at Harrisonburg, Fredericksburg, and Radford.

The creation of these schools did not banish the problems experienced by classroom teachers who had been poorly or inadequately prepared. Therefore, the old summer institutes which had received such hearty support from the first State Superintendent of Public Instruction during the 1870s and in the years following continued during the first two decades of the twentieth century to be tremendously important. "Ten or twelve such institutes were held in various sections of the state each summer." As late as 1939, summer training for teachers was reported as still being "a very effective method of training teachers for the public free schools". A comparative analysis of the participation of teachers in summer normals from 1880-1902 shows that enrollment steadily increased and that by the end of the nineteenth century, institutes were considered indispensable. (See Appendix P.)
Farmville was from time to time the location of one of the summer institutes. The school was advertised as having commodious dormitories which were comfortable, equipped with "electric lights, hot and cold baths, and every modern convenience." Teachers were urged to attend and to take advantage of the strong courses offered which would prepare them for examination and certification.

The town of Farmville and surrounding localities were especially interested in having teachers attend the summer normals because the institutes gave local "teachers an opportunity to continue their studies, especially professional studies." Beginning in 1895 and continuing until 1934, Farmville contributed funds toward the cost of running the institute. In 1906, the town alone contributed $300.00 toward the expense of the school. This was combined with support from the county of Prince Edward, other nearby divisions, and the state to cover the cost of the summer school. The summer programs were cordially received by the town which showed the student a hospitable, polite, and obliging spirit. Community resources were
freely shared and access to public buildings and grounds was unlimited. The people of the community also attended many of the normal school activities.\textsuperscript{736} The same kind and enthusiastic reception which greeted students in the summer of 1906 persisted through the early 1920s as attested to by Mrs. Sybil Dodson and Mrs. Aubrey Allen. They especially remembered the welcome by the town officials\textsuperscript{737} and the entertainment provided by the town band.\textsuperscript{738}

During the 1906 session, the Farmville summer school was conducted by J. L. Hall and the faculty was made up of a history teacher from Richmond High School, mathematics professor from Randolph-Macon College, civil government teacher from Norfolk, nature study instructor from the practice school at William and Mary, physics and physical geography instructor from a Kentucky high school.\textsuperscript{739} The remainder of the classes were under the guidance of instructors from the Farmville school. The Farmville teachers were responsible for teaching physiology, primary methods, arithmetic methods, vertical writing, manual training, drawing, theory and practice.\textsuperscript{760} Algebra was also taught but no instructor was named.\textsuperscript{761}

The summer schools held at Farmville in the 1910 and 1911 sessions included the subjects commonly taught in the public school branches plus classes in school management and
methods. There were three hundred and twenty-seven (327) from Virginia and five (5) from North Carolina enrolled in 1910\textsuperscript{762} and two hundred and eighty (280) from Virginia plus six from North Carolina and one from Florida in 1911.\textsuperscript{763} Thirty Virginia school divisions were represented in 1910\textsuperscript{764} and fifty-two in 1911.\textsuperscript{765} These summer schools depended very heavily upon the teachers of Farmville Normal School for staff and both of them were under the direction of President J. L. Jarman who served as the conductor. Many instructors, not teaching at Farmville during the 1910 summer session, were busily engaged with institutes held at various places. According to the Virginia Journal, Farmville instructors had the following commitments for the summer of 1910:

Dr. C. W. Stone, of the Department of Education, Teacher's College, Columbia University, N. Y.; Dr. F. A. Millidge, of the Department of Geography at the Summer School of the South, Knoxville, Tenn.; Dr. R. T. Kerlin, of the Department of Literature, lecturer for the University Bureau of Travel will spend his summer in England; Miss Coulling of the Art Department, will be at the Summer School at Big Stone Gap, Va.; Miss Andrews, of the Department of English, will be at the University Summer School at Charlottesville, Va.; Miss Sutherlin, assistant in the Department of English, at the Summer School at Covington, Va.; Miss Woodruff, principal of the Training School will be at the Summer School at Norfolk, Va., and Miss Pierce and Miss Dunn, supervisors in the Training School, will teach at the Summer School, of Burlington, Vt.\textsuperscript{766}
During the 1912 summer school, seven of the regular normal school teachers, chose to remain in Farmville in order to teach summer school there, but others again elected to teach in summer sessions in widely scattered locations. There was one at each of these locations: Summer School of the South, Big Stone Gap, Covington, University of Indiana. Two were at the University of Virginia and three were at Columbia University. Dr. Millidge of the Farmville School was considered "a useful factor in teachers' institutes within the state and throughout the South". From 1907-1917 he received repeated calls from various places in Virginia and "delivered lecture courses in the summer schools of the State Universities of Virginia, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Georgia though he himself never sought such engagements".

The Summer Program

In 1916, summer school was increased from four to six weeks because the summer school professional certificate was "raised from a two-summer course to a three summer course." Professor S. P. Duke of Farmville had the responsibility for outlining the education courses necessary
for the summer school professional certificates. He was part of a group made up of the heads of Department of Education at other normals and members of the Education Faculty at the University of Virginia.\textsuperscript{771} In 1918, the Elementary Professional Certificate replaced the Summer School Professional Certificate. To be eligible for the Elementary Professional Certificate via summer sessions, three six weeks summer terms over a three year period were required. In 1922, the Elementary Certificate required three full summer quarters.\textsuperscript{772}

Summer school catalogs for the period 1920-24 give a fairly complete picture of what the sessions were like. It is made clear that the summer program was not a session of the normal school but rather was one "conducted under the general management of the State Board of Education and supervision of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The purpose of these schools [was] the advancement of the cause of education in the State of Virginia".\textsuperscript{773}

The faculty, made up mainly of Farmville's regular instructors, were reported to be thoroughly familiar with public schools and their needs. However, benefits were also recognized as reciprocal. The sharing of experiences in terms of giving and gaining new ideas served to provide mutual growth opportunities.\textsuperscript{774}
Courses were arranged to accommodate the needs of three separate groups in 1920:

1. Those seeking preparation to take the State examinations to secure a first or second grade certificate.

2. Those working toward an Elementary Professional Certificate.

3. Those who had graduated from four year accredited high schools and wished to take the six weeks of professional work needed to receive a certificate.

In 1921, the State Normal School at Farmville decided to go to a three term summer plan and in 1922, the school was extended further to provide the equivalent of twelve weeks of instruction. Actually, however, the students only attended school for eleven weeks because school was held on Saturdays of the last term. By coming to the twelve week summer sessions for three years, students could receive the elementary certificate for either the primary or grammar school. This also enabled those who desired to enter the second year of the primary or elementary course and then receive a full diploma after one more year of study. For many teachers, the summer sessions provided the only possible means of professional development. In order to secure the elementary
certificates, it was necessary in 1922 and 1923 to complete either the primary\textsuperscript{778} or the grammar grade\textsuperscript{779} course outline which is presented in Appendix Q.

During the 1920's, review classes were held each summer to prepare those who desired to take the State examination for either the first or second grade certificate. Instruction was offered in arithmetic, grammar, general geography, physical geography, United States history, Virginia history, English history, civics, drawing, hygiene, theory and practice, agriculture, writing, and methods in primary reading.\textsuperscript{780}

Summer sessions were intended to allow teachers the privilege of securing certificates of different types without having to enroll as full-time students during the regular sessions. As summer school locations increased and as the length of sessions were extended, teachers had more opportunities to receive serious exposure to professional instruction. Had the summer programs not been available, deficiencies and inadequacies among public school teachers would have been even more pronounced.
In-Service Activities

In addition to the summer school programs with which the Farmville school was involved, on-going in-service activities with the public schools were constantly being conducted. In 1909 an article in the November Virginia Journal noted, "The faculty has been well represented at the various institutes held this fall." Among those reported to have been working with various schools were the following: Mr. Lear in History, Miss Andrews in English, and Dr. Stone in the training school. These were working with the schools in Appomattox. Miss Smith in Literature and Reading had been to Cumberland and Goochland. Miss Andrews and Dr. Millidge in Geography had helped at Blackstone and the latter had also given a talk at Keysville.781

In December 1909 the faculty were reported to have addressed Teacher's Associations throughout the State. As a result, "The public school teachers seem to be quickening their interest in matters educational and much interest is shown in the methods used at the Normal School".782 Among the activities reported were the following: Dr. Stone spoke to Amherst teachers on "School Conditions Fundamental to Good Language Work; Miss Smith gave a recital at Waverly for
the benefit of the school library; Dr. Stone, Miss Andrews, and Mr. Hodge were on a program at the Farmville Teachers' Association. On three consecutive days, November 11, 12, and 13, the following instructors spoke in the places specified—Miss Haliburton at Marion, Miss London at Bedford, Dr. Kerlin at Wytheville, and Dr. Millidge at Fredericksburg and Warsaw. During November 1910, the faculty addressed Teachers' Associations in Norfolk, Bedford City, and Marion. These examples are illustrative only; each month's journal carried a new listing of the engagements of normal school faculty at public schools.

Visiting in other schools for a single day or for more concentrated work was typical for the normal school faculty. Miss Dunn, who was a rural supervisor for the normal school spent a great deal of time working with schools in Amelia and Nottoway Counties. She also published a book called **Educative Seat Work**, as a product of her association with these two school divisions. It became immediately popular for teachers in rural schools and for all of those working with lower grade children. According to a review in "The Focus," immediately following publication letters began to arrive asking for copies. The review stated, "Supervisors of wide experience are pronouncing it the best they have ever seen." Among the topics discussed were:
1. how to make seat work self educative

2. kinds of seat work for use with each subject

3. daily programs with reference to use of seat work periods

4. bibliography and addresses for securing useful materials.788

Other instructors, like James M. Grainger, traveled great distances to be associated with other normal schools in order to get fresh ideas for the Farmville School and to help those whom the school served. Grainger spent the summer of 1920 at the normal school at Hyannis, Massachusetts learning how recreation served as a regenerating influence in a teacher's life. He was so impressed by this experience that he wrote an article in The Journal of Education Method to share what he had learned with others.789

The Farmville Normal School was very busy in terms of year long in-service performance. It was summer school, however, which provided the most direct and popular means for assisting public school teachers to develop as individuals with professional responsibilities. By 1919, all four of the normal schools for women served as regular
locations for summer schools. "In this way the schools [were] each year brought into contact with hundreds of teachers in the public schools of the State."\textsuperscript{790}

A summary of in-service training from 1901-1924 leads to the conclusion that the normal school made extensive contributions to the professional development of teachers already in the field. Although summer schools were under the sponsorship of the State Board of Education, the Farmville school frequently served as a host location. By 1910, Farmville, like other state normals, offered annual summer programs. The summer programs were designed especially for those who were already employed as teachers or who wished to become certified to teach. Graduates of four year high schools could take professional courses leading to a certificate and others could take a review course to prepare for the state examination leading to either a first or second grade certificate. By 1922, it was also possible to attend for three summers and secure the Elementary Certificate for either the primary or grammar grades. This preparation could be supplemented by one more year of full time work to earn a diploma.
The faculty of the normal school at Farmville were active in terms of teaching at the summer normals held at Farmville and in widely scattered areas throughout the country. They also maintained an on-going in-service affiliation with public schools in various parts of the state. The faculty were dedicated to working as directly as possible with the public schools in order to continually elevate the quality of instruction.
Characteristic 4. Course of Study (1901-1924).

The concept of professionalized subject matter for teachers developed in normal schools. (Harper, p. 117.)

ADMISSION

To be admitted to the 1901-02 session, students had to be at least fifteen years old, have good health, possess a "vigorous" intellect, and be strong of character.\textsuperscript{791} State students were to come on the recommendation of their local superintendents and they had to be physically strong.\textsuperscript{792}

The State Normal School maintained a preparatory school throughout its history. Since high schools were not commonplace in the state, most of the students who entered the normal school needed secondary training prior to beginning the normal, or professional, preparation. Once students were admitted to the school, they had to take examinations for determination of the appropriate entry level. The preparatory school, or academic course, began with what was called the First Year. In 1901, admission to the first year required the students to be tested in reading, writing, spelling, English, mathematics,
geography, and history. Those not showing satisfactory preparation in these areas were placed at the upper levels of the training school. Those desiring entrance to classes in advance of the first year of high school had to show adequate preparation in each previous year's work.

By 1903, the normal school had adopted an enlarged course of study which required an additional professional year of everyone who desired to receive a diploma. Those students who had graduated from an approved high school could enter the professional program directly. Those without such high school credentials were admitted to higher work only if they could show satisfactory preparation.

Students were entering the schools at varying times and staying for uncertain periods. For example in 1905, the faculty determined that when public school teachers entered the school for only a few weeks, the grade received should be for the amount of work done and should be accompanied by an explanation about the duration of the study.

The school admitted students in both the fall and the spring terms but in 1908, courses offered in the fall were not repeated in the spring, therefore fall entrance was strongly advocated. To assist with this problem and with the difficulties encountered in trying to enter students at
the most suitable level, a Committee on Classification was established. Among the general guidelines for proper placement of students were these:

1. Graduates of approved high schools were admitted to one of the professional courses. Those who completed a four year high school program were awarded a full diploma upon completion of Professional Course II. Those from three year high schools had to take one year of academic work prior to Professional Course II to receive this professional diploma. The nature of this preliminary work was designed for each individual by the Committee on Classification.

Graduates from approved high schools could take the manual arts or Kindergarten course and receive the special diploma of the course. They could also take the professional year of the elementary course and receive its certificate.

2. Students who had completed work equivalent to high school graduation were given trial admission under the same expectations as those held for graduates of approved high schools.

3. Pupils who had completed only graded school work were placed in the academic course.

4. Pupils not falling into one of the above classifications were tested for admission to the first year of the academic course.

5. Teachers holding licenses were automatically admitted.

6. No credit was allowed toward the professional year for work done at other institutions.
For purposes of clarification, an approved high school was one which required a given number of units of study for graduation. Thus, an approved four year high school was required to offer at least sixteen units of work and have the equivalent of three full time teachers. The three-year approved high school was required to have twelve units of work and the equivalent of two full time teachers.

In 1917-18, the entrance requirements were extended to allow those with first grade certificates to enter the first year of courses II, III, or IV and thus become eligible for the Professional First Grade Certificate. Course II prepared for primary grades, III for grammar grades, and IV for high school.

By 1923, graduates of approved high schools could enter any program. They could expect to earn a diploma after two years or bachelor's degree after four years of study. The same general regulations listed earlier for entrance to the 1908-09 session still prevailed. However, transcripts from other schools were now required to be sent to the Classification Committee although certification from private tutors was not acceptable. In 1908, professional preparation at other schools was not transferable. In
1923, the state had four normal schools for women and the Farmville School would accept professional work done at "Registered State Normal Schools or standard colleges". An additional provision was made in the entrance requirements for 1923-24. Those teachers who held first grade certificates, who were twenty-one years old, and who had taught at least three years after receiving the certificate were allowed to enter the first year of the primary or the grammar course and thus become eligible for the Elementary Certificate. However, none of this work could be used toward a diploma until the full number of required high school units were completed.

When Jarman became president, high schools were just beginning to become a common part of the public school system. Thus, the early entrance requirements focused upon literary qualifications and adequate elementary school preparation. Applicants were therefore thoroughly examined to determine placement. By 1908, however, more approved high schools were available and this made the extensive testing done earlier less necessary. Those not graduating from an approved high school had to enter the academic course to secure the preparation deemed prerequisite to the professional years. The regulations for entrance changed only slightly from 1908-24. It remained the job of the Classification Committee to determine the proper placement.
of students who were entering the normal school with such diversified backgrounds. The major requirement for admission to professional study at the normal school from 1902-1924 continued to be graduation from an accepted high school program. Students, who desired admission but who did not possess this minimal requirement, could be enrolled in the academic course at the pre-professional level.

CURRICULUM

When Jarman became president of the normal school at mid-session 1901-02, he hereby inherited the course of study of the previous administration. This course of study remained basically unchanged for the 1902-03 session. In 1903, a faculty committee was appointed to prepare a revised course of study. The new course was to gradually substitute for the one in operation.\textsuperscript{808} In his 1903 report to the state superintendent, Jarman made it clear, however, that the academic course would have to be maintained until high schools had become truly commonplace in the state. The academic course was of secondary grade, designed to prepare students to undertake professional studies.\textsuperscript{809}

Those receiving the professional diploma previously had been required to take only one year of normal studies but an enlarged course of study was reported for 1903-04.
session. This revised course required an extra year for those seeking the professional diploma, although it was already required for all full diploma graduates. The former classical and scientific diplomas were abolished to leave the school with only one course of study culminating in a single diploma, known as the Professional Diploma.  

The extra year of professional work was continued but within two years, the school had returned to offering several diplomas for specialized purposes.

Manual Training and Kindergarten Courses

In 1904, a Manual Training Department was added. All students were required to take two years of manual training to enable them to teach such subjects in the public schools. Students were also required to teach the manual training courses which had been incorporated into the training school. Manual training included instruction in paper folding and cutting, weaving, woodworking, and mechanical drawing.

A kindergarten program was also in operation by 1904. The training school included a kindergarten class which could be used for observation and practice during this
two year professional program.814 This course was organized around Froebel’s theories and included considerable work in art, music, and drama but no math or reading.815 The addition of this program plus the manual training class led Jarman to report that the normal school was providing “adequate preparation for teaching any branch now required or likely soon to be required in the public schools of the State”.816

The English Program

There were many changes in courses, programs, and diplomas during Jarman’s administration. However, the most persistent problem dealt with language arts, especially English and spelling. Beginning in 1905 and continuing throughout the normal school period, there was an on-going discussion about how to correct the deficiencies in written and spoken English. Correctness of expression was deemed mandatory for a student to be able to clearly demonstrate her knowledge of subject matter.817 After much comment, the faculty decided to reject the English Department’s proposal that every teacher give a grade on subject matter and English and then average the two. It was determined instead that each teacher should be “allowed to decide upon his own method of attaining a final grade”.818
In 1910, the faculty agreed that the "English habit" needed cultivation in every department. Integrating English instruction into every course was heavily emphasized. In 1911, the English Department distributed "Guides for Written English" and everyone was asked to cooperate in the effort to improve general English usage. In 1913, the faculty concluded that language arts needed thorough attention in all aspects. Thus, in October 1913, special classes were offered in writing, spelling, reading and grammar to offer remedial help. A complete view of how the remedial handwriting course was structured can be found in Appendix S. Remedial classes were not a new experience, however, because as early as the 1908-09 session, special spelling classes were held for "all students from any class above the Review Year, who, during the first month's work, showed weakness in spelling". It was further stated that professional students would be watched very closely and "no student notably poor in spelling [would be] allowed to graduate until such weakness [was] remedied".

The English controversy continued and in 1915, the English Department presented a paper designed to secure more correlation and cooperation between the English Department and the other departments. The focus was upon the oral and written English of students in the following areas:
Although the English Department still desired to have English graded in each subject, "some were strongly opposed to the grade on a test being influenced by anything but the subject matter of the test". It was decided that English should be graded separately and the grade should be given directly to the English Department.

In 1916, the English Department was finally able to report that students were showing general improvement in English proficiency. However, teachers were encouraged to give longer tests to allow students an opportunity to provide evidence of their ability to express ideas effectively.

In 1918, the normal school published The Bulletin--"English in the High School". Part I of this issue explained how English was taught in the high school department of the State Normal School at Farmville. Part II described plans, methods, and activities which normal school teachers had tried and found to work successfully. These were presented with the belief that the articles would be useful to other teachers of high school English.
The first part was mainly descriptive and generally discussed the characteristics of each class, the nature of the students, methods used, and the attempt at correlation. Much attention was given to the way in which departmental cooperation enabled correlations to become highly effective. For example, The Tale of Two Cities and history of the French Revolution, were taught in such vital association "that the students could hardly say whether the work was primarily history or literature".828

This booklet was printed with the idea that it would be helpful to other schools but also with the awareness that the normal high school was much different from other high schools.

The Spelling Program

Spelling also became a very controversial curriculum issue. In 1907, the Simplified Spelling Board, a New York organization, requested that the normal school faculty adopt the simplified plan. "Simplified" spelling omitted silent letters, used phonetic spellings, and employed abbreviated forms in spelling words. The faculty voted in 1907 to continue with the traditional method829 but the simplified method continued to be discussed as late as 1916.830 The
literary magazine entitled *The Focus* began to use the non-traditional approach in 1914, although it was acknowledged as an experimental attempt. In 1915, the students voted on the issue and a "substantial majority" favored the simplified plan. The faculty, on the other hand, accepted the simplified method in 1916 but the decision was very close, with only a one vote difference. The president expressed concern over the faculty’s decision. He feared that since normal school students had been trained in the traditional method, making the simplified spelling an acceptable method might cause confusion. It was then decided that simplified spelling should not be used in official publications and correspondence.

Although "simplified spelling" was of much interest to the faculty, the school's most outstanding contribution to this subject area related to methods for teaching spelling by the traditional approach. In 1914, the normal school published *The Bulletin on Spelling* which dealt with the theory of spelling and types of spelling lessons. Recognizing that the ability to spell had much bearing on a graduate's ability to get a teaching position and that inability to spell was a commentary on the inefficiency of a school, the normal school placed much emphasis upon the teaching of spelling. The *Bulletin* included sample lessons.
used in grades one through seven of the training school. It was felt they would be helpful to other public school teachers.  

High School Work

Other less controversial, but very important aspects of the curriculum, dealt with expanding the course of study to include rural work, demonstration work, and preparation for high school teaching. In 1906, the Committee on Instruction recommended that domestic science be added to the curriculum. This was approved and added to the Department of Biology, Chemistry, and Physics. In the same year it was recommended that an extra year be added to the course of study to provide more advanced work for those in the high school program. This was done by adding another year to the academic course and allowing the first year to become a review year for those who lacked the background which would allow them to enter at a higher level. This arrangement permitted more exposure to higher levels of course work such as advanced rhetoric, advanced biology, advanced algebra, etc.
As public schooling, including high schools, became more available, the Executive Committee ordered the Review Year dropped.\textsuperscript{839} The abolition of this year had no adverse effects upon enrollment.\textsuperscript{840} By 1911, most students were able to enter at the second academic level or higher. The general increase in the level of school, especially at the secondary school prompted Dr. Jarman to ask the heads of departments to decide how much added course work would be required in each department to prepare students for high school teaching. He felt that the normal school "should be giving this training as soon as possible" since the public high school was becoming very popular.\textsuperscript{841}

A course, called Professional IV, was begun in 1913 and was established specifically for high school teachers.\textsuperscript{842} This was a generic program designed to prepare teachers for high schools in general rather than for specialized subject matter. There were no major or minor areas of concentration.\textsuperscript{843} However, observation and teaching were considered professionally germane to all curricula at the normal school. Therefore, provision was made for those entering the high school to practice teach in high school subjects at the training school. This opportunity was made possible by moving the first two years of the academic course into the training school.\textsuperscript{844}
In 1915, professional preparation of high school teachers was increased from two years to three years. This allowed students to select both a major and a minor, beginning in the 1917-18 session. The major was begun in the spring semester of the first year and completed in the fall semester of the third year. Students attended their major class four times a week (each period was forty-five minutes) for six semesters. Four semesters of four periods per week were required for the minor. The program was also generously endowed with elective subjects. The various departments were made responsible for reviewing their own work to be sure the normal school was meeting the rapidly changing needs in public education.

**Rural School Work**

By 1910 the normal school had created a Rural School Department. The Southern Education Board donated one thousand dollars ($1000) to the school to be used for the salary of a rural supervisor who would aid in a scientific study of rural problems. The supervisor's duties were to report to the normal school as needed for conferences with the director of the training school and to give lectures on rural school work to those in the professional courses.
In 1915, a cooperative arrangement was begun with nearby county schools. The emphasis on rural schools was intense. In order to give normal school students a chance to observe and practice in a rural setting, Rice High School was secured as a demonstration school. Miss Fannie Dunn became the rural supervisor. The Normal School Board set aside one thousand dollars to aid in supervision and with the transportation of students to the rural schools.

By the 1916-17 session, both a rural school course and a county demonstration course were available. The increased number needing experience in the rural schools led Dr. Jarman to request that the Normal School Board purchase "two Ford machines at $375 each." This need for transportation was made more acute when the normal school also began to use the Cumberland County Schools for observation and teaching in 1918.

A four year course in home economics was adopted in 1918 to replace the two year course. It was purported that the four year course would actually be less expensive than the two year course because up to sixty percent of the work would be done in related subjects outside the Home Economics Department. Since home economics provided a good background in science, students would also be prepared to meet the increased public school demand for science teachers. Dr. Jarman, however, was more concerned about
the demand for home economics teachers, per se, because of the rapid escalation of junior high school programs requiring home economics. He encouraged his faculty to anticipate the demand and prepare teachers for the positions.857

ACADEMIC ADVISING

In 1912, the faculty became deeply concerned about the study habits of students. To address the issue the faculty decided to teach a book on "how-to-study". The plan required each of the departments to take a portion of the book and concentrate on it for two weeks by using the subject matter of their department for purposes of making application.858

In the fall of 1913, the faculty determined Juniors needed more guidance before having to make their choice about courses for the spring. Therefore six lectures were to be given on educational psychology, the historical development of kindergarten, primary, grammar, and high school education.859 Each student was assigned to a female faculty member for both academic and personal advising.860 According to the guidelines established by the Committee on
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Advising, advisors were to suggest courses, assist with class related difficulties, and to promote a better understanding of the school's programs. In the 1913-14 session, the school had five different professional programs:

- Course I Kindergarten
- Course II Primary
- Course III Intermediate and Grammar
- Course IV High Schools
- Course V Graded Country Schools

Students just completing high school were found to be very uncertain about which of these programs best suited them. The faculty therefore thought it necessary to provide a foundation during the first professional semester. This was done by making the work of the fall term the same for all students in courses I-IV.

**CURRICULUM SUPPORT FROM GOVERNING BOARDS**

In 1914, the Board of Trustees of the State Female Normal School was replaced by the State Normal Board. In his last appearance before the Farmville Trustees, Dr. Jarman told the local board that each member could feel pride in the school which was being turned over to the new
management. With reference to the course of study, he said, "the course of study has kept pace with the material growth and stands on a par with the best in the United States."864 The Trustees had overseen many additions to the curriculum, as well as some deletions. Among the last of their approved changes was a fifth professional course to prepare teachers for graded country schools.865

Under the new board, there was a continued interest in the existing programs. The board was supportive of the rural school programs and provided assistance for supervision and transportation. The high school program was extended to three years and the course of study gained collegiate status in 1916 when the Legislature granted the normal school the right to confer a bachelor's degree.

COOPERATION, CORRELATION, AND WAR STUDIES

Believing that learning could be made more effective by cooperative effort, in 1917 a Committee on Departmental Reports requested that the faculty work toward greater correlation among the departments to prevent overlap of work and provide better understanding of subject matter in other departments. The faculty heard and accepted the following resolution.866
That at each regular faculty meeting one hour or as much thereof as necessary be given to an informal discussion of the aims, principles, and subject matter being worked out by each department, said discussion to be led by the head of the department, and that these discussions occur in alphabetical order of the departments.

Cooperation at its best was shown by the faculty's concern over issues resulting from World War I. Courses were changed, added, and deleted. New classes in history and geography were developed. The demand for French replaced German. English, science, sociology, and economics were all studied in the light of new conditions which had developed and were expected to develop.867

In December, 1918, the Committee on the War presented a plan for systematic study of the war situation. As accepted by the faculty, the plan called for one hour to be set aside each week to study the following topics:868

1. Geography of War
2. The Government of the European Countries
3. Historical Background of the War
4. Course of the War
5. Russia
6. Socialistic Tendencies
7. Biological Effects
8. Some Solution suggested to the questions of international law raised by the War
9. Industrial Reconstruction
10. Educational Reconstruction
11. Social Reconstruction
The War Courses were taught by different faculty members who gave rotating lectures to groups of about thirty students. The aim was to help prospective teachers develop a more comprehensive and integrated view of significant war problems. This was considered to be especially important since they would be the teachers who would have to deal with the aftermath resulting from the war.

The War Study was carried out during the spring term of 1919. The War Course Committee recommended that the study only be taught to the first year professional students in the fall term. It was a much abbreviated course and was carried out by the history and geography departments.

DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES

The course of study expanded greatly during the twenty-three years from 1901-1924. In the 1901-02 session, there were only three courses—the normal, scientific, and classical. This curriculum led to a diploma for the equivalent of two years of preparatory work plus one year of professional work. A full diploma was awarded to those taking two years of professional work. By 1904, the normal school offered three years of preparatory work and required two years of professional work for a professional diploma.
The preparatory course was intended to provide high school studies for those not having access to secondary work elsewhere. This became known as the academic course and was extended to cover five years of work by the 1906-07 session. In 1906, the school began to offer a review year for those not sufficiently prepared to enter the first academic year. (See Appendix T.)

In 1907, graduates were entitled to the following diplomas and certificates:

1. Full diploma—for two years of professional work plus the completion of the four year academic course or its equivalent.

2. Professional diploma—for two years of professional work plus the completion of a three-year approved high school program.

3. Kindergarten diploma—for two years of professional kindergarten work and the equivalent of four years of high school work.

4. Certificate—for those completing only three years of high school and one year of professional work.

For the 1908-09 session, the full academic course, including the review year continued to be offered for those needing secondary work. The normal school proper offered
the four diplomas and one certificate in 1908.\textsuperscript{873} By 1912, two certificates and only two diplomas were offered.\textsuperscript{874} (See Appendix U.\textsuperscript{875}) Regardless of the course chosen, character was considered as important to certification as academic attainment. The catalog customarily carried the following notification.\textsuperscript{876}

Let it be understood that no student is counted worthy of a diploma or certificate, whatever may be the grade of her academic attainments, who has not been found uniformly dutiful and trustworthy.

In January, 1916, the General Assembly "granted the Virginia Normal School Board the privilege of conferring degrees in education"\textsuperscript{877}. This was an academic turning point which indicated the professional status which the State Normal Schools had earned for themselves. The period from 1901-1916 had been one of rapid growth in enrollment and in the expansion of the curriculum, neither of which showed any signs of decline.

The catalog for 1916-17 noted that six professional courses were offered, four of which led to a diploma, one to a degree, and one to a certificate. The courses were:

Professional I Kindergarten - Primary
Professional II Primary
Professional III Grammar
Professional IV High School
Professional V Rural Schools
Professional VI County Demonstration
Course IV led to a diploma after two years or a degree after four years. The two year course that was begun in 1913 was extended to three years in 1917-18 and to four years in 1918-19. Courses I, II, III, and V led to a diploma, and VI to a certificate.878

The number of students continuing beyond the two years of professional training was not great. Nine students earned the Bachelor of Science degree in Education in 1921 and this was the largest number granted in any year since it was first offered.879 By voluntary action of the Board of Visitors, the University of Virginia accorded the Farmville bachelor's degree full credit toward a master's degree. This was the first normal school degree esteemed worthy of full credit at the university.880

The literary societies and the school paper both attempted to encourage interest in earning a four-year degree.881 Elizabeth Moring Smith882 and Virginia Wall,883 were among the few who stayed to earn a degree in 1923; however, these two graduates recognized that many of their fellow students were financially unable to remain the two extra years even if they desired to do so. The degree was promoted as giving the graduate prestige and an advantage in
the job market. In fact, The Rotunda claimed that a degree from the normal school received preference to an academic college degree in securing a teaching position.884

By 1924, the normal school had five professional programs leading to a diploma and one to a degree.885 The entrance requirements to all programs had become a four-year high school diploma representing not less than sixteen units of study. The following certificates to teach were issued upon course completion:886

1. Collegiate Professional--for the four year B.S. degree.

2. Normal Professional--for the completion of a two year professional program.

3. Elementary Certificate--for the completion of the first year of courses I, II, or III.

4. Second Grade Certificate--for completion of twelve weeks of professional work during summer school.

By resolution of the Virginia Normal School Board in 1919, differentiated courses had been assigned as speciality areas for each of Virginia's State Normal Schools in order to avoid needless duplication and to be more economical in the use of public money. (See Appendix V.887) All four schools were able to continue what was considered their most important function, namely that of training elementary teachers. Each was also able to continue to offer a two
year modified course, so arranged as to make transfer into any four year normal school program in the state without undue loss of credit. The differentiated course for the advanced work was assigned, thusly.

Farmville - four year program for training high school teachers.

Harrisonburg - four year program for training home economics teachers.

Fredericksburg - four year program for training teachers in music, industrial arts, and commercial subjects.

Radford - four year program for training elementary supervisors and specialists in rural education.

ASSESSMENT

Evaluation of student performance was a matter of frequent discussion in faculty meetings. Each faculty member was required to hand in biweekly reports of students' progress to the president's office. All students not earning a passing mark were personally notified of their status in order that they might be able to remedy problems before deficiencies accumulated. At the end of each term parents or guardians received reports of work for the semester just completed. In 1908, a mark of "fair" was required to pass each subject "except in the professional
classes, where good is required in English, History, Government, Geography, Arithmetic, Reading, and Teaching. Work was graded as excellent (E), very good (VG), good (G), fair (F), and poor (P). It was possible to give plus and minus grades as well. Prior to 1908, averaging was done by using a twelve point scale, with an E+ receiving twelve points. In 1909, faculty dissatisfaction led to a reversal of the scale and the allotment of thirteen rather than twelve points. The resulting scale then became:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13
E+ E E- VG+ VG VG- G+ G G- F+ F F- Poor

This was considered a more acceptable plan than the former because it was an "opportunity for grading below Fair Minus (F-) in teaching as well as academic work."

In 1911, the faculty changed the numerical values of 1 - 13 to a scale of 75 - 100. The revised scale was as follows:

F- F F+ G- G G+ VG- VG VG+ E- E E+
75 77 79 81 83 85 87 89 91 93 95 97-100

The biweekly notification of students not doing satisfactory was continued. Personal reminders to students were referred to as "notes" and the receipt of such could disqualify an individual from the honor roll. It was
decided by the faculty that "one note should not debar a student from the honor roll provided that note did not fall below the passing mark".\textsuperscript{894}

By 1917, the Faculty Handbook was devoted almost entirely to information about schedules, tests, and grades. The following information was reported concerning grades.\textsuperscript{895}

1. The grading scale was to be
   A for extraordinary fine work
   B for above average work
   C for average work
   D for below average work
   E for failing work

2. The distribution suggested was to be
   A 10\% approximately
   B 20\% approximately
   C 40\% approximately
   D 20\% approximately
   E 10\% approximately

3. Plus and minus were not to be used

4. Test grades were to be averaged with daily grades, with relative values left to the teacher.

5. Danger of failure for a student was to be reported to the Registrar.

6. Deficient grades were to be entered into a record known in the language of the school as "Black Beauty". Deficient grades were noted in two ways "E" for failing and "W" for warning that the student was on the verge of failing.

7. Reports of deficient grades were to be sent to the student by the Registrar. This was to prompt the student to put forth extra effort and to give the President information about student progress.
8. Reports were expected to be considerable in number before a failing grade was given on a term's work.

9. The term grade for each student was to be recorded on three tickets—one each for the student, Registrar, parent.

10. Students' tickets were to be handed to them at the end of the last class meeting of the term.

11. Two tickets were to be turned in to the Registrar's office—one to be kept there and one to be sent to the parents.

12. Grades were to be submitted for work completed with a statement of what needed to be done for any student who had to withdraw from school.

13. A notation of "Dropped because failing" was to be used on the tickets of students who dropped classes.

14. A notation of "Condition" was to appear on the tickets for students who needed to make up work. A time limitation for making up the work was to be specified. Work not made up within the time limitation was to become a failure. Work made up within the allotted time was to receive the appropriate grade.

In 1917, grades were still turned into the president's office and the president kept a watchful eye on the records. In the spring term of 1917, he asked the faculty to keep more careful records for "Black Beauty" because students were not being reported for poor marks as often as they needed to be. In 1918, the president's secretary began serving a dual role as secretary and the official Registrar. Grades were from that point forward kept in the Registrar's office. However, becoming more
professionalized in the matter of record keeping did not force the faculty into rigidity with the grading system. When illness kept a student from class for nearly a month, "all of her teachers agreed to pass her on her term's work with an A grade because of her fine scholarship".898

The faculty decided that the honor roll would be composed of students who earned no less than a grade of G- in the academic classes and G+ in those professional subjects requiring a G- for passing.899 (English, History, Government, Geography, Arithmetic, Reading and Teaching.900) In 1918, the faculty felt it was time to have two separate honor rolls for the academic department (high school) and the professional department. The term "honor roll" was to apply to both departments and be attainable by about thirty percent (30%) of the students in each department. Grades for the term rather than biweekly grades were to be used to determine honor roll eligibility. To qualify for the honor roll, a student had to have A's or B's on three-fourths of her subjects, with no grade of "E", and no unexcused absences, or misconduct notes".901

During 1919, the faculty continued to discuss the honor roll. Some members of the faculty felt it would be more appropriate to have a proficiency roll instead of an
honor roll for the professional classes. The faculty voted to maintain the honor roll for all classes but to devise stricter standards.\textsuperscript{902} Thus, the faculty adopted revised standards for averaging grades and recommended the distribution given below.\textsuperscript{903}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd &amp; 4th years</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Professional</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Professional</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd &amp; 4th Profes-</td>
<td>Percentages left to individual teachers because classes were so small.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The faculty maintained constant vigilance over the students' academic performance. They were concerned about both in-class and out-of-class time utilization. For example, a time analysis study was done in 1918 with twenty-five randomly selected girls from the First Professional Class. Students were asked to log their hours for three weeks according to the amount of time which had been recommended for studying and the actual amount of time spent in studying eight different subject areas.\textsuperscript{904} Students reported studying nearly seven hours above the recommended time. This helped the faculty to pace assignments realistically and adjust classes accordingly.
The faculty wanted study time arranged so that it could be maximally used. For this reason, they had to decide whether Saturday or Monday should be used for the weekly class holiday. Since the Sabbath meant literally "no work" for some students, a committee was formed in 1919 to report on Sunday study. The study revealed that of the two hundred sixty-five (265) boarding students responding, one hundred fifty-six (156) studied on Sunday, two hundred two (202) thought it was wrong to study on Sunday and two hundred twenty-five (225) were taught it was wrong to study on Sunday. However, they were nearly evenly divided on the question of holiday. One hundred thirty-eight (138) wanted Monday as a holiday and one hundred thirty-seven (137) did not.905

An analysis of the Faculty Minutes shows that much faculty time was spent in dealing with a wide range of problems encountered by students during practice teaching. Believing many of these problems could be prevented, a "Committee on Qualifications for Admission of Professional Students to the Training School" was formed in 1920.906 As a result, it was recommended that a standing committee composed of the Director of the Training School and two members of the faculty be established. This standing
committee would be made responsible for staying in close contact with students during their professional year\textsuperscript{907} and also for monitoring the necessary academic requirements.\textsuperscript{908} (A fuller consideration of these requirements can be found in Characteristic Five of this section.)

Dr. Jarman reported in 1919 that only a small number of students were failing and even then teachers were allowed to give a retest if it were necessary for enabling the student to pass the semester's work.\textsuperscript{909} Dr. Jarman repeatedly encouraged his faculty to think through the amount of time required outside of class for the preparation of assignments.\textsuperscript{910} In 1922 and again in 1923, he suggested that students should carry the equivalent of fifteen hours of recitation per week with a corresponding one and a half hours of outside preparation for each class.\textsuperscript{911}

The normal school gradually increased the emphasis upon testing. Even the course of study provided for an elective course in Educational Measurements for those students in the high school curriculum. The catalog described it as:

an advanced course in the construction of tests, and the use of tests in classifying pupils, diagnosis, teaching, measuring efficiency, and vocational guidance. Statistical and graphical methods are developed.\textsuperscript{912}
The school began to make use of standardized tests in 1922 when it gave an intelligence test to all of the First Year Professionals. The Otis O'Neel Tests were administered and a report was given to the faculty in the spring of 1923. The report contained answers to the following questions:

1. How do Farmville students compare with the students of other normal schools?
2. Is there a limit below which students cannot fall and hope to succeed in the Normal?
3. Is the poor student a delinquent or a misfit?
4. Do high scoring students stand out as superior students?
5. What is the relation of intelligence to scholarship?
6. Am I giving the right proportion of A's, B's, C's, D's, and E's?

The test provided the following answers to the questions posed:

Answer to Question 1. The results were reported in total point scores with the median for twenty normal schools being 157, while Farmville's was 139.

Answer to Question 2. Such a lower limit was not ascertained. Of the two Farmville students who made the lowest score, one had previously earned one B, eight C's, and 5 D's while the other had made 3 D's and 3 E's. However, scoring low was noted as decreasing the chances for passing.
Answer to Question 3. The answer provided here was that the test scores helped to deal intelligently with poor performing students.

Answer to Question 4. The question was answered by only giving the names of individual students. Without evidence of their academic performance, the answer provided is now meaningless even though it undoubtedly was very revealing to the faculty in 1923.

Answer to Question 5. Intelligence was noted as probably being the most important factor affecting scholarship. Although it might be offset by hard work and ambition, it should be seriously considered in teaching and marking.

Answer to Question 6. The answer to this question was followed by the theoretical grade distribution model and this statement:

The intelligence score enables one to determine the proportion of pupils who should receive each mark. Only in such a manner can the marks of various instructors be made comparable, in other words, standardized.915

The matter of grades was not taken lightly at the normal school. Jarman urged supervisors of student teachers not to be too liberal in grading. They were reminded that C, not B, represented average performance. The faculty were urged to conform to the theoretical standard of grade distribution:916

10% A, 20% B, 40% C, 20% D, 10% E.
It was with this discussion of grades that the faculty concluded its last official meeting as a Normal School Faculty on January 2, 1924. At the next meeting of the faculty on February 19, 1924, Dr. Jarman announced: "Our new name is State Teachers College at Farmville, Virginia".

LIBRARY

The library of the normal school was consistently viewed as essential to the work of the school and to the true professionalization of teaching. In 1902, the president reported that the library contained only three thousand volumes but that it was definitely a working library and as such it was used constantly. However, he noted the library badly needed more reference materials.

The catalog for 1901-02 stated that books related to every department of the normal school were available as well as reference sources, such as encyclopedias, lexicons, atlases, dictionaries, pamphlets, and government documents. It was possible to check out reference books as well as fiction. The aim of the library was to make research material readily available so that the library might become "a literary workshop".
From three thousand volumes in 1902, the library grew to over ten thousand classified volumes in 1923. In addition to the collateral, reference, and recreational sources, the library was also supplied with seventeen newspapers from within and without the State plus one hundred fifteen periodicals selected to complement the work of each department.922

In its earliest history the library had been staffed by volunteer effort and by rotation of responsibilities among the instructors. This system became inadequate and the teacher of physical culture assumed charge of the library in addition to her other duties. By 1905, however, both the Physical Culture Department and the library became staffed on a full-time basis. It was considered especially important that graduates of the normal school take the "library spirit" with them into the public schools.923 This was used as justification for having a trained librarian "to give her whole time to the library".924 By 1911, the normal school offered five courses in library methods. Four of these were to help the students make intelligent use of the library and the fifth was "to train prospective teachers in the administration of a small school library while teaching."925
The library was reported, in 1911, to be among the best in terms of the selection of material and the care of the books. However, the major needs at that point were for a magazine filing system so older magazines could be located more easily and a reference room to relieve the congestion in the rest of the library.\textsuperscript{926} By 1913, rooms vacated by the training school were used to expand library facilities so that a reference room became available.\textsuperscript{927} The library was in constant use\textsuperscript{928} as a place where supervisors assisted student teachers in doing "the research connected with preparing lessons and the whole student body did much of their studying for class work and reading for recreation. They thronged to the library day and night".\textsuperscript{929} This diligent use of the library was fostered by a Library Committee which coordinated efforts between the various departments and the library. In 1911, library workshops were held in all departments and the heads of the Literature, English, and Reading Departments worked closely with the librarian.\textsuperscript{930} Use of the library was encouraged by each department and the library was considered one of the most valuable of the school's assets. The librarian regularly requested lists of reserved books\textsuperscript{931} and also issued very liberal borrowing policies\textsuperscript{932} to maximize the library as an academic resource.
Interviews with those who attended the normal school revealed that a great amount of library work was routinely assigned. The outside reading and writing load was heavy and the library was very important in this respect. The instructors at the normal school expected those who were to be teachers to be resourceful and to make diligent use of the library as a professional tool. Topics assigned often dealt with current issues in public education. For example, Belle Gillian Smith remembered well the time she spent in preparing a term paper on "consolidation of schools". Similarly, Martha Bondurant Wilson recalled the school's library was very good and since literary and debating societies were very active at the school, this greatly increased usage.

Thus, it seems that the library of the State Normal School at Farmville was a valuable part of the professionalization of teaching. There was an awareness that the library was essential both to the preparation and actual work of a teacher. Harper points out that normal school education was concerned about any area which contributed "directly to giving the teacher more understanding of her work". Thus, as the State Normal School expanded its library resources, facilities, and programs, it provided increased opportunities for study, research, and the managing of public school libraries.
This section has discussed several major ways in which the Farmville school contributed to the development of a concept of professionalized subject matter. Among these ways was that of making entrance requirements commensurate with the level of public schooling preparation. Recognizing that many students lacked access to high schools, the normal school continued to maintain an academic course. This permitted students with potential for teaching success to secure secondary work at the normal school and then be allowed to enter a program for professional training.

Another way in which the school contributed to professionalized subject matter was by developing new curricula according to public school needs. A kindergarten course of study was available in 1904 for those who desired to concentrate on early childhood work. A rural education program was begun in 1910 and a specially designed program for secondary teachers was inaugurated in 1913.

The school also consistently emphasized the necessity for English proficiency. Difficulties in being able to speak well and to write clearly, effectively, and with correctness of spelling were persistent problems. These were basic skills which every teacher had to be prepared to teach and therefore had to be able to demonstrate. On the other hand, the ability to integrate ideas was considered equally important. Thus, an
interdisciplinary approach was used to present a more comprehensive view of issues and topics. By cooperative efforts, the faculty used correlation as a means of teaching several subjects in a comprehensive manner. The War Course serves as a good illustration of the attempt to integrate learning in a way that was deemed professionally significant. The war was seen as having a definite place in the education of a prospective teacher and was therefore considered worthy of being added to the curriculum.

Assessment was considered an important part of learning. The faculty experimented with various methods of grade assignment and elevated standards to increase pupil motivation. The note system, honor roll, and higher standards for the training school, all indicate the faculty's concern that students be thoroughly prepared for their profession. The faculty always maintained vigilant personal and academic concern for students. Recognizing that the maturity level of the students and their lack of professional exposure limited their ability to make wise academic choices, a system of advising and orientation was begun in 1915.

The normal school made the Education Department the focal point about which the rest of the teacher preparation program evolved. This department remained in charge of providing the professional skills needed for successful
teaching. Psychology, school management, the history of education, observation and practice teaching were the areas in which the Education Department trained in 1901-02. By 1923-24, these same areas were still strongly emphasized but the course offerings had been extended to include methodology, courses in primary, elementary, and secondary education, as well as in curriculum, philosophy, ethics, educational measurement, and rural school problems. The entire school looked to the Education Department's leadership for curriculum direction.

Laboratory experiences were considered to be of major importance. Students were required to spend a large portion of time in observation and practice in the appropriate educational setting before finishing their professional programs. The school considered this provision so important that the academic course was reorganized to allow students to teach high school subjects. Cooperative arrangements were also established with nearby school divisions to permit work with rural schools.

The library was valued as an extension of the classroom and laboratory experiences. Students were expected to utilize library sources to extend instruction, to stay abreast of current events, and to maintain
up-to-date knowledge of professional issues. Furthermore, instruction in library usage prepared graduates to manage public school libraries.

Educational standards continued to increase at the normal school. The course of study became more diversified and the demands for scholarship became more rigorous. In 1916, the work done at the normal school was considered both meritorious and worthy of collegiate status. Although, the school did not become recognized as a state teachers college until 1924, it was given the right in 1916 to confer a collegiate degree in education.
Characteristic 5: Model School (1901-1924).

There was a tendency to emphasize laboratory experiences in model schools or schools of practice. (Harper, p. 118).

The Farmville Normal School, from its beginning, recognized the laboratory school as an indispensable part of teacher education. According to John P. Wynne "at no time has there been any doubt of the efficacy of the campus school as one way, perhaps the main way, of providing direct experience for prospective teachers". From the time of its opening, the practice or model school included both elementary and secondary students. Boys and girls attended the elementary division, but only female students were admitted to the secondary program. Male students, who wished to continue their education, had to transfer to the Farmville High School or to some other facility outside of the normal school.

PURPOSE OF THE TRAINING SCHOOL

The 1901-02 session of the normal school opened with a total of thirteen faculty members. It offered a three year high school program and a one year required professional or normal program. When Jarman became
president of the institution in February, 1902, one of his first concerns was for the inadequate physical provision made for the practice school. The next year, a wing was added to the main building of the school and the practice school was moved into it. The more commodious facilities allowed the enrollment to be increased and hereby "to provide more pupils for practice teaching done by the professional seniors". It was thus the intention of the normal school to bring prospective teachers into intimate contact with children. Formal study, theoretical exposure, psychological investigation, and research were all recognized as having a rightful place in the professional preparation of teachers. However, these alone were judged to be insufficient and without direct experience with children, "no one [could] be expected to meet the full requirements of a well qualified teacher".

The laboratory school at Farmville had a dual purpose. It was designed first as a place to give teaching experience. Although exposure to the practice or training school was an on-going part of all experiences at the normal school, the real professional initiation began during the first semester of the senior year. Preliminary to any actual teaching, students were expected to observe in various grades, take detailed notes on instruction and classroom management, and to analyze the problems with which...
they would be confronted. After an appropriate period of observation and discussion, each student was required to teach under diversified experiences and in various grades until such time as the critic teacher felt satisfied that she could successfully "teach and govern a school". As shown by the Faculty Minutes of 1903, this could be a lengthy process. One student was instructed to continue teaching "until she had learned to discipline and to yield herself to those in authority over her".

The other major purpose of the training school was to serve as a model school which exemplified the soundest educational plans for teaching children. It was not considered to be a practice school in which embryo teachers were given liberty to experiment with innovative ideas and various instructional schemes. Instead, it was "a carefully supervised school, in which children [were] actually trained according to the best pedagogical principles and latest educational thought".

Every effort was made to provide the most suitable physical environment for the training school. The new west wing into which the training school moved in 1903 was decorated with pictures and murals from the art department. It was well-lighted, carefully ventilated, equipped with
adjustable seats, and employed the best in hygienic practices. It was designed to inspire pupil-teachers to catch "the true professional spirit".  

From 1903 forward, frequent mention is made of the up-to-date equipment and excellent professional environment provided. Virginia Wall, who later became the college registrar, attended the normal school from her kindergarten year in 1907 through 1924 when she acquired her Bachelor's degree. She, like her nephew Bill Wall who is presently editor of the Farmville Herald, can recall with clarity the excellent facilities and competent teaching which characterized the training school. Bill Wall reported that the town was extremely proud of the school because professional standards were kept high. Martha Bondurant Wilson said the State was very proud of the training school and tried in every way to make it a "model" school. "The State made sure it had the best," Mrs. Wilson reported. The entire training school was designed to arouse the highest ideals and bring out the best that was in both pupils and teachers.

As early as 1886, the model school had a class made up of "little tots" who came to be taught "by the most approved modern methods" for one hour per day. One group came for the morning hour and another for the afternoon hour. While these classes may represent the first
kindergarten age groups to be taught at the normal school, no formal program existed to prepare teachers for professional kindergarten positions until 1904. Dr. Jarman in his Annual Report for the 1902-03 session maintained that the normal school was the heart of the public school system and should therefore anticipate its needs. He recommended the commencement of a two year program which would prepare teachers for kindergarten work. The move toward a kindergarten program early in the 1900's is a matter worthy of note since nursery schools and kindergartens did not gain a great deal of momentum in the United States before the 1930's. However, two years after its beginning, the kindergarten program was declared "to have demonstrated its 'excuse for being' inasmuch as it increased in size, in percentage of attendance, in the enthusiasm of its Mother's meetings and in its promise of membership for the coming year". Interestingly, that early kindergarten program still has a decidedly modern ring to it. The same description offered in 1905 could serve as a characterization for many kindergarten classes of the late 1980's. For example, the program included sharing time, emphasis upon the family, nature study, good morning time, nap time, center time, story time, movement time, and informal seating arrangement plus circle time.
As set up in 1904, the training school consisted of eight grades in a 2-4-2 structure, excluding kindergarten. There were two primary grades, 1-2, four intermediate grades, 3-6, and two grammar grades, 7-8. Administratively, the school had a director and a supervisor for each of the three organizational levels.956

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

The standards for excellence were kept high in the training school. This can be discerned from the fact that no student who failed to earn a certificate of promotion from the training school could be given automatic admission to the normal school, however, those who passed could enter the normal school without further examination.957 Similarly, heads of all departments in the normal school were made directly responsible for subject matter. This was done to make certain "that the greatest care [was] exercised by Heads of Departments in passing student-teachers into the Training School work."958

Heads of Departments were required to offer methods courses designed to provide the "know-how" for teaching the several branches. These courses were not to be recipes for teaching a specific course of study but were rather to be
generalizable enough to allow the student "to use her own ingenuity in adapting her method to suit the exigencies of her particular school" when she assumed a teaching position.

The special methods appropriate for the lessons taught in the training school were under the direction of the training school supervisors who served as models and critics. "Model lessons were taught by the supervisors; and the student teachers [wrote] out their own lesson plans and [had] them criticized and approved before daring to stand before their classes." The supervisor was directly responsible for lesson "criticisms" but the heads of departments were encouraged to observe students as they taught. Department heads were then allowed to submit written criticisms to the supervisor to be "kept on file to assist in determining the efficiency of the student teacher". This was especially important since the school policy clearly stated that students would "not be allowed to graduate, no matter how proficient they may be in the academic branches, until they have satisfied the Training School Faculty that they are qualified to teach." According to Holton, it was the actual teaching under supervision which provided the training most essential for a "school-teaching vocation in Virginia". It was only in
this setting that supervisors and department heads could count on the assistance of children to give the student-teacher the "real" experience of teaching. In 1908, Dr. Jarman had the good fortune to secure "a progressive western pedagogue, Dr. Cliff W. Stone of Cedar Falls, Iowa as Head of the Department of Education and Director of Teacher Training". Dr. Stone had received the B.S. and Ph.D. from Columbia and he also held the Full Diploma from the State Normal in Oshkosh, Wisconsin. Soon after his arrival, a committee was appointed to begin deliberations about revising the course of study for the training school. This was a matter which would require much cooperative endeavor from the entire school for nearly five years. In the meantime, Dr. Stone set about solving other matters of concern. In order to address the issue of time loss from various classes demanded by observation in the training school, he divided the senior class in half. This allowed one group to finish their academic classes while another group devoted time to the training school. Dr. Stone also suggested that standards be established whereby investigation into a student's likelihood of success in the training school could commence in the Junior Year. This was recommended in response to the faculty's difficulties in dealing with poorly performing student
When a student was failing, the policy was to notify her and call her for a conference with the Director of the Training School. Stone's recommendation to establish pre-professional-year requirements was not really taken under serious study until 1920 as can be seen by the multiple cases of inferior performance which continued to be handled by the training school faculty. Dr. Jarman wanted to be informed about the progress of all students so difficulties continued to be openly discussed in faculty meetings. For example, among the individual commentaries about the progress of student teachers in 1910 were the following:

1. unable to write lesson plans; must stop until she can.
2. improvement—little, if any.
3. weak but earnest.
4. willing worker but passing doubtful.
5. having trouble with nature study.
6. lacking in enthusiasm.
7. trying but nervous.

In spite of problems encountered by individual students, the training school was credited with doing "far more efficient work in the training of its pupils than the
average school of the State, because it has always had in its supervisors and grade teachers the best teachers procurable". The school was considered superior to ordinary public schools because it kept in touch with the most advanced educational thought and because the course of study was constantly enriched by contributions from the subject matter of various departments. Furthermore, departmental emphasis upon methodology and the general enthusiasm so common among young teachers were listed as additional advantages of the training school over public schools in general.

It was at times difficult, however, to determine if the normal school gave direction to or took directions from public schools. Prior to 1911, the eighth grade was considered part of the grammar school. However, the faculty decided in 1911 to have only seven grades in the elementary school and allow the secondary course to begin with the eighth grade. The rational given was as follows:

1. a seven year program was sufficient for the elementary curriculum.
2. Pupils could enter high school at fourteen.
3. a seven year plan was the length of most public school programs.
4. Graduates would teach in seven year school and hence they should be trained in them.

The Committee on the Course of Study was instructed to outline the appropriate courses and to eliminate whatever might be in the eight year program that could not be put into the seven year one. This revised seven year pattern permitted Latin and algebra to be added to the eighth grade and it also provided more teaching opportunities for those desiring secondary work.

Under the eight year program, each grade level, including kindergarten had a course of study which included the following areas.


As Director of the Training School and "imbued with the current Dewey philosophy of education", Dr. Cliff W. Stone gave much of his attention to devising a new training school course of study especially for the Farmville
institution. The Committee was appointed in 1909\textsuperscript{982} and worked until 1912 before it was able to present the "Tentative Formulation".\textsuperscript{983} Dr. Stone insisted upon having all the details clearly laid out to present relationships clearly and easily. Thus the tentative plans were initially on large charts to show the centers of interest, the related subject matter, and the needs of children. As described by Grainger:

\begin{quote}
    each item of subject matter was placed not just as something to be taught for its own sake; but as it would catch the interest and serve the needs of the children at a given period of growth. In brief, this was a 'child centered' curriculum.\textsuperscript{984}
\end{quote}

Although the course of study was under the direct leadership of Dr. Stone, it was actually a cooperative project on which every member of the training school faculty worked.\textsuperscript{985} It was originally intended for in-house use only, but as the "Tentative Formulation" was received by educational agencies, it quickly gained acclaim "as an outstanding contribution to the problems of curriculum development".\textsuperscript{986} This positive response from various sources led Dr. Stone and the training school faculty to put the "Tentative Formulation" into a book format. The book entitled \textit{Training School Course of Study} was published in 1914. It presented detailed plans for a Kindergarten
through a seventh grade program, with descriptions of developmental patterns of children, appropriate centers of interest, and subject matter organized according to the centers of interest. The intent of the course of study was to be more than just a listing of courses. It was arranged "to show the relation of formal subject matter to the life interest of the learners".987

Dr. Jarman noted that the course of study was proving to be remarkably helpful, not only to the normal school but to educators throughout Virginia and the United States.988 Edward O. Sisson of the University of Washington complimented it as the first serious, extensive plan of its kind.989 Dean Davenport of the University of Illinois lauded it for its emphasis upon life activities, noting, "The tendency has doubtless been too much to teach subjects rather than life and certainly to ignore activity, exalting knowledge in the abstract to an altogether artificial pinnacle."990 H. E. Bennett of the Department of Education at William and Mary wrote "With regard to the Course in general, it is undoubtedly the most valuable thing of the sort I have gotten hold of yet and we are not hesitating to make use of it in framing our own course.991 The Atlantic Educational Journal praised it for its layout according to
both grades and subjects, "so that the usual compromises caused by the elimination of one or the other arrangement are avoided". Dr. E. A. Kirkpatrick of the State Normal School of Fitchburg, Massachusetts called it "splendid"; Dr. W. A. Baldwin of the State Normal of Hyannis, Massachusetts, term it "an admirable piece of work"; Dr. F. G. Bonser of Teacher's College, Columbia University proclaimed it "far in advance of any other Course of Study I have seen coming from public or normal schools"; Cornelius J. Heatwole of the State Normal School at Harrisonburg, Virginia said "it is the best program of studies, I have seen yet for the elementary schools."

The positive response to the training school course of study greatly increased the professional attributes of the State Normal School at Farmville. According to James M. Grainger, who was Chairman of the English Department and who edited the Training School Course of Study, a national survey of normal schools was done soon after the publication of the book. Farmville placed "among the best ten in the country, largely, no doubt because of the 1914 publication of the Training School Course of Study". Dr. Stone, who played the leading role in the curriculum building project, also gained national recognition in education and was soon called to serve at Bellingham Normal School in the State of Washington.
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The training school achieved another major professional accomplishment in 1914. The rapid increase in the size of the professional classes in the normal school made enlarged training facilities absolutely essential. It had become necessary in 1911 to use a school-owned residential building to house two additional training school classes. Thus, in 1912 the Legislature saw fit to appropriate a sum of thirty-five thousand dollars ($35,000) for the construction of a new training school. In 1914, a new training school opened "with no expense spared to secure the best type of up-to-date equipment." The building itself was one hundred fifty feet long in the front with two wings, each of which ran back ninety feet. There were more than twenty-five rooms with two floors plus a basement. A work room was provided for student teachers and the supervisor for each grade had a private office. This latter provision was considered especially important because it provided a place for long, private conferences about student teaching performance.

The new building, likewise, included private offices for the principal and the director. Having the Director of Teacher Training located in the building was considered
advantageous because it allowed him to maintain close
contact with student teachers and provide help as
needed. Samuel Page Duke, who would later become
president of Harrisonburg Normal School, served as principal
of the newly located training school during the 1915-16
session and Dr. Stone served as Director until he was
succeeded in 1918 by Dr. W. F. Tidyman, also a noted
curriculum specialist. Thirteen training school faculty
members served under the leadership of these men in 1915, a
number equal to that of the entire institution when Jarman
became president in 1902.

Professional credentials had also greatly improved.
In 1902, there were thirteen faculty members, including the
president, the director of the training school, and the
principal of the training school. Of these only two held
the doctorate. Dr. Kline who was in charge of the training
school was a Ph.D. from Clark and Dr. Arnold who taught
English and History was a Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins. Except
for one graduate of Randolph-Macon College, one A.M. from
Randolph-Macon's Woman College, and one B.L. from the
University of Nashville, and one B.A. from Emory and Henry,
the remaining faculty were graduates of normal schools and
female seminaries. However, as noted in the catalog, almost
all of the 1902 faculty showed evidence of continuing
education endeavors. Six were listed as students in courses at Harvard, Cornell, Radcliffe, Chicago, and Teacher's College, N.Y.¹⁰⁰⁷

By 1915, there were five bachelors degrees and one masters degree among the thirteen members of the training school faculty, excluding the principal and director who held graduate degrees. The remaining six of these were graduates of normal schools and all had attended college beyond their normal school programs. Summers were widely utilized to secure additional training. South Carolina State, Chautaugua, N. Y., the University of Chicago, and Columbia provided the most frequent sources of continuing education in 1915.¹⁰⁰⁸

A professional attitude, rather than a purely vocational one, surrounded the work of the 1915 training school. Teaching conditions in the new school were said to be ideal.¹⁰⁰⁹ The rooms were large so that model lessons could be taught in a natural setting rather than "be put on the stage in the auditorium".¹⁰¹⁰ Each room could accommodate up to forty observers plus the children. Two years of the high school work (grades eight and nine) were also housed in the training school to permit practice teaching at a level high enough to qualify students in the secondary program to fill high school positions.¹⁰¹¹ The
Board of Trustees had broadened the normal school curriculum in 1913 to include the preparation of high school teachers and teachers for graded rural schools.\textsuperscript{1012}

Other provisions, indicating heightened professional interest, were the exhibition and museum rooms. The exhibition room was a repository "for samples of the very best textbooks, maps, and other kinds of school apparatus".\textsuperscript{1013} Publishers were asked to continually add to this collection. The museum, on the other hand, contained samples of the children's work in each of the various subject/interest center areas. The purpose of these displays was to help student teachers decide upon acceptable standards of performance. "By these exhibits the new student teachers from year to year will be able to judge their work and see how it may be improved".\textsuperscript{1014}

Just as he considered the normal school to be the heart of the public school, Dr. Jarman believe the training school was the most important part of the normal school and he stated forthrightly, "Our whole work centers in the Training School."\textsuperscript{1015} For this reason, he had no hesitation about asking for outside assistance to facilitate smoothness of operation. He, therefore, unhesitatingly depended upon a cooperative administrative arrangement with the public
school system in Farmville to "maintain consistent enrollment at all grade levels in the Training School where teacher training was involved". This gave him assurance of having a sufficient number of children for observation and practice purposes. This alleviated problems of being either over or under subscribed each year. By 1910, the enrollment in the normal school made it necessary to increase the training school size. Thus, instead of having one supervisor or teacher for two grades, it became necessary to have one for each grade. Between 1903-1913, the names of supervisors such as Misses Haliburton, Dunn, Woodruff, Pierce, and Peck would become widely recognized and respected in Farmville and throughout Virginia. These teachers were real crusaders for the cause of public education. They wrote a great deal, especially in the Virginia Journal, and became active participants in state and local professional activities. (See earlier references to their activities under Characteristics Three and Four in Section III.)

TRAINING SCHOOL EFFICIENCY STRESSED

The training school was organized on a kindergarten, elementary, and secondary basis. A child could enter the kindergarten program at the age of four and stay until he
was six. This was followed by seven years of elementary work and two years of high school work. The last two years of high school were taught in the normal school and only girls were admitted to these. With two years of kindergarten, seven years of elementary school, four years of secondary work, and four years of professional study, the Farmville school was offering a total of seventeen years of schooling by 1916.

Although the public recognized the training school was intended to serve as a laboratory in which students were to be given practice teaching experiences, the normal school made a concerted effort to assure the public that teaching in the training school was of the highest quality. The training school Bulletin from 1915-16 offered the following as proof.

1. Students in the training school were always less than a year from graduation and would immediately upon their graduation enter the public schools as regular teachers.

2. Students who failed to make satisfactory progress were removed from teaching.

3. Students put forth maximum effort in teaching because their graduation depended upon it.

4. Students were allowed to teach only a few classes each day and then only after as much as two hours were spent in preparation for each lesson.

5. Students were assigned to teach small groups of students and to provide much individual help.
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6. Students with different personalities offered many education values to children.

7. Students were under constant supervision from the grade supervisor, the head of the department, and the director of the training school. Supervisors were required to "take the class at certain times for uninterrupted teaching for one or two weeks, and must take the class in hand whenever there is a sign of inefficient teaching". Furthermore, department heads were required to observe in the classrooms daily and the director was responsible for giving "the greater part of his time in correcting and directing the work in the grades".

As further proof of the efficiency of the school, the following characteristics were given:

1. Students showed themselves to be among the best of all those who enrolled in the normal school proper.

2. Student performance showed that those in the elementary program of the training school were better trained for high school work than those who entered the eighth grade from other schools in the state.

3. Students in the training school showed a decreased tendency to dropout of school. In 1915, the city of Richmond had a 16.5% rate, the training school had a 4% rate. This represented nine pupils, seven of whom moved and two of whom were confined to home because of illness.

4. Students showed regularity in attendance. For the 1914-15 session the percentage of attendance averaged 94 percent, excluding kindergarten.

5. Students in grades 1-7 showed a 93% promotion rate. High school students were not included because they were promoted by subjects and kindergarten was not included because at age six, all students could enter first grade. In 1914-15, there were thirty-six (36) kindergarten
students enrolled, one hundred forty-seven (147) elementary students and seventy-eight (78) high school students—a total enrollment of two hundred sixty-one (261).1023

6. Students showed themselves well prepared as judged by school examinations. The training school used "scientific scales" as often as possible. Among those used were the Courtis Tests in Arithmetic, the Ayres and Thorndike Scales in Writing, and the Ayres Scale in Spelling. The scores for the latter as reported in 1915 can be found in Appendix W.1024

STANDARDS RAISED

During the years between 1913 and 1920, there was an escalade interest in the establishment of professional standards—perhaps because of the expanding course of study which moved into secondary work in 1913 and into the conferring of a collegiate degree in 1916. In 1913, a committee was appointed to study the essential qualifications of a teacher. This was considered important in helping a student teacher make the best use of her abilities.1023 It was also suggested that teaching seniors attend conferences, teach for more prolonged periods, and learn how to promote more effective seatwork.1026 Miss Dunn, a member of the faculty, had earlier published her book entitled Educative Seat Work and likely prompted this last suggestion. In 1914 Dr. Stone, as head of Education Department, was always interested in improving professional
standards. He proposed that methods courses be examined and that feedback be given concerning what student teachers seemed to be lacking. He further recommended that the faculty study Gilbert's *What Children Study and Why* and Charter's *Methods of Teaching the Common Branches*.\textsuperscript{1027} In 1915, the principal of the training school asked for permission to do some research on graduates of the school "to find out what kind of teacher they had become".\textsuperscript{1028} Thus, there seemed to be an interest in evaluating the effectiveness of the training school program.

Grades represented another attempt to standardize procedures in 1914. The composite grade on student teaching was to be arrived at by compiling supervisors' grades with those of department heads. The formula used was as follows:\textsuperscript{1029}

\[
\text{Composite grade} = \text{Supervisor's Average} \times 3 + \text{Head's Average} \times 2
\]

The training school director was not to offer a grade but he could be consulted concerning it. The grading system used was as follows:

- A extraordinarily fine work
- B above average work
- C average work
- D below average but passing
- E below passing.
In 1920, the faculty decided to use "passed" and "not passed" for marking student teachers although those in the high school program continued to be graded on each subject.1030

The year 1914 was a red letter one for the training school in many respects. The new building was completed, professional expectations were analyzed, and two major publications were issued. In addition to the Course of Study, a book on Spelling was also published by the cooperative endeavors of instructors in Education, English, the training school, and "some outside friends". These friends were Miss Mary Lee Davis of the Richmond Normal School, Superintendent Zenos E. Scott of Ashbury Park, N. J., Professor W. A. Maddox of Oswego Normal School, and Professor C. J. Heatwole of Harrisonburg Normal School.1031 The book was divided into two parts: The Theory of Instruction and Types of Lessons. Its purpose was to help the classroom teacher modify traditional methods of merely testing for spelling on words that students had attempted to learn independently but which had not really been systematically taught.

The interest in spelling was perpetuated by Dr. W. F. Tidyman who became Director of the Training School in 1918. Dr. Tidyman wrote a book called Supervised Study Spelling which emphasized study procedures as a means of
increasing spelling success. Tidyman was "particularly interested in the scientific aspects of curriculum-making in elementary subjects...and his work in spelling was recognized as significant throughout the country".1032

Other professional contributions to curriculum development included the publication of two other books: *English in the Elementary Grades* and *English in the High School*. These were attempts to share with public schools the work which was being done in English at the State Normal School. Thus, by 1918, the training school had in many respects, become a model for public schools, especially in curriculum-making which had become a pervasive issue during the second decade of the 1900s. A model playground was even established and a playground specialist was secured to "direct...the play of the Training School pupils."1033

By 1916, many students were being sent to Farmville High School and Rice High School to do their practice teaching.1034 Within one year, the training school enrollment increased sixty percent with more than six hundred pupils being taught by normal school seniors in 1916.1035 There were three hundred eighty-five students in the junior and senior professional programs in September, 1916.1036 The increased enrollment and the interest in rural training programs forced the normal school to enlist the help of surrounding public schools to provide off-campus
laboratory teaching experiences. Martha Bondurant Wilson remembered doing her practice teaching at Rice in 1917. She rode the train to and from the school where she spent 2 1/2 - 3 hours in the classroom each day for three months. She also recalled that some students taught in Buckingham and were taken there by a school bus. In 1917, the school was given permission to purchase two Ford automobiles to transport students who "taught in three month shifts, three teachers instructing a grade during each session".

In spite of earlier attempts to guarantee high professional performance from student teachers, the faculty felt uncomfortable about some students who were being admitted into the training school program. Therefore, in March 1920, a committee was appointed to study the question of admitting professional students as teachers in the training school. On May 25, 1920, this committee reported the following information to the faculty.

1. the admission requirements for teaching in the training school were too low. This resulted in harm to children and frustration for the faculty.

2. the low requirements encouraged some students to enter a profession which they were not able to handle and hence they weakened the profession itself.

3. the first year should be a testing period for screening out the unfit or for extending the preparation time for weak but potentially able students.
4. the academic fitness of the student for teaching should not be overshadowed by personality.\textsuperscript{1040}

To address these matters, it was recommended that the director of the training school and two academic faculty members compose a standing committee to see that the following academic requirements were met:\textsuperscript{1041}

\textit{For Courses I, II, and III}

1. One-half of the student's grades shall be C or higher. Of these grades three must be on the five essential subjects, English, History, Reading, Arithmetic, and Geography.

2. No student who has more than one F or more than five periods of extra work may enter upon her teaching. A "Condition" counts as a D grade until removed by a higher grade.

3. If more than half of the student's grades fall below C, the D grades count as three-fourths (75\%) credit, thus making it necessary to repeat one-fourth of the classes in which she has received D.

\textit{For Course IV}

An average grade of C or higher must be made on the student's major and minor.

\textit{For Course V}

An average grade of C or higher must be made on Sewing and on Cooking.

Temperamental and physical unfitness should sometimes debar a student from attempting to teach. But such student may in the judgment of the faculty be allowed to remain in school, taking academic subjects only.

(See Appendix X for the full report of the committee.)
The recommendation of the Committee was accepted and the academic requirements stated above appeared in the catalog through 1924.

The normal school worked hard to maintain high professional standards in the training school which was regarded as the heart of the entire institution. From its beginning in 1884, the normal school was governed by a Board of Trustees who believed a laboratory school was essential to the training of teachers. The State continued to support this special facility at Farmville Normal School even though the schools at Radford, Harrisonburg, and Fredericksburg had to depend upon local schools to provide their laboratories for practice teaching. President Chandler at Fredericksburg wanted above all else to have a campus school but such did not become a reality until the 1928-29 session. Of the four normal schools, only the Farmville Normal School had an on-site training school. Even when increased enrollment and program diversification required the Farmville Normal School to use other facilities to supplement the training school, the laboratory school continued to occupy a central position in fulfilling the institution's established purpose.
In summary, it can be concluded that the training school, as an essential appendage of the normal school, continued to serve as a laboratory in which students were required to prove their ability to teach. It was considered the most important feature of the entire institution and indeed was the only reason why the other departments existed. They provided the theory and background knowledge considered prerequisite to student teaching but a student, unable to perform satisfactorily in the practice setting, was not permitted to receive a normal school diploma. The training school served as a feeder and a finisher of the normal school program. Female students who successfully completed the training school program were given automatic admission into the normal school program but they ultimately had to return to the training school to prove their professional fitness.

The training school served as a place for observation and practice. It was attended by students in kindergarten through grade eight until 1911 when the organizational structure changed. The elementary program then ended with grade seven but students in grades eight and nine could attend the first two years of high school at the training school. Grades ten and eleven were housed with the normal school and only females were admitted to the normal school proper.
Dr. Jarman was vitally interested in the training school and secured early approval (1904) for a kindergarten training program. He also arranged for the school to be housed in the best possible facilities and to have the most up-to-date equipment available. He sought out able instructors, like Stone, Duke, Dunn, and Tidyman, who were instrumental in curriculum building and the raising of professional standards. Under the leadership of such people, the training school made some notable professional contributions. Several publications gave the Farmville Normal School state-wide professional recognition but the Training School Course of Study published in 1914 did more than anything else to give the school recognition beyond the state of Virginia. Following this acclaim, there was an increased professional interest in other curriculum areas and in the improvement of professional standards.

Activities formerly considered extra-curricular came to be considered important as part of the teacher preparation program. (Harper, p. 119.)

Literary Societies

Literary societies were among the earliest extra-curricular activities established at the State Normal School at Farmville. Although their purpose was to provide both social and intellectual intercourse, the original aim was to foster academic development in literary pursuits. Prior to 1893, The Daughters of Virginia Society was organized and this group published a monthly paper called "Greetings". References to the Society are plentiful but "No records of this society have been kept so the reason for its deterioration and final decline is not known". In 1903, the Cunningham and Argus Literary Societies were started "to promote literary excellence". The former was named for John A. Cunningham who had served as president of the normal school from 1887-1897. The latter was named for the mythological Argus who had a hundred eyes. The society's motto logically became "To see better". Membership in both societies was limited to fifty (50) each.
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When the literary societies were first begun, the school was very small and there were likely not more than one hundred students who met the high scholarship expectations. However, as the course of study lengthened, as more high schools graduates entered and as school-wide standards improved, there were many qualified students who were unable to be initiated because of the membership limitation. For three years discussion centered around whether to expand the membership limitation or to start new societies. The latter argument prevailed and "The Pierian and The Athenian Societies were organized." The Athenian Society, named for the Greek goddess of wisdom, was begun on November 4, 1908 and the Pierian Society held its first meeting on December 26, 1908. The name for this society was taken from Pope's quotation: "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing. Drink deep or taste not of the Pierian Spring."

The societies encouraged students to keep scholastic standards high. Thus, being asked to join any one of the four societies was a distinctive honor. The stated aims for the societies were threefold, namely:

- to build up higher literary standards.
- to cultivate womanly social graces.
- to develop and strengthen individual talent.
The societies completed studies centering around southern writers, women writers, and authors such as Tennyson, Dickens, Shakespeare, Sheridan, Stevenson, Goldsmith, Bryan, Scott, Thackeray, etc. Among the other activities sponsored by the literary societies were socials, plays, musical programs, poetry and story reading, receptions, etc. In 1909, the work of the societies was reported as good, the interest as lively, and the rivalry among them as "perfectly friendly".

The Faculty Minutes of 1910 record the beginning of two new societies, the Jefferson and the Ruffner, named for Thomas Jefferson and William Henry Ruffner. These, as reported to the Board of Trustees, were debating societies which brought the total to "six societies doing work along literary lines". Membership in the debating societies was open to all students interested in debating. Debates were extremely popular among the literary as well as the debating societies. Topics were widely varied but among the early topics debated by the literary societies were these:

"Resolved: The comic sections of newspapers should be abolished."

"Resolved: That Latin should be a part of the required course of study of secondary schools."

"Resolved: That specialization in education is carried to too great an extent."
"Resolved: That the United States should have a protective tariff."\textsuperscript{1062}

Since literary and debating societies were becoming popular in public schools, it was deemed important for normal school graduates to have experiences which would enable them to organize and direct such societies. According to the school literary magazine, "The main purpose of the societies is to teach the members how to conduct a literary society, give them practice in debating, and afford an opportunity to familiarize themselves with current events".\textsuperscript{1063}

A 1922 issue of the school paper noted that the literary societies "grew and developed in influence and high standards until just before the great war" when their activities gave way largely to war concern.\textsuperscript{1064} However, in a 1915 issue of The Focus, it was noted that the societies needed reform. It was argued that too little emphasis was being placed upon literary ability and too much upon the more social aspects.\textsuperscript{1065} The societies were accused of being clannish.\textsuperscript{1066}

Although The Rotunda reported that "at the close of the war, the literary societies were begun again on a firm footing",\textsuperscript{1067} there is evidence that the debate over the value of the societies continued over the next several years. In a survey of the students done in 1919,
seventy-seven percent felt they were worthwhile, they helped to broaden horizons, conquer fears, increase self control, and stimulate expression.\textsuperscript{1068} Attempts were made by President Jarman\textsuperscript{1069} and by representatives of the societies\textsuperscript{1070} to revitalize interest throughout the entire year of 1919. However, when the Athenian Society met on October 1, 1920, there were not enough girls present to conduct a meeting.\textsuperscript{1071} This decline of interest in literary societies was attributed to increased opportunities and other organizations.\textsuperscript{1072} To stimulate interest, the societies moved from closed membership to open membership\textsuperscript{1073} but this proved to be totally ineffective.\textsuperscript{1074} By 1924, the societies had reverted to closed membership and "more interest was shown by everyone".\textsuperscript{1075}

\textbf{Student Publications}

After the demise of the "Greetings", the Normal Record was published in 1896 as a quarterly magazine for an unascertained period of time. It ceased to exist sometime prior to February 1905 when the first issue of Guidon went to press. This publication was backed by the Cunningham,
Argus, and Athenian Literary Societies. Its name was taken from the Shakespearean quotation, "I stay but for my Guidon". The Guidon lasted only five years. It carried nostalgic articles, such as "Ante-Bellum Days" and "Christmas 'for de War" in addition to poems, jokes, stories, and essays.

Why the Guidon failed is uncertain but a replacement soon followed in the form of the Focus which appeared by 1911. This magazine carried a widely diversified selection of material. It covered topics ranging from the literary societies to homesickness and the value of tears. The Focus, like the Guidon, was issued monthly and sold for one dollar per annual subscription.

The Focus continued until 1922 when the efforts made toward this publication were transferred to the school newspaper. The paper had started in 1920 and was originally called the Dummy. This was merely a stand-in title used until the paper could be appropriately named. The editorial of the second issue sought suggestions for a name which would be "original, distinctive, and full of 'punch', but not too outlandish, clever, or whimsical". After only five issues, a name was secured. That name was the Rotunda and after sixty-seven years, the paper still continues to be printed under the same title. The impetus for the suggested name was obviously the rotunda of the main building of the
normal school. The rotunda was both the visual and actual center of the campus since it housed the administrative offices, classrooms, and dormitories.

According to the 1921 catalog, The Rotunda staff was composed of students and alumnae, assisted by reporters for all classes and organizations. In addition to providing valuable work of a journalistic nature, the paper aimed to inform students, faculty, and alumnae and draw them closer together.1079

The longest running publication of the State Normal School, aside from its catalogs, was the school yearbook which began as the Normal Light in 1898. By 1901, a much larger annual was being published and the name was changed to The Virginian. After eighty-seven years, that name continues as the title of the school's yearbook. Of particular interest is the 1909 yearbook which was designed to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the school. According to the Trustee's Minutes, it was to tell what the alumnae had accomplished, to give information and photographs of the presidents, first Board of Trustees, Dr. Curry, and the faculty. It was to show the growth and development of the institution, as well as give a picture of the lighter side of school life. "It should be a handsome and valuable historical volume, creditable to the school,
and to the State which founded and supports it". The Virginian occasionally took the form of a smaller classbook (such as in 1910) rather than the usual yearbook style. In 1918, however, the students decided not to publish an annual at all. They chose instead to donate the amount which would ordinarily have been spent for that purpose toward a charitable war cause. Publication of The Virginian was resumed in 1919.

Chapel

Chapel was considered the most important part of the normal school student's schedule. It was generally held for a twenty minute period Monday through Friday. It was a time when faculty and students assembled in the auditorium to hear announcements, to sing hymns and school songs, to listen to speakers; but above all else, it was a time of recognizing the sovereignty of the Almighty. In interviews with graduates of the normal school, recollections of these happenings were clear. Elizabeth Jarman Hardy remembered chapel as a time when notes (announcements) were given by her father, Dr. Jarman. Martha Bondurant Wilson said the teachers would often lead chapel when Dr. Jarman was absent. She recalled that school songs and hymns were a
regular part of chapel. Belle Gillian Smith had memories of many different speakers, especially ministers and educators. Although Virginia's governors sometimes came to speak, the speaker most remembered by Elizabeth Jarman Hardy was Richard Evelyn Byrd.

Chapel was accompanied by strict regulations. According to an undated student handbook of the State Normal School, there were four very important rules:

1. All students, except teaching professionals, are required to attend Chapel, unless excused by the President of the school.
2. Students are required to sit in the seat assigned them in Chapel.
3. Students must stand during the singing of hymns.
4. There must be no laughing, talking, whispering, or any unnecessary noise during chapel exercises; neither must there be any reading, writing or work of any kind.

According to Elfie Meredith, Sybil Dodson, and Helen Norfleet Merritt, students feared being summoned to Dr. Jarman's office above all else. If one dared whisper during chapel or if one had committed a prior offense of any type, she was sure to hear those fateful words "Meet me in my office after chapel."

Chapel was considered an important supplement to the curriculum. After returning from Washington and attending a presidential inauguration, Dr. Jarman related the events
of the occasion, including attention to the suffragettes. This led the students to unbound applause at the mention of "one woman who marched with all that forty thousand men". Current issues such as this were frequently used as chapel topics. For example, on December 16, 1921, Emmeline Pankhurst, a noted suffragette from England addressed the topic "Women versus Bolshevism".

Young Woman's Christian Association

Of all the organizations associate with the State Normal School, none had the pervasive influence of the Young Woman's Christian Association. The literary magazine of 1914 said "there is hardly one in school who is not influenced in some way by it". The organization began in 1896 and became a charter member of the national Y.W.C.A. For a number of years it was under the cooperative leadership of the teachers and students who worked together to foster mission study, Bible study, and Christian character. In 1908, Dr. Jarman recommended that a Y.W.C.A. Secretary be employed to work full time. A graduate of the school was secured but she died before taking the office. It was then another two years before a graduate of Radcliffe, Miss Eleanor Richardson, assumed the duties of resident secretary.
Dr. Jarman also secured permission and funding from the Board to send an annual delegation to the Southern Student Conference held each summer in Blue Ridge, North Carolina. This was considered the best way possible for students to represent the religious side of the normal school.\textsuperscript{1098} According to the Trustee's Minutes, "the Conference is to show the Christian side of school life, what the large educational gatherings of the past several years, has been to the scholastic side".\textsuperscript{1099} This and similar conferences gained even greater momentum over the years. Elizabeth Moring Smith remembered attending the Y.W.C.A. Cabinet meeting in Sweet Briar, Virginia, the Blue Ridge Conference, and the International Student Volunteer Convention in Des Moines, Iowa. She, Dr. Jarman, the Y.W.C.A. resident secretary and five other students went to Iowa by train in 1920.\textsuperscript{1100}

The Y.W.C.A. compiled the first handbook for students at the normal school. It included a daily schedule (see Appendix Y\textsuperscript{1101}) plus a Y.W.C.A. schedule.\textsuperscript{1102} Additional information was provided about room arrangement, mail delivery, school organizations, and membership requirements for the Y.W.C.A.\textsuperscript{1103} The Y.W.C.A. sponsored "White Ribbon" girls who were available at the opening of school to help new students with matriculation and with finding their way around the school.\textsuperscript{1104} It was also a
major sponsor for social activities throughout the normal school period. One of its earliest and most lasting social traditions was the honoring of each student on her birthday.\textsuperscript{1105} A comparison of the 1908 and 1923 Handbooks shows that although numerous committees were added, the Y.W.C.A.'s basic aims and expectations changed very little over the years between 1908 and 1923. Christian character and regularity in church attendance were expected of everyone.\textsuperscript{1106}

**Music and Art Activities**

Music instruction was recognized as an important aspect of a teacher's preparation from the earliest history of the normal school. The aims of the Music Department were to "encourage intelligent interpretation and expression of musical thought" and to "cultivate the musical taste through the study of classical and standard compositions."\textsuperscript{1107} The courses for 1913 dealt with sight singing, theory, history, and methods for teaching various grade levels.\textsuperscript{1108} By 1923, advanced courses, harmony, and music appreciation had been added.\textsuperscript{1109}
Dr. Frazer had attempted to create a department of instrumental music in 1899, however, as late as 1921, the catalog still carried the statement, "No instrumental music is taught in the school." From 1912 through 1921, students who desired such training were referred to Mrs. Elsa Schemmel Schmidt who was the head of the Farmville Conservatory of Music. According to a conservatory brochure, the purpose was to enable the normal school students to obtain special music training in addition to their regular training as teachers. Instruction was offered in piano, organ, voice, harmony, composition, music history, and aesthetics of music. Although the catalog for 1920-21, specifically stated no instrumental music was taught, an item in the May, 1920 issue of the Virginia Journal indicated otherwise. According to this reference, the school orchestra gave its first concert on March 20, 1920.

This orchestra was organized several years ago, under the direction of Miss Munoz, head of the Department of Music, and has grown until it now contains some eighteen or twenty pieces, including violins, mandolins, guitars, cello, cornet, and flute.

The 1923-24 Catalog stated there was an orchestra of twenty-five members but those desiring advanced work were allowed to take private lessons.
Music was included as an essential part of the academic and professional curricula and vocal music was considered very important for teachers. The Glee Club was a very active part of the extra-curriculum. The 1909 Glee Club performance was judged to be an elaborate entertainment quite in keeping with the tradition which it had set in former years. In 1919, it was made a star course number because of its excellence. The membership of the group ranged from fifty to seventy-five in 1923.

In an article written by Dr. Jarman in 1919, normal schools were complimented for their emphasis upon public school music. Their influence in this area was repeatedly recognized throughout the state by the quality of work being done by teachers in general and music supervisors in particular.

The curriculum of the normal school also was limited in the amount of art experiences which could be provided. In 1901, form and drawing were taught in both sections of the first two years of the academic program. With the creation of the Manual Arts program in 1904, art became part of that department. Handwork, woodwork, construction, and mechanical drawing were heavily emphasized in the four courses taught. The drawing department provided such instruction as was considered essential for the classroom teacher; however, little opportunity was available for one
to develop and extend individual talents. Students desiring such individual enrichment had to depend upon private lessons. Miss Mary E. Grainger maintained a studio on the school grounds and she was listed in the 1918-19 catalog as an experienced artist from whom students could receive individual instruction.\textsuperscript{1122}

By 1923, the school had a separate drawing department. In addition to the methods courses, classes were offered in applied arts, advanced drawing and design, and art appreciation. The school offered an opportunity for those with special artistic aptitude to develop the skills needed for them to become teachers of drawing.\textsuperscript{1123}

**Drama**

The *Guidon* made a plea for the commencement of a dramatic club in 1905. Drama was purported to be tremendously valuable for those who would become teachers.\textsuperscript{1124} The 1908 *Virginian* noted that the school had just begun a course in dramatic art and had presented "The Lost Pleiad" in Crewe on April 30.\textsuperscript{1125} In 1909, the Dramatic Club presented "Miss Fearless and Company" to raise funds for the twenty-fifth year commemorative annual.\textsuperscript{1126}
Performance became a regular feature of the school in the following years. The 1914 Focus commended the high standards and excellent performances of the group.\textsuperscript{1127} The 1917-18 catalog stated that the Dramatic Club of twenty-five to thirty members was chosen by "trying out" and was intended to develop special dramatic abilities.\textsuperscript{1128}

Drama was a favorite form of entertainment and through the annual lyceum programs, many fine cultural opportunities were provided. Elizabeth Moring Smith received her entire formal education at the Farmville school, beginning in the training school and finishing with a B.S. in 1923. During these years, she kept a scrapbook which shows the great variety of plays and other events which were a part of normal school life. Included among the dramatic groups which appeared were the Devereaux Players, the Foremost Dramatic Players and most popular of all the Coburn Players.\textsuperscript{1129} By 1916, the latter group had made five trips to Farmville to give performances of Shakespeare's plays.\textsuperscript{1130} The favorite event for those attending summer school each year were the Chautauqua assemblies featuring plays, lectures, and concerts.\textsuperscript{1131}
Sororities and Clubs

Sororities were very popular at the Farmville School. Zeta Tau Alpha, a sorority which would within seventy-five years grow to embrace a worldwide membership of more than 65,000 people, was founded at Farmville in 1898.\textsuperscript{1132} In addition to Zeta, Kappa Delta had been founded earlier (in 1897), and Sigma Sigma Sigma had also been founded in 1898.\textsuperscript{1133} With the establishment of Alpha Sigma Alpha, there were four national sororities at the school by 1901.\textsuperscript{1134} In the 1923-24 Y.W.C.A. Handbook, the rules for rushing were given.\textsuperscript{1135}

The handbook also mentioned Pi Kappa Omega which was an honor society organized in 1918 to encourage "the highest type of leadership, scholarship, and service among the students".\textsuperscript{1136} Members of this organization had to have completed one year of professional studies, be of high moral character, be an influence for the best ideals, and maintain a grade of A on at least one third of the professional subjects and B on the remainder.\textsuperscript{1137}

The State Normal School had a wide variety of other clubs and organizations. In addition to the ones previously discussed, there were athletic clubs, language clubs, geographical clubs (i.e., Eastern Shore, Lynchburg), the
very popular Cotillion Club, Kodak Club, Travel Club, etc. In order to provide balance and equitable distribution of club and class offices, a point system was used which limited the extra curricular involvement of individual students. For this reason, Elizabeth Moring Smith remembered she was unable to accept the presidency of her senior class because she was Editor of the school paper.1138

From Rats to Graduation

The term "hazing" used in the late 1800s gave way to "ratting" in the early 1900s. In 1907, rats, who were the first year professional students, were treated rather humanely, according to Claire Burton.1139 By 1908, however, suggestions were being given for getting rid of rats. These included among other lighthearted ideas having them prove their musical ability by singing the laundry list backwards.1140

Graduation naturally was the highlight of each year. The event always lasted several days. In 1912, it began on the first day of June and concluded on the fourth. It began with the Senior Reception on Saturday and was followed by the Baccalaureate Sermon on Sunday. Monday was Class Day
and Tuesday was Commencement. The same procedures were followed in 1917 and in 1923. According to Elizabeth Moring Smith, "Everything was done with dignity and with great devotion to the school."

Physical Training

Health was a persistent concern throughout the normal school period. Health and sanitation conditions were a regular feature of the president's annual report to the State. Thus, physical participation became a significant part of the curriculum from the "light gymnastics" of 1884 to champion basketball games in the 1920s. The 1904 catalog said teachers should be physically strong; therefore, "a gymnasium with a complete outfit for physical development" was maintained. A regulation suit, consisting of a divided skirt, blouse, and gymnasium shoes, was required. In 1905 stunts provided the major winter activity; in the spring, archery, basketball, baseball, and tennis were played.
By 1907, the Athletic Association was reported to be unusually large with nearly three hundred members. There were eight basketball teams, two hundred members of the Tennis Club and "for those who do not care for such violent exercises, there is the Croquet Club".1148

By 1915, Field Day had become an annual event. Only the seniors and juniors--and of those only the best--were allowed to participate.1149 Interclass competitions fostered spirit and also permitted students to secure coveted monograms.1150 In the fall of 1919, the Athletic Association decided to present a loving cup to the class scoring the most points each year.1151 Participation was opened to students in the lower classes by 1921. Among the more popular events were the following: calisthenics drill, shuttle relay, running high jump, potato race, forty-yard dash, arch goal relay, baseball throw, three-legged race, suitcase race, and hurdling.1152

In 1921, the faculty established a committee on athletics "to fix some standards of eligibility on teams and to try to get other Normal Schools to do the same thing".1153 This was a well-advised move since games between the normal schools became highly competitive.1154 By 1922, a student had to maintain a "C" average in order to play on an athletic team in an inter-school game.1155
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In 1922, Dr. Jarman made an official statement endorsing athletics. He recognized the beneficial effects upon school spirit, as well as the physical. "Every prospective teacher," he said, "should not only be able to play all of the popular athletic games but should be prepared to direct them as well."1156

**Student Government**

Although 1910 is looked upon as the year in which a system of student government began, the idea was actually voiced much earlier by a faculty member. The Faculty Minutes for September 26, 1892 read: "A system of self-government for the pupils was proposed by Miss Vickroy".1157 A committee was appointed but no later evidence exists to show the outcome.

Louise Ford, second President of the Student Government Association, wrote that the actual formation of the organization came as a result of a senior civic class. After having discussed the election process and going through a simulated election, a group of students approached President Jarman to discuss a plan of self-government for the normal school. He heartily approved, and a constitution
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was written. Mass meetings of the student body were held and by a nearly unanimous vote, student government was begun. E. B. Brooks, was elected as the first president but because the school year was nearly over, she served only three weeks.

According to the constitution established, the purpose of the organization was "to preserve the student honor and to further the interests of the students." There were four areas for which the student government association was responsible: dishonesty, public conduct, defacing public property, and behavior in the halls, dining room, chapel, and during quiet hours. If a student were found guilty of misconduct, the student government aimed to help her "see her error and correct it". Dr. Jarman reported to the Board of Trustees in 1911 that the student government had operated on a trail basis for one year and had proven helpful, "especially in control over study hours."

An analysis of the Student Government Minutes for 1916-1917 reveals the major charges brought before the Executive Committee, composed of five representatives from the senior, junior, and fourth-year classes were:

- cheating
- noise
- talking to boys on the street
- cutting up magazines in the library
- riding in an automobile without permission
being downtown at inappropriate times
being in violation of study hours (most frequent cases)
being impudent
"borrowing" items without permission
hanging out of windows¹¹⁶⁶

On April 24, 1917, the Executive Committee and Senior Committee met to draw up regulations for "the new plan of Student Government rule because it had been decided to let Student Government have entire control of all school affairs outside of the classroom".¹¹⁶⁷ The rules and regulations were drawn up and each student received a copy of the Constitution and Regulations of the Student Association which was actually a handbook to replace the one formerly issued by the Y.W.C.A. This booklet contained chapel, library, campus, study, infirmary, and dormitory regulations. It also included regulations for town students, as well as campus residents.¹¹⁶⁸

When a student signed her application to enter the school, she agreed to uphold the standards of the school and automatically became a member of the Student Government Association.¹¹⁶⁹ Beginning in September, 1923, when a student entered the normal school, she was expected to sign the following pledge:¹¹⁷⁰

I ..................... having a clear understanding of the basis and spirit of the Honor System whereby our college life is governed, pledge myself to abide by the regulations of student government, to uphold
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in every phase of college life the highest standard of personal honor, and to accept my responsibility for helping others to live up to such a standard.

In summation, it is clear that literary and debating societies were among the most popular of the normal school extra-curricular activities until about 1915. As other activities became more readily available, these societies decreased in favor. Other literary endeavors included school magazines, a yearbook, and a school paper. After several unsuccessful attempts, the school magazine passed off the scene and the weekly school paper called The Rotunda became the primary publication. Yearbooks, or classbooks, were published every year from 1901-1924 except one year during the war.

Religious activities provided many leadership opportunities, social exchanges, and spiritual benefits. The Y.W.C.A. was a powerful campus organization. Nearly every student was a member and until the formation of the Student Government Association, no organization had as many members as the Y.W.C.A.

Chapel was more than a religious assembly. It was a daily time of "gathering together" when faculty and students met to pay divine respect, to hear announcements, to listen
to speakers, and to welcome dignitaries. It was also a time when students who had been negligent or who had bent the rules would be invited to meet the president in his office.

Although some provision was made in the course of study for music and art from 1902-1924, those with special talents had to depend upon private tutors. Vocal music, such as would equip the classroom teacher, was offered throughout the period. The Glee Club began prior to 1901 and quickly became very popular. Instrumental music could be secured at the Farmville Conservatory in 1912. It was not until the second decade of the century that the normal school offered any instrumental training. Art, like music, was provided in a rudimentary fashion, although by the close of the normal school era, enough courses were offered to enable those with talent to teach drawing.

The Dramatic Club offered excellent training for teachers and provided a highly enjoyable source of entertainment. Its performances and the lyceum numbers offered throughout the year were eagerly anticipated by the normal school students. A variety of other clubs, including the establishment of four national sororities, formed a part of the normal school's extra curriculum. Pi Kappa Omega was the chief honorary organization but athletic clubs and special interest organizations also afforded social and special interest opportunities for the students.
Hazing had started before the turn of the century but it continued into the twentieth century. It offered a chance for new students to be inducted into the school by means of an established tradition. Professional students entered as "rats" but graduated with dignity. Graduation exercises lasted several days.

Athletic activities steadily gained momentum from 1901-1924. The annual Field Day program fostered both competition and class spirit. Basketball became very popular and led to inter-school games and the establishment of standards for eligibility to play. By 1922, Dr. Jarman fully endorsed athletics and proposed that every teacher had an obligation to be involved in such activities.

The Student Government Association was begun at the State Normal School at Farmville in 1910. Students proved themselves able to handle self-governing challenges and were given increased responsibility for doing so. Students entering the normal school automatically became members of the Student Government Association. Each was expected to sign a pledge to uphold the highest standards of personal honor.

Normal Schools were established to meet certain public needs and they used the most expedient methods for meeting the challenges. (Harper, p. 120.)

Pragmatic Purpose

The pragmatic attitude of the Normal School at Farmville is evident in its 1901 statement of aims. The explicit purpose of the school was "to fit students for teaching" and it intended to accomplish this goal by means of these objectives:

1. by giving thorough instruction in the subjects taught in the common school and such additional instruction as time would allow.

2. by providing knowledge of the processes involved in learning in order that they might train the minds of children.

3. by focusing upon methods of instruction "based upon a knowledge of the mind and of the value of each subject taught as a factor in mental development."

4. by allowing students to engage in purposeful observation followed by the opportunity to apply educational principles in practice teaching situations.

5. by developing character, independence, love of learning, responsibility, and enthusiasm.
In 1901, when students left the normal school to assume instructional duties, there was little contact with other professionals. It was therefore extremely important that the normal school provide the fundamental skills needed for basic instruction in the public schools. In a real sense, the institution taught those subjects which its graduates could expect to teach their students. The three r's plus social studies and science were the most important areas but these were enriched by courses in art, music, and Latin. Instruction in psychology was heavily emphasized throughout the professional course. In 1901, the Department of Education offered three courses in psychology. The elementary course attended to "mental phenomena and processes including sensation, perception, memory, association, attention, instincts, emotions and volition." Fitchener's Primer of Psychology and James' Briefer Course in Psychology were used as textbooks. The course in genetic psychology centered upon comparative study of mental and physical growth and gave special attention to adolescent and child development. The applied psychology course examined the implications of psychology for school work and also presented "a survey of the more reputed
methods of instruction, as story-telling, Socratic method, monitorial methods, and developing methods. Courses in ethics and school management were also offered.

By 1908, the State Female Normal School was described as a technical institution designed to train teachers for the State of Virginia. The statement of purpose given in the 1908-09 catalog remained unchanged throughout the normal school period which ended in 1924. According to the description given, the teacher needed more than academic preparation. Professional work therefore permeated the entire curriculum. Incidental instruction in methods was a characteristic part of subject matter presentation; courses in school management prepared one to organize and conduct schools; and psychology courses explained mental development. Hattie Mae Robertson Jarratt of the class of 1910 recalled everything was centered around the "apperceptive basis" and an important textbook of the period was The Psychology of Thinking by Irving Elgar Miller.

Throughout all of the normal school's history, the most pragmatic of all forms of instruction was that which evolved around the training school. Students were required to observe model lessons, to submit lesson plans based upon these observations, and to meet for regular discussions of these observations. Practice teaching was considered
the most significant of all of the normal school opportunities. The training school program was designed to give pupil-teachers a chance "to train and exhibit their natural and acquired qualifications for practical service in our public schools".\textsuperscript{1180}

From its establishment, the school had been designed to train white female teachers to accept professional roles in the public schools of the state. As state educational needs changed, the State Normal School responded to those needs. Admission requirements were continually increased as were the requirements for graduation from the normal school. Originally, a student scarcely had to do more than write her name to gain entrance. By 1901, she had to be examined in reading, writing, spelling, English, mathematics, geography, and history.\textsuperscript{1181} By 1911, public high schools were becoming fairly common and the normal school had adopted entrance standards based upon a clearly stated definition of "approved high schools".\textsuperscript{1182} High school graduation from an approved three or four year program had become essential for admission to professional study. The nature and type of diploma also changed with public school demands. The Licentiate of Teaching had been replaced in 1897 by several separate diplomas but the normal and professional programs still required only one year. By 1904, two years of normal school were needed for the professional diploma and by 1907.
the normal school required two years of professional work rather than one for all diplomas. Those completing just one year of professional study were entitled to a certificate only. This increase in professional study was the beginning of a trend which would move the normal school toward a collegiate program. In 1916, the normal school was granted the privilege of conferring degrees. This was a major step in normal school education, both for the Farmville school and for the schools at Radford, Harrisonburg and Fredericksburg which were given the same privilege. From a pragmatic standpoint, it was no longer reasonable to expect a student to sufficiently equip herself for professional duties within two years, especially if she planned to teach in high school.

The Farmville school maintained a high school division throughout its normal school history. This program was referred to as the academic course and was especially important because of the large number of students who still lacked access to approved high schools. The training school actually served as a feeder source for the professional program. As observed by a student in the class of 1906, it was "only a little crowd" who had graduated from high school elsewhere and could therefore enter directly into the professional course. Most of the professional students had
either attended the full training school program or else had entered the academic course in order to secure the high school work required for the professional course.\textsuperscript{1185} As the number of high schools increased rapidly, admission into the professional programs became contingent upon graduation from high school. The 1916-17 catalog stated that for entrance into the six courses offered by the school, all required the equivalent of a four year high school diploma, except preparation for county demonstration work which required an individual to already have had three years of teaching experience and to possess a certificate.\textsuperscript{1186} Thus, it was essential that the normal school provide the necessary training for those not possessing the required educational background.

\textbf{Pragmatic Response to CEA Campaign.}

In a campaign launched by the Cooperative Education Association in the spring of 1905, public attention was directed toward the inadequacies of public education. According to Heatwole, there were only fifty (50) high schools in Virginia in 1905 but by the following year, the number had grown to seventy-five (75).\textsuperscript{1187} Between 1906 and 1910, the number of high schools increased at the rate of nearly one hundred per year.\textsuperscript{1188} This was indicative of the
favorable regard which formal public education was gaining. It also added to the already existing deficit of trained teachers. In 1903, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction had reported a need for 1500 new teachers each year to meet the demand for white teachers. At that time Farmville was the only normal school in this state preparing white female teachers. This meant that the few existing high schools had to become the major source from which elementary teachers could be secured. However, the Superintendent of Public Instruction insisted that only colleges, universities and normal schools should supply high school teachers. Yet, it was a decade later before the Farmville school began a program, especially for the training of high school teachers.

The reaction of the normal school to the statewide reform efforts which began in 1905 clearly reveals its ability to take a pragmatic attitude about professional responsibilities. The Cooperative Education Association met in December, 1904 and set up plans for what was to become the "May Campaign" of 1905. This was intended to be a major publicity event which would create state awareness about the needs of public education. Much of the credit for the success of this reform effort is due Governor Andrew
Jackson Montague, Robert Frazer, former president of the normal school, and Joseph D. Eggleston of Prince Edward County who would become State Superintendent in 1906. Bruce R. Payne, who served as a member of the Board of Trustees at the Farmville Normal School until his term ended in 1910 was chairman of the publicity committee and in this capacity, he "kept the papers filled with educational literature." The CEA had eight "planks" around which its efforts were organized: nine months of school for all children, high schools within reasonable distance for all children, well-trained teachers, agricultural and industrial training, efficient supervision, promotion of libraries, schools for the defective and dependent, citizens educational associations in every county and city.

Since the normal school had been established for the purpose of training teachers, these aims were to have an impact upon the rest of the normal school period. The needs for well-located high schools, agricultural and industrial training, efficient supervision, and available libraries were to become primary considerations. According to Buck, it is possible that the normal school chose to continue to prepare mainly elementary positions, leaving the preparation of high school primarily to colleges and universities.
At any rate, it was not until 1910 that Dr. Jarman began to make serious considerations about offering training for high school teachers.\textsuperscript{1197} By that year, there were at least three hundred sixty (360) high schools in the state.\textsuperscript{1198} As a result of this expansion, Dr. Jarman recommended that training for high school teaching be given as soon as possible.\textsuperscript{1199} By 1913, a course specifically for the professional training of secondary teachers was being offered.\textsuperscript{1200} Four years later, the program had become more specialized and was offering a major and a minor,\textsuperscript{1201} in addition to the opportunity to earn a collegiate degree.

As the demand for professionally trained white female teachers intensified, it became obvious that the Farmville school could not produce nearly the number of new teachers needed each year. It was for this reason that it became necessary for the Legislature of 1908 to establish additional normal schools.\textsuperscript{1202} By 1919, the pragmatic view which led to the establishment of the different schools also led the State to assign differentiated courses for teacher preparation to the four schools. Farmville became primarily responsible for training high school teachers, Harrisonburg for home economics teachers, Fredericksburg for music, industrial arts, and commercial teachers, Radford for
elementary supervisors and rural education specialists. A course designed to prepare teachers for rural graded schools was begun in 1913. The aim was to train teachers "to do the same high-class work in country schools as has been done for some time in city schools". Included in this program were the following courses designed to meet the practical needs of country schools:

1. The Country School and the Rural Community.
2. Country Life Recreation.
5. Course of Study and Schedule Problems.
6. Agriculture.
7. Teaching and Observation.
8. Household Arts.
10. Educational Seatwork. (This class met twice a week and centered around independent activities for children, using materials which could be procured in rural communities at little or no expense).

As early as 1910, the normal school had secured a supervisor to aid in the study of rural problems, to coordinate the work of rural schools, and to give lectures on rural education to those in the professional course.
The rural graded school course was started in 1913 and by 1915, the normal school had begun observation and practice teaching experiences in the nearby schools. This was a significant move because as Link notes "Small, isolated schools often had difficulty finding normal school graduates". Miss Fannie Dunn served as the first supervisor and under her initial guidance and later under Miss Florence Stubbs, the program grew rapidly and was extended in 1917 to include additional rural school systems. In 1920, the normal school hosted a Rural Conference with speakers "from all parts of the United States". Among those in attendance were teachers, rural supervisors, divisional superintendents, home economic specialists, physicians, educational specialists, school and community league presidents, students, and others.

Home Economics was first begun at the normal school in 1907 and by 1918, a four year course in home economics was offered. This program served the dual purpose of preparing teachers to assume positions as science teachers as well as home economics teachers. Cooking, sewing, household arts, manual arts, agriculture, and other rural arts had assumed their places among the courses considered to be needed "to prepare a teacher to function in the modern world".
The addition of library training to the course of study also shows the pragmatic nature of the normal school. The Cooperative Education Association had included the promotion of libraries as one of the nine "planks" to which the 1905 campaign gave attention. The Farmville school had started a Juvenile Library in the training school in 1904. It contained only two hundred books originally but it still provided an opportunity for the professional students "to learn how to manage and use a small library".\textsuperscript{1214} By 1907, course work had been expanded and the normal school claimed that its graduates were trained in library methods "so that the public school library will fall into safe hands"\textsuperscript{1215} and so that "all graduates take with them into the public schools of the State somewhat of the library spirit."\textsuperscript{1216}

**Training School—A Pragmatic Experience**

The training school afforded the most practical of all experiences provided in the professional training of teachers. It was here that students had an opportunity to put the educational principles they had studied into practice. It was this experience of teaching under supervision which provided the most reasonable facsimile of what it would be like to assume independent charge of a classroom.
The training school served a dual purpose. First, it provided an education for elementary students and for certain high school pupils. The second purpose and the reason for the first was to give students in the normal school an opportunity to work with children in a laboratory setting. The training school directly reflected the changing needs of the public schools. This is well-illustrated in the matter of preparatory work. Until high schools became fairly conveniently located for most students, the normal school was forced to offer an academic course which in 1908 included four years of regular course work plus a review year for those who needed extra work before being admitted to the academic department. However, within a few years, rural school improvements made this extra work unnecessary and the review year was dropped before the 1911-12 session.

The academic department fluctuated between the normal school and the training school. In 1911, all grades above the seventh were moved to the normal school but with the creation of a course to train high school teachers in 1913, it was soon necessary to move the eight and ninth grades back to the training school to provide a place where students could have practice teaching experiences with secondary students in the training school. This structural flexibility regarding the training school shows the normal
school's willingness to adjust its program to whatever was considered to be the most efficient method for preparing public school teachers.

The normal school also sought and received from Farmville an agreement to have as many local children enrolled in the training school as was necessary "to maintain consistent enrollment in grade levels...where teacher training was involved". Other local public schools were likewise used to supplement the training school and to provide appropriate practical experiences for those preparing to teach. Thus, it seems the Farmville school followed the pragmatic disposition described by Harper and took from any source that "which had a direct bearing on [its] problems."

It can be concluded that the State Normal School at Farmville was very pragmatic in its approach to teacher training throughout its history. Even its aims and purposes were totally pragmatic—it existed merely to equip students to teach. To fulfill this obligation, it had to provide much of its own preparatory work. The statewide school system never reached the point during the normal school years when all students came to the school sufficiently prepared to begin professional work. However, requirements
for admission became more dependent upon high school graduation and the normal school was willing to go through the process of classification and program restructuring in order to elevate professional standards.

The normal school was quite pragmatic in the area of curriculum. New programs were quickly curricularized and those no longer needed were dropped. The attempt of the Cooperative Education Association to bring reform to public education clearly manifests this curriculum flexibility of the normal school. The Farmville School responded immediately to the need for high school programs, for rural school programs, for efficient supervision and for better library training.

The training school was almost totally a pragmatic endeavor. As a laboratory for teacher training, it afforded students a chance to convert professional studies into practice. The professional program itself was pragmatically organized, focusing upon how children learn, how teaching could be made effective, and how to manage classrooms. It was the experience of putting these concepts into operation in the classroom which proved the student's suitability for professional responsibility.

The State Normal School at Farmville was willing to restructure programs, to negotiate with public schools for children to participate in the training school, to use
local schools to supplement the training school experiences, and to do whatever was necessary to provide laboratory experiences for its students. "The whole aim of the institution [was] to render to the State the greatest possible service in the training of teachers".1221
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Chapter IV: Summative Review
Review of the Problem

The purpose of this study has been to describe the normal school experience at a typical teacher training institution operating during the years 1884-1924. Charles Harper in his book published in 1939, *A Century of Public Teacher Education*, identified seven trends which he purported to be characteristic of most normal schools at the turn of the century. These trends, referred to in this study as characteristics, were used as a conceptual framework for a case study at Virginia's first normal school for white females. Historical data concerning each of these characteristics were analyzed in order to describe what was happening with regards to each at the State Normal School at Farmville during the years 1884-1924. In the process of comprehensively describing events related to each of Harper's characteristics, specific contributions of the school emerged. This chapter shall therefore be devoted to a summary analysis of the findings regarding each of the characteristics, to a delineation of the contributions which the Farmville school made to the professionalization of teaching, and to a recommendation for other possible areas of research related to this study.
Review of the Background of the Problem

The institutional history of the Farmville school preceded the establishment of the normal school in 1884 by at least forty-five years. It was incorporated as the Farmville Seminary Association on March 5, 1839; in 1875, it became Farmville College; and on March 7, 1884, it became the State Female Normal School. Although the Farmville location was selected more for its opportunism than for any other reason, the acquisition of a normal school to train white female teachers was a momentous occasion in the history of teacher education in the state of Virginia.

Dr. William Henry Ruffner had served as State Superintendent of Public Instruction for twelve years. In that capacity, he had breathed life into the newly created system of state education. He was responsible for drawing up the organizational plans for a system which had been mandated by a Reconstructionist Legislature. His ability to reconcile Northern liberality with Virginia conservativeness and to devise feasible plans for operationalizing the Underwood Constitution required remarkable astuteness. Providing free education to all citizens in a state which had previously depended primarily upon private schooling was a challenge sufficient unto itself. This, however, was immeasurably complicated by the fact that there was no
available source of professionally trained teachers from which to draw. Ruffner, therefore, continuously urged the State to give substance to the fifth section of the 1869 mandate "to establish normal schools as soon as practicable". This was not actualized until after Ruffer vacated the superintendency, however.

As the demand for teachers continued to escalate, the State gradually accepted the fact that it had a responsibility to provide the kind of normal school training Ruffner had advocated. In 1882, it established a school to train black teachers and finally in 1884, the Legislature honored a bill drafted by J. L. M. Curry to establish a normal school to train white teachers. Since the citizens of Farmville had offered to donate the plant of the old Farmville Female College, the Legislature, not wishing to spend a significant amount on the venture accepted. Thus, with very modest beginnings in an old academy building and an annual appropriation of only ten thousand dollars, the State Female Normal School began in 1884.

Resolution of the Problem

With this brief review of factors leading to the establishment of the Farmville school, attention shall now be turned to a resolution of the problem by addressing each
of the subsidiary questions. To provide a systematic plan of presentation, the same format will be used that was employed in the previous chapter. The seven subsidiary research questions related to the seven characteristics described will be analyzed. Those seven questions are discussed in the following order:

1. How did the administrative and teaching staff help to promote teacher training and give it professional status?

2. What efforts were made to provide close contact and communication between the normal school and the public?

3. What was the nature of the in-service training for public school teachers provided by the normal school?

4. What was the course of study like and how did it change over the years to meet professional needs?

5. How were the needs for practical teaching experiences accommodated?

6. What kinds of extra curricular activities were approved by the normal school and how did these change over the years?

7. What evidence can be found that the Farmville School moved from a rather pragmatic philosophy of training teachers to a more academic philosophy?

Question 1. How did the administrative and teaching staff help to promote teacher training and give it professional status?
The relationship of the Board of Trustees moved from a very paternalistic involvement in the daily activities of the school in the early years to one of strictly business considerations for matters such as economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. During the years of beginning, the Board was primarily concerned about getting the school established, opened, and operating. It worked to overcome funding problems, to secure the proper leadership for the school, and to be certain that a program of studies was designed to equip teachers for Virginia's classrooms. Because the normal school was a new venture in the State and the students were young females who in many cases had never been away from home before, the Board felt it necessary to assume definite in loco parentis responsibilities. The obligation, however, manifested itself more in the form of involvement than in rules and regulations. The vice-principal of school in 1884 referred to the Trustees as "guardian angels". They inspected everything from classrooms to living accommodations. They visited all classes to observe instruction and then had time for social exchange with the students. During the years of beginning (1884-1887), it can be concluded that the Trustees felt responsible for the total school, for the personal welfare of each student, and...
for the thoroughness of preparation for the teaching profession. With reference to the latter, the Board commendably approved a dual tract curriculum for elementary and advanced studies. The failure of this plan to materialize must be attributed to a lack of funds rather than to a lack of foresight on the part of the Board. Similarly, the Board instituted a model school to begin simultaneously with the commencement of the normal school. Believing practical experiences to be an essential part of teaching preparation, the Board refused to leave laboratory experiences to chance. During the years of development (1887-1901), the Board was less intimately involved with routine operations of the school and chose instead to look into matters dealing with facilities, equipment, and strengthening of the curriculum. Enrollment was increasing and many students were forced to board with the town residents. Thus, the Board worked for additional dormitory space as well as for new buildings for classrooms, laboratories and a gymnasium. The course of study was expanded to include new departments of instruction and to offer three separate kinds of professional preparation for teaching. In 1897, students were allowed to graduate in English, Scientific, or Classical studies. The separate tracks offered a more comprehensive professional and
academic background than the narrow single-track normal course which had existed with only slight modifications since 1884.

As the normal school became securely established, it entered into a period of refinement and change (1902-1924). During this period, the Board continued a vigorous seeking of legislative support for additional buildings and "betterments". Consequently, facilities were improved and the number of faculty and staff increased. The course of study underwent many modifications, as the Board remained opened and sensitive to changing public education needs. In 1904, the professional program was extended by one year which made two years rather than one year of training an acceptable standard for teacher preparation. In 1914, the Board attempted to secure collegiate status for the school but it was not until 1916 that the baccalaureate degree was approved. However, by the end of the normal school era, professional preparation, especially for high school teaching, was leaning heavily toward four years of training.

The Board of Trustees maintained a very close working relationship with the school throughout the normal school years. However, with the creation of the Harrisonburg, Radford, and Fredericksburg Normal Schools, governance responsibilities were transferred from the hands of local board to that of a centralized State Normal School
Board. This meant that the personal association of the members of the Board with any particular school was lessened. Although competition may have existed as members sought to promote certain personal interests, the Board successfully dealt with common problems related to finances and programs. All four schools grew steadily during the period and each was recognized by the Board for the character of work done to promote teacher preparation. Accordingly, the Board fully supported efforts to raise professional standards. Therefore, the Board petitioned the Legislature to not only permit conferring degrees but to also elevate the institutions from State Normal Schools to full-fledged four-year State Teachers Colleges.

Presidents

William Henry Ruffner knew the needs of Virginia's public schools better than any other person of his day. During his twelve years as State Superintendent, he visited extensively in the public schools. Hence, he knew from first hand observation what kind of training teachers needed. It therefore was quite logical that he should be the unanimous choice of the Board of Trustees to serve as principal during the years of the normal school's establishment. Ruffner was chosen to be principal on April 519.
9, 1884, and the urgency of his task was so great that he began on April 28, 1884, to visit "the best normal schools" in the country in order to compare systems and familiarize himself with operational intricacies. He was guided by this same professional interest to select Miss Celeste Bush, a Connecticut normal school instructor, as vice-principal for the school. Ruffner considered it his responsibility to personally select each teacher for the school. His first staff consisted of only eight teachers and himself but the teachers chosen represented five states with only two being from Virginia. Securing these teachers was an enormous task, considering Ruffner's determination to have only instructors who had been especially trained in normal school work and considering the few short weeks in which this matter had to be accomplished.

In addition to staffing the school, Ruffner also had to enroll students. This he did primarily by means of circular advertisement. He had to prepare the notices and include appropriate information about standards for admission, about the course of study to be offered, and the importance of the school for providing "professional fitness for teaching". Dr. Ruffner's influence throughout the State proved tremendously helpful in terms of securing
acceptance for what was still considered by many to be an innovative, perhaps unnecessary, plan for preparing teachers.

Ruffner's major contributions during the years 1884-87 were primarily in the areas of staffing and finding students for the new school. To his credit, he employed eight professionally trained teachers and enrolled more than a hundred students for the first session. Ruffner deserves to be recognized for a loyalty to education which took precedence over traditionalism. Just as he labored for excellence in public education for everyone, so he worked, without bias or hostility to find the best professionally trained faculty available. Recognizing that Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York had normal schools which had been operating for a fairly long time, he disregarded the typical Southern prejudices toward Northerners and determined, instead, to find the best. The careful choice of that first faculty was perhaps Ruffner's great accomplishment as principal. As the research has shown, Ruffner actually depended upon the vice-principal to run the school and had she not been so competent, the opening of the school might have been chaos. Similarly, had the faculty not have been so strong, the school could have collapsed because of failure to provide truly professional training. However, the fact that Ruffner loaned his name and influence to the
institution were also important contributions. The respect which he had won during his twelve years as State Superintendent paid rich dividends in terms of the public support he enlisted for the normal school.

Although Ruffner openly purported that the normal school was the most important part of the public system, he served as its principal only three years. Conflict with certain members of the faculty caused internal problems which led to a series of resignations including Ruffner's. John A. Cunningham succeeded Ruffner and served ten years as head of the school. He entered the normal school's history at a very crucial time and brought it out of turmoil into stability. Of the original faculty, only three members returned in 1887 when Cunningham assumed the reins of leadership. Cunningham brought with him a background of experience in the public schools which enabled him to understand the needs in teacher preparation. As a conscientious and able administrator, he made recommendations to the Board for expansions in physical facilities, the course of study, and size. During his ten-year tenure, the enrollment nearly tripled (growing from 93 to 250) and the faculty increased by five positions.

Cunningham was a scholarly man who was generally considered to be an able teacher. He was referred to as a progressive educator and since he was very interested in
curriculum development, this seems to be a valid assumption. He quickly disposed of Ruffner's highly lauded oral "teaching exercises" in favor of more practical and realistic experiences. His major recommendations to the Board dealt with the addition of departments of instruction and the expansion of the curriculum. Cunningham believed that time needed to be extended in the professional preparation programs. For this reason, he recommended a more diversified program which culminated in separate diplomas depending upon the track chosen by the student.

Dr. Frazer had served as President of the Industrial Institute and College of Mississippi before he assumed the presidency of the normal school. Enrollment increased by fifty-four students while Dr. Frazer was president. The modern language and physical education programs were expanded and a separate Department of Education was established. Frazer proposed that students buy their own texts, believing a sense of ownership of professional tools to be very important. He was very student oriented and advocated that faculty should give themselves openly to the school. Frazer's effectiveness, like Ruffner's was diminished by internal problems. He freely admitted his relationship with the Board of Trustees was less than harmonious. Frazer was apparently a man of resolute
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determination and rather than to have the authority of his office circumvented, he chose to resign after only four years.

The major contributions of both Cunningham and Frazer were in the area of curriculum. Cunningham enlarged the course of study by making extensive additions to the course offerings and increasing professional requirements. Frazer's most notable contribution was the creation of separate departments to give more focus to certain academic areas. He began a separate Department of Education and this helped to establish teaching as a definite profession and gave it a special program with which to identify.

Joseph L. Jarman became President in 1902 and remained in that office for forty-four years. He was a young man when he accepted the position but he inherited a school which had already gained respect throughout the State. Although, Cunningham was the only one of his predecessors who had remained in office for any appreciable period of time, Jarman entered a growing institution and one which was eager to make teacher training commensurate with public school needs. The differences which existed between Frazer and the Board were laid to rest before the new president's arrival. According to the records available, Jarman enjoyed a consistently supportive relationship with the Board, an understanding relationship with the faculty,
and a highly respected relationship with the students. The man tends to take on almost legendary proportions so positive are the written accounts and oral histories given of him. Jarman was undoubtedly a very diplomatic administrator who knew how to handle the demands of his office with administrative expertise undergirded by a tremendous amount of human relations insight. Nevertheless, Jarman was the kind of president who was needed to help the normal school refine and extend the quality of the already well-established teacher training program.

Because he was able to rally community effort, Jarman fostered a sense of unity among the faculty, students, and local citizens. He took upon himself the responsibilities for local and state leadership and encourage his faculty to do likewise. He accepted positions on numerous commissions, committees, and councils related to normal schools, colleges, and educational associations. Among his roles were those of serving on the State Board of Education, President of the State Teachers Association, State Director of the National Education Association, and President of the Normal Section of the Southern Education Association. He believed that people associated with the Normal School were its best advertisement. For this reason,
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he and his faculty were actively involved in providing in-service opportunities for public schools, attending conferences, and writing professionally related material.

Jarman's stress upon the importance of cooperation as the key to any successful endeavor and the school's strong emphasis upon a child-centered curriculum suggest that Dewey's influence was pervasive. However, Dr. Jarman reportedly was tolerant of modern philosophies but not indulgent, preferring instead to subject ideas to critical review. He did not opt immediately for innovative ideas but rather he sought solutions to problems in teaching by practical, concrete, definite and human approaches.

When Jarman became president in 1902, the school required only one full year of professional work. Under Cunningham's plan, students could choose more than one year of professional studies but were not required to do so. Thus, when Jarman arrived, there was a four year normal course but three of these years were really just secondary work, preparatory for the professional year. Obviously, this left only one year of actual college level work. Under Jarman's leadership, the school developed into a four year, degree-granting institution and in 1924, it became recognized as a State Teacher's College.
Faculty

An analysis of the Faculty Minutes for 1884-87 reveals that the faculty's concern was first and foremost for matters related to instruction, such as library provision, grading, academic problems, qualifications for admission, instructional materials, etc. This highly professional attitude is likely attributable to the professional backgrounds from which the faculty had been derived. Dr. Ruffner had been careful in his selection of teachers. The model school teacher had taught in the public schools, three had attended normal schools, two had taught in normal schools, one had graduated from Hampden-Sydney, and the music teacher had been trained at the Boston Conservatory. The Faculty Minutes communicate a definite concern about the lack of adequate background preparation on the part of the student. The faculty were eager to offer professional instruction but were often frustrated by a lack of proficiency in basic skills and by improper study habits.

The major contribution of the faculty from 1884-87 was the persistent concern over academic matters and a refusal to allow their personal problems to interfere with their professional obligations. There were "irreconcilable differences" between Dr. Ruffner and certain members of the
faculty during the 1886-87 session. The Faculty Minutes, however, give no indication of this. Only by a review of the Board of Trustees Minutes and by the fact that the principal, the vice-principal, and three faculty members resigned at the close of the 1886-87 session does it become clear that acute problems existed. Commendably, faculty meetings did not degenerate but rather remained focused upon professional concerns and the progress of the school.

Another contribution made by the faculty of 1884-87 was the personal respect accorded students. Although the students were young females who had been reared in a society that was very protective of them, no evidence could be found that the faculty tended to either over-protect them or over-regulate their behavior. The school was conducted as a professional school not as a "finishing school for young misses".

During the period of development (1887-1901), the faculty maintained a high level of personal interest in the students. This can be discerned from an analysis of the Faculty Minutes which indicate an ongoing concern for the academic performance and the general well-being of the students. However, information regarding the faculty and their contributions is at best limited.
Typically, normal schools hired their own best qualified graduates according to Charles Harper. This was the case with Miss Celeste Parrish who had joined the faculty during the Ruffner administration. She had also been a part of the controversy which surrounded the final year of his term. According to Dr. Ruffner and to her own students, Miss Parrish was an outstanding member of the faculty at the normal school. She was very interested in the latest developments in education, including psychology and rural education. She distinguished herself early and was called to teach at Randolph-Macon Woman's College in 1893. She later went to Georgia where the Legislature honored her "as the South's leading woman and educator".

Miss Gaines was also a very able teacher who left the normal school to study at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology before going to Adelphi College as head of the Biology Department. She and Miss Parrish helped to spread the influence of the Farmville school to other states.

The normal school was likewise influenced by ideas from throughout the country. Though not a great deal is available about individual faculty members of the period, it is known that Harvard-Annex, Oswego, Peabody, Cornell, and the Farmville School were among the sources from which faculty were drawn. The faculty showed great diligence in furthering their education. Summer study and leaves of
absence were frequent. Only the faculty's concern for students outdistanced their interest in their own personal academic preparation.

Among the major contributions of the faculty from 1887-1901 were their interests in gaining professional expertise through individual plans for study and personal development. Those faculty who accepted positions at other schools, as well as those who went to other schools to study, helped to spread the influence of the Farmville School.

The faculty of 1901-1924 were active professionally. They were writing a great deal and were also providing direct service to the public schools. The Virginia Journal was the primary vehicle used by the faculty to cultivate a sense of professionalism. Most of the writing was directed toward helping the classroom teacher by providing suggestions or giving practical advice about handling the instructional responsibilities.

W. F. Tidyman and W. C. Stone were among the most prolific writers on the faculty. The former was recognized for his contributions to the teaching of spelling. The latter was especially interested in mathematical concepts but at the normal school, his most distinguished service was in curriculum building. He helped the faculty to cooperatively formulate a Training School Course of Study.
which received a great deal of state and even national recognition. Dr. Stone had been a student under E. L. Thorndike but he was also a disciple of John Dewey. His advocacy of the Dewey philosophy is clearly evident in the child-centered curriculum which the Farmville school developed.

The normal school issued bulletins from time to time which addressed special needs in education. The topics included among others, how to provide appropriate seat work; spelling; English; and principles for effective supervision. In addition to writing bulletins and journal articles, the faculty traveled about the State to speak at professional meetings and to offer teachers special assistance. Although most of these efforts were concentrated at the local level, some faculty members were participants in national conferences. They were supportive of professional organizations at the local, state, and national levels.

The faculty were regularly engaged in summer schools either as teachers or students. Dr. Jarman encouraged professional growth and the faculty capitalized upon the opportunities provided. A study of the Trustee's Minutes reveals the Board's willingness to grant frequent leaves of absence for study purposes. Summers were likewise used
extensively for study at various institutions through the country. Columbia, Peabody, and Cornell were three of the most popular places to take summer training.

The number and preparation of the faculty steadily increased throughout the Jarman era. The faculty grew from thirteen in 1902 to thirty-seven in 1908. In 1902, only two instructors held doctorates, and one held an A.M. and one a B.S. By 1908, there were five earned doctorates and Dr. Jarman held the honorary Ll.D. There were two master's and six bachelor's degrees. By 1924, of the forty-three faculty, the following degrees were possessed: one earned doctorate, one honorary doctorate, ten masters, fourteen bachelors, and seventeen without a bachelors. Thus, while only one person had an earned doctorate, more faculty were acquiring bachelor' and master's degrees.

As faculty qualifications increased so did the demand for normal school instructors. Salaries at Farmville remained low and this caused the school to lose many of its best qualified members. It appeared that Farmville was merely serving as a proving ground after which faculty would move into better positions. In 1920, the issue was finally addressed to the Virginia Normal School Board which approved Dr. Jarman's decision to raise departmental head's salaries by 25% and supervisors by 12 1/2%.
During the period of 1901-1924, the faculty became better prepared themselves, maintained a vital interest in professional self-improvement, wrote many practical guides for the classroom teachers, and participated in professional organizations. The Farmville Normal School served as a state model for the other normal schools after 1908 but was threatened by depletion of its instructional force because of low salaries. As colleges from inside and outside of the State, as well as other agencies, began to offer more attractive positions, the faculty was robbed of some of its most able people. Perhaps, this is why in 1923-24 there was only one earned doctorate, possessed by Tidyman who was the Director of the Training School. On the other hand, since salaries were substantially increased in 1920, this may also account for the increased number of bachelor's and master's degrees held by those on the faculty in 1923-24.

Question 2. What efforts were made to provide close contact and communication between the normal school and the public?

The Farmville School followed a very typical normal school pattern in terms of site selection. As Charles Harper mentions in his book, *A Century of Public Teacher Education*, old academy buildings frequently became the home
for newly created normal schools. The Farmville school was no exception; yet, it had advantages. It could be conveniently reached by train and this was an element not to be overlooked in a day of slow travel. Farmville was a rural area and therefore it was considered more healthful than an urban area. The building was solidly constructed and offered ample classrooms in the 1884-87 period. The boarding accommodations, however, were far too few. Nevertheless, the town which invited the school to be located there also opened its doors to boarders. This led to an integration of the academic and town communities from the beginning. In spirit, the school belonged to the Farmvillians; they took pride in it and protected it. The community invited students into their homes and the school invited the townsfolk to join the students for special occasions. The early relationship was a warm, reciprocal affair.

The contact with the State began with the act of establishment and was continued via its annual appropriations to operate the school. From the beginning, the school was well received as can be discerned from the fact that one hundred eleven students showed up for the opening of the first session. It was indeed the "people's school", arranged so that every county and each city of five thousand people could be represented by at least one student.
plus one for each additional representative in the House of Delegates. These state students were entitled to free instruction in return for a pledge to teach in Virginia for two years. This was an agreeable exchange since most of the students were not able to pay for their education and since it gave the State some guaranteed source of trained teachers. The familial relationship between the public schools and normal school created a mutual dependency. The normal school depended upon division superintendents to provide names of candidates for admission to study and the public schools depended upon the normal school to recommend teachers to be employed. The Executive Committee realized the professional importance of this association from the start and prior to the opening of the school, it communicated to the State Board of Education a desire to initiate a close working relationship.

The normal school was created by the State for the benefit of the State. This fact probably fostered a subservient role at times. It also allowed many details to evolve around expediency rather than purpose. For example, once Virginia had decided to have a normal school, the location was determined more by Farmville's willingness to give the property than by design. Likewise, in the matter of arrangements for tuition and fees, decisions were made by the State. The plan of studies was largely dictated by the
requirements of the public schools. Hence, many of the
decision making and leadership roles were usurped by the
State. Thus, the Virginia State Normal School, like normal
schools elsewhere, actually had very little to say about its
own behavior. The State decided upon the mission, student
representation, the course of study, and the location. At
times, the contact with the state was so close that it
became stifling.

On the other hand the relationship with the local
community was much more relaxed. From its beginning in 1884
and throughout the years until 1924, the normal school
continued to maintain a close, harmonious relationship with
the town of Farmville. Many of the students lived in the
homes of the town residents; the president was considered
Farmville's first citizen; and the faculty were active
community leaders. There was never any evidence of conflict
or hostility between the town and school. In fact, the town
opened its facilities to the school and vice-versa.
Students of the normal school were a part of church and
community activities and the town sought to support the
school with financial and moral reinforcement. With the aid
of the Farmvillians, a Student Building was constructed to
provide a place for extra-curricular activities. The
disastrous fire of 1923 showed the real depth of feeling
which the community had for the school.
buildings had originally belonged to Farmville but as the State Normal School grew up in the town, it became an inseparable part of the spirit of Farmville.

By 1887, the influence of the normal school was beginning to be felt throughout the State. By 1901, approximately four hundred students had graduated from the normal school and more than two thousand had matriculated. The work of the school was favorably looked upon from sources throughout the State. This was due in large part to the normal school's attempts to be as accountable as possible to public education. It had specific aims designed to assure the public that teachers were being prepared personally and professionally to undertake instructional responsibilities. Thus, the relationship between the normal school and the State resulted in very little autonomy for the normal school. By public decree, its sole purpose for existence was to train teachers. Furthermore, the school had little to say about who would be admitted—this was largely determined by the quota system. The school was not in a position to decide upon instructional fees because this was primarily handled by State provision for free tuition as a barter arrangement for two years of public service as a teacher. However, the legislative quota system worked effectively in terms of drawing students from all parts of the state and subsequently returning trained teachers to
supply the public education demands. Though the normal school was unable to meet the demand for the number of qualified teachers needed, it did build a reputation for itself which was felt throughout Virginia and even beyond.

As the normal school proved itself and began to gain widespread public favor, the Legislature became willing to provide the necessary funds for programs and facilities. As a result, the school was able to provide more thorough training. By 1896, President Cunningham purported the school was doing excellent work; in fact, the Farmville school reportedly was providing work comparable to that of leading progressive schools in the rest of the country. According to the State Report for 1900, the school was so highly esteemed that it could no longer accommodate many of the applications which it received. Likewise, those who had been trained by the school were in demand far beyond what the school could supply. Superintendents worked closely with the normal school to recommend qualified candidates for admission and to secure the names of teachers who could come to them with high testimonials from the normal school.

Representatives of the school, whether the association was the result of graduation, administration, governance, or in other capacities, had a great deal of effect upon public opinion at both the local and state level. The normal school in this way remained close to the
public. It drew students from the public schools, trained them to teach, and then returned them to their community with the commission that they were not only to teach but to improve the general quality of public life.

During the period from 1901-1924, Dr. Jarman placed great emphasis upon the teacher's larger influence. He felt that teachers should be trained to meet community, as well as school needs. He considered this sufficient justification for expanding the course of study to include training in library work and rural community needs, such as manual training, agriculture, and domestic science. Furthermore, Jarman strongly emphasized the normal school's responsibility for preparing students to teach any subject presently offered or soon to be offered in the public schools. He believed that it should never be necessary for a person to have to leave the State in order to secure professional preparation to teach.

Communication with the public schools was a major contribution of the normal school. It encouraged the instructors to be constantly busy aiding local schools. Similarly, it brought State leaders to the school in order to acquaint prospective teachers with vital issues. This was an important means of familiarizing them with the kinds of problems they could expect to confront as teachers throughout the State. This was significant since normal
school graduates were rapidly fanning out to cover all portions of the Commonwealth. Cummulatively, there were four hundred (400) graduates of the normal school in 1900, there were over eight hundred (800) in 1908, and in 1924, there were two thousand six hundred twenty-three (2,623) graduates and seven thousand seven hundred thirty-one (7,731) matriculates. In terms of productivity alone, the normal school consistently supplied a vast number of teachers for Virginia's public school system.

Question 3. What was the nature of the in-service training for public school teachers provided by the normal school?

In-service education had already become an established part of the public school system before the establishment of the Farmville Normal School. Ruffner had insisted upon teacher institutes as a valuable stop-gap measure until normal schools were begun. County and city institutes became routine procedures and even statewide Summer Normals had commenced. Even after the State Normal School opened, the institutes remained a vital means of providing practicing professionals with a chance to revitalize and to learn new skills. These summer programs were not a part of the normal school but yet the school was
closely connected with them. Even prior to the opening of the school, the Trustees invited teachers in the field to avail themselves of the benefits of the normal school. Faculty members were also expected to be available during the summer to assist with institutes held for teachers on an in-service basis. As early as 1885, the Board of Trustees resolved that summer sessions would be offered at Farmville unless the State Superintendent or an agent of the Peabody Fund decided otherwise.

In terms of in-service contributions, the State Normal School encouraged teachers to participate in the benefits of the normal school. It offered its faculty and its physical facilities for the purpose of providing four to six weeks of summer training for teachers who wished extra professional assistance. The professional responsibility for in-service instruction was a task for which the Farmville School clearly felt obligated.

A summer normal institute was held at Farmville in 1886. In 1889, four of the normal school instructors were involved with institutes held in various parts of the State. Between 1891-93, nearly all of the faculty participated in institutes. By 1895, the normal school had opened its facilities for use by the summer institutes. In 1896, the president of the normal school served as conductor of the
summer program held at Farmville. The 1896 session, with the exception of one instructor, was taught entirely by the normal school instructors.

The summer institutes held at Farmville in the 1890s included instruction in such classes as were regularly taught in the public schools. The State had assumed responsibility for summer institutes in 1894; therefore, the program and the general plan of organization were determined by the State Superintendent. The normal school was mainly a service agency providing facilities and instructors for the state-sponsored institutes. When the State became responsible for the institutes, the result was more uniform standards and a prescribed course of study. The normal school naturally became a designated site for such summer training. In 1898, sixty school divisions were represented at the Farmville Institute.

Teachers were urged to attend and take advantage of courses which would prepare them to stand for examination and certification. Teachers who were unable to attend the regular normal school sessions found summer programs an especially appealing means of becoming certified to teach. Teachers were welcomed by the school and the community. Farmville, Prince Edward County, and surrounding school divisions considered the Farmville summer institutes so professionally helpful to local teachers that they
voluntarily contributed to the financial support of the programs. Attendance at the summer schools continued to increase and by 1910, over three hundred students were attending, with a few of them coming from outside of Virginia.

Perhaps the greatest contribution which the normal school made to the summer programs was the benefit of its own faculty. During the summer of 1910, instructors from the normal school were in at least nine different locations other than Farmville. In addition to other places, one was in New York, one in Tennessee, two in Vermont, and one in England. The same widespread pattern was repeated in 1912. Dr. Millidge was considered to be one of the finest available lecturers and was therefore very popular in summer programs throughout the South.

In 1916, the requirements for those obtaining professional certificates via summer schools were raised. This automatically changed the length of summer programs. The sessions were then extended from four to six weeks. By 1922, the Elementary Certificate required three full summer quarters. Summer programs were designed to permit teachers to secure certificates of different types without having to enroll in the regular professional course. Thus, summer institutes made major contributions toward decreasing the deficiencies and inadequacies of public school teachers.
In addition to summer institutes, the normal school faculty engaged in a variety of other in-service activities. They remained in very close touch with the local school systems which called upon them frequently for lecturers and for assistance in difference subject matter areas. The normal school instructors used the needs perceived in the public schools as a foundation for extensive writing. Miss Dunn was a rural supervisor from the normal school who wrote a book on how to provide productive seat work. She also regularly wrote articles for the Virginia Journal of Education. In all respects, the faculty seemed dedicated to helping public school teachers acquire additional professional skills.

Question 4. What was the course of study like and how did it change to meet professional needs?

Admission

The State delegated the authority for determining admission requirements to the Trustees. They were to establish the rules for selecting and examining students to be admitted and to extract from those receiving gratuitous instruction a pledge to teach for two years. The Trustees gave system superintendents the right to recommend
candidates for admission but the final decision on admissions was entrusted to the faculty. General admission requirements were vague in terms of academic preparation, stating simply that a student must be well-grounded "in the six primary branches" taught in the public schools. Character, health, and age were as important as prior preparation. Those admitted were taught free unless they refused to pledge themselves to two years of service.

Students with very poor academic preparation were frequently admitted since standards of proficiency had to be determined in relationship to what public schools had to offer. Thus, admission requirements increased in gradual ways as public school standards increased. Superintendents were encouraged to recommend only the best candidates and to give preference to those well prepared in the primary studies of the public schools. However, no uniformity existed in the methods used by superintendents to examine candidates for recommendations. Once a candidate was recommended by her superintendent, the normal school still had the right to refuse admission. This seldom happened during the early years because Dr. Ruffner made the normal school examination very easy so as not to frighten the girls away.
Students admitted to the normal school often showed very little evidence of academic achievement. On a ten-point scale, some were admitted with an average of three. Dr. Ruffer justified this by saying that refusal to accept them would hurt the normal school and their own local schools. The former might be made unpopular and the latter would be deprived of professionally trained teachers if candidates were refused. Obviously, admitting poorly prepared students created difficulties for them and hampered the progress of those who were ready to assume regular professional work. The solution for this problem was to begin a preparatory program in 1885 which allowed students with deficiencies a chance to receive extra studies before entering the professional program.

In 1884, students had scarcely to be able to do more than write their names. By 1887, however, the requirements for admission had become somewhat more demanding. Candidates who wished to enter the "First Year" had to be tested in English, grammar, arithmetic, geography, and United States history plus being required to write a composition. To be admitted to a more advanced class, students were tested on all subjects ordinarily studied in the previous year. Those who did not earn scores high enough to be admitted to the normal school continued to be placed in preparatory classes for prerequisite instruction.
Entrance examinations could be administered to candidates before leaving their homes by local superintendents or they could be taken at the normal school. Actually, very few students were denied admission. Only those looking for a tuition free school with no special purpose in mind were turned away.

As high schools became more common, those who graduated from an approved high school could enter the normal school directly. Those without high school credentials had to be tested and a Committee on Classification determined proper placement for entering students. Aside from the emphasis upon a student's having the equivalent of a high school diploma, admission requirements changed very little during the normal school years. Age, health, and character remained important considerations from 1884-1924.

The preparatory program was a major contribution of the normal school because it made an academic course available to those who had been unable to acquire high school preparation. Actually accepting some ill-prepared students may be viewed as a common sense approach. It helped the normal school survive and simultaneously provided redress for deficiencies in order to enable schools to have teachers with at least minimal professional training.
Curriculum

As originally planned, the normal school was to offer an elementary course and an advanced course. The two together would have covered primary through high school studies. Financial insufficiency prevented the advanced course from being offered. Even students who pursued the elementary course frequently had to remain three to four years in order to make up for their inadequate backgrounds. Since few school divisions offered secondary education, the preparatory school became an essential bridge to the professional program. There were four classes: A, B, C, and D. Students were automatically placed in the D class for one semester. If they proved themselves able to handle higher work, they could be elevated at the end of the semester.

A model school was a part of the normal school from its beginning and the preparatory school was started in 1885. The attempt was to provide a comprehensive program where academic inadequacies could be addressed, a place of practice and observation, and a school where professional training was given. Thus, the main concern of the professional department was to have students thoroughly prepared to teach the common branches.
The normal school from 1884 to 1887 made extensive use of the oral method in its instruction, with books being used mainly for reference. This oral method bears a great deal of resemblance to object teaching and may well illustrate the Pestalozzian influence which had gained popularity at the Oswego School and spread to normal schools all over the country. However, the mechanical process of copying and reciting remained a very real part of the instruction. Model lessons were also taught by the normal school instructors and after observation, students were then expected to repeat the lesson. This was called the Teaching Exercise. After each student's presentation, classmates, and the teacher were given an opportunity to offer criticisms.

The major contributions of the normal school toward the professionalization of teaching as related to the curriculum from 1884-87 were in the areas of preparation, content, and methodology. The school realized a classification process was necessary to gear instruction to the proper level. By starting all students at the D level, placement according to readiness could be more realistically handled. The normal school curriculum followed that of the public schools very closely; however, the common school branches or courses were supplemented by didactics which focused strictly upon professional instruction. The
inclusion of courses in school law and management along with psychology, methodology, and practice teaching created a pattern of pedagogical instruction which showed amazingly little substantive difference from the professional studies of a century later.

Under the administration of Cunningham, methodology and training in the Practice School became more heavily emphasized. The School of Practice was a graded school which offered a place for both observation of model lessons and a place where seniors could do practice teaching. All of the regular subjects of the public schools were taught plus drawing and vocal music.

The normal school provided "special courses" in which individual programs could be arranged for those merely desiring a certificate. For those who wished to receive the "Licentiate of Teaching", it was necessary to complete the regular normal course. By the 1888-89 session, provision was made for three classes—Junior, Middle, and Senior. The Junior and Middle years focused upon subject matter while the Senior Year was strictly professional. The following year, an additional term of preparatory work was added.

Although revisions were made in length of the program offerings, as well as in the courses provided, the annual report of 1890 lamented the normal school was still unable to offer the kind of instruction offered by the best
northern and western normal schools. The lack of thorough instruction in languages, especially Latin, French, and German, was considered problematic. By 1891-92, both Latin and German were offered as optional courses. By the 1893-94 session, industrial work had become another option. Since the teaching force was limited, a decision was made in 1893 not to extend the course of study further.

A major change in the curriculum was approved by the faculty in 1897. The course of study was rearranged on a classical, scientific and normal basis. Accordingly, the normal course remained a three-year course (including the academic course) but the scientific and classical courses became four-year programs. Diplomas, bearing the name of the corresponding course—normal, classical, or scientific, replaced the Licentiate of Teaching. The classical and scientific courses were awarded a "Full Diploma" which exempted holders from further examination by school divisions.

Soon after Dr. Jarman became president, he appointed a committee to revise the course of study. As a result, an extra year was added in 1904 for those in the professional course. Subsequently, the classical and scientific diplomas were abolished. Two years in the normal school were required of all students and only one diploma, the Professional Diploma, was retained. However, two years
later, the normal school again offered several diplomas based upon differentiated programs. A variety of diplomas and certificates continued to be offered throughout the period from 1906-1924. However, in 1916, the General Assembly granted permission for the normal school to confer degrees in education. Although students were slow to choose the four year program over the still existing two year program, this marked an academic turning point from which the institution moved steadily toward a collegiate level.

In addition to the changes in diplomas, many changes were made in course and program offerings in the 1900s. A Manual Training Department and a kindergarten program were commenced by 1904. In 1906, domestic science courses were added to the curriculum and in 1910 a Rural School Department was created. With support of $1000 per year from the Southern Education Board, a rural supervisor was hired to aid with the study of rural problems. In 1915, arrangements were made with nearby schools for the normal school students interested in rural education to observe and teach in rural high schools. A general program designed especially for the training of high school teachers was begun in 1913. Major and minor areas of concentration were not begun until 1915 when professional preparation for high school teachers was increased from two to three years. Classes met for forty-five minute periods four times each
week. A four-year curriculum leading to a bachelor's degree was authorized in 1916. In 1918, a four year course in home economics was adopted to replace the former two year course.

Two of the most frequently discussed aspects of the curriculum were the areas of English and spelling. English proficiency was a major consideration for perspective teachers in the early 1900s even as it is today. In 1910, the faculty agreed to cultivate the "English habit" by placing emphasis upon integrating English instruction into every class. As early as 1899 remedial classes were offered in English and spelling. In 1913, remedial classes were offered in writing, spelling, reading, and grammar. In 1915, standards for written and spoken English were drawn up by the English Department and each department in the school was encouraged to enforce them. Improvements in general proficiency were reported in 1916. The English Department was a strong and very vocal part of the normal school. It advocated cooperation among all departments and proposed that correlation of subject areas be utilized for a more realistic development. In 1918, the normal school, under the direction of the English Department, published "English in the High School" as a model and guide for high school English teachers.
Spelling was an on-going area of concern for the faculty. Records indicated that in 1899, 1908, and again in 1913, special classes were conducted for those having difficulty in spelling. Students were watched closely to detect weaknesses in spelling and those who were "notably poor" in spelling were not permitted to graduate until the deficiency was removed. In 1914, the normal school published The Bulletin on Spelling which included sample lessons for the elementary grades. Being able to spell was considered essential to getting a job and being able to teach spelling effectively was assumed to be every teacher's responsibility. Dr. Tidyman, who was director of the training school, published a book in 1922 called Supervised Study Spelling which emphasized the importance of study procedures and meaningfulness in word presentation.

One of the controversial areas with which the faculty dealt was the "simplified spelling" program. This was an abbreviated method marketed by a New York organization called the Simplified Spelling Board. In 1907, the faculty voted not to use this new system but in 1914, the literary magazine began using it on an experimental basis. In 1915, a poll of the students indicated they favored the non-traditional approach. In 1916, the faculty also voted their approval but with a margin of only one vote. President Jarman expressed concern
that the new spelling would cause much confusion. It was then decided not to use simplified spelling in official documents. Since no evidence of a continuation of the plan or the argument can be found after 1916, it appears that simplified spelling at the normal school had a short history.

Cooperative efforts were strongly stressed in the 1901-1924 period. Cooperation was Dr. Jarman's motto and the faculty subscribed to the idea in collectively accepting responsibility for English proficiency, for the publication of Bulletins (the most notable being the Training School Course of Study in 1914), and for the correlation of courses. This emphasis upon cooperation likely indicates that the philosophy of John Dewey had gained wide acceptance by the faculty. At any rate, the faculty worked out cooperative plans for correlating studies related to war issues in 1918. The entire course of study was revised. German was replaced by French and courses in English, science, sociology and economics were modified to meet new conditions. In the spring of 1919, a War Course dealing with geographical, historical, biological, legal, industrial, educational, and social perspectives was taught by faculty who gave rotating lectures. The purpose was to provide an integrated view of the factors which could be expected to have an effect upon life following World War I.
In spite of the broadening of the curriculum and the extension of the general level of public education, it was necessary for the normal school to maintain an academic course well beyond the end of the normal school era. Although high schools in Virginia began to increase rapidly between 1906 and 1910, rural conditions and poor transportation made them inaccessible for many students. Thus, Farmville continued to provide whatever preparatory work was needed to enable students to enter the professional course even as it refined and enlarged its collegiate offerings.

Assessment

Testing was a matter of frequent consideration from 1884-1924. Dr. Ruffner had downplayed the role of examinations, believing that a teacher should be better able to ascertain scholarship by daily contact than by protracted examination. Cunningham agreed with Ruffner, feeling that tests generally became too burdensome. In order to prevent this from happening, the faculty agreed in 1890 that no student should have more than one test per day. However, it frequently became necessary for the faculty to be reminded not to test so often.
Between 1890 and 1894, a system of numerical grading was worked out by the faculty. Seventy-five was set as the lowest cumulative grade which would be acceptable for promotion or graduation. A grade of sixty-five in any one subject would demand repetition. In 1908 a twelve-point scale was being used, with E+ receiving twelve points. This was changed in 1909 to a thirteen-point scale to provide an opportunity to give a grade of less than "Fail Minus". The lowest mark on the thirteen point scale was "poor". In 1911, the faculty reverted to a numerical scale, based upon 75-100 for passing. By 1917, the faculty used the A B C D E grading plan rather than the Excellent, Very good, Good, Fair, and Poor used earlier. A grade distribution of 10% A, 20% B, 40% C, 20% D, and 10% E was recommended.

It was customary to inform students of their progress on a regular basis. In 1894, students were informed four times during the term and at the end of it. By 1908, faculty handed biweekly reports to the president and students not making a passing mark were personally notified. The president continued to be responsible for notifying students of poor performance until 1918 when his secretary assumed the duties of Registrar. Until 1918, the normal school had only one honor roll for both professional and academic students. Although the honor rolls were separate in 1918, students in both departments had to have
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A's and B's on three-fourths of the subjects carried, with no grade of "E" and no unexcused absences or misconduct notes. The honor roll was to be attainable by about thirty percent (30%) of the students.

It was not unusual for students to complain of being overworked. In 1899, the faculty voted not to allow those failing examinations to retake them and this caused grave concern for Seniors. Subsequently, a Committee on Senior Work was appointed. As a result, revisions in schedules were made to ease their work load. The president also requested that less research be required of students and the lecture method be used less frequently. Minutes of the Faculty bear annual testimony to the instructors' concern about student performance. In order to pace work realistically, a time-analysis study was done in 1918 to find out the actual amount of time students were studying. It was discovered that students were exceeding the recommended time by nearly seven hours. In 1919, a study was conducted to ascertain students' opinions about studying on Sunday. Of the two hundred sixty-five (265) responding, two hundred two (202) thought it was wrong to study on Sunday even though one hundred five (105) did so.

Standards became a matter of increasing concern after the normal school became able to offer a degree in Education. A Committee on Qualification for Admission of
Professional Students to the Training School was formed in 1920. This committee was responsible for monitoring student performances during the Professional Year and making certain the necessary academic requirements were met before student teaching. However, student performance showed steady improvement, and in 1919, Dr. Jarman reported only a small number of students were failing. It was suggested that students carry fifteen hours of recitation with one and half hours of outside preparation for each.

Emphasis upon testing, including standardized test increased and in 1922, the Otis O'Neel Tests of intelligence were administered. The results were reported in total point scores and showed that Farmville's scores were somewhat below average when compared with other normal schools. The median score of twenty (20) normal schools was 157 and Farmville's was 139. The test was viewed as means of helping the faculty deal more realistically with students and have some appropriate frame of reference for distributing grades.

Library

The State Normal School established a library during its first year of operation in 1884. By 1887, the library received daily and weekly papers plus scientific, literary,
and educational journals. It had substantial holdings on American History and was constantly adding books in other areas. Since students had few personal books, the library was a prized resource. By 1897, plans were underway for enlarging the library facilities and moving it to more commodious quarters.

By 1902, the library contained three thousand volumes but was in need of more reference material. However, it did have resource material related to every department in the school. Research was highly regarded and the library's aim was to become a literary workshop.

In the school's earliest days, the faculty members served as volunteer librarians. Later, the teacher of physical culture assumed the librarian's duties on a part-time basis. By 1905, however, a full time librarian was hired because it was considered important for students to take the "library spirit" into the public schools when they graduated. By 1911, the normal school offered five courses in library methods.

The library was in constant use as attested to by those who graduated from the normal school. It was also an essential place for student teachers who spent much time, under the direction of their supervisors, doing research for their lesson preparations. Each department likewise encouraged students to make extensive use of the library.
Among the methods employed to make the library a fully utilized resource were a Library Committee, departmental workshops, and lists of required readings placed on reserve. The library also made borrowing privileges liberal in order to encourage students to use the library as a primary academic tool.

Question 5. How were the needs for practical teaching experiences accommodated?

A model school was considered a fundamental part of the normal school from the beginning. The Committee on Organization recommended that it be attached to the normal school for observation and practice purposes. The model school was begun in 1884 but it did not have a very large number of students the first year and it also had to be used to help deficient normal school students. Both of these problems began to improve by the school's second session because preparatory classes were added and the school became more generally popular. There were thirty-nine children less than ten years old by the second year.

Students in the normal school observed demonstration lessons and then prepared and taught their own lessons. Lessons were always intensely scrutinized by the model school teacher who held criticism sessions with the pupil
teacher to point out areas needing correction. Miss Minor, the first model school teacher, had come from the "famous training school" of New York and was very highly respected. Dr. Ruffner believed the model school should be nearly perfect which meant having the best available teacher.

One of the early problems was trying to coordinate classes in the normal school with work in the model school. This issue was never completely resolved during the 1884-87 period. Students had to miss time from classes upon some occasions in order to arrange sufficient time in the model school. The exact amount of time required for observation and teaching during the period could not be definitely ascertained.

When Cunningham became president in 1887, he concentrated upon ways in which to better coordinate the activities of the normal, preparatory, and model schools. The normal school was described as being totally professional work; the preparatory school was a school for grammar and primary students; the model school was for children under ten. Cunningham believed the model school should be a place which exemplified the best in teaching and where normal students could observe, teach, and receive constructive feedback. He insisted that students spend a much larger portion of their time in actual teaching. To accomplish this, seniors were sent to the model school in
sections and both first and second semester seniors were required to teach under supervision. In addition to the normal school studies, they were required to observe daily and to teach every five weeks. Seniors were primarily instructed in psychology, history of education, and methods for teaching the courses regularly taught in the public schools. The classes of the model school were taught entirely by seniors who were directed by critic teachers and the principal of the model school.

Cunningham reported in 1891 that student teachers were freely criticized and encouraged. Proof of this is found in the Faculty Minutes. Students' performances were handled on a case-by-case basis. Those possessing strengths were commended while weak ones were refused graduation until their deficiencies were remediated. However, the school provided a supportive environment and tried to build self-confidence as well as instructional skills.

Cunningham looked to the normal schools of the North and West as models. He therefore brought the model school and preparatory department together and called it a School of Practice. This arrangement allowed the students to observe in the lower and upper grades and it also allowed those with inadequate backgrounds to gain the preparatory instruction necessary for entering the normal department. Cunningham felt the school of practice was a pedagogically
sound approach to providing both of these features. Boys and girls were taught through grade six; however, only girls were allowed beyond sixth grade. The upper division was reserved for those who were eligible to enter the normal department.

Dr. Frazer continued to refine the work of the practice school when he became president. He created a Department of Education and the chairman of that department also became the director of the practice school. Textbooks, materials needed, and the nature of the course work were described in the catalog. The importance of practice teaching as the capstone experience received continued emphasis.

One of Jarman's early concerns as president was over the inadequate housing for the practice school. Thus, in 1903, an addition, called the "West Wing", was added to the main building and the practice school moved into it. This permitted an increase in enrollment in the practice school and in teaching opportunities for the normal school students. Professional students were expected to observe, analyze problems, and teach various grades. Diversity of experience was highly regarded in learning to teach and govern a school. The minimum amount of time required of a student teacher has not been clearly specified but every student was required to continue teaching until she had
proven her competence in instructional ability and in management strategies. Students were carefully supervised at all times to prevent harm to those under their tutelage.

Under Jarman's administration, the physical environment of the practice school received considerable attention. Seating, lighting, ventilation, health conditions, and attractiveness were matters of great importance. The school was designed to arouse the highest in professional ideals for the students and to serve as a model for the community and the State.

Dr. Jarman contended that the normal school should anticipate and meet the needs of public schools. He, therefore, began a program to prepare kindergarten teachers in 1904. This program was based directly upon the philosophy advocated by Froebel and included many of the same features found in today's kindergarten programs, both in terms of instructional emphases and physical arrangement.

During the early years of the Jarman administration, the practice school became known as the training school and in 1904, it was set up on a K-2-4-2 structure. This included kindergarten, two primary grades (1-2), four intermediate grades (3-6), and two grammar grades (7-8). In 1911, the eighth grade was moved to the secondary course of study.
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Dr. C. W. Stone became the director of the training school and head of the Department of Education. He was considered a progressive western pedagogue having previously been at Cedar Falls, Iowa. He was a graduate of Oshkosh and a Ph.D. from Columbia. Dr. Stone believed strongly in the Dewey philosophy and thought cooperation to be the key to professional success. He therefore engaged the entire normal school faculty in the preparation of a course of study for the training school. Work began in 1909 and the tentative plan was issued in 1912. It presented detailed plans for a kindergarten through seventh grade programs. It included descriptions of developmental patterns for children, center arrangement, and subject matter related to the centers. It was intended to relate learning to the life interests of children. The course of study developed for the training school clearly stands out as a major educational contribution. It was hailed as a notable success throughout Virginia and received attention throughout the country. After it was published in 1914, Farmville was reported to be among the ten best normal schools in the country.

Dr. Stone was concerned about efficiency of instruction and developed a modular plan (somewhat like the one which is currently used) in which seniors were divided into groups so that one group could finish their academic
classes while another spent time in the training school. This addressed the issue of time loss from classes for training school experience which had been a persistent problem since the earliest days of the school. He also recommended that standards be established for screening out students during the pre-professional year who were likely to have problems in the training school. This suggestion was not really acted upon until 1920.

The training school was considered superior to public schools because of its attempts to stay in contact with the latest educational developments and because subject matter was enriched by in-put from all departments of the normal school. The emphasis upon methodology was listed as another reason for its excellence.

In 1914, the training school was able to move into its own separate quarters. The school had reached a severe state of overcrowding and an ultra-modern, twenty-five room, three-floor building was constructed. It provided ideal teaching conditions where model lessons could be taught in large rooms which would accommodate forty (40) observers plus the children. Two years of high school (eighth and ninth grades) were also included in the training school to allow for student teaching at the secondary level, after a high school curriculum was begun in 1913.
The school was highly respected by the Farmville community and by the State. The training school program was considered outstanding as was attested to by the reception given the Course of Study. The building and equipment were excellent. The faculty was called outstanding by the community and indeed professional credentials were constantly improving. By 1915, there were five bachelor's and one master's degree among the thirteen member faculty. All other faculty had graduated from normal schools and all of them had attended college beyond their normal school preparation.

The training school had a cooperative agreement with Farmville in which it provided training for boys and girls through elementary school but males then had to transfer to the local high school. The school purported that teaching, although done in a laboratory setting, was guaranteed to be only of the highest quality because of the careful arrangements made for preparation and supervision. Standards were also being constantly escalated, particularly between 1913 and 1920. Teaching experiences were lengthened, professional experiences such as conferences were emphasized, more feedback on courses and on the general level of preparation was sought, and procedures for standardizing student teaching grades were studied. In 1916, the normal school was authorized to offer a bachelor's
degree but there remained some feeling that overall professional performance was still not high enough since some students were entering the training school poorly prepared. Therefore, in 1920, a committee studied the matter and recommended higher admission requirements in all courses as prerequisites for teaching in the training school.

Question 6. What kinds of extra-curricular activities were approved by the normal school and how did these change over the years?

Believing that experience in the arts greatly enhanced the professional value of the teacher, the normal school, from its first session, required students to take a class in the Arts. This was a course which taught penmanship and book-keeping, as well as drawing, music, and calisthenics. The normal school offered only vocal-music, but instrumental music could be taken locally. Such lessons were encouraged and students were exhorted to give diligence to the pursuit of them. The acquisition of musical skills was highly encouraged because they provided teachers with valuable assets for community and classroom purposes. Both spoken and written language skills were heavily emphasized. Elocution was taught as part of language study. Speaking
was also emphasized in the "teaching exercise" and in presentations prepared for rendition before audiences. Literary societies were formed during the 1884-87 period which indicates written expression was valued as an extra-curricular activity early in the normal school's history.

The major extra-curricular contributions of the normal school from 1884-87 were in the areas of music, drawing, calisthenics, and communication. Musical and literary expertise were regarded as being very important to the teacher. Since many of the normal school graduates would take positions in isolated, one-room schools such resources enabled them to greatly enrich the lives of their pupils.

By 1888, interest in physical activities was increasing. By 1890, calisthenics were required each day and a course in physical culture was required to promote growth and to correct defects. In 1899, the president recommended to the Trustees that plans be commenced for erecting a gymnasium.

Literary activities were very important and in 1896, the Normal Record was begun as a quarterly literary magazine to replace the earlier paper called the Greeting. The Normal Record was replaced in 1905 by the Guidon which lasted for five years. In 1911, the Focus began and
continued until 1922 when the school paper called the Rotunda began. The school's first yearbook, known as the Normal Light began in 1898. This would prove to be the school's longest running student publication, although the name was changed in 1901 to The Virginian. The yearbook or classbook was published annually but the class of 1918 decided to forego the memory book and donate the funds to a war cause. Publication resumed in 1919. The 1909 yearbook has become an especially valuable historical source. It was designed as a commemorative issue for the school's twenty-fifth anniversary and as such included information on former presidents, trustees, faculty and important institutional events.

Speaking skills, like writing skills, were heavily stressed. Students were selected to give "quotations" in assembly and essays at graduation. Debating was a means of providing speaking skills and logical reasoning ability. The interest in debating was alive in 1896 and by 1910, there were two organized debating societies, the Jefferson and the Ruffner, which were open to all students.

The literary societies were much like the debating societies but the later were organized on an open membership basis. The literary societies were also active in 1896 and they provided regular Friday night entertainment. Students would assemble to hear original works read by the students.
who had composed them and then the merit of the works would be judged by the audience. The literary societies began on a closed membership basis with fifty members each, selected for high scholarship. As the school grew, there were more eligible students. Thus, in 1908, two more societies were formed when the Pierian and Athenian societies joined Argus and Cunningham. The aims were to build high literary standards, cultivate social graces, and develop talent. Both the literary and debating societies helped to make students aware of issues and to build expertise in language facility. The societies also provided a major source of social life for the students. For this reason, they were extremely popular until around 1915, after which time interest steadily declined in spite of concerted attempts at revival.

Religious activities composed a significant part of student life throughout the normal school period. The Young Woman's Christian Organization, which was a likely outgrowth of the New York Chatauqua movement, began at Farmville in May, 1896. Membership increased rapidly and by 1914, nearly every girl in the school was a member. The organization emphasized Bible study, prayer, Christian works, and social opportunities.
Christian leadership conferences were held across the country and at the urging of President Jarman, the Board of Trustees agreed to fund an annual delegation to the Southern Student Conference. In 1908, the Board also approved the hiring of a full-time Y.W.C.A. Secretary, although intervening circumstances delayed actually securing such a person for two years. Dr. Jarman, the resident secretary, and students attended conferences sponsored by the Y.W.C.A. in places as far away as Iowa.

One of the major contributions of the Y.W.C.A. was compilation of a student handbook which included prayer schedules, Y.W.C.A. information, and general information about the school such as policies, organizations, room arrangement, and mail delivery. The Y.W.C.A. helped with orientation of new students, with matriculation, and with social activities.

An assembly program known as chapel was a regular part of the school day. President, faculty, and students came together for twenty minutes each morning, Monday through Friday. It was a time of camaraderie when hymns and school songs were sung, announcements were given, and lectures were presented. Strict seating and behavior regulations governed chapel. It was a time for meditation, reflection, and learning about new topics. Guest speakers were often notable public figures, such as the Governor.
However, in the absence of a public address system, chapel was most importantly a time for giving "notes" about events and expectations.

The course in music was gradually broadened throughout the normal school's history. In spite of Dr. Frazer's efforts, no evidence exists, however, that the school included instrumental music in the curriculum before 1920. Yet, it was a very significant part of the extra curriculum from 1884 forward. The school consistently arranged with local music teachers to provide instrumental lessons for students who wished to have them and from 1912-1921, lessons could be secured from the Farmville Conservatory of Music.

In addition to its regular music courses for elementary teachers, the normal school offered special preparation for music supervisors. In 1919, Dr. Jarman commended the normal schools for the thorough music preparation given to public school teachers. This regular course work was supplemented by Glee Club work as an additional extra-curricular activity.

Art work, like music, was emphasized from the beginning of the normal school. Form and drawing were taught in 1901. In 1904, art was included in the Manual Arts Department and such drawing and other art exposure as was deemed necessary for the regular teacher was provided.
In 1919, those with special talents were referred to an artist who had a studio on the school grounds. By 1923, however, a separate drawing department offered opportunities to develop the skills needed to become an art teacher.

Drama training was begun around 1908 and by 1914, the Dramatic Club was reported to be very successful. By 1917, students desiring to join the club had to prove their talent by "trying out". Dramatic performances, given by touring groups, provided a source of genuine entertainment for the students. Lyceum programs, summer Chautauquas, and traveling actors provided a major source of cultural enrichment for the students.

Sororities gained rapid popularity. By 1901, the normal school had four sororities which would become nationals. They were Zeta Alpha founded at Farmville in 1898 and Kappa Delta, Sigma Sigma Sigma, and Alpha Sigma Alpha. Pi Kappa Omega was organized in 1918 to encourage leadership, scholarship, and service. Limited entertainment and traveling difficulties led students to form a variety of clubs and organizations from which they could derive friendships, fun, and a sense of belonging. Winning the right to belong was also important as shown by the hazing activities. Information on "ratting" is limited. This was
nevertheless considered a rite of passage and in a lighthearted way permitted students in their first year to gain acceptance in the professional program.

Graduation, on the other hand, was a very serious occasion marked by ceremony, ritual, and dignity. It began on Saturday with a reception and concluded on Tuesday with the awarding of diplomas.

There was an increasing emphasis upon physical training throughout the normal school years, moving from light gymnastics in 1884 to championship games in the 1920s. The Athletic Association had three hundred members in 1907 with activities ranging from basketball to croquet. Field Day was a major event by 1915. This was a time for junior-senior competition which featured a variety of activities open for participation. These events culminated in the awarding of a loving cup which did much to foster class spirit.

By 1921, games of various sorts were becoming more competitive, both within the school and with other schools. In 1921, a committee was established to fix standards for eligibility. As a result in 1922, a team member had to have a "C" average for inter-school games. The beneficial effects of sports on school spirit were especially applauded. In 1922, Dr. Jarman proposed all teachers could profit from athletic involvement.
The organization involving the greatest number of students after 1920 was the Student Government. From an idea that evolved in a senior civics class, the nucleus for self-government at Farmville was born. The organization was intended to elevate the place of honorableness and to make the students more responsible for their own behavior. It was concerned about four areas: dishonesty, public conduct, defacing public property, and behavior in the halls, dining room, chapel and during quiet hours. The student government intended to correct the erring student rather than to condemn. The Executive Committee was made up of five representatives from the junior, senior, and fourth-year classes. The matters brought before them dealt with few major problems other than cheating and an occasional "borrowing" without permission. Most cases involved talking to boys or being in violation of study hours.

By 1917, new regulations were drawn up because the student government was given control over all affairs outside of the classroom. Thus, a handbook, to replace the Y.W.C.A. handbook, was assembled. This booklet included information about chapel, library, campus, study, infirmary, and dormitory regulations. The regulations applied to boarding and non-boarding students. Furthermore, every
student had to sign a pledge when she entered the school to uphold the standards of the school as a member of the Student Government Association.

Question 7. What evidence can be found that the normal school moved from a pragmatic attitude toward teacher training to a more academic orientation?

During the years of beginning, 1884-87, the normal school exhibited a pragmatic attitude toward the admission of students, selection of the faculty, boarding accommodations, and especially the course of study. The normal school could not afford to be very selective in its admission process since a scarcity of public high schools caused great unevenness in preparation. Therefore, students who applied were generally admitted with the intention of helping them remediate deficiencies. After the first year of operation, a preparatory school was established to offer the education students needed to enter the professional program. This was a totally practical way of compensating for the lack of prior schooling.

The normal school was founded under a pragmatic attitude. It was only after the demand for teachers became a matter of urgency that the institution was authorized. The selection of its principal and instructors was guided by
a common sense approach of seeking out those whose backgrounds indicated an ability to handle the requirements of a new school. Students were selected more by their willingness to attend than by any proven academic ability. Housing was also handled by reacting to circumstances. A lack of dormitory space soon sent an overflow crowd into private homes. With limited funds and an uncertain future, the idea of increasing the dormitory facilities was out of the question.

The course of study was extremely pragmatic. The normal school felt an obligation to prepare its graduates to teach competently and effectively in the elementary schools of the State. This demanded that pedagogy be heavily emphasized and that the subjects common to the public schools be thoroughly mastered. Extensive use of the oral method reduced the need for textbooks which was another practical step considering the scarcity of books and limited ability of students to purchase them. Another practical aspect of the course of study was its attention to experiences in the model school. Establishing a model school attached to the normal school made it readily available for observation and practice.

The professional, single-purpose nature of the normal school forced it to become a pragmatic institution. It did whatever was expedient in order to secure students,
train them, and send them into classrooms to teach. Both the future of the public schools and the normal school demanded this approach. Within the first three years, there was very little academic orientation, at least not in the collegiate sense. The normal school itself was little more than a secondary experience, often narrow in scope and limited in background. Yet, by using a pragmatic approach, the normal school was able to take under-prepared students and provide them with sufficient backgrounds for elementary teaching. As a result of this accomplishment, the normal school contributed immensely to the forward movement of Virginia's public school system.

By 1887, the school had become more firmly established and had secured its second president. As head of the school, Cunningham began immediately to evaluate the effectiveness of the school in preparing teachers. Among his earliest changes were those involving practical preparation for actual instruction. By 1888, he had decided the highly praised teaching exercise of 1885 was obsolete and should be replaced with a less time consuming, more realistic experience. This bears out Alpheus Crosby's statement that the pragmatic nature of the normal school made courses glory one day and folly the next.
Cunningham also emphasized the need for more time to be spent in the school of practice where students could have pragmatic experiences dealing with children, either by observation or teaching. Likewise, he stressed the need for more practical courses in methodology to provide instruction in how to teach the various subjects. Textbooks also were put into regular use. In 1884, textbooks were not thought necessary but by 1889, they were considered a necessary feature of the academic course and a valuable supplement to lectures in the professional course.

A pragmatic attitude continued to govern the admission and classification of students. Students were admitted on a case-by-case basis and were assigned to classes in accordance to what could be ascertained about their backgrounds. Students enrolled in the school for varying periods of time, according to what their individual circumstances would allow. For this reason, highly individualized plans were often decided upon by the faculty. However, for those having the equivalent of a high school diploma, only one year of strictly pedagogical study at the normal school was required prior to the Jarman administration.

The course of study was the subject of many pragmatic considerations. As emphases in the public school curriculum shifted so did the normal school course of study.
Since the normal school had to prepare teachers to teach the public school subjects, it had to remain adaptable. This often meant the addition of courses, such as industrial work, manual arts, rural education or physical training. At other times, it meant extending the diploma requirements or the length of schooling. In 1897, the faculty chose to offer separate English, scientific, normal, and professional diplomas. However, by 1904 the school required two years of professional work for everyone and offered only one diploma. By 1907, it was again offering several diplomas as dictated by its constantly changing course of study.

The pragmatic nature of the school was made explicit in its 1901 statement of aims. It was to offer instruction in the common school subjects, to provide knowledge of how learning takes place, to focus on methods of teaching, to give opportunities for students to observe and teach, and to develop personal qualities. The 1908 catalog defined the school as providing technical instruction. This statement remained through 1924 and serves as a reminder that the normal school chose to maintain a pragmatic rather than a purely collegiate emphasis. Even after it earned the right to grant a degree in 1916, it still retained its emphasis upon practical application more than upon theoretical knowledge alone. Professional work permeated the curriculum which was heavily loaded with school management, methods,
and psychology courses. Of course, work in the laboratory school was the center about which the professional program revolved.

During its first year of operation, the normal school found it necessary to create a preparatory school. It also found it necessary to maintain it throughout the normal school period even though high school programs increased across the state. This increase forced the normal school to begin preparation of high school teachers in 1913. This was actually a fulfillment of an 1884 objective because the school had originally planned to offer an advanced course but was prevented from doing so by a lack of funds. In a similar manner, the normal school accepted the challenge for preparing rural teachers. As early as 1910, the normal school had begun work with rural school systems. In 1913, it began a rural graded schools program and by 1915, it was sending student teachers into the rural schools to get first-hand practical experience. The normal school teachers became active writers and participants in trying to improve rural school conditions. Courses, in rural arts and especially in home economics, expanded rapidly after 1918. Legislation, such as the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, undoubtedly did much to promote interest in all vocational areas. The normal school anticipated this need and paced its program accordingly.
Although the normal school acquired better facilities, better trained faculty, and a more diversified program of studies, it continued to have a pragmatic attitude. By the 1916-17 session, it offered a B.S. degree in the high school course of study, a diploma in kindergarten, primary, grammar, or rural school work, and a certificate in county demonstration work. To receive the B.S. required four years and in spite of attempts to create interest, there were only nine students who earned a bachelor's degree in 1921. Nevertheless, the school was, gaining a reputation for an academic emphasis which went beyond just the technical or normal training. The Board of Visitors at the University of Virginia accorded a bachelor's degree earned at Farmville full credit toward a master's program. This was an act of high esteem since this was the first normal school degree considered worthy of full credit at the University. In 1924, the State also recognized the improved academic status of the normal school and deemed it the equivalent of collegiate level performance. Thus in 1924, the evolutionary process was completed and the State Normal School at Farmville became the State Teachers College at Farmville.
Conclusion

This study found that the State Female Normal School at Farmville, Virginia offered a typical teacher training experience during the years from 1884-1924. It conformed very closely to each of the seven characteristics which Charles Harper purported to be significant trends in normal school education. Until 1908, it was the only institution in the state exclusively for training white female teachers. As a pioneer school, Farmville carried the responsibility for providing the professional training for the majority of Virginia's white teachers. As the oldest State institution for training white teachers, it also served as the state's model for later schools. Even though the Farmville school openly claimed to look to outstanding normal schools in the north and west as examples worthy of professional emulation, the Farmville school established wide credibility for itself both within and beyond the state. It received strong public support and quickly established a reputation as an outstanding institution for training teachers. Locally it was considered to be one of the finest teacher training schools in the nation. Mayo, as United Commissioner of Education, reported it to be the best such institution in the South and a national survey of normal schools taken

585
after the release of the 1914 *Training School Course of Study* placed it among the ten best normal schools in the country. Thus, it can be concluded that the State Normal School at Farmville did make substantial contributions to the professionalization of teaching.

The leadership provided by the trustees and presidents enabled the normal school to continuously expand its programs and increase its standards for admission and graduation. Normal school faculty likewise gave evidence of a strong desire for continuous professional development. They spent much time in personal and professional study programs and became active participants with the public schools in building successful educational programs throughout the state. Normal school instructors were much in demand as speakers, in-service leaders, and consultants. They were also heavily engaged in professional organizations and in professional publication. Many of them were prolific writers who made extensive use of educational journals to communicate topics of professional interest to teachers throughout the state. Articles were nearly always pragmatically oriented with the intention of helping practicing professionals with their instructional responsibilities in the state's widely scattered public schools.
The normal school maintained vigilance over public school needs and immediately made adjustments in the curriculum and extra curriculum to accommodate the anticipated needs of those who were preparing to enter the profession. The pragmatic nature of the school also placed heavy emphasis upon laboratory experiences. Commendably, the normal school began a model school during its first year of operation and never abandoned its emphasis upon observation and practice as essential professional preparation. However, the need for rural education and expanded high school experiences also led the normal school to enter into an early partnership with the public schools for additional laboratory opportunities. This relationship contributed mutual benefits to both the normal school and the public schools.

Of the many contributions made by the normal school, none is more important than the reciprocal opportunity it provided for young females to be educated by the State to serve as teachers for the State. Without the benefits of the tuition-free normal school, many students would have been deprived of even a secondary education; communities would have been denied a valuable source of professionally trained teachers; and the cause of public education in Virginia would have suffered immeasurably.
The State Normal School at Farmville provides a classic example of the evolutionary process involved in early teacher preparation. It began unpretentiously in the fall of 1884 by offering a single elementary course of study which culminated in a diploma after one year of professional preparation. As requirements increased and the curriculum diversified, the school, by 1916, was able to offer a diversified curriculum and a bachelors degree in Education. This degree gave the normal school collegiate dignity and allowed the school to move toward even greater professional recognition when it became the State Teachers College at Farmville in 1924.
Recommendations for Further Study

In the process of collecting the data for this study, a number of other possible research topics emerged. Among those which are directly related to this study are the following:

1. A study of the student life at the State Female Normal School. Very little investigation seems to have done concerning the social history of the normal school era in Virginia. The question of what it was really like to be a student at a female normal school in 1884 to 1924 begs to be answered while many of the graduates are still available.

2. A study of the similarities and differences in the four white normal schools from 1908-1924. As shown by Bruce Emerson's study, there is a real paucity of information about the normal school period in Virginia's educational history.

3. An in-depth study of the lives and contributions of the four men who served as presidents of the State Female Normal School. Any one of the four would constitute an interesting study but their appears to be much about Frazer which has never been researched. He made productive educational contributions before he became president of the normal school. After leaving the school he accepted a position with the State Board of Education and became an active participant in the state agitation for better education. He needs to be brought out of obscurity and be recognized for his early contributions to education. The story of Dr. Jarman's contributions also need to be more fully told. He served half of his tenure as president of the Farmville school after it became a State Teachers College. Jarman was a widely respected leader who received numerous honors during the later years of his presidency. He served on the
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State Board of Education for eight years and was also offered the State Superintendency which he refused at the urging of friends and alumnae who did not want him to leave the college.

4. A study of the development of the State Teacher's College at Farmville. Using the history of the normal school as a foundation, the seven characteristics used in this study might be used to delineate the changing characteristics in teacher preparation as the school acquired a collegiate perspective. Qualitatively, a study might explore how teacher education at the collegiate level differed from teacher training at the normal school level.

5. A study of the physical development of the institution as it grew from an old, unpretentious academy building with a Victorian appearance to the present stately campus where traditional buildings are mingled with contemporary structures. The school went through a period of massive property expansion and campus beautification during the Jarman years. The Victorian tower was exchanged for a Jeffersonian rotunda and other architectural changes combined with planned landscaping gave the school its graceful, Southern charm. Later periods, especially the 1960s, brought periods of rapid growth to the physical facilities of the school. Each building might be studied for its architectural history, educational service, and the political and social circumstances affecting it.

6. A study of the historical development of the laboratory school from its beginning in 1884 until it closed in 1982 after the State decided it was no longer providing a necessary service. The study would consider the kinds of provisions made for laboratory experiences, the kinds of contributions the laboratory school made to the preparation of teachers, and the changes made in the course of study throughout the years of the laboratory school's existence.

7. A study of teacher certification in Virginia. This study would involve the history of teacher certification and how it changed according to the changes in social and political
circumstances. The study would consider the kinds of certificates offered for various purposes, how the certification process has changed and the implications for the future of teacher certification.

8. A study of summer institutes in Virginia. This would include a history of summer training programs, where they were located, who staffed them, what the course of study was like, and the factors leading to their being assimilated into college summer schools.

9. A study of the relationship between rural schools and the normal schools. Since normal schools were heavily involved with the in-service training of rural teachers and since the rural schools served as laboratories for practice teaching, there was a definite bond between the two.

10. A study of the academic and social changes resulting from the school's becoming a fully co-educational institution. Until 1976, the school was primarily a female teacher education institution. The academic program had become more broadly focused but was still largely dedicated to its original purpose. However, with the arrival of male students, the school began to undergo major academic and social changes. The study would analyze these changes and determine the effect upon the intellectual and social climate of the school.

11. A study of the effect which the present reform movement stemming from *A Nation at Risk* is having upon teacher preparation programs in colleges which were formerly normal schools. These roots run very deeply and attempting to deal with changes which are diametrically opposed to historical underpinnings is difficult. For example, the early emphasis upon the importance of methodology and school management now stands to be sacrificed to a more thorough preparation in the Arts and Sciences. The normal school labored to secure the privilege of awarding a bachelors degree in Education and was finally successful in 1916. The institution now expects to award its last bachelor's degree in Elementary Education to the
12. A study of the history, development, and ultimate demise of the School of Education at Longwood. Beginning in 1897, the Department of Education became the pivotal point about which all else evolved. By the 1970s, however, teaching positions were less available and the curriculum had been broadened to include preparation in many different areas. The mission of the school still included, but was not solely devoted to, teacher education. The motto was no longer "Education for all: We Teach to Teach". The 1980s brought a national emphasis upon reform in teacher education and in Virginia, it spelled an end to an undergraduate degree in Education. The Education Department which was created in the normal school era, which dominated the course of study during the State Teachers College years, and which led the evolutionary march into the Longwood period will pass into history during the early 1990s. It has contributed heavily to school systems throughout the state. Indeed, as a matter of supposition it appears reasonable that there are very few individuals who acquired their entire education in Virginia (going through the full scale of grades K-12) who have not at one time or another been taught by a teacher prepared under the influence of the Department of Education at Farmville. This department has contributed immeasurably to the State's system of public education. Specifically, how has the School of Education at Longwood College influenced education in the State of Virginia? This is a question of no small importance, if there is any truth in the words of Henry Brooks Adams who said, "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops."
Appendices
APPENDIX A

NUMBER OF STATE STUDENTS TO WHICH EACH COUNTY AND CITY IS ENTITLED.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accomac</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albemarle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appomattox</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botetourt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles City</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpeper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberlands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland and Buckingham</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickenson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinwiddie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth City</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauquier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvanna</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goochland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensville</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harnett</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James City</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Queen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louden</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loudoun and Fauquier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunenburg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericksburg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynchburg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersburg</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX B
STATE STUDENTS AND GRADUATES*

*The following shows the number of State students and graduates each year: (1884-1887)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1884-5</th>
<th>1885-6</th>
<th>1886-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Students (including teachers of public schools admitted on their licenses)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C
Description of the Oral Method*

Modes of Teaching

The principle sought is developed as far as possible by a system of questions addressed orally to the students in class which will often bring together truths already known in such a way as to reveal their fundamental relations, and suggest the desired principle. Examples and perhaps concrete illustrations may also be employed as guides. The teacher must, of course, make affirmative statements, but these are made only when the principles or the fact cannot be reached through the previously existing knowledge or the understanding of the student. When, by the combined efforts of teacher and students, the desired statement is put in due form, it is written on the black board, and copied into the note-books, and subsequently recited upon.

After a time topics are assigned, which the students are required to prepare themselves to expound; and they are expected to resort not to particularly specified books, but to any books they can find which will afford them the help they need. A reference room, furnished with suitable books, is provided for this purpose; and publishing houses are glad to send donations of their school books for the use of the students.

The details of a system like this will vary, of course, with the nature of the study, and with the intellectual training already possessed by the student. There are some branches in which the teacher must tell more, and the student must use books more, than in others.

But a still more specialized feature in the course is the Teaching Exercise given daily by the students as a part of each lesson. The students repeat the teacher's work according to their several abilities. Usually the student is notified in advance that she will be called upon to teach a given topic at the proper time, and she is expected to develop the subject by a carefully-prepared system of questions and statements, exactly as if she were instructing a class in her own school. And at the same time she is expected to keep order, and to be treated with all the respect accorded to the regular teacher. At the end of each exercise the members of the class are allowed to make criticisms, and the teacher also corrects any error as to matter or manner.

APPENDIX D

Faculty and Student Enrollment 1887-1897*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>Number In Faculty</th>
<th>Number In Home Dep't</th>
<th>Number In Normal Dep't</th>
<th>Students In Normal School Dep't</th>
<th>Students In Training Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1887-88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888-89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-90</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-92</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892-93</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893-94</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894-95</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>(Omitted)</td>
<td>(Omitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-97</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Taken from "Dr. Cunningham's Administration", Term paper, p. 3. No author or date given.
## Appendix K

### Summer Institute

**Program of Daily Work.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. 1</strong></td>
<td>Sec. A</td>
<td>Sec. C</td>
<td>Sec. D</td>
<td>Sec. A</td>
<td>Sec. B</td>
<td>Sec. C</td>
<td>Sec. D</td>
<td>Sec. B</td>
<td>History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. 2</strong></td>
<td>Sec. B</td>
<td>Sec. A</td>
<td>Sec. C</td>
<td>Sec. B</td>
<td>Sec. A</td>
<td>Sec. B</td>
<td>Sec. C</td>
<td>Sec. B</td>
<td>Physiology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physiology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. 3</strong></td>
<td>Sec. C</td>
<td>Sec. D</td>
<td>Sec. A</td>
<td>Sec. B</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Sec. D</td>
<td>Sec. A</td>
<td>Sec. B</td>
<td>Sec. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. 4</strong></td>
<td>Sec. D</td>
<td>Sec. C</td>
<td>Sec. B</td>
<td>Sec. A</td>
<td>Sec. D</td>
<td>Sec. C</td>
<td>Sec. B</td>
<td>* Sec. A</td>
<td>Arithmetic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arithmetic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supervisor.**

- Supervision. Theory and Practice.
- Theory and Supervision. Practice.

*These periods are allotted for rest of instructors.

This program is a tentative one and can be adjusted to varying conditions.

*1894-95 Biennial Report of State Superintendent
Summer Institute*
APPENDIX F
ENTRANCE EXAMINATION*

The following specimens of former examination questions for entrance to the Normal School will be a guide to applicants for admission:

GRAMMAR.

If we retrench the wages of the schoolmaster, we must raise those of the recruiting sergeant.—Edward Everett.

1. Write out a complete analysis of the above extract, using any system familiar to you.
2. Parse if and recruiting, sergeant.
3. Define we.
4. Give the principal parts of the verbs compel, freeze, see, lie, and lay.
5. Give a synopsis (first person, singular number) of the verb be, in the potential mode.
6. Write an interrogative sentence or sentences containing:
   a. A phrase modifying the subject.
   b. A compound relative pronoun.
   c. A pronoun in the possessive case.
   d. A verb in the subjunctive mode. Underscore the parts required.
7. Give the plurals of money, chimney, valley, duty, and Henry.
8. Write three nouns which have no plural, and two which have no singular.
10. Write one or more declarative sentences containing all the eight parts of speech; underscore the words representing the several parts of speech.

ARITHMETIC.

1. Given the dividend, 807, and the quotient, 34 1/2. Find the divisor.
2. If the first, third, and fourth terms of a proportion are given how may the second term be found?
3. What are the proceeds of a ninety-day note for $500, discounted at a bank at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum?
4. Why does the value of a decimal remain unchanged when ciphers are annexed?
5. A square field contains 20 acres. Required the number of rods of fence to enclose it. Carry the answer only to one decimal place.
6. A commission merchant sold 900 pounds of turkeys at 23 cents per pound, and retained for his services $10.35. What rate of commission did he charge?
7. In what time will $125 amount to $145.75 at 6 per cent, simple interest?
8. 14 A. 10 sq. rd. is what part of 50 A. 100 sq. rd.?
9. Find the cost of 2,315 pounds of coal at $5.75 per ton.
10. A merchant failed, and paid his creditors 55 cents on the dollar. If he paid in all $3,874.75, what was the amount of his indebtedness?

GEOGRAPHY.

1. Name the five principal tributaries of the Mississippi.
3. In what zone is North America? Africa?
4. What mountain ranges are on the boundary between France and Spain? between Norway and Sweden? between Russia and Siberia? between Thibet and Hindoostan? Only two of the four ranges required.
5. Name five principal river boundaries of the United States.
6. Mention the zones of the earth, and give the width of each in degrees.
7. Name five rivers that discharge their waters into the Chesapeake Bay.
8. What is the most direct water-way from New York to Calcutta?
9. What are the principal agricultural productions of this country?
10. Mention two cities of Virginia on the Norfolk and Western Railroad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year, First Term.</th>
<th>First Year, Second Term.</th>
<th>Second Year, First Term.</th>
<th>Second Year, Second Term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class D.</td>
<td>Class C.</td>
<td>Class B.</td>
<td>Class A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in School of Practice.</td>
<td>in School of Practice.</td>
<td>in School of Practice.</td>
<td>in School of Practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>Algebra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elocution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total recitations periods per week. | 33 | 30 | 27 | 25 |

Latin was not required.

*Course of Study—Virginia School Reports, 1887, p. 83.*
APPENDIX H

STATE FEMALE NORMAL SCHOOL*
Course of Study 1888-89.

I. NORMAL DEPARTMENT.

First or Junior Year:

Language, including Syntax, Composition, and thorough Sentence Analysis.
Algebra and Geometry.
Physiology, one term.
Physical Geography, One term.
General History, one term.
Drawing.
Vocal Music.
Elocution.
Latin (elective).

Second or Middle Year:

Language—History of the English Language,
Rhetoric and Literature.
Geometry, one term.
A Teacher's Review of Arithmetic, one term.
Physics, one term.
Chemistry, one term.
United States History, one term.
Drawing.
Vocal Music.
Latin (elective).

Third or Senior Year—Professional Course:

First Term: Psychology.
Methods In! Arithmetic, Geography Grammar, Reading.
History and Science of Education.
School Economy.
School Laws of Virginia.

Second Term—Practice:

The entire school day is given to practice in the Practice School for the half year. This work includes, besides the actual teaching, a carefully-conducted course of critical discussion of the organization, instruction, and discipline of a school.
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II. PRACTICE OR TRAINING SCHOOL COURSE.

Arithmetic (completed), Penmanship,
Geography (completed), United States History,
Language, Grammar, Reading, Drawing, and
Vocal Music.

This revised course of study will be begun in
October, with such modifications as may be necessary to meet
the needs of the classes which have followed the former
course. It will be a year or two before it can be
completely followed, and is presented as indicating our aim
and not what we are at present accomplishing.

*Virginia School Reports, 1888, pp. 42-43.*
APPENDIX I
TABULAR VIEW OF THE COURSE OF STUDY*

CLASS E—ONE TERM.
1. A five months' rapid review of
   English Grammar.
   Arithmetic.
   United States History.
   Geography.
2. Instruction in
   Free-hand Drawing.
   Vocal Music.
   Physical Culture.

JUNIOR YEAR—TWO TERMS.
Language, including Composition and thorough Sentence
   Analysis.
   Algebra and Geometry.
   Chemistry, one term.
   General History.
   Drawing.
   Vocal Music.
   Physical Culture.
   Latin or German
   Industrial Work.

MIDDLE YEAR—TWO TERMS.
Language—History of the English Language,
   Rhetoric and Literature.
   Geometry, one term.
   Trigonometry, one term.
   Astronomy, one term.
   Physics, one and a half terms.
   Chemistry, half term.
   Civics, one term.
   Drawing.
   Vocal Music.
   Latin, or German, or Industrial Work.

SENIOR YEAR—PROFESSIONAL COURSE.
   Psychology.
   History and Science of Education.
   School Management.
   School Laws of Virginia.
   Observation and Practice in the Practice School.
   Methods in Arithmetic, Grammar, Geography, and
   Reading.
   In this course, instruction, observation, and practice
   are carried on along parallel lines through both terms of
   the year.


604
APPENDIX J
Course of Study (1895-96)*

First Year - First Term
Rapid review of English grammar, arithmetic, geography, history of United States, instruction in free-hand drawing, vocal music and physical culture.

First Year - Second Term
English, including syntax, composition and thorough sentence analysis; algebra through simultaneous equations; ancient history; free-hand drawing; vocal music; Latin or German begun; physical culture, according to the Swedish system; dress-cutting or telegraphy (elective).

Second Year - First Term
English continued as in previous term; geometry begun; algebra continued; chemistry begun; easy Latin reading or German grammar or shorthand (elective); vocal music, drawing, physical culture.

Second Year - Second Term
American literature begun; elements of rhetoric and essay writing; algebra completed, geometry continued, History of England; chemistry continued, physics begun; Latin or German continued--elective with shorthand and typewriting; vocal music, drawing, physical culture.

Junior (or Third Year) - First Term
English literature, rhetoric and essay writing, solid geometry and trigonometry, physics and astronomy; Latin, German, or shorthand, vocal music, drama, physical culture.

Junior Year - Second Term
An extensive study of some one period in English literature, history of Reformation; botany: laboratory work in Chemistry; physical geography, advanced Latin; plane analytical geometry.

Senior Year - First Term
Methods of teaching arithmetic, language, geography, and reading; school management; school laws of Virginia and history of pedagogy; observation and school of practice.

Senior Year - Second Term
Psychology, physiology, five months daily practice in the school of practice.

APPENDIX K
Courses of Study (1898-99)
STATE FEMALE NORMAL SCHOOL.
 COURSES OF STUDY.*

Note.—The figures following subjects give the number of recitation
periods a week—of forty-five minutes each. The aim is to have the
class-room work, requiring outside preparation, average about fifteen
hours a week.

I.—NORMAL COURSE.

FIRST YEAR—Section A.—English, 5; Arithmetic, 5; Geography, 5;
U. S. History (and its Eng. relations), 5; Hygiene, 1; drawing, 2; Music
and Physical Culture, 3.

Section B.—English, 5; Latin, 5; Algebra, 5; History (General), 5;
Hygiene, 1; Drawing, 2; Music and Physical Culture, 3.

SECOND YEAR—Section A.—English, 5; Latin, 5; Algebra, 2; Geometry,
3; Botany, 2; School Organization and Management, 1; Drawing, 2; Music
and Physical Culture, 3.

Section B.—English, 4; Latin, 5; Algebra 3; Geometry, 2; Chemistry,
3; Physics, 3; Drawing, 2; Music and Physical Culture, 2.

SENIOR YEAR—(Professional)—Section A.—(Methods.)—English, 5;
Arithmetic, 5; Geography, 5; History (United States), 3; Civics, 1;
Drawing, 2; Music, 2.

Section B.—Arithmetic, 1; Physiology, 4; History of Pedagogy, 2;
Science of Education, 2; Psychology, 3; Ethics, 2; Teaching in Practice
School and Laboratory work in Biology, 10.

II—SCIENCE COURSE.

FIRST AND SECOND YEARS—Same as in Normal Course. (I.)

JUNIOR YEAR—Section A.—English, 5 (or stenography, 5); History
(English), 3; Geometry (Plane and Solid), 5; Chemistry (with Laboratory
work), 10.

Section B.—English (Literature), 5; Trigonometry (Plane and
Spher.), 5; Botany, 3; Physics, 5; Drawing, 2.

SENIOR YEAR—Sections A and B.—Same as in Normal Course I.)

III.—CLASSICAL COURSE.

FIRST, SECOND, AND SENIOR YEARS—Same as in Science Course (II.)

JUNIOR YEAR—Section A.—Latin (half-term), 5; Plane Geometry
(half-term), 5; French, 5; German, 5; (*or, instead of Modern Languages,
Stenography, 5); History (English), 3.

Section B.—Latin, 5; French, 5; German, 5; (*or, instead of Modern
Languages, Stenography, 5); English Literature, 5.

Typewriting accompanies Stenography, taking, at least, equal time
additional. The electives of the Junior Year are available for classes
of six or more.

*State Female Normal School, Catalogue, 1898-99, p. 12.
APPENDIX L
The Junior Year*

The extension of our course of study was an experiment of absorbing interest to the Faculty. Each teacher saw in the Junior year an opportunity for better work in her department, and plans were made with enthusiasm which were intended to culminate in a course, not of college grade it is true, but far better than that given in most high schools. We hoped the new course, requiring one more term, would materially raise the grade of the school, since it was introduced at the point when a student's mind has begun to show the results of the training in the lower classes, and she was thus fitted to grasp more advanced subjects with intelligence. We expected that we could send out pupil teachers into the Training School with more maturity and far better prepared than hitherto. But we have been confronted with a serious difficulty. The Normal course of three years, with its diploma, was established to give the few who should find it impossible to take the full four-year course leading to the Classical or Scientific diploma, an opportunity for our professional training and an accredited recognition of that opportunity. We hoped that a large majority of our students would take the longer course, offering as it did better and more extended work than we had been able to give before. But, although in the readjustment of courses necessary in making so many changes, we could not expect the best results at once, still the Faculty has been much disappointed at the number of students who are omitting the Junior year and contenting themselves with the Normal course. Some, perhaps, do so because it is impossible for them to do otherwise, but many are following, we fear, that headlong rush to "finish" school and get a diploma, which is the great cause of most of the superficial education unfortunately too often met with, in our State as elsewhere. It is this tendency that must be fought with all our might if we are to stand for thorough work. We wish that each one of our students could see clearly the necessity for an education, the best possible, and realize that there are few sacrifices too great to make for it. We should like to have each one filled with the determination to obtain it, even by her own exertion if need be.

I wonder if the student who does not make a persistent effort to take the Junior year realizes what she gives up? She has neither French nor German. She has but a slight course in Mathematics, no solid Geometry, nor Trigonometry. She has no Chemistry and her knowledge of Physics is confined to that offered in a most elementary course. She has had some Literature, it is true, but a mere introduction to the subject. In short, such a student has but a bare
foundation, and is fitted to teach only in primary and grammar grades, while those taking the Junior year successfully would be fitted for positions in our best high schools. And, better still, the ambitious girl may go from us to some higher institution to do college work.

We believe the time is coming when a more thorough preparation will be demanded of the teachers in even our primary schools. Every year the work is setting a higher value on education. Let it not be cheapened with us. We depend upon our student to help uphold our standard, that we may do our part in the educational development of our State.

*State Normal School, The Virginian 1901, p. 47.
APPENDIX M

TEXT-BOOKS (1896-97)*

The School now furnishes most of the text-books, at a rental of two dollars per session for all used. Students should bring with them such text-books as they have. For the information of students and others, the following list is given:

English Grammar,.............. Whitney & Lockwood.
United States History,............ Fiske.
General History,.................. Myers.
English History,................... Montgomery.
Civil Government,.................. Fiske.
English Literature,................. Stopford Brooke.
American Literature,.............. American Classics.
Latin Language,.................... Collar's Series.
Arithmetic,....................... Appleton, White.
Algebra,......................... Wells, Wentworth, Olney.
Geometry,........Secpee's Inventional, Hill, Wentworth, Wells.
Trigonometry,...................... Wentworth.
Astronomy,....................... Lockyer, Young.
Botany,............................ Gray.
Chemistry,........................ Cooley.
Mineralogy,........................ Dana.
Physics,........................... Gage, Ganot.
Physiology,........................ Martin.
Descriptive Geography,........... Appleton.
Psychology,........................ James.
School Management,................ Raub, Holbrook.
Stenography,...................... Graham.
German,............................ Stern, Eysenbach.
French,............................ Stern & Meras.

APPENDIX N
Virginia Normal School Board*

Be it enacted by the general assembly of Virginia, That a board of visitors for the State Normal Schools for white women of Virginia be, and is hereby created, which shall be and remain a corporation and be known as the "Virginia Normal School Board."

1. The said board shall be composed of twelve members, one from each congressional district, and two from the State at large, appointed by the governor, subject to confirmation by the senate. Each member shall hold office for a term of four years, provided that at the first appointment one-half of the members shall be appointed for two years and one-half for four years. Thereafter all appointments shall be for four years, except in case of a vacancy in which event the appointment shall be for the unexpired term. Members of the said board shall serve without compensation, but all expense incurred on account of services on said board shall be paid by the State. The superintendent of public instruction of the State shall be ex-officio a member of the said board. The governor of the State in his discretion, shall have all the rights and privileges of a member of the said board. Six members shall constitute a quorum.

2. The said board shall succeed to all the property, property rights, duties, contracts, and agreements now controlled by and vested in the board of trustees of the State female normal school at Farmville, the State normal and industrial school for women at Harrisonburg; the State normal and industrial school for women at Fredericksburg; and the State normal and industrial school for women at Radford. The State female normal school at Farmville shall hereafter be called "The state normal school for women at Farmville." The state normal and industrial school for women at Fredericksburg shall hereafter be called "The State normal school for women at Fredericksburg." The State normal and industrial school for women at Radford shall hereafter be called "The State normal school for women at Radford."

The "Virginia normal school board" shall have full authority to manage and control the four said state institutions of learning located at Farmville, Harrisonburg, Fredericksburg and
Radford, respectively. The said board shall safeguard the State funds of the said schools and distribute all appropriations by the State in a careful and economical manner, and shall appoint, subject to the limitations of its funds and appropriations made by the State, such officers, teachers and employees as it may deem necessary, and may remove any one of them at any time for cause.

It shall be the duty of the said board to prevent, as far as possible, unnecessary duplication of work in said schools, to provide for the correlation of the work of said schools with each other and with the primary and grammar grades and high schools of the State. It shall have power to grant certificates of graduation and shall fix the necessary entrance requirements and courses of study, and shall provide proper facilities for carrying on the work of the said schools. It shall be the duty of the said board to prepare all budgets to be presented to the general assembly, and to make recommendations for maintenance and enlargement as the needs of the schools demand. The said board is further empowered to appoint such committees of its members and employees, as, in the said schools, separately or collectively. If in its judgment it seems best, the said board may appoint the presidents of the respective schools as an executive council, which shall constitute a proper correlation of the work of the said schools with each other and with the public school system of the State. When requested by the board to do so, the presidents of the respective schools shall meet and confer with the said board in an advisory capacity, and they may be appointed on any of its committees, but shall have no vote in the meetings of the said board.

3. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith, are hereby repealed, and the boards of trustees of the State female normal school at Farmville, the State normal and industrial school for women at Harrisonburg; the State normal and industrial school for women at Fredericksburg and the State normal and industrial school for women at Radford are hereby abolished.

APPENDIX O

Publications of Faculty (1908-1924)*

F. A. Millidge
"Suggestions on The Teaching of Frye's Higher Geography", October, 1908, pp. 10-13 and December, 1908, pp. 3-7.

Margaret W. Haliburton
"Lesson Plans", November, 1908, pp. 12-16.
"Some Suggestions for Correlating Story Telling with Other Phases of Work", December, 1908, pp. 24-25.
"The Daily Program" (reprinted from October, 1908 issue and because of requests, appeared for the second time), November, 1909, pp. 72-76.

Lula O. Andrews

Robert T. Kerlin

Lula O. Andrews

Thomas D. Eason

Fannie W. Dunn

Lula O. Andrews
"A Lee Program", January, 1912, p. 147.

S. P. Duke
Fannie W. Dunn

F. A. Millidge

M. Boyd Coyner
"What is Mental Discipline?" May, 1916, pp. 499-501.

James M. Grainger

Christine Munoz

J. L. Jarman
"A Greeting to the Teachers of Virginia", September, 1917, p. 17.

Raymond V. Long

J. M. Lear

Mary D. Pierce

J. L. Jarman
"What the State Normal Schools for Women Are Doing to Prepare Teachers", May, 1919, pp. 345-347.

J. M. Grainger
English for the Seventh Grade", December, 1919, pp. 131-135.

Florence H. Stubbs
Teaching Citizenship in Rural Schools", November, 1919, pp. 85-89.
Maude Townsend
"Language Work in the Lower Fourth Grade of Farmville Training School", June, 1919, pp. 399-401.

W. F. Tidyman
"Values in Reading", January, 1919, p. 179.

Bessie L. Ashton

G. H. Bretnall
"Use and Abuse of Recess", December, 1920, pp. 131-133.

James M. Grainger

Lila London
"The Drill Lesson in Arithmetic", September, 1920, pp. 3-5.

Jennie M. Tabb

W. F. Tidyman
"Essentials of Language in the Elementary School", December, 1923, pp. 139-142.

Ilma Von Schilling
"Grammar Grade Department", December, 1923, p. 159; March, 1924, p. 291.

*Publications of the Normal School faculty in the Virginia Journal of Education (1908-1924).*
APPENDIX P
THE SUMMER NORMAL INSTITUTE, 1880-1902

The summer school has been and still is a very effective method of training teachers for the public free schools. The first Normal Institute on a statewide basis for white teachers was held in the buildings at the University of Virginia July 14 to August 25, 1880. During this same summer a Colored Normal Institute at Lynchburg "opened July 15 and continued full six weeks without interruption." Probably a tabulation of the enrollment in summer normals for the twenty-two year period, 1880-1902, may prove of some worth for comparative purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Colored</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>1,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>1,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>1,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>1,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>1,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>1,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>1,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>1,813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*McGuffey Reader, 1937, P. 289.*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
## APPENDIX Q

### COURSE FOR PRIMARY TEACHERS*

**LEADING TO THE ELEMENTARY CERTIFICATE**

#### FIRST SUMMER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours Per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Methods I</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Composition and Grammar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¹Music</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SECOND SUMMER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours Per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Methods II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, Child Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography and Nature Study</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic and Methods ¹</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¹Music</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### THIRD SUMMER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours Per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Curriculum</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²Drawing and Industrial Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The two periods of Music count as one.
²Drawing and Industrial Arts three double periods.

Note: Classes in writing will be offered for those students who are unable to furnish the required certificate of proficiency in this subject, but no credit will be allowed for this work.

COURSE FOR GRAMMAR GRADE TEACHERS*  
LEADING TO THE ELEMENTARY CERTIFICATE  

FIRST SUMMER  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Hours Per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Composition and Grammar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods in History and Geography</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECOND SUMMER  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Hours Per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic and Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¹Music</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THIRD SUMMER  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Hours Per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¹Music</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²Drawing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The two periods of Music count as one.  
²The Drawing has two double periods.  
Note: Classes in writing will be offered for those students who are unable to furnish the required certificates of proficiency in this subject, but no credit will be allowed for this work.

APPENDIX R

Course of Study 1903-1904*

First Year

Section A.—Reading and Spelling, 5; Grammar, 3; English History, 3; Geography, 3; Arithmetic, 3; Latin, 3; Music, 2; Drawing 2; Physical Training, 2.

Section B.—Grammar, 3; U. S. History, 4; Geography, 2; Arithmetic, 3; Algebra, 4; Latin, 3; Music, 2; Drawing, 2; Hygiene, 1; Physical Training, 2.

Second Year

Section A.—English, 3; Latin, 3; Botany, 4; Algebra, 3; Geometry, 3; Civics, 3; Music, 2; Drawing, 2; Physical Training 2.

Section B.—English, 3; Latin, 3; Physics, 4; Algebra, 3; Geometry, 3; General History, 3; Music, 2; Drawing, 2; Physical Training, 2.

Junior Year

Section A.—English, 3; Chemistry, 4; Physics, 4; General History, 3; Drawing, 1; Physical Training, 2; and any two of the following subjects: Latin, 3; French, 4; German, 4; Solid Geometry, 3.

Section B.—Physical Geography, 3; Physiology, 4; Chemistry, 4; History of Education, 3; Drawing, 1; Physical Training, 2; and any two of the following subjects: Latin, 3; French, 4; Trigonometry, 3; American Literature, 3.

Senior Year

Section A.—Arithmetic and Methods, 3; Advanced Grammar and Methods, 4, half term; Observation, 5, half term; American History 3; Nature Study, Geography and Methods, 5; Psychology I, 3; Music, 2; Physical Training 2.

Section B.—Psychology II., 3; Educational Seminar, 2; School Management, 2; Physical Training, 2; Teaching.

The training school, around which the work of the normal school centers, has been greatly strengthened. In addition to the principal there have been added two supervisors. Miss M. W. Haliburton for the first and second grades and Miss F. W. Dunn for the third and fourth grades.

A kindergarten has also been established. Miss Elizabeth J. Freeborn was elected Director.

The academic department has been strengthened by a more systematic arrangement of the work into departments and by the addition of three members to the faculty.

APPENDIX S

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON HAND WRITING*

I. The Bases for Sending Students to the Class

1. Legibility as heretofore is to be the basis for sending students to the class

   The standards as indicated by Ayers' Standard and adopted last year are:

   a. For exemption from handwriting class
      1. In test papers, 60
      2. In papers prepared out of class, 70
      3. In board writing, 75

   b. For recommendation for release from handwriting class, 75

   In writing on paper any system is to be accepted so long as it is sufficiently legible, but on the blackboard the system adopted by the state is preferable. At present this is the Haaren system.

2. Backhand is to be discouraged on paper and it is not to be allowed on blackboard. If backhand is not promptly eliminated it should be regarded as proper basis for sending to the class.

   In as much as being able to write on the blackboard is especially essential to the teacher, the committee recommends that each junior and senior be tested in blackboard writing as often as practicable. To this end it is recommended that each department in turn systematically have work placed on the board by each junior and senior reciting in the respective departments. It is further recommended that the English Department, in co-operation with Mr. Eason start this work and report on the working of the plan at the next Faculty meeting.

II. The Work of the Writing Class

1. The work of the writing class will be largely blackboard writing and in this the state system will be followed as far as practicable. (At present the Haaren.)

2. As soon as the student is sent to the class Mr. Eason plans to test her writing, give her what she seems to need and keep her only as long as is needed to overcome her deficiency.

*Farmville State Normal School, Faculty Minutes, n.d.
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Course of Study (1906-07)*

The course of study is as follows:

Review Year in Public School Branches.

Section A.—Grammar, 4; spelling, 2; reading, 3; arithmetic, 4; United States History, 3; geography, 4; writing, 1; hygiene, 2; physical training, 2.

Section B.—Grammar, 4; reading, 3; spelling, 2; arithmetic, 4; United States History, 3; civics, 2; geography, 4; writing, 1; physical training, 2.

ACADEMIC COURSE

First Year

Section A.—Composition, 3; reading, 2; algebra, 3; ancient history, 3; Latin (grammar), 3; manual training, 2; drawing, 2; music, 2; domestic science, 2; physical training, 2.

Section B.—Composition, 3; reading, 2; algebra, 3; constructive geometry, 2; ancient history, 3; Latin (grammar), 3; Manual training, 2; drawing, 2; music, 2; domestic science, 2; physical training, 2.

Second Year

Section A.—Rhetoric, 3; mythology, 2; algebra, 3; geometry, 3; modern history, 3; music, 2; physical training, 2; and one of the following groups.

   Group II.—Latin (Viri Romae), 3; and French or German, 3.

Section B.—Rhetoric, 3; American literature, 3; arithmetic, 3; geometry, 3; modern history, 3; music, 2; physical training, 2; and one of the following groups.

   Group I.—Manual training and drawing, 4; botany, 5.
   Group II.—Latin (Caesar), 3; and French or German, 3.

Third Year

Section A.—English literature, 3; commercial geography, 3; physics, 5; chemistry, 6; physical training, 2; and any two of the following:

   Manual training and drawing, 4; solid geometry, 4; English history 3; Latin (Caesar), 3; French, 3; German, 3.

Section B.—English literature, 3; industrial history, 3; psychology, 4; chemistry, 6; physical training, 2; and any two of the following:

   Manual training and drawing, 4; plane trigonometry, 4; English history, 3; Latin (Cicero), 3; French, 5; German, 3.

Fourth Year

Section A.—Advanced rhetoric, 3; word study, 2; physical training, 2; and fifteen periods of the following:
English literature, 3; spherical geometry, 4; economics, 3; Greek history, 3; geology 3; physics, 6; chemistry, 6; advanced biology, 6; Latin (Cicero), 3; French 3, drawing, 2; music, 2; domestic science, 3.

Section B.—Advanced rhetoric, 2; composition, 3; physical training, 2 and fifteen periods of the following:

English literature, 3; advanced algebra, 4; sociology, 3; Roman history, 3; astronomy, 3; physics, 6; chemistry, 6; advanced biology, 6; Latin (Virgil and Horace), 3; French, 3; German, 3; drawing, 2; music, 2; domestic science, 3.

PROFESSIONAL COURSE I.

Junior Year.

Section A.—Grammar, 3; reading and methods, 3; Arithmetic and methods, 2; history, 3; writing and methods, 1; manual training, 2; drawing, 2; music, 2; psychology, 3; primary methods, 3; physical training, 2.

Section B.—Methods in language, 2; juvenile literature, 2; arithmetic, 3; history and methods, 3; geography and methods, 5; nature study, 3; manual training 2; observation 3; physical training, 2.

Senior Year.

Section A.—Civics, 3; history of education, 5; methods and management, 3; educational gymnastics, 2; physical training, 2; teaching, 6.

Section B.—Ethics, 2; philosophy of education, 3; advanced psychology, 3; child study, 2; seminar, 1; physical training, 2; teaching, 8.

PROFESSIONAL COURSE II.

Junior Year.

Section A.—Grammar, 3; reading and methods, 3; arithmetic and methods, 2; history, 3; zoology, 5; writing and methods, 1; music, 2; psychology, 3; primary methods, 3; physical training, 2.

Section B.—Methods in language, 2; juvenile literature, 2; arithmetic, 3; history and methods, 2; geography and methods, 5; botany, 5; music, 2; observation, 2; physical training, 2.

Senior Year.

Section A.—Civics, 3; manual training, 2; drawing, 2; history of education, 3; methods and management, 3; educational gymnastics, 2; physical training, 2; teaching, 6.

Section B.—Nature study, 3; manual training, 2; drawing, 2; philosophy of education, 3; child study, 2; physical training, 2; seminar, 1; teaching, 8.

KINDERGARTEN COURSE.

Junior Year.

Section A.—Freihel's gifts and occupations, (theory and practice), 4; stories, games and songs, 2; music, 2; primary methods, 3; psychology (elementary), 3; manual training, 2; physical training, 2; observation, daily, in the kindergarten.

Section B.—Freihel's gifts and occupations (theory and practice), 4; stories, games and songs, 2; mother play, 1; music, 2; child study, 2; manual training, 2; observation, daily, in both the first primary grade and the kindergarten.
Senior Year

Section A.—Theory of Froebel's occupations, 2; mother play, 2; kindergarten principles, methods, and program, 1; drawing, 2; history of education, 3; physical training, 2; practice teaching in the first primary grade, with observation in the kindergarten; or practice teaching in the kindergarten, observation in the first primary grade.

Section B.—Mother play, 2; kindergarten principles, methods, and program, 1; drawing, 2; education of man, 1; psychology (advanced), 3; physical training, 2; practice teaching and observation, same as in Section A.

ELEME NTARY COURSE.

First Year.

Section A.—Composition, 3; reading, 2; algebra, 5; general history, 5; manual training, 2; drawing, 2; music, 2; domestic science, 2; physical training, 2.

Section B.—Composition, 3; reading, 2; algebra, 3; constructive geometry, 2; general history, 3; manual training, 2; drawing, 2; music, 2; domestic science, 2; physical training, 2.

Second Year.

Section A.—Rhetoric, 3; mythology, 2; arithmetic, 3; physics, 5; zoology, 5; manual training, 2; drawing, 2; music, 2; physical training, 2.

Section B.—Rhetoric, 3; American literature, 3; chemistry, 6; botany, 5; manual training, 2; drawing, 2; music, 2; physical training, 2.

ELE ME NTARY PROFESSIONAL.

Section A.—Grammar, 3; reading, 3; arithmetic, 2; history, 3; physiology, 1; methods and management, 3; primary methods, 3; physical training, 2.

Section B.—Methods in language, 2; juvenile literature, 2; civics, 3; geography, 5; nature study, 3; psychology, 3; observation, 3; physical training, 2.

APPENDIX U

Diplomas and Certificates Offered in 1912*

1. The Full Diploma. This diploma was awarded those with the equivalent of four years of high school plus completion of the professional requirements of the normal school. This led to a Full Normal Professional Certificate which replaced the Collegiate Certificate. It remained a ten year renewable certificate.

2. The Kindergarten Diploma. This diploma demanded completion of the kindergarten course plus high school or its equivalent. This diploma also required students to be tested in music ability by the kindergarten supervisor.

3. The Normal Professional Certificate. This certificate required three years of high school plus professional studies. It replaced the Professional Diploma and yielded a seven year renewable certificate.

4. The First Grade Certificate. This certificate was given to those completing the elementary course and led to a three year non-renewable certificate.

*State Normal School, Catalogue, 1911-1912, p. 35-36.
APPENDIX V

IMPORTANT NOTICE

(Concerning Differentiation of Courses in State Normal Schools for Women.)*

The Virginia Normal School Board invites careful attention to the following resolutions, which were adopted by the Board on April 12, 1919, and which are of very great importance to the future development of the Normal Schools.

Resolved, That the most fundamental work of the State Normal Schools and their most important function is to train teachers for the elementary schools. Ample provision must be made for this training and proper facilities therefore must be provided before any of the appropriation from the State or revenues from the schools can be used for any other purposes.

Be it further resolved, That the increased demand in the State for teachers of high school subjects, for teachers in special departments and for rural supervisors should be met by the State Normal Schools as far as possible without interfering with their primary function.

Resolved, That in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort and to contribute to the most economic use of public funds, the work of training high school and special teachers and rural supervisors is hereby arranged in accordance with a plan of differentiation of work which will make it unnecessary for each one of the State Normal Schools to carry the heavy burden of a large number of special courses paralleling similar courses in other schools.

The work common to all of the schools will be as follows:
1. Two-year courses for the training of elementary teachers.
2. Modification of the two-year course to meet the needs of students who may desire to pursue any one of the special four-year courses assigned to the several normal schools as outlined below. These modified two-year courses are the same as the courses of similar length now being offered at the normal schools, it not being the intention of the Normal School Board to interfere with the present catalogued two-year course. Such modified two-year courses at whatever normal school taken will be credited as the first two years of the special four-year course assigned to any one of the normals. In this way students will have preserved their appropriate credits.

In accordance with this plan every school is assigned a specific subject, but every other school is given the liberty of offering the present two-year course in that subject. This arrangement is preserved in order that young women may go from
one normal for advanced work in a special subject or subjects to
another normal without suffering inconvenience or loss of
credits. The only exception to this arrangement is found in the
case of the commercial course which will be offered in its
entirety at Fredericksburg.

The differentiated work of advanced grade leading to degrees
is assigned to the particular schools as follows:

To Farmville a four-year course for the training of high
school teachers.

To Harrisonburg a four-year course for the training of
teachers in home economics.

To Fredericksburg a four-year course for the training of
teachers in music, industrial arts and commercial subjects.

To Radford a four-year course for the training of supervisors
of elementary schools and for specialists in rural education. To
Radford is also assigned the task of extension work in rural
education. This is a wide field of endeavor and all of the
normal schools are expected to cooperate in the future as in the
past, but under this plan the Radford Normal is given the duty to
study the needs of and give general direction to rural extension
work.

In view of the fact that all of the normals have heretofore
been allowed to offer four-year courses for the training of high
school teachers, it would be an apparent hardship on students who
have entered these courses not to allow some period in which
readjustment can be made. The operation of this resolution will
therefore become effective July 1, 1921. In the meantime no
normal school will accept new students for the third and fourth
years in any special department other than that assigned to it by
this resolution.

*State Normal School for Women, Catalogue, 1919-1920, pp. 5-7.
APPENDIX W

CLASS EXAMINATION AVERAGES IN SPELLING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade II Averages</th>
<th>97 97 99 90 93 92 83 79 73 77 74 52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayres' Standards</td>
<td>99 98 96 94 92 88 84 79 73 66 58 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade III Averages</th>
<th>98 100 100 97 100 94 93 88 87 79 77 73 77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayres' Standards</td>
<td>100 99 98 96 94 92 88 84 79 73 66 58 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade IV Averages</th>
<th>95 94 92 90 80 86 81 75 66 55 61 58 63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayres' Standards</td>
<td>100 99 98 96 94 92 88 84 79 73 66 58 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade V Averages</th>
<th>98 99 98 96 94 84 88 84 79 73 66 58 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayres' Standards</td>
<td>100 99 98 96 94 92 88 84 79 73 66 58 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade VI Averages</th>
<th>99 100 99 95 95 88 83 70 71 69 59 48 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayres' Standards</td>
<td>100 99 98 96 94 92 88 84 79 73 66 58 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade VII Averages</th>
<th>100 98 97 95 94 95 93 90 76 73 72 66 58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayres' Standards</td>
<td>100 99 98 96 94 92 88 84 79 73 66 58 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination grades above Standard------28
Examination grades Standard-------------17
Examination grades below Standard-------32

Report of the Committee on Qualifications for Admission of Professional Students to the Training School.*

Your committee appointed March 16 to examine into the question of admitting professional students as teachers in the training school begs to submit the following report:

The committee is convinced that the present requirements of admission to the training school are too low. This condition results in irreparable injury to the children and lays a heavy burden upon the training school faculty. It encourages certain students to enter a profession for which they are not yet, perhaps never can be ready, and feeds into the profession weak teachers whose presence lowers professional standards throughout the state. It is these substandard teachers who do much to delay the coming of higher salaries and other improvement in the teaching profession. The first year, in the opinion of the committee, should be used as a testing period at the end of which deficient students should be required either to extend their time here before entering the training school, or, in bare justice to the girl and to the state be definitely warned away from the profession. Strength of personality and the gift of imparting knowledge do not take the place of academic equipment; both are necessary for any reasonable proficiency in the profession. The committee has carefully examined into the records of certain weak students of the past two years—students who in the opinion of their supervisors and others should not have entered the training school nor even the profession. The committee believes that academic tests of the students' fitness should work in an automatic and impersonal way and submits the following recommendations.

Administration of the Requirements

The requirements as made below should be carried out through a standing committee consisting of the director of the training school and two of the academic faculty. It would be best for this committee to keep as closely in touch as possible with first professional students as to academic and other qualifications.

Academic Requirements

1. One half the students' grades shall be C or higher. Of these grades three must be from the five essential subjects, English, history, reading, mathematics and geography.
2. Of the grades that fall below C the present plan allows no student who has more than one E or extra work over five periods to enter the training school. This requirement should be adhered to. Moreover conditions should count as a D grade until removed with a grade of C or higher.

3. If more than half of the student's grades fall below C the D grades count as three-fourths (75%) credit thus making it necessary to repeat one-fourth of the classes on which she has received D. For example: Mary Brown Course II. A First Professional has completed 19 subjects not including Physical Education.

7 subjects have a grade of C or higher (including English Composition. 12 grades fall below C and are distributed as follows:

10 -- D
1 -- Condition) i.e. 11 grades D
1 -- E

With 11 D's she receives credit for 8 subjects leaving 3 subjects to be taken over. The committee in conference with Miss Brown's teachers shall decide what subjects must be repeated taking into consideration what course she has chosen, her special weaknesses, etc. In certain cases the committee may allow appropriate substitution for the courses which would otherwise be repeated.

Course IV girls should have the written consent of the departments in which they wish to major and minor. The committee has found that in this group failure in teaching is largely due to the students' selection of subject for which she was radically unfit. The committee thinks also that the faculty could improve our standards by correcting the common impression among students that C is a below average grade.

The committee wishes to express strongly its belief that weak records could in a good many cases be prevented by reclassifying the student in one or more subjects if the instructor finds by the experience of a few weeks that the student is beyond her depth. If five terms must be spent by a weak student in getting her diploma it is in many cases far better that the girl spend one of these terms in the fourth year of the high school rather than in repeating professional work which does not build up her weak places.

It is advisable also to reduce the amount of "accommodation teaching" using any time that a student can spare for extra academic studies taken parallel with her teaching.
Non Academic Qualifications

Experience shows that poor work in the training school comes in certain cases from the wrong attitude toward the work. The committee in conference with members of the faculty and with the head of the home might pass upon the moral fitness of a girl to train young children. (See 1919-20 catalogue page 40). Temperamental and physical unfitness should debar a few students, but students of this type might be allowed to remain in the school taking academic subjects only.

This committee feels that it is a great injustice to all parties concerned to allow a student with serious deficiencies to continue her course and fail at or near the time of graduation, when the deficiencies could have been remedied before the teaching experience had begun. We hold that responsibility for adequate training in subject matter rests squarely upon the academic faculty and not upon the training school staff. Still less should deficiencies in their teachers be visited upon the children. The clear understanding of these requirements by the first professionals when they first enter the school and the resulting publicity will go far to improve the present situation.

Signed  Bessie C. Randolph
         Ellen I. Hardy
         J. M. Lear
         Committee.

*State Normal School, Faculty Minutes, May 25, 1920.
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A Day's Program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Rising Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15</td>
<td>Warning Bell &amp; Morning Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40</td>
<td>Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>First Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>Second Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Recess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Fourth Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>Fifth Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Warning Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10</td>
<td>Warning Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15</td>
<td>Sixth Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Seventh Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45</td>
<td>Eighth Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>Warning Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Supper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30</td>
<td>Prayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>Study Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Recreation Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Lights Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Graduation 1912*

STATE FEMALE NORMAL SCHOOL, FARMVILLE, VIRGINIA

The twenty-eighth Commencement of the School was held from June 1st to June 4th, beginning with the Senior Reception on the evening of the 1st. About three hundred guests were present, including the Senior Class, the Faculty, guests of the Seniors and a number of the prominent people of the town, among them the Town Council.

On Sunday evening the Baccalaureate Sermon was preached by Dr. H. D. C. Maclachlan, of Richmond. Th Seniors, one hundred and twenty-four in number, marched into the Auditorium singing a processional hymn; the ministers of the town all took part in the service and the choir of the occasion was composed of the members of the Glee Club.

Monday evening was given over to the Class Night exercises; the class songs were unusually good and many excellent hits were made at Faculty and students. On this occasion President Jarman presented a handsome silver service to Miss Martha W. Coulling—the gift of Alumnae, Faculty and students in recognition of twenty-five years of faithful service to the institution. Miss Coulling is head of the Department of Drawing.

On Tuesday morning, June 4th, the regular Commencement exercises were held; the speaker of the occasion was Dr. Charles Alphonso Smith, of the University of Virginia, who delivered a most able and interesting address on "American Literature in Foreign Lands."

President Jarman delivered the Diplomas to the graduates and declared the session of 1911-1912, closed.
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Abstract

AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER TRAINING AT THE STATE NORMAL SCHOOL AT FARMVILLE, VIRGINIA

Betty Jo Whitaker Simmons, Ed.D.


Chairman: Professor James M. Yankovich

The purpose of this study was to trace the development of teacher training at the Virginia State Normal School located at Farmville from its inception in 1884 through 1924 when it became a State Teachers College. The study focused upon seven characteristics identified by Charles Harper in 1939 as being typical of the developmental history of normal schools. Following these seven characteristics as a framework, the study analyzed the contributions made toward the professionalization of teaching by 1) presidents, trustees, and faculty; 2) public support; 3) in-service education; 4) curriculum provision; 5) laboratory experiences; 6) extra-curriculum offerings; and 7) pragmatic efforts.

Historical methodology was used in the data collection. Extensive use was made of the Annual Reports of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and of the catalogs and bulletins of the State Normal School. The archives of Dabney Lancaster Library at Longwood College, Farmville, Virginia proved to be a valuable source of primary data. In addition to the review of the literature and numerous other sources, personal interviews and the Minutes of the Trustees and Minutes of the Faculty were invaluable.

The study concluded that the State Normal School at Farmville, Virginia conformed to the seven characteristics identified by Charles Harper. In addition the study provided evidence that Farmville was a pioneer institution of higher education in Virginia and that through its professional teacher training leadership, the success of public education in Virginia was advanced.