

fair to claim for them much of the credit for advance in education.

5. That normal schools should be supported at the common charge, because otherwise they will not be founded in sufficient numbers, and because they need to do a work which schools dependent for support upon popular patronage cannot do.

6. That such schools are in no sense public charities, but that the public should support them for its own sake as a wise means of economy.

Prest. Hewett next dwelt upon the work of the normal schools, and in conclusion asserted as follows:

1. That they should make their pupils acquainted with human nature in its capacities, tendencies, wants, and limitations, especially as these appear in the life of the child.

2. That the subject-matter of instruction should receive attention to any extent that may be necessary, and that I believe that the ideal normal school will not omit it altogether.

3. That the study of methods and modes ought to make up a larger part of the work of these schools.

4. That, while it would be foolish to attempt uniformity in detail, it is desirable that there be uniformity in adherence to underlying principles, and that a body of educational doctrine should be formulated and disseminated.

5. That the work of training or practice should have a prominent place in all our normal schools.

6. And, in addition to what has been said already, that every normal school should awaken in its pupils a genuine enthusiasm respecting the work of teaching, and a true professional feeling, or *esprit de corps*.

Prest. Hewett also said: Are these assertions of mine true or false? Are there other things equally fundamental, which I have overlooked? How shall we best settle these questions and others that may arise? When we clearly see what we want to work out in our schools, how shall we arrive at better modes of working? How shall we bring the truth that we know before the people so as to do them the most good, and to move them to give us the most assistance in our efforts to bless the coming generations? These are the questions for the consideration of which we are met together.

THE MODEL SCHOOL.

Prof. Charles De Garmo, of Normal, Ill., read a paper on "Place and Function of the Model School." In recapitulating the conclusions of the paper, the author said that he found the function of model schools to be four-fold; the work consisting primarily of model-teaching for imitation and of actual pupil-teaching in the training department; incidentally of experimentation on new ideas and methods, and the determination of the kind and quality of work to be done in the common school. He found that model-teaching for imitation should come early in the course, and may profitably be confined to the primary grades. That the pupil-teaching should come in the latter half of the course, and should be continuous rather than broken, and in the main conducted in the presence of a cloud of witnesses. That experimental and determining work, though important, are now merely incidental, and likely to be neglected. Through their model and training schools must the normal schools of America look for the exposition of their best results, and through them more than any other agency must they look for the approval and support of the people. That is professional work which fits for teaching, and that is the best professional work which best fits for teaching; but to be properly appreciated and supported our normal schools must not only be professional schools, but they must also seem to be professional schools. That the end and aim of model schools is professional can be seen by everybody.

CO-EDUCATION OF THE SEXES.

H. S. Tarbell, of Indianapolis, Ind., Chairman of the Committee on Education for Girls, submitted his report on the question of co-education in secondary and collegiate schools. It contained the following propositions:

1. The object of general education for every individual being the same, the means used should be the same, except as modified by the characteristics and circumstances of the person to be educated.

2. These means should be a thorough elementary training in those objects best suited to give needed information and essential culture, followed, when the individual circumstances require and permit it, by a higher elective course of study.

3. The question of the education of girls, as distinguished from the education of boys, is only a phase of special education. There are no intellectual differences between the sexes that require or justify a difference in their general education.

4. Neither the right of girls to equal advantages with boys nor their equal capacity for intellectual effort and attainment is longer disputed, though certain mental differences in the sexes are generally recognized.

5. Sex is but one element, and not always the main one, in determining what the higher education of the individual shall be, or at what point it shall commence; co-education is the plan of nature, and the practical difficulties in its way are disappearing before improved methods, and in the light of successful experience.

6. In institutions established by the State and supported by the public funds, the element of economy, combined with efficiency, will always be carefully considered; and if the State gives the girls within its borders equal advantages with the boys, it will endeavor so to do with the least expenditure and with the smallest practicable addition to educational machinery, or of disturbance to existing institutions. These conditions are evidently met by the admission of girls to the institutions provided for boys.

7. Experience shows that the higher education of young women is successfully conducted in the same institutions and classes with young men, without the presence of either sex affecting the other more than at church or at the theatre. The young women become more decorous; the young men, more reserved and dignified. The danger of improprieties in the association of the sexes in schools is less than in the cominglings of fashionable life.

8. In all schemes of school education allowance must be made for the education to be obtained from the family, society, the church, and the State, and for the time and effort which these means of education will consume. A further allowance must be made for the demands of growth and the contingencies of ill-health and some degree of irregularity of attendance. Young people should not be allowed to work up to their strength. There should always be the possibility of greater effort without the appearance of harm. These allowances being made and the system being elastic enough to admit them without serious jar, the co-education of the sexes will be found to have important advantages for both over and scheme of education for boys and girls separately. It seems, therefore, to be for the interest of the State, of society, and of most individuals that co-education of the sexes should prevail in institutions supported by the State.—*Report of National Council of Education, Saratoga, July, 1883.*

COMMON SENSE AND SPECIAL SENSE IN COMMON SCHOOLS.

A good deal of the recent criticism on our common schools is off the track and of little practical use, because it is a one-sided judgment, by specialists, on an institution whose vital merit is its commonness and its adjustment to the ordinary needs of all sorts and conditions of people. Specialists are, of course, exclusive and are apt to give undue prominence to their own line of thought and operation. Thus, an eminent master of a technical school very naturally looks at education through a vista bristling with the tools of his department and easily falls into the notion that the "use of tools" is an indispensable requisite to a common school education. But since the artisan class, even in cities, rarely exceeds one-fourth the population, a compulsory education of all male children in the use of tools would change the common school for the whole people to a school of mechanics for a minority. Possibly, one-