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I was a first generation college student who was an average high school student. Leaving my family, home, and Columbia Heights neighborhood for the northern woods of Bemidji, Minnesota, to attend Bemidji State College was an unnerving yet enjoyable experience. Given my love of children, selecting majors in Elementary Education and Elementary Physical Education was a simple choice. Learning about becoming a teacher was made easier because Bemidji State College had a laboratory school located in the Education building. I spent as much time with my college-age peers as I did with elementary-age children, witnessing first hand the application of theories into practical action. This teacher preparation program not only effectively prepared me for the years I spent teaching in the public schools, but also has served me well at the university.

When I was hired at MSU in 1984, I was told that there had been a Campus School from 1888 to 1972. This was exciting news given my positive experience at Bemidji, but I did not have the time to pursue this interest. After teaching in the Health and Physical Education department for 10 years, I began teaching in the Education department. One of my major assignments was, and still is today, teaching the Foundations of Education course. A major component of this course is the study of the history of education. I thought to myself, “What better way for students to learn about the history of education (e.g., Progressive Education) than to study their own local history.” So, I began including class visits to the library’s archives so students could look through the many photographs and primary source documents that told the story of this fascinating small school.

During the 2005 Spring Semester, I received a sabbatical leave. Finally, I would have large amounts of uninterrupted time to conduct a systematic study of Moorhead’s Campus School. With the assistance of Dr. Terry Shoight, Archivist, and his assistant, Korella Selzer, I began looking at the many boxes of primary source documents and hundreds of photographs that told the Campus School story. While working on the archival research project, I was also teaching at Moorhead’s alternative high school—the Red River Area Learning Center. These two activities provided a wide range of activity: from quiet to loud, from isolated to congested, and from singly focused to chaotic. However, the more time I spent working on these two projects, the more similarities I noticed. The Campus School teachers had focused on students and their interests, attempted to individualize instruction, emphasized local as well as global curriculum perspectives, used innovative teaching and testing strategies, and understood the importance of building small learning communities. These were the same ideas the alternative school literature indicated results in effective alternative education for youth with many risk factors and the same kinds of ideas we were trying to use at the alternative school.

As a result of what I have learned and the time spent on these two projects—two years on this book and six years at the alternative school, I will donate all proceeds from the sale of this book to create a scholarship for Red River Area Learning Center students to attend Minnesota State University Moorhead.

A major challenge to overcome in writing this book was deciding on an organizing framework. Not only was the school housed in several different buildings, but the philosophy of the school was transported to local rural schools that were affiliated with the Campus School and university. Additionally, the closing of the school was its own story as were the all-school reunions held to celebrate the positive memories associated with the Campus School. And, although not by formal name “campus school,” it’s essential identity lives on through the MSUM Early Education Center. This information, then, was used to create the topics identified in the table of contents.

I hope you enjoy the book. Contact me if you have stories to add.
CHAPTER ONE: THE MODEL SCHOOL IN OLD MAIN: 1888-1908
Moorhead Normal School was created as a place to prepare teachers. This purpose was clearly described in the 1890-1891 Minnesota State Normal School at Moorhead Catalogue and Circular:

The design of a normal school is without doubt professional, aiming to prepare its pupils to teach in the public schools of the state. To this end, it is of the greatest importance that its graduates possess a thorough and even minute knowledge of such branches of learning as they may be called upon to teach. The first thing to be accomplished then, is to give pupils thorough instructions in the subjects taught in these schools. In the second place, pupils must be trained in the best method of teaching these branches... (Figure 1).

The Normal School’s singular role expanded, in 1921, when Moorhead Normal School became Moorhead State Teachers College and students could study for four-year bachelor’s degrees. The 1950s witnessed an increase in both liberal arts and professional programs and as a result the university’s mission expanded again. For example, in 1955 the first Master of Science degrees were awarded in Education to three teachers. To reflect these changes, the institution’s name changed to Moorhead State College in 1957. This programmatic growth continued through the mid-’70s when MSC became Moorhead State University. A fifth name change occurred in 2000. The institution would now be known as Minnesota State University Moorhead. Throughout its history, MSUM has carried on the fine tradition of preparing students for P-12 teaching positions in the Red River Valley of Eastern North Dakota and Western Minnesota.

The MSUM teacher preparation story runs parallel to its Model School story, which began in 1888 and continues today with the Early Education Center. Throughout the normal school years (i.e.,1850s-1920s), model schools were typically elementary schools located on normal school campuses as sites for students to complete practice teaching. Today, the National Association for Laboratory Schools provides various professional services to the many laboratory schools operating in the United States and around the world.

The Moorhead Normal School
State Senator Solomon Comstock, a founding father of the then booming town of Moorhead (Figure 2), introduced legislation in 1885 to create the state’s fourth normal school. Three years later the school opened with 50 students; this number increased to 165 by 1904 (Figure 3). As with most Normal Schools, students attended to finish high school or enroll in a one (i.e., elementary diploma) or a two-year (i.e., advanced diploma) professional course of study that would prepare them for teaching positions.

This study included both discipline-specific and professional education courses. The professional education curriculum featured the following courses: History of Education; Philosophy of Education; Child Study and Observation; Arithmetic, Grammar, Geography, and Reading Methodology; School Economy, which included topics like school buildings and equipment, grading and managing classes, securing student cooperation, the teacher’s position in the community; school boards; and Practice Teaching.

Much of the professional education curriculum was housed in the Normal Schools’ Training Department whose purpose was to provide “skillful practical application of the best educational theory.” Specifically this occurred through a sequence of theory, methods, and observation courses followed by practice teaching. Practice teaching was defined as spending 50 minutes per day for 12 weeks with the same class of children while teaching the same subject. About one-half of each 50 minute period was spent in large group teaching, with the remaining time devoted to helping individuals, consulting with Critic teachers (i.e., expert teachers who helped practice teachers), or preparing teaching materials.
This is the title page from the Minnesota State Normal School at Moorhead Catalogue and Circular. Third Year. 1890-1891 and a print of Old Main, the original "Normal School" building that was erected at a cost of $60,000.
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The Daily News Print. 1891.

Solomon Comstock, known as the Father of the Moorhead Normal School.

Figure 2

A photograph of Old Main from the Annual Catalogue of the Minnesota State Normal School at Moorhead for 1897-1898. Tenth Year. The Model School was located on the first floor of Old Main. Note the classic three-arch design of the building.

Figure 3
Practice teaching at the Moorhead Normal School began in 1889 with eight students assigned to schools in the Moorhead Public School district. Individuals holding joint appointments in the Normal School and Moorhead district provided supervision. However, the school’s first president, Livingston Lord (Figure 4), wanted more control over practice teaching supervision and as a result, the Model School was used as the exclusive site for practice teaching beginning in 1893. Normal School tuition was $30/year and waived if graduates signed a pledge promising to teach in Minnesota for two years. Normal School students paid $3.50/week for dormitory room and board and rented books for $1/quarter of study. Normal School faculty were hired for their ability to teach discipline-specific and professional education courses (Figure 5) and received annual salaries ranging from $750 to $1,300.

In the 1880s, the State Normal School Board stated a concern for improving public school as well as Normal School teaching. This may have been part of the rationale for the board hiring teachers who could teach effectively in both areas, as most of the original Moorhead Normal School teachers did.

The Moorhead Normal School program extended to rural communities through summer institutes. Institutes were planned for those individuals not able to attend on-campus programs and possibly were the precursor to continuing education departments and correspondence courses. The school’s first institute teacher was W.F. Rocheleau, who also taught Natural Science on campus (Figure 6). Mr. Rocheleau was described as “energetic, brim full of ideas and wholly identified with his work.” This teacher captured the school’s vision for its teachers that originated with Livingston Lord, who wanted faculty who were scholar-teachers committed to their work. The early Moorhead Normal School attracted an astonishing group of teachers. This may have occurred because of Livingston Lord’s reputation for being dedicated to the truth and committed to the pursuit of knowledge. Some examples of this kind of teacher included Elma La Trance, who graduated from normal schools in Perth and Ottawa and served as principal in the Menominee, Wisconsin, public school system before coming to Moorhead Normal in 1900. Another example was Mrs. Cora McColloM Smith who studied at Harvard, completed extensive schooling in medicine and surgery, and served as Dean of Women at the State University in Lawrence, Kansas, before coming to Moorhead Normal in 1903 to be Department Head in Physical Training.

Four other examples were Miss Bickell, the 1903 Primary Critic teacher who graduated from Chicago University; 1904 Music teacher Miss Ethel Middaugh who graduated from the New England Conservatory of Music; 1904 Manual Training and Drawing teacher Mr. F.E. Greene who graduated from M.I.T.; and 1904 Physical Education teacher Miss Grace Kingsbury who graduated from Cambridge, took three summers of study at Harvard and taught in the School of Education at Chicago University. These descriptions of committed teacher-scholars also characterize one of the Model School’s early Critic teachers: Miss Abbie Smith. She presented a paper at the 1904 Minnesota Northwest Education Association Annual Meeting that was held on the Normal School campus. Her paper was titled, “School House as a Community Social Center in Elementary Education.” Miss Smith described how schools were not only becoming a more powerful social force and influence than the home, but also the most important democratic place for children to meet and learn from each other.

The Model School

The Model School was located on the first floor of Old Main and opened in 1888 with about 100 K-8 students (Figures 7, 8, 9, 10). Students were charged $12/year for tuition. The curriculum included Reading, Arithmetic, Nature Study, Music, Physical Training (Figure 11) and Drawing for all grades, with Language, History and Geography offered to students in grades 4-8. Students in grades 1-6 received instruction in Writing, while students in grades 7-8 were taught Spelling. Oral language was included for students in grades 1-3.
Livingston Lord, the Moorhead Normal School's first president. The 1888 Moorhead Daily News reported that Lord had the support from educators across the state.

Figure 4

Mr. Rocheleau was appointed to his post as Summer Institute Conductor, prior to the Moorhead Normal School opening. This suggests the importance the State Normal School Board placed on improving public school instruction.

Figure 5

The 1892-1893 Moorhead Normal School faculty. Row 1, from left to right, Miss McElliot, Arithmetic; Miss Wadsworth, History and Civics; Mr. Livingston Lord, Psychology and School Economy; Miss Kimball, Drawing and Geometry. Row 2, from left to right, Miss Hale, Model School Critic Teacher; Miss Scanlan, Model School Critic Teacher; Mr. John Paul Goode, Natural Science; Miss Hadley, Reading, Literature and Physical Culture. John Paul Goode's students were well known for their excellent map drawing skills. His widely used world atlas is currently in its 21st edition.

Figure 6
The 1905 and 1906 issues of the *Normal Red Letter* (i.e., the Normal School newspaper) revealed the engaging nature of the curriculum at the Model School. During this time, a study of iron mines was included across most grade levels. Primary grade students had their learning enriched by playing with simulated iron mines built in their classroom sand tables. Other groups of children visited a local iron foundry and observed the casting of iron objects. Another example described in the newspaper was the window box flower and vegetable gardens that were planted and cared for by the students. Observation skills were an important outcome associated with these gardening lessons. Additionally, children used the plant study for purposes of practicing drawing, speaking, reading, and writing skills. These four photographs (Figures 12, 13, 14, 15) also reveal the progressive nature of the school as students, dressed in costume, performed various dramatizations and dances about their learning.

The school had four classrooms with two grades occupying each room. A Critic teacher was assigned to each classroom. Most classroom instruction was provided by practice teachers, with Critic teachers offering teaching demonstrations and guidance as needed. A 1900 issue of the *Normal Red Letter* indicated that the intended purpose of the Model School was to provide practice teaching opportunities for Normal School students so they could develop “good habits of teaching.” It was also thought that by working with other practice teachers and Critic teachers an understanding for other’s perspectives could be developed.

These “good habits of teaching” were demonstrated by Critic teachers and practice teachers so parents and community members could learn about teaching at the Model School. For example, during Normal School commencement exercises, Model School students regularly performed various demonstration lessons, including calisthenics and Indian clubs; Science, Literature, and Dramatics; and various Literary and Musical programs (Figure 17). The purpose of these performances was to share with a broader audience the various activities that made up the day-to-day curriculum. Moreover these performances were favorably received, as evidenced by this description from the 1908 *Normal Red Letter*: “…the songs were sparkling and fresh…the drills were the best ever…and the performances of the littlest string of kindergarten children were quite too delightful for words to tell” (Figure 18).

The Model School was an integral part of the Moorhead Normal School campus. A review of the Normal School yearbook, *The Praeceptor*, revealed that Normal School and Campus School faculty shared joint appointments. For example, Physical Culture, Music, and Drawing were taught in both schools by the same staff, while the first Model School Director taught the General Methods and History of Education courses in the Normal School. Furthermore, in most issues of the *Normal Red Letter*, there was a column titled, “Model School” that described important Model School events and issues.

Additional evidence showing a connection existed between the Normal and Model School is seen through these words written in a “Model School” column from the 1906 *Normal Red Letter*:

> Among the things which deserve special mention are the articles made by the Model School children in the Manual Training Department.

> There are racks of all sorts, coat hangers, book shelves, towel rollers and little pieces of furniture, all made artistically, and arousing great interest among the children. The entire department is working to get up an excellent program for the last day of school.

In 1907, the second president of the Moorhead Normal School, Frank Weld, requested funding from the state legislature to build a separate Model School building. Weld’s request was approved; possibly, because of the prestige the Model School program had earned in the community. School enrollment grew continually during the Old Main
Figure 7, Figure 8, Figure 9, Figure 10. Photographs taken of Model School students enjoying free time. It would have been interesting to visit with Model School teachers about safety and supervision, c. 1905.
Thirty-four third and fourth grade Model School students in the Old Main gymnasium, where their physical education classes were conducted. Notice the still rings, basketball hoops, vertical ladder, and support beams. c. 1902.
Third and fourth grade Model School students engaged in a multi-disciplinary Geography and Language lesson from a study of Holland. These students are dramatizing the story “The Leak in the Dyke,” c. 1905.

A third grade Model School History lesson from a study of King Arthur stories. The two students engaged in the sword fight are “Sir Balin” and Sir Salan,” c. 1905.
years. In the 1905 Normal Red Letter it was suggested that this steady growth "...speaks well for the management of the [training school] department and means a widening of the opportunity for the practice teachers."

Regular improvements made to the Model School's facilities confirm the value placed on the school and its program by the Normal School. Some improvements included a new gymnasium, new oak cabinets, graining of all woodwork, recoating black boards so they were several shades darker, new recitation rooms, and the regular purchasing of new library books—200 in 1905.

Revealing that students and their interests were an important and valued part of the school program was the purchase of a specimen collection case for "...whatever of interest the children can bring." In sum, the Model School in Old Main was highly regarded and considered an indispensable part of the total Normal School program (Figure 19).
Here is a Model School classroom used for third and fourth grade instruction, as evidenced by the Arithmetic lesson written on the chalkboard. Also, apparent is the global perspective of this Geography lesson—student participation in international game play: Chinese Get Up, c. 1905
This photograph, taken in the 1880s, of a May Pole dance, represents the kinds of activities described in the Normal Red Letter.

Figure 17

This was the stage in Old Main where Model School students performed various literary and musical programs.

Figure 18
Model School students, standing in front of Old Main, dressed in costume for a King Arthur dramatization, c. 1905. Three years after this photograph was taken, a new Model School building would open and welcome students to the next chapter of the Model School story.
Chapter 2: THE MODEL SCHOOL BUILDING: 1908-1930
Construction and Design of the Model School

From its inception, the Model School enjoyed a fine reputation for providing quality instruction and engaging curricula for children; demonstrating and testing innovative educational practices and policies; acting as an observation site for college students enrolled in education courses; and serving as a site for education majors to practice teach. This reputation resulted in new programs being developed, facilities being updated regularly and consistent increases in enrollment. In 1907, crowded conditions in Old Main and the Model School stimulated a plan to add onto Old Main or construct a new building for the Model School. A decision was made by the Moorhead Normal School’s second president Frank Weld to build a new Model School building west of Old Main, facing 11th street, and connected to Old Main by a covered walkway (Figures 20 and 21). Construction costs for the new building totaled $55,000 or in 2005 dollars adjusted for inflation, $1,129,000. When the new school opened its doors in 1909, student enrollment was 175; this number increased by 67 students within one year (Figure 22). The Bulletin of the State Normal School: 1909 provided this description of the Model School building:

The building is an ample structure, 134 by 160 feet, built of buff brick and trimmed with stone. It consists of a high, airy basement floor, two floors in the clear, and a big attic... The building is heated by steam from the central heating plant. It is admirably equipped in respect to sanitation, has convenient and commodious toilet and bath rooms, and plenty of wardrobe accommodations.

It has superior facilities for domestic science, and delightful equipment for kindergarten. Its assembly and recitation rooms for the respective departments are designed with particular reference to convenience and economy in conducting classes, and it is believed that facilities for recitation will be ample for some time to come. The building has a number of particular features that will add much to the life of the school—the library on the ground floor, the lecture room for observation purposes adjoining it, the combined sewing and dining rooms at the opposite end of the same floor, and a big playroom in the attic (Figure 23).

The Model School building combined the best thinking of not only the architects assigned to the project, but also the school’s teachers. Inclusion of teachers on the design team may be the reason why it was considered by many to be the most modern and exceptional school in the area. The school was also considered very teacher-student friendly because it was the only area elementary school featuring a specially-designed library with a collection of 5,000 books (Figure 24) and indoor play area. Because of its reputation, having a child enrolled in the school was thought to be special. Many parents registered their children at birth to try and secure a spot in the kindergarten class when their child reached school age. Some parents whose children were attending other schools transferred them to the Model School to take advantage of what this new building and its programs had to offer, such as, regular field trips to learn about the Moorhead community (Figure 25).

Floor plans, printed in The Bulletin from 1909, precisely detail the form and function of classroom spaces in the Model School (Figures 26, 27, 28). Of interest was the school’s design that allowed easy access to Old Main’s gymnasium, Main Hall, and auditorium (Figure 29). The design used four large rooms with two grades of children occupying each room: first and second grade, third and fourth grade (Figure 30), fifth and sixth grade, and seventh and eighth grade. Possibly this design was incorporated into the building plan to provide ample space for active learning lessons. The kindergarten program, for children four and five years of age, was housed on the third floor (Figure 31). In 1921, a junior high program was added with the first high school class of eight students graduating in 1930. An important part of the junior high program was home economics. This curriculum area was taught in a well-equipped setting, where mid-morning milk break and hot lunch were also served.
Figure 20

Old Main and the Model School building. Notice the trolley car near the buildings. It was used to transport teachers and students back and forth from town to campus, c.1908.

Figure 21

A winter time photograph of the Model School building.
The Model School building was constructed to ease crowding in Old Main, c. 1911.
The most modern school building in the area was the Model School, c.1912.
Figure 24

A photograph of the Model School library taken in 1911.
The 1922 Kindergarten class photographed in front of the Moorhead State Teachers College bus.
First floor plans.

Second floor plans.

Third floor plans.

A 1913 photograph showing hallway access in the Model School.
Figure 30

Thirty-five primary grade children in their Model School classroom. Notice the teacher working with a small group of children in the back, the wall-to-wall chalkboards, and wonderful light entering the room through the large windows.
Kindergarten teacher and her class performing a finger play. Note the beautiful piano, large class size (28 children), baby buggy, child in the rocking chair, and the religious photograph.
Curriculum and Instruction in the Model School

A Critic teacher was assigned to each classroom to work with its practice or student teachers and the two respective groups of grade level children. Most classroom instruction was provided by practice teachers with Critic teachers providing supervision and offering demonstrations and guidance as needed. Practice teachers were encouraged to modify their teaching to better meet the needs of their students, the times, and the community. This encouragement speaks to the “big picture” perspective so aptly modeled at the school. Today, this practice would be considered overly progressive, if not radical by many policymakers.

The scope and sequence of the Grade 1-8 Model School curriculum, as described in The Bulletin of the State Normal School, Moorhead, Minnesota: 1913, was based on the Minnesota Course of Study (i.e., state curriculum) and included the following subjects.

Grade One, Grade Two, Grade Three, and Grade Four: Reading, Oral and Written Language, Spelling, Writing, Arithmetic, History, Geography, Nature Study, Music, Drawing, Desk Work Manual Training, and Physical Exercise (Figure 32).


The required high school curriculum included four years of English; Algebra and Geometry; General Science, Biology, Physics or Chemistry; Modern History, American History, and Social Problems; and Physical Education. High school elective courses were Latin, French, Art History, Home Economics, Industrial Arts, History of Music, Band, Choir, Ancient History, Commercial Law, and Economic History.

It is interesting to note that the history course was the unifying and common theme for the curriculum being taught in every grade. This may speak to the importance the Model School placed on reinforcing the concept of Americanization. During this time period, Americanization demanded that immigrants conform to values such as patriotism, capitalism, meritocracy, and democracy and to adopt American customs, culture and language, while minimizing or discarding their own customs, culture, and language. Possibly, those responsible for curriculum development at the Model School saw the study of history as a means to promote and reinforce the Americanization ideal.

Interestingly enough, in 1919 there was a conference entitled, “Minnesota State Americanization Conference” that offered sessions like, “Methods of Americanization in Industry,” “Methods of Reaching the Immigrant Girl,” “Community Singing as an Americanization Method,” and “Methods of Racial Cooperation.” Given the important role the Americanization movement played during this time, it seems plausible then, that a school might use history as a unifying curriculum theme. From an academic standpoint, history may have also been selected as a method for constructing integrated and thematic curriculum because of its relationship to a wide variety of disciplines (e.g., literature, geography, writing, art).

Words written in The Bulletin of the State Normal School: 1919 capture the intent of this theme:
Figure 32

A large group game being played on the campus lawn in 1918.

Figure 33

Eighth grade girls participating in the 50 yard dash in 1924.
Every exercise is planned with a view to developing thought, feeling and action essential to the proper spirit of Americanism. An outline is worked out in each grade level as a vital part of the history course, and in connection with the other subjects and school activities.

Embedded in the Model School curriculum, during the years from 1908 through 1930, were many activities whose purposes were to engage students in purposeful, authentic, and meaningful learning. The 1924 School Director, Frederick Whitney, clearly articulated this notion by stating that

...the basic principle of activity in our Model School...[is] to arrange the curriculum for our elementary and junior high school students that they may become well prepared for social participation in the life of our democracy. We assume that, if they are good little citizens in their Model School community, there will be a stronger possibility that they may become efficient citizens in later life.

The Model School’s academic program may also have reflected the general discontent associated with curriculum and instruction at many schools during this time. This kind of curriculum and instruction was characterized by being teacher-directed, rigid, and individually-focused with emphasis on recitation and memorization. This approach was replaced, in many schools including the Model School, with a problem-based and innovative kind of education that was framed by the curiosity, creativity, and needs of the child—social, emotional, cognitive and physical; and with a focus on learning with and from peers while actively engaged in learning that grew out the child’s experience.

This way of thinking about children, teaching, and learning formed the basis for the Progressive Education Movement (1890-1930) and most likely influenced the academic programs of many campus schools that were housed on various state teachers college campuses across the country. From 1908 to 1930, curriculum and instruction at the Model School certainly reflected educational policies and classroom practices associated with this movement. Although not to the same extent as with the Model School, the local Moorhead Public School system was influenced by this same movement. An analysis of all existing Moorhead Public School records, covering the time period from 1913 to 1930, revealed a few examples of this kind of curriculum and instruction.

Activities from a few different grade levels that illustrate this more progressive and innovative profile are described below. Several of these activities appeared in a 1924 publication, titled Bulletin of the Moorhead State Teachers College: Typical Activities of the Children in the Model School. An important outcome of the Kindergarten program was to develop "...good reading habits and attitudes by increasing the child’s vocabulary, by encouraging oral expression, by creating a desire for good literature, by developing tastes and appreciations aside from the ethical value of the story itself.” This outcome was accomplished through a daily story time in which all children listened to and told their own stories. Picture books, poetry, dramatic play and finger plays were relied upon as curriculum materials (Figure 34). This emphasis on reading continued in first grade through instruction that began with folk tales and nursery rhymes.

This instruction provided a context in which students would initially recognize words and later analyze words phonetically. The reading curriculum included various activities, such as action reading; reading one’s own writing; learning names for color words, high frequency words, and body part words; and playing matching word games (Figure 35). Other important Kindergarten outcomes were providing opportunities for children to engage with a wide variety of materials, student-selected projects, and social learning through cooperative play with others.

Teacher-imposed time constraints to complete projects quickly were not forced upon the children, as one teacher...
characterized "...often [the child’s] attention is so riveted that one day’s work will not suffice, and [the child’s] interest will hold over for many days." This value, when contrasted with values such as the importance given to time- and test-driven curriculum associated with the federally-imposed legislation No Child Left Behind Act (2001), would provide needed relief today for many teachers and students rushing to prepare for externally-imposed education. Thus, children being forced to adhere to adult imposed constraints was simply not part of the philosophy at the Model School. This was particularly evident with the flower and vegetable lessons as gardening was an important part of the curriculum each spring. The children, using shovels, rakes and hoes, completed all tasks associated with preparing the soil, planting the seeds, tending the plants, and harvesting the crop (Figure 36) at their own pace and in their own time. In addition to engaging the children with these materials, gardening may have been included in the curriculum to develop responsibility and problem solving.

In the early 1890s, Normal School President Livingston Lord indicated that the sum total of teaching was permeating the child’s experience with information. His influence was evident through the gardening lessons, a wonderful example of interdisciplinary and experiential learning. Students were literally learning biology through practicing observation, arithmetic through measuring and graphing, and geography through matching plant selection to climate zone characteristics. In addition, positive social interaction skills, through working together to achieve a group goal (e.g., planting the garden) were accomplished.

Another example of engaged learning was solving problems associated with life-situations (e.g., taking turns) while planning, building, and equipping the classroom’s dramatic play centers (e.g., drug store) (Figure 37). Learning to play with others and having ownership for one’s learning were principles guiding the education of young children at the Model School. This idea was beautifully captured by School Director Frederick Whitney, who in 1924, wrote “In the good school...conditions are so arranged that a child learns through his own thinking, feeling, and doing under the wise guidance of those who see in their own needs as adults the end to be attained in the learning.” Further illustrations of positive socialization and having ownership for one’s learning were evident when all students took turns serving as classroom leaders and when groups of children built bird houses for their nature study. Additionally, students most likely learned positive social skills and felt ownership for their learning when they produced the puppet show “The Three Bears.” The children’s original play grew out of modifications made to the original story. One can only imagine the negotiating and compromising that was needed to accomplish this task. Also, they made their puppet theater out of a large cardboard box, built movable scenery and puppets, made outfits and dressed the characters, and manipulated the puppets through cuts made in the theater’s floor.

To promote learning about hygiene and good health an imaginary trip to “Health land” was carried out by students in grades three and four. Two lessons per week, conducted over a six-week period, were devoted to this study in which students learned health-related information (e.g., why and when they should drink milk), slogans, songs, and rhymes that were then incorporated into the class sand table as objects (Figure 38). Some slogans were: “M is for milk which makes muscle and bone” and “Don’t be afraid to bathe, you won’t shrink.” The theme of the sand table was the community of “Health land.” Additionally, students created individual booklets that represented a railroad time table for the “Health land Flyer.” This train traveled through “Health land” and stopped at such locations as Bathtubville, Fruit Valley, Hot Soup Springs and Play Meadow. Children, working in groups and responsible for specific locations, developed the needed educational information for all locations. Parents reported that their children thoroughly enjoyed visiting “Health land” and learned much about hygiene and good health.

An important outcome for fourth grade students was learning about the world in which they lived. In one such global study, as described in the 1924 publication, Bulletin of the
A dramatic play scene from 1924. Opportunities were provided to not only achieve social outcomes (e.g., cooperative play), but also academic outcomes such as pre-reading skills.

This photograph reveals an example of student-centered, meaningful, and engaging learning in reading. Students must have felt empowered for their learning as a result of participating in lessons like this one.

A photograph of the children's garden.

Cooperation was also needed to successfully operate the classroom drug store.
A 1924 photograph of the classroom sand table transformed into "Health land." The educational components of "Health land" are readily apparent in this scene.
Moorhead State Teachers College: Typical Activities of the Children in the Model School, students undertook an examination of Japan. One activity of this study included planning and constructing a Japanese Tea Garden in the classroom sand table. This work took much effort and time, but was thoroughly enjoyed by the children.

The art student teacher created a Japanese chalkboard scene directly behind the sand table to add authenticity to the tea garden. In addition, students wrote and illustrated original stories about a trip to Japan that were read aloud and then attached to the classroom bulletin board (Figure 39). The entire classroom was decorated to capture a feeling of being in Japan—black and white panels, cherry blossoms and other indigenous flowers. The culminating event was a tea party in which the children wrote and designed invitations for their parents. At the party, students read and dramatized stories, sang songs, and performed dances important to Japanese culture. This kind of learning can be contrasted with many schools today that are reducing or eliminating social studies instruction because of time needed to prepare students for the high-stakes tests associated with the federally-imposed legislation No Child Left Behind Act (2001). It is ironic that in the 21st century, when many advocate the importance of thinking globally, schools are being pressured to turn inward and not engage students with broader global learning.

Another example of the global community serving as curriculum is evident in the two month study of Holland that was conducted by students in grades one, two, and three. The study relied upon Kilpatrick’s project method of instruction, which was used to provide intentional and meaningful activity within a social context. These students built cardboard barns and other buildings, made butter, created Dutch costumes, made Dutch scenes in their sand table, sang Dutch songs, read Dutch stories, performed Dutch dances, and made posters (Figure 40). This study was extended to Arithmetic by preparing flower pots for planting, decorating flower boxes, and making objects for the sand table. Two important social outcomes associated with this study were students gaining an appreciation for another country and its peoples and using cooperative skills to plan and work with peers throughout the project. It is easy to understand why parents wanted their children to attend a school so devoted to engaging and interdisciplinary curriculum and student-centered instruction intended to promote cognitive as well as social outcomes.

Three additional examples, also from the mid-1920s, of this kind of curriculum and instruction included the fifth grade organizing a classroom-version of the Minnesota State Fair. To accomplish this task, students gathered information by writing to companies for needed materials and by requesting samples of natural resources and various locally-produced business products. In a study of Minnesota’s early history, children became interested in animals associated with fur trading so they created animal picture charts, wrote original fables about Minnesota animals, and made animals in industrial arts for a puppet show with dialogue they created. Students in grades four, five, and six read “Pandora’s Box” and developed a play about this story, and performed it for the entire school as part of a study in moral values; they also planned a Christmas program and lunch for their mothers, and gave them gifts made in Art class as a way to learn about giving; and to learn about serving others, these same students created pantomime scenes for an all-school program about their favorite heroes. In 1925, a publication titled, Bulletin of the Minnesota State Teachers College: Experiments in the Enrichment of the Elementary Curriculum described several activities representing the “best principles of curriculum construction.”

Two essential purposes of these activities were: “to bring freshness and reality to the curriculum activities of the various grades and to utilize the motive of Industrial Arts...as a unifying process in extending and intensifying unity of experience.”
Most of the important elements from the global study of Japan are evident in this photograph: chalkboard art, Japanese Tea Garden scene in sand table, and student stories displayed on the bulletin board.
A photograph showing Industrial Arts projects (e.g., sand table objects) and students in costume as part of the two-month Holland study.
One interesting example of such activity was the three month historical study, conducted by the fifth grade, that examined the life and times of Benjamin Franklin (Figure 41). Emerging from this study was the children's keen interest in learning about how the colonists lived. Many activities, across several curriculum areas, were used to take advantage of this interest.

The list below is provided for readers to fully appreciate the scope and sequence of learning in a typical instructional unit at the Model School.

**Language**
- **Expository Writing** (e.g., How the colonists made brooms)
- **Friendly Letters** (e.g., To the president telling how we made candles)
- **Informal Notes** (e.g., To the fourth grade about a program)
- **Formal Notes** (e.g., To parents to invite them to a play)
- **Business Letter** (e.g., To the Colgate Company asking for materials to make soap)
- **Original Poetry** (e.g., The Colonists' Light)
  - Put some tallow in a mold.
  - Let it stand till hard and cold.
  - If it comes out long and white
  - You will have a standard light.
- **Organizing and Outlining** (e.g., Stories about cleaning materials)
- **Oral Talks** (e.g., Explanations about materials)
- **Writing a play for 24 characters** (e.g., Depicting life in a colonial home - "A day in the life of the Prescott home")
- **Increased Vocabulary** (e.g., render, tallow, itinerant)

**Arithmetic Problems**
(e.g., write in succinct form word problems about candle making)

**Poetry**
About candles and candle making from Shakespeare

**Stories**
About whales, candles and colonial life

**Art**
*Colonial furniture* (e.g., studying and designing)

**History**
- Life of Benjamin Franklin
- Early Colonial Settlements
- Early Colonial Homes and Industries

**Arithmetic**
- **Word Problem Solving** (e.g., using information provided by a Standard Oil candle expert—To light an average Fargo home with electricity costs of about $3.99/month. To give the same amount of light by candle it would cost about $140.00. What is the difference in cost?)

**Music**
- Singing Psalms

**Playing Colonial Games**
- Pop Goes the Weasel
- The Needle's Eye

**Penmanship**
Writing stories for a book titled, "Colonial History"

**Industrial Arts**
Building a Colonial House. Students made a Colonial house measuring 2 feet wide, 2 feet high and 3 feet long with 2 rooms, 2 doors, and a fireplace. They traveled to north Moorhead to cut logs and carried them back to school, notching them so nails would not be necessary.

The fifth grade teachers concluded that this historical study was very successful; it satisfied John Dewey's notion of studying history because it was not just about increasing historical knowledge, but rather using this knowledge to construct a clear understanding for the how and why of history. Students were also involved in purposeful activity across the curriculum and had time to fully engage their interests.
The 24 character play, "A day in the life of the Prescott family." Notice the effective use of costuming and stage design.
Some objectives associated with publishing the magazine were described by Principal and history, civics and eighth grade reading teacher Ella Hawkinson:

1. to unify the junior high school by an interest that would permeate the entire department.
2. by appreciating our debt as well as our relationship to the past, to realize our oneness of culture.
3. to create a deep interest in The Book, through wonder and realization of its growth.
4. to develop interest in a wider field of experience.
5. to create a lasting desire for more and better reading.

Examples of student learning from The Moccasin that match with the project's objectives and reflect the importance of inter-disciplinary curriculum (e.g., history, English, science and use of the library) are seen through the following analyses of the Spring 1925 and Spring 1929 issues. The Spring 1925 issue of The Moccasin used the theme: History of our Community (Figure 42).

The junior high students learned about many different topics related to this theme and then wrote about them in this issue. Topics of this place-based study were: Our heritage from the pioneers, The vision of the pioneers, The faith of the pioneers, Relation of Red River Valley to the United States and other countries, Fur trade, The Selkirk settlement, Buffalo hunting, Indians, Dog trains (Figure 43), Red River carts, Early steamboats, Stageline, Oakport farm and Oshkosh settlement, Townsite speculation, Railroads, Early settlement in Moorhead, Pioneer reminiscences, A chronology of interesting dates, Founders of Moorhead (Figure 44), Moorhead public schools, Concordia College, State Teachers College, City of Moorhead, and the Junior High Constitution.

Students engaged in numerous activities and used various materials to learn about the above stated topics; such as, local pioneers speaking to students, analyze printed materials from the Agassiz Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, review of primary source photographs, and student interviews with pioneers. An interview conducted by an eighth grade Model School student with Mrs. Holes, one of the first settlers in the Moorhead region, revealed this information: “When I first came to the Red River Valley, before the time of Moorhead, I came in a wagon drawn by oxen” (Figure 45). These are wonderful examples of place-based or locally-framed curriculum that if practiced in schools today would be considered progressive and innovative. Ella Hawkinson, Junior High principal and teacher, wrote these words in the 1925 Spring issue The Moccasin, regarding the value of this local historical study:

As historians and organizers of this material for the community pageant, as collectors of articles for a temporary museum, and as publishers of this issue of The Moccasin, they have relived the past. But, best of all they have, thru direction in English and Social Studies activities, met the pioneers, admired their qualities and faith thru acquaintance with them in the vicinity and in literature...

Shipbuilding and ships were the theme of the Spring 1929 issue of The Moccasin (Figure 46). While studying ships in history class, students became intrigued with ship building and decided to build five different ships as a class project. As with much of the learning during the Model School building years, class projects frequently emerged from the curriculum and were many times directed by the students. The ships were the Viking, Golden Hind, Santa Maria, Mayflower, and the Pirate (Figures 47, 48, 49). Students located pictures of each ship type, read about them and then created plans for building them. Using pine blocks of wood and small knives, hulls were shaped and cut out of the wood blocks. Then, keels, rudders and masts were attached using wood glue.

Students made riggings and ladders from cord and then connected these pieces to the masts. Sails, made from white canvas, were also attached to the masts. Flags of various nations were also nailed to the masts. The hulls were stained to give the appearance of being old and weather-beaten. The five ship models were displayed in various Moorhead shop windows and in the school's library. A play written by two teachers and performed by the junior...
Figure 42

THE MOCCASIN

HISTORY OF OUR COMMUNITY
Dedicated
TO THE PIONEER

*They rise to mastery of wind and snow;
They go like soldiers grimly into strife
To colonize the plain. They plough and sow
And fertilize the sod with their own life,
As did the Indian and the buffalo.*

-HAMLIN GARLAND.

STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
Moorhead, Minnesota
SPRING TERM 1925

Figure 43

In winter the noted dog trains of the northwest were used instead of Red River carts. The sledge was something like our modern toboggan, a low, flat affair, wide enough for one man, and with room behind him for supplies and furs. The sledge was usually pulled by five or six dogs, headed by a trained leader whose worth was, many times, twenty dollars. The dog's life on the train averaged between eight to twelve years. Each day he would receive but one pound of pemmican for his food. The train carried about five hundred pounds and even with this heavy load one would often see them going over the snow at the rate of seventy-five miles per day. They carried valuable loads of furs, food, and mail.

-EDITH WAGNER.

Figure 44

Founding fathers of Moorhead.

Figure 45

Cover of the Spring 1925 issue of The Moccasin.
Santa Maria and Viking Ships.

Spanish Pirate Ship.

Golden Hind and the Mayflower Ships.
high students for the entire Model School and College was given on April 11, 1929. The play was titled, “Those Who Go Down to the Sea in Ships” (Figure 50).

The students were thrilled when the Model School Director indicated he would make a movie of the play so the actors and actresses could see themselves on the big screen.

Additional examples of progressive and innovative learning activities from the Junior High academic program, as described in issues of The Moccasin from the mid-1920s, included ninth grade general science students constructing a telephone system and telegraph as part of their study about electricity, and eighth grade applied mathematics students using their classroom floor plans to learn about measurement and drawing to scale, and calculating costs for running common electrical appliances. Interestingly in 2006, the Moorhead School district received a grant to make their high school Mathmatic classes more applied to promote student interest and positively affect student achievement—good curriculum practices have always been good curriculum practices. Also, during the 1924 election a debate about whether or not the Democratic party was more worthy of support than the Republican party was held in the eighth grade History class, along with dramatizations about voting. These three curriculum examples reinforce the idea that the academic program at the Model School was student-centered, engaging, and utilized many different ways for students to learn and demonstrate what they learned. Today, this kind of thinking is associated with Howard Gardner’s work about the Multiple Intelligence Theory.

Not only did the Junior High School offer a varied, challenging, and engaging academic program, but also an after-school program that provided its students with numerous opportunities for varied participation, leadership development, and positive socialization (Figure 51). Football, basketball (Figure 52), kitten ball, volleyball, hockey, archery, quoits, track and field, aerial darts, and ping pong were some extra-curricular activities enjoyed by junior high students in the 1920s.

The Model School building years demonstrated progressive educational thinking that was actualized and illustrated through numerous curriculum and instruction practices. This design allowed students to engage in learning that can be conceptualized in five ways: learning was contextual and embedded in the lives of students and their community (Figures 53, 54); learning was experiential and supported problem solving and creativity (Figures 55, 56); learning was framed by curriculum that was not only interdisciplinary, but also linked to unifying themes; learning was intended to promote the value of active participation in a democracy (Figure 57); and learning was holistic and engaged students cognitively, socially, and emotionally (Figure 58).

I hope that these descriptions of curriculum and instruction from the Model School (1908-1930) will result in the school’s academic programs being more thoroughly understood and appreciated for the significant contributions they made to students and their learning. On February 9, 1930 Old Main and the Model School were destroyed by fire. Although the building was gone, the excellent academic programs remained. The school found temporary residence in several homes near campus and within two years the Model School would find permanent housing in the newly constructed Lommen Hall.
Figure 50

The pirate ship scene from the class play.
An engaging after-school program complimented the high quality academic program.
All kinds of music performances were important to Model School students as well as teachers.
A high school musical group boarding the train at the downtown Fargo train depot.
Figure 55

Model school students expressing themselves artistically through creation of Halloween hats.

Figure 56

A photograph from 1927 showing students painting and reading during a free-choice time period.
A student-directed lesson commemorating Abraham Lincoln's birthday.
Industrial Arts was used in the Model School to promote several different outcomes.
Chapter Three: Department of Rural Education and the Affiliated Rural Schools: 1917-1951
An interesting and related part of the Model School story was the MSTC Department of Rural Education and Affiliated Schools, which began in the 1910s and continued until the early 1950s. The overall aim of this department was to improve rural school teaching by providing specialized rural teacher education course work and by using rural schools as observation and student teaching placement sites (Figure 59). During this time period, the department and its affiliated schools were recognized as one of the finest rural education programs in the nation.

The idea of improving teaching in rural schools may have been influenced by the 1908 Commission on Country Life that was appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt. From this commission would emerge "The Country Life Movement." The commission conducted an exhaustive study of rural life by surveying 550,000 individuals and holding 30 hearings. Major findings of the commission's 1911 Report were that life in rural America was in decline, while immigration, urbanization, and industrialization were beginning to shape a new American society; as a result, the country was at risk. This conclusion rested on the Jeffersonian belief that agriculture was the key factor in determining the country's level of prosperity and character—without a strong and dynamic agricultural base the country's economy and virtue would falter. A major reason for this decline was identified as the poor quality of rural public schools and its teachers. Words published in the 1911 Report of the Commission on Country Life leave no doubt about the commission's thinking about who was responsible for these problems: "The schools [and teachers] are held to be largely responsible for ineffective farming, lack of ideals, and the drift to town."

Additionally, there was concern that an emphasis on preparing students to live and thrive in urban settings was occurring at the expense of learning about and celebrating rural life.

In order to resolve these problems, recommendations were made to improve the training of rural teachers: require teachers to become involved community members by taking up residence in the districts in which they taught; and emphasize agriculture, nature study, and home economics in the curriculum. Another recommendation emerging from this report was for rural schools to serve as their community's social centers. It was thought this would result in schools becoming the centers of community life—socially, economically and politically, thereby placing the focus for communities well being and welfare in the schools. It seems plausible, then, that those responsible for teacher training and curriculum development at Moorhead Normal School and then Moorhead State Teachers College may have had their work influenced by the Country Life Movement of the early 20th century.

**Department of Rural Education**

Early evidence of rural school teacher education course work is found in *The Bulletin of the State Normal School, Moorhead, Minnesota: 1912.* The course, Rural School Methods (Figure 60), was framed by the Elementary School Curriculum for Minnesota Schools and included observations in rural, ungraded classrooms and covered the following areas: school sanitation and decoration; school management and organization; children's literature, plays, games, and songs; penmanship and spelling; general lessons and opening exercises; elementary agriculture; and social life in rural communities.

These last two areas match directly with recommendations set forth in the 1911 Report of the Commission on Country Life. In addition, reading and language methods were emphasized as were learning to adapt instruction to the needs of the community and discussions with supervisors about classroom observations. This 1912 course included the essential element of methods courses taught on the Moorhead campus today: the "how to" for teaching various curriculum areas (e.g., EECE 441 Children's Literature: Content and Methods).

In 1904, the first Rural Education department in the United States was founded in Kalamazoo, Michigan, at
A typical, ungraded classroom in a rural one-room school house.
Western State Normal School. Twelve years later, a Department of Rural Education was created at the Moorhead Normal School and headed by Mary Conant (Figure 61). This department offered coursework leading to a two-year Advanced Diploma in Rural Education Curriculum. The Bulletin of the State Normal School, Moorhead, Minnesota: 1916 described the following professional education courses as part of this curriculum:

1) History of Education
2) Theory of Education
3) Rural School Methods
4) Grade Methods
5) Rural Teaching
6) Grade Teaching
7) Rural School Management

Rural School Management was an important course and offered concurrently with student teaching. Interestingly enough, the current MSUM teacher education curriculum uses this same delivery model: a management course (i.e., ED 443) is offered concurrently with student teaching. The Rural School Management course provided instruction in the study of rural community life, home school relations, management and organization of one room schools, grading, daily program, opening exercises, recess, lunch program, attendance, discipline, sanitation, school equipment, decoration, library records, and school reports. A “C” average in all coursework was a prerequisite for admission to the course. Those readers who completed a classroom management course as part of their teacher preparation program will recognize many of these topics.

The classroom management course that I took at Bemidji State University in the 1970s certainly included several of these topics. It is obvious, from the prior descriptions of courses taught on the Moorhead campus, that those responsible for teacher education and public school teaching knew the importance of professional education coursework, but also call for its removal from the teacher education curriculum. In 2004, The Teaching Commission published a report titled, Teaching at Risk: A Call to Action. This commission, made up mostly of politicians and private sector CEOs, asserted that schools were at risk because of low quality teaching that could be remedied by completely revamping teacher education. This overhaul would mostly occur through eliminating education and pedagogy coursework. I wonder what Mary Conant and her colleagues in the Department of Rural Education would have thought of this recommendation?

An important part of the rural education program of study, beginning in 1925, was four weeks of student teaching in rural schools. By 1928, this requirement had increased to six weeks, today it is 10 weeks in length. Student teaching at Moorhead State Teachers College followed the national pattern of requiring an integrated student teaching experience: some teaching done in rural settings and some done in more urban settings. For MSTC student teachers, rural teaching was done in the affiliated schools while the more urban teaching occurred in the Model School Building and later what would become Lommen Hall.

Student teaching in rural schools followed a graduated sequence, beginning with observations and moving to supervision of students and then to part-day teaching to full-time teaching near the end of the experience. Daily and weekly plans were prepared by student teachers and reviewed by their supervisors. Also, regularly scheduled conferences were held with supervising teachers to discuss the lessons that were taught. All of these same program components continue today for MSUM student teachers. A major difference between student teaching in the early days of MSTC and today is that MSTC students completing their student teaching in rural settings were expected to live on site or with neighboring farmers and participate in school and community life not only during the week, but also on weekends. This is certainly not the case today as many students are balancing the demands of work, family, and school.
Students enrolled in the Rural School Methods class most likely preparing to leave campus for a rural school observation or returning to campus from such an observation, c. 1919.

Mary Conant returned to her alma mater and began teaching rural education courses in 1914, and then became the first department head of Rural Education in 1916.
Affiliated Schools: 1917 - 1951

In order to provide students with meaningful and practical application for their rural school coursework, classroom observations and student teaching placements were carried out in rural schools "affiliated" with the college. Affiliation between the college and rural schools was defined as a relationship with high degrees of interdependence and reciprocity. Additionally it was posited that because many graduates were hired as rural school teachers, it was logical to have these students complete some student teaching in these same settings. This logic continues to operate today, however the need has changed. Teacher education curricula has moved from a focus on preparing students for rural school teaching to curricula designed to better prepare a largely white, female, and middle class cohort for teaching in more urban settings with large numbers of students of color.

Approximately 1800 MSTC students completed their student teaching assignments in these laboratory-like, ungraded rural schools of 18 to 25 students. Over the years, these students were supervised by over 100 rural school teachers who held faculty status at the Moorhead Normal School and then Moorhead State Teachers College. The rural school student teaching experience was intended to provide students with opportunities to participate in all activities associated with the rural school, including teaching, supervising study, and housekeeping. Another important outcome of the experience was for students to experience living and actively participating in rural communities so they would come to not only understand rural life, but also to appreciate this way of living and be advocates for it.

These desired outcomes were clearly described in The Bulletin of the State Normal School, Moorhead, Minnesota: 1917: "...the students in training come into direct contact with a rural community and its activities, and with a progressive teacher who embodies in her work the newer ideas and ideals of rural education." The importance of preparing effective teachers for work in rural schools was captured succinctly in these words written in the Moorhead State Teachers College Annual Catalog: 1923:

A teacher needs better education and training to teach all grades alone in the country than she does to teach one or two grades under supervision in a graded school. There is no known reason why children who live in the country should not have just as well trained teachers as children in a city or village.

These words, from the 1917 and 1923 MSTC Bulletins, certainly resonate with ideas expressed in the 1911 Report of the Commission on Country Life.

There were 13 one-and two-room rural schools affiliated with Moorhead Normal School and later Moorhead State Teachers College over a 34 year period from 1917 to 1951. These schools were located within 15 miles of campus. The affiliated schools were quite progressive and served as learning laboratories for students enrolled in the rural education curriculum. Under supervision from Department of Rural Education faculty, affiliated schools teachers engaged in experimentation and innovation: traditional grading and reporting systems were replaced with frequent parent-teacher conferences and regularly written teacher evaluations of student work as well as the implementation of new curriculum and instructional approaches. Teachers also experimented with innovative learning materials across the curriculum.

Various benefits (e.g., cultural) were gained by the communities supporting the affiliated schools as college faculty provided leadership for local community events. Following are photographs and brief descriptions of the 13 rural schools affiliated with Moorhead Normal School and Moorhead State Teachers College (Figures 62-74).
The first rural school to affiliate with Moorhead Normal School was Sunnyside School. This relationship began in 1917 and continued until 1938. During this 21 year period, eight teachers worked at Sunnyside School. It was located about three miles south of campus on the east side of Highway 75.

Clearview School was constructed in 1915 and participated in the affiliated program from 1925 to 1936. Twelve teachers taught at Clearview School during its 11 year affiliation. A 'teacherage' or onsite living arrangement was part of the Clearview School teaching experience. The school was located seven miles southeast of campus on County Road 74 and received its name because of its position on the flat lands of the Red River Valley—the school had a "clear view" of the surrounding area.
Oak Mound School was affiliated with the college longer than any other affiliated school: 1925-1951. It was built in 1913 and was served by two or three teachers at a time. The building's capacity was 100 grade one through ten students. Oak Mound School provided a 'teacherage' for its staff who paid $12/week for room and board. The school was located about 10 miles from campus on County Road 98.

The Gunderson School was affiliated with the college for twenty years from 1927 to 1947. Eight teachers were employed at the school. The school served an important function for the community in providing a place to hold community events (recommendation from the 1911 Report of the Commission on Country Life). The Gunderson School was located eight miles northeast of the college on County State Highway 11.
Grover school was affiliated with the college from 1928 to 1935 and employed four teachers. It was located nine miles northeast of the college on County Road 68.

Riverside School was the third longest running affiliated school in this group of 13 affiliated rural schools. It served the needs of Moorhead State Teacher College students and children from the surrounding area from 1926 to 1946. The school was aptly named as it faced the Buffalo River. It was located about eleven miles from the college on County State Highway 11.
In 1931, the first 11 years the Koester School was affiliated with Moorhead State Teachers College, 41 students were enrolled. Two different buildings occupied the Koester School site, which was located 17 miles southeast of the college on County State Highway 2.

Onan School holds the distinction of being the oldest school in the affiliated program. It was built in 1886; however, it is the school with the third fewest number of years in the affiliated program: 1935 to 1939. An addition was later added to the front of the school. It was located 12 miles southeast of the college on County Road 63.
Figure 70

One of the longer running affiliated schools, Averill was affiliated with the college for 15 years and continued in this relationship until 1951 when rural school affiliation ended. In the mid-1930s, Averill School received assistance from the W.P.A. Project to update its physical structure. It was located 16 miles northeast of the college on County Road 19.

Figure 71

The Sabin School employed two teachers for its ungraded academic program. It was affiliated with Moorhead State Teachers College for six years, from 1936 to 1942 and was located eight miles southeast from the college on US Highway 52.
The Baker-East School is ranked second for the fewest number of years affiliated with the college (1939-1942) and holds the distinction for least number of teachers employed during this time (one). It was located about 14 miles southeast of the college on US Highway 52.

Originally known as Fobes School, the school's name was changed to Elmwood School by its students. Elmwood School is tied with Baker-East School for second place in the category of "fewest numbers of years" affiliated with MSTC. It was served by two teachers during this same three year period: 1939 to 1942 and was located 13 miles southeast of the college on County Road 71.

The last rural school affiliated with Moorhead State Teachers College was the Baker-West School. This school was affiliated from 1940 to 1942 and was served by just one teacher, just like the Baker-East School. It was located about 14 miles southeast of the college on County State Highway 15.
Rural School Demonstrations: 1923-1941

Two-day demonstration events were made available to county superintendents, rural teachers, and those interested in rural education to disseminate information about the kinds of progressive teaching practices occurring in the MSTC Affiliated Schools. These demonstrations, begun by Dr. Clifford Archer, Department Chairperson of Education and Psychology (Figure 75), revealed to attendees the expertise the college had not only in practicing, but also promoting best practices in rural teaching. Participants would gather on campus in the mornings and travel to the affiliated schools to observe various teaching demonstrations as well student art and project exhibits (Figure 76). These events were well received as typically 75 to 100 individuals attended.

The college prepared a four-page brochure for each two-day demonstration that described various classroom demonstrations and student exhibits planned for each day (Figure 77). Some demonstration topics from the 1930s are noted below. These titles suggest the interesting and progressive nature of the educational program at these rural schools.

1929 Grover School
Oral Reading (Radio Program)

1930 Gunderson School
Language Instruction Motivated by Science

1931 Clearview School
Fourth Grade Geography
(Expedition to the North Pole)

1935 Oak Mound School Group Piano Instruction

1936 Sunnyside School
Correlation of General Science 8 and Geography 7

1938 Riverside School
The Puppet Theater in a Rural School

1938 Koester School
The Place of English in Social Studies

1938 Gunderson School
Discussion: Should graphs be used to stimulate competition within the group or to stimulate individual improvement?

1939 Gunderson School
Exhibit: Four Years of a School Newspaper

Following a full day of classroom observations and discussions, participants returned to campus for the evening portion of the program (Figure 78). This included a banquet and presentations about timely and important educational topics. Superintendents and MSTC faculty were invited to speak as were state- and national-level experts. Three examples identified in program brochures give insight into the breadth and depth of these presentations:

1. In 1931, Dr. Brueckner, Professor of Elementary Education from the University of Minnesota, gave an address titled, “Education, Crime and Progress.”

2. A panel discussion on “Formality versus Informality in Classroom Instruction” was held in 1934 with Alice Corneliusen, MSTC Rural School Chairperson, facilitating the discussion.

3. A 1937 session titled, “Improving the Supervision and Administration of Rural Education” was provided by Dr. John Rockwell, Commissioner of Education, Minnesota.
During the MSTC years, C.P. Archer made many contributions while teaching and administering in the Education program. He was responsible for creating many of the affiliated rural school partnerships.

A representative lesson that may have been observed during the two-day affiliated rural school demonstration events.
RURAL
SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION
—at—
MOORHEAD STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
—and—
AFFILIATED SCHOOLS

THURSDAY AND FRIDAY MARCH 10-11, 1927

The cover from the March 10-11, 1927 Rural School Demonstration brochure.

1928 Rural School Demonstration participants standing on the steps of Weld Hall.
Ms. Alice Corneilussen

The most famous rural school/MSTC teacher was Alice Corneilussen, who grew up 15 miles south of Moorhead on the family farm. She attended rural Clay County schools, Moorhead public schools, Moorhead Normal School, Moorhead State Teachers College, and completing her student teaching at the Glyndon School (Figure 79). Later she earned a Master of Art's degree in Rural Education from Teachers College at Columbia where she had John Dewey, William Bagley, and William Kilpatrick as teachers. Additional coursework was completed at the University of Chicago, Peabody College, and the State University of Iowa. She was the teaching principal at Oak Mound and Supervisor/Chairperson of the Rural Education Department from 1927 to 1950 (Figure 80). From 1950 to 1963, Alice Corneilussen was the Campus Elementary School Principal and then taught in the Education Department until 1967 when she retired.

Dorothy Dodds, longtime campus school and college teacher, described Alice Corneilussen as “very progressive... she was open and student-centered... just a good person.” A School Director supported this conclusion by stating she was “…professionally alert in all aspects of her work besides having a splendid capacity to direct the personnel of the school with efficiency.”

Rural School Reunion: 1980

During the 1930s there were about 150 one and two-room rural schools in Clay County. These schools began closing due to teacher shortages caused by WW II and school consolidation to save money. However, those involved with the thirteen MSTC Affiliated Rural Schools remembered them fondly as evidenced by the 75 teachers, administrators, students and family members who attended a School Reunion in 1980 (Figure 81).

Dr. Gerhard Haukebo, Vice-President for Public Affairs, was quoted at the time about the purpose of the reunion, “…to celebrate an era of nostalgia, accomplishment and pride that was created by [these] Minnesota pioneers in education.” When Alice Corneilussen was interviewed at the reunion, she fondly remembered the best part of these rural schools, “…the esprit de corps that existed among students, parents, staff and administrators.” An important contribution the rural schools made to MSTC was providing its student teachers with an excellent laboratory in which to learn about teaching—the college was thought to have one of the finest student teaching programs in the nation during this time. Again, Alice Corneilussen speaking about the rural school program: “We were delighted when we had a student teacher...I loved having them. I liked the company of fresh youth—they made a real contribution to these schools” (Figure 82). Alice Corneilussen’s words certainly speak to the positive nature of those working in these one and two-room schools during this exciting time in the life of MSTC and the Campus School program.
Figure 79
Alice Cornelussen as an MSTC student.

Figure 80
Alice Cornelussen when she was serving as Rural Education Department Head in 1942.
MSTC Rural Affiliated Schools Reunion
August 14-15, 1980

Comstock Memorial Union
Moorhead State University
CHAPTER FOUR: THE CAMPUS SCHOOL IN LOMMEN HALL: 1932-1972
Overview of the Lommen Hall Years

On February 9, 1930, fire destroyed Old Main and the Model School building. Initially it was hoped the Model School building would not suffer the same fate as Old Main; however, newer building materials and its location adjacent to Old Main were not enough for the school to escape the destructive fire. Beth Hopeman (later wed to Dr. Roland Dille) was a kindergarten student attending the Model School during the 1929-1930 school year. When asked about the fire, she remembered staying home with her mother and brother, while her father and other siblings walked to campus to see the fire. Later, her mother took her to see the burned-out buildings. Beth remembers seeing small red chairs from the Model School strewn all over the school lawn and covered with ice. The day before the fire, Beth and her classmates brought their favorite dolls to class as they were going to make Japanese-like kimono costumes for them. Although she was not heart-broken about losing her “Rosey” doll, she was sad to lose the first doll she ever had with wig-like hair. Another individual who experienced the fire was Bob Litherland, long time Moorhead resident and owner of the Moorhead Dairy Queen for 46 years. Bob started out in the Model School in 1924 at the age of 22 months; he told me that he was the youngest student to ever attend the school. The school agreed to take care of him while his mother worked at the Campus Grocery store located near the intersection of 11th Street and 7th Avenue South, and his father worked as a coach. His memories of the fire included huge crowds gathering on a cold evening to watch the fire as he sat on his father’s shoulders. Bob recalls firefighters struggling to extinguish the enormous blaze that ultimately would leave behind the charred remains of the once majestic Old Main and Model School buildings. Francis Hansen, class of 1933, remembers a high school dance being held in Old Main the evening before the fire.

Between 1930 and 1932 Model School classes were held in six homes near campus. These homes were purchased by the Alumni Association. High enrollment during this period (i.e., 122 elementary and 107 secondary students) suggests positive support from the community, despite the hardship of using homes as classrooms. Bob Litherland attended second grade in these temporary classrooms and described climbing steps to get to his classroom where he and his classmates sat two to a desk.

In 1932, a new building sometimes called the Training School (re-named Lommen Hall in 1969 after longtime Model School director Ms. Georgina Lommen) was opened at a cost of $215,000. Georgina Lommen graduated from the University of Minnesota with a B.S. degree and later earned a Master’s degree from Teachers College at Columbia University. While attending the University of Minnesota, she developed a rural education teacher training program for its Agricultural School. She was named the Campus School’s first director and served until 1943, when she retired. Following her retirement and until 1969, the school would be known as the College Laboratory School. Georgina Lommen was held in high esteem by many Minnesotans because of her numerous contributions to elementary school curriculum, teacher retirement policies, PTA activities, and international education. Student words taken from the last issue of the Campus High School yearbook (CAMHI, 1971) described this famous and influential Moorhead educator:

Miss Lommen gave most of the many years of her life to the continuation and development of education. She, as the first director of the Campus School, devoted much of her time and talents to help make the Campus School the educational institution it has been and is...[and] she was also very active in Fargo-Moorhead civic activities, such as F.M. Opera Forum...we, the last students of the M.S. High dedicate the historical section of the 1971 Annual to her memory, in the knowledge that through her efforts the Campus School remained possible. She [was] a women of strength, not only physically but mentally and spiritually. She guided the school through those hard and trying first years of the school’s growth.
The school that would bear Georgiana Lommen's name was nearly 300 feet long and 70 feet wide and served grades K through six on the main floor, with high school students using the second floor. A large auditorium featuring a 28 foot stage was regularly used for various fine arts performances. The high school student response praised the new building as these words from 1932 issue of the student publication The Moccasin, attest:

Little did we realize after the tragic fire of 1930 that within two years we would be located in a new building as wonderful as ours. Now that our physical environment is the best to be wished for, we may look into the future and see a vision of a greater and better high school in other respects beside the physical. Truly, there are wonders that may be ahead of us as well as behind us.

Not only was the high school program housed in the "most modern high school building in the state [of Minnesota]," it gained accreditation in the same year through the North Central Association of Secondary Schools. During the 1930s, entrance examinations were used to admit students; students were selected for membership in the National Honor Society; and of the 12 teachers employed in the K-12 program, nine had Master's degrees or the equivalent, and one held the Ph.D. The trend of employing graduate degree-educated teachers continued as evidenced by the 15 out of 19 1957 staff who held master's or doctorate degrees. A review of available Campus School teaching rosters for the period 1932 to 1972 reveals many teachers and administrators earning advanced degrees at prestigious institutions like Teachers College at Columbia University, the University of Chicago, Peabody College, and the University of Minnesota. These pieces of the Campus School story (i.e., accreditation, entrance exams, honor society membership, and advanced degrees) confirm the school's academic emphasis. Furthermore, these 1938 words written by High School Principal Ella Hawkinson provide additional verification of a school steeped in enthusiasm for student learning and dedicated to academic quality:

You have come with a splendid spirit to learn, to cooperate and to make College High School the best school. We believe you are here because you desire the advantages that a selected student body brings. You are a part of a big college, part of a school numbering nearly a thousand. As a school connected with a college, you and your teachers will strive to set standards in citizenship and scholarship that will bring credit to College High School and Moorhead State Teachers College. Let us work for quality...your spirit is splendid, and your effort will not lag...

The College High School Alma Mater also reflects the positive feelings students and staff had about their school:

Gold and Blue, ever true
To the Baby Dragons team
Loyal friends to the end.
Watch the banners ever gleam
Work and play through the day.
Keep the standards soaring high
That is how we hold sway
Our spirit never dies.

College High, College High
The school for which we stand
We're the best; stood the test.
For the first school in the land
Sing for all, praise of her
And we'll welcome with glad hearts
All true entering in
To our good old College High.

A favorable response also came from the elementary program as well. This poem was written by a second grader to celebrate the new school building:

Gold and Blue, ever true
To the Baby Dragons team
Loyal friends to the end.
Watch the banners ever gleam
Work and play through the day.
Keep the standards soaring high
That is how we hold sway
Our spirit never dies.
I am going to school this morning
Happy and gay
I like the new building
I am going to school this morning
Happy and gay.

The quality of the instructional program at the Campus School is readily captured by Marilyn White (daughter of MSTC professor Byron Murray), class of 1943, who told me that that curriculum at the school “opened the world to them” as students. She remembers always being told “why did this happen and not just the facts” about what happened. One example of this worldly curriculum was going to hear Franklin Delano Roosevelt speak in Fargo. Students attending the local public schools, she noted, did not attend this speech.

Not just a school focused on academics, Marilyn shared that teachers would set-up prom dates for those students lacking the necessary social skills to attempt this task. They also taught students to dance if they couldn’t so they would have more fun at their prom.

The Campus School’s educational program was ordered into five departments: Kindergarten program for four and five year old children; Primary program for grades one and two; Intermediate program for grades three, four, five, and six; Junior High School program for grades seven, eight and nine; and High School program for grades ten through twelve.

The School Director was the educational leader for the entire K-12 program and also coordinated the student teaching program. The administrative structure was further delineated with each program having a principal and assistant principal who provided student teaching supervision.

There were five Campus School goals that framed the school’s mission. These were described in various materials covering the time period of the Lommen Hall years and included:

1. Providing pre-student teaching observations and student teaching experiences.
2. Serving as a demonstration site for teachers from surrounding communities.
3. Acting as a site for experimentation and research.
4. Acting as a site for creation, demonstration and evaluation of innovation in theory, policy, and practice of schooling.
5. Disseminating information learned from demonstration, experimentation, research, and innovation.

As stated in The Bulletin of the State Teachers College: 1943, it was believed that the best way to achieve these five goals was to provide exemplary education for the Campus School students that would ultimately prepare them for democratic living in a complex and rapidly changing world. This thinking remained viable throughout the Lommen Hall years, as evidenced by this program description written in the Moorhead State College Bulletin: 1961-1963:

The Moorhead State College Campus School is an important center for the preparation of teachers... It provides an excellent opportunity for observing Master Teachers, who also serve as supervisors... It is a center for experimentation in improving teaching methods, and for educational research.

This statement of purpose was enthusiastically endorsed by the Director of the Campus High School, who in 1966 wrote

“... [the] obligation to strive for improvement at all times and to accept without question the demonstration and innovation role as a lab school function. To fail to try, is to fail to be a model laboratory school.”

Throughout the Lommen Hall years, the school experienced ever shifting campus-wide support for its programs and experienced regular changes in administrative and teaching staff. These two factors, when added to the dif-
ficulty of trying to achieve the stated school goals, made accomplishing them difficult; and in part, resulted in the high school closing in 1971 and the elementary school closing in 1972. However during the Lommen Hall years, the school was sometimes criticized for not accomplishing these goals and other times congratulated for accomplishing them. During the 1960s and 1970s, many campus schools across the country closed because they also tried to be too many things to too many groups—trying to achieve too many goals.

From interviews I conducted with six individuals who attended the Campus School in the 1930s and 1940s, a picture of a thriving school, strong in academic reputation with robust music and theater programs, supported by wide-reaching extra-curricular offerings and a strong sense of community, emerges. One individual stated that she had transferred to the Campus School for her senior year and was readily accepted by her peers. She reported this made her feel at home because cliques were not part of this school’s culture, as they were at the school she previously attended. This conclusion was also supported by Diane Andreason, class of 1971, who remembers a school without cliques where everyone felt like they belonged to “one big happy family.”

These six individuals remembered starting school late each year because of farm responsibilities. When they returned, teachers willingly helped them learn what they missed so they could catch up to their peers. Evidence that the Campus School was not only a thriving school, but also a school supported by parents, is apparent by responses parents gave on a 1953 survey designed to determine what they appreciated about the school’s academic program. Some outcomes parents were particularly appreciative of included: children learning the Three Rs, children learning to respect and cooperate with others, students learning to become more self-confident, and students being exposed to a variety of activities. Additional proof that parents supported the school and cared about their children’s education is revealed through 1953 records showing that 80% of elementary school parents attended parent-teachers conferences. This attendance rate was also typical during the 1960s, according to Campus High School teacher and MSU English Methods teacher Dr. Sheila Gullickson. These attendance numbers are easy to understand, given the ‘open door’ policy the school had with parents—they were encouraged to visit the school. In a 1954 letter written by the school’s director, parents were invited to school so they could participate in a demonstration lesson and in so doing, experience ‘learn[ing] by doing.’ Between the years 1935 and 1967, Campus School enrollments were relatively stable, averaging 370 students, with the exception of the WW II years. The range in enrollment was 324 students in 1941 to 411 students in 1965.

World War II affected life on campus in many ways. There were War Program courses designed to prepare high school students for military or community service. Specifically, military training was part of the physical education curriculum for both MSTC and Campus School students. Female MSTC students, living in the female-only Wheeler and Comstock dorms, were required to live off-campus, thereby providing up to 1650 Air Corp Cadets with on-campus lodging. Many rooms and offices in various buildings were used exclusively for the Army Training Program. These arrangements resulted in overcrowded classrooms and shared spaces for students and teachers alike. The Campus School’s large gymnasium and part of its basement were used as barracks for the cadets. Although the war created many hardships, these words from the 1943 The Bulletin: The College in Transi­tion revealed the willingness of the college to support the war effort:

The Moorhead State Teachers College is meeting its responsibility to the State and to the Nation through the two significant activities in which it is now engaged—the education of teachers for the public schools and the training of aircrew students for the Army. The two functions are complimentary. Each contributes to the other... [We] are grateful for
the opportunity to contribute to the great causes of enlightenment and freedom now being challenged by the foes of Democracy.

Nationwide the war years resulted in extreme teacher shortages, with thousands of emergency teaching certificates being issued, schools being closed, and teaching positions eliminated.

While the Campus School can be characterized in many ways (e.g., positive home-school relations), two elements exemplify the years between 1932 and 1972: educational innovation with curriculum and instruction and wide-reaching and successful extra curricular programs.

Proof that educational innovation was an integral part of the Campus School program is evident from writings in the 1969 Moorhead State College: The Bulletin: Report to the Alumni. In 1969, MSC was nationally recognized as one of eight colleges to evaluate new national accreditation standards for teacher education. One reason given for this selection was the Campus School's innovative programs.

The programs identified in this report were inter-grade grouping within a subject area (e.g., grades 8 and 9 in English), inter-grade grouping between subject areas (e.g., grades 9 and 10 with World Geography and World History in a two-year block), experimental math curriculum, new language arts curriculum, and Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory grading for high school Social Studies. Innovation also extended beyond the walls of the school. In 1971, the Social Studies department and students worked to promote a community-wide vote on the Vietnam War. This was accomplished by utilizing community speakers in the classroom to learn about democratic processes associated with this kind of vote. Gerry Jacobs, social studies teacher, was quoted in the November 8, 1969 Valley Times, as saying, “The project was the best learning experience the kids could have, and I think everyone is a little surprised that we moved the system.”

In accordance with our study of democracy we are attempting a city-wide vote on the Vietnam issue. We have been conducting a survey and petition which we hope to present to the City Council. We would ask the public to take a stand either for President Nixon’s policy or complete and immediate withdrawal from this war...This project is not just a passing whim of ours. We are sincere in carrying it out to completion—meaning the actual vote—if the people care to make their voice heard on this one issue they would give us their support.

Another example of innovation through activism was evident in 1969, when about 90 Campus High School students engaged in public protests, wrote state legislators, and worked to gather signatures to campaign on behalf of their school custodian Nels Stallberg. Nels was required to retire at 70, which would have left him one month short of reaching 10 years of service, thus being ineligible for state retirement benefits. The student’s actions moved State Representative Douglas Stillers to action and as a result a creative employment accommodation was made so Nels could work another month, and then retire with benefits. As often happened, Gerry Jacobs, social studies teacher, provided the needed adult leadership. He was quoted in the November 8, 1969 Valley Times, as saying, “The project was the best learning experience the kids could have, and I think everyone is a little surprised that we moved the system.”

Certainly, these experiences not only empowered the students, but they also witnessed, first hand, the positive results associated with becoming civically engaged. The Campus School seemed to be a place where teachers were role models who affirmed many important values.

Additional examples of curriculum innovations included experiential and discovery-based Science; Humanities course; cultural emphasis in Social Studies; French, Latin and Spanish language courses; Industrial Arts for female students; an integrated Reading, Social Studies, and Science course; and a field-based Economics course. An example of how curriculum was carefully studied and
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then extended beyond the college’s border is evident in a partnership project with the University of Minnesota. Beginning in 1936 and continuing for two years, the Campus School was selected by the University of Minnesota to serve as an experimental site for a social studies curriculum project. Campus School teachers experimented with and evaluated a regional K-12 social studies curriculum under the direction of Dr. Krey from the University of Minnesota and Minnesota State Department of Education. Two additional examples of curriculum and instruction innovation occurring in the 1940s were high school Mathematics and Social Studies classes using community-based problems that were relevant to lives of the students. A particularly innovative program was framed by the theme “Defense through Conservation.” This theme was used to integrate core classes across the curriculum: English, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies.

One fascinating innovation was an integrated seventh and eighth grade English and Social Studies class. For example, a place-based six-week curriculum was offered in 1953 to study the Moorhead community. Using the community as curriculum, students visited businesses, nonprofit organizations, city agencies, and service providers, and historic buildings; interviewed citizens; and read old newspapers to learn about their town. An example of how curriculum was not only locally, but also globally defined is seen through opportunities afforded to seventh and eighth grade students in 1950. These students adopted European war orphans and used various interactions with these children for class projects.

Another noteworthy curriculum innovation, led by teacher Gerry Jacobs, was integration of geography, science and art in a study titled, “Geographic Traverse.” Here, students sampled various phenomena between two geographical points to gain understanding of the entire area. On one such traverse, students, their teachers and student teachers traveled between 100 and 200 miles north, south, east, and west from campus to learn about various phenomena, such as animals in a wildlife refuge, life on an American Indian reservation, and the economics of an iron mine. Students and teachers spent one week at a time away from school, traveling by bus and camping in parks. A senior trip to the Mississippi Gulf Coast region, using Geographic Traverse, was taken in 1970. Quoting from the 1970 Student Yearbook: “A band of adventurous carefree [students] departed Moorhead, Minn., for 20 days and 5,000 miles later returned: weathered and exhausted, but wiser by the knowledge only experience teaches.”

Later examples of instructional innovation were TV production, team teaching, individualized instruction, independent study, differentiated instruction, and alternative assessment options. Some innovative administrative policies and practices were college preparatory emphasis, middle school philosophy and organization, increased unscheduled student time for additional elective course enrollment, and college class enrollment options. The philosophy supporting these innovative practices and policies is readily seen in these 1969 words from the school’s Director:

The Campus School must be a school that is willing to try new things...we cannot be concerned about standardized testing programs which indicate whether a student is learning what someone else thinks they should be learning...our primary purpose must be to work with new ideas and new approaches to curriculum and learning...we must continue to shake off the doldrums of habit and influence...

These words offer a different perspective about schooling, teaching, learning and testing, and provide quite a departure from the current standardized and accountability-driven mandates associated with the No Child Left Behind requirements. Additional comments from the Campus School Director in 1969 about innovation and student-centered learning:

I’m impressed with the amount of learning that
is not traditional, not the parrot-feedback kind of learning. I am proud of many students because of their ability to be flexible, to think for themselves and to adapt to new kinds of situations.

Imagine the affect if these words were spoken today. Our educational landscape is made up of some schools embracing these ideas, some choosing to move away from them and many being forced to move away from them as a result of the punitive No Child Left Behind sanctions for not achieving government-mandated requirements. There is much to learn from the Lommen Hall years that could make today’s schools not only more effective, but also more focused on children and their welfare.

This section on innovation closes with more words from the Campus School Director, who in 1969 wrote this about middle school education: “Flexibility and age-group grouping bring together young people in a climate of learning that does not put demands upon them beyond their years.” This kind of student-centered thinking is contrasted with a 2006 Education Week article written by Florida Commissioner of Education Cheryl Yecke, who suggested that the problem with middle school education is the “middle school concept” that over-emphasizes the student and his/her developmental level at the expense of rigorous standards, accountability, and academic reform.

Beginning in the 1930’s, the Campus School’s after-school program played an important role in adding to the strong sense of community and opportunity for positive socialization and leadership development for students. Combined with the innovative instructional program, afterschool programs represent the importance the school placed on thinking of its students holistically.

Parents must have been aware of these benefits, given the breadth of the programs and high student participation rates. During an interview, Dr. Sheila Gullickson, a high school teacher, methods instructor and student teaching supervisor, recalled, “There was a strong expectation from parents for their children to do after-school activities.”

The impressive after-school activities and extra-mural programs for boys and girls lasted throughout the Lommen Hall years. Twelve different sports (i.e., baseball, kittenball, volleyball, quoits, hockey, archery, track and field, basketball, football, wrestling, golf, and gymnastics) were provided. Literary work opportunities included Dragon’s Eye High School Newspaper, Other Dragon’s Eye Elementary School Newspaper, CAMHI Student Yearbook, and The Moccasin. Other extra-curricular activities included cheerleading and pep club; key club; marching band and majorettes; Girls Athletic Association; and debate, declamation, speech, and theater contests. Activities were also provided that focused on socializing and building community (i.e., homemaker’s club; school carnival; school picnic; Christmas party; annual senior trip; and Homecoming, Prom, and Sadie Hawkins dances). Various opportunities were also offered that supported the academic side of school life (e.g., study abroad program, current events club, French club, student advisory club, library club, Future Teachers of America club).

Three components of the extra-curricular program recognized for quality and providing many memorable moments for students and their families were the musical and theater departments and athletic program. Some theater productions included: Heart Trouble: A Comedy in Three Acts (1939), Uncertain Wings (1947), Tune In: A Musical Comedy (1955), Childhood (1966), and The One Ring Circus (1972). In 1965, 15 of 18 seniors played in the band and never received a contest grade lower than “A.” Steve Poitras, class of 1963, remembers fondly the 1957-1958 District Basketball Championship held in Memorial Auditorium at Concordia College. This game was one of the few times that the Baby Dragons defeated Moorhead High School, which was quite an accomplishment given Moorhead High School typically graduated about 300 students, while the Campus High School typically graduated about 30 students.
In the 1950s and 1960s it was quite common for the Baby Dragons to have undefeated or one loss football seasons and capture the Little Valley Conference title. Longtime Campus High School football coach, Don Anderson, was a state-wide leader in wins between the late 1940s and early 1960s.

One of the more notable Campus School alumni, who participated in many of these programs, was Gary Larson who grew up on the family farm near Sabin. Gary's high school accomplishments, as listed in the 1957 CAMHI, include the following: Basketball 9-12, Baseball 9-12, Football 9-12, Track 9-12, Letterman 9-12, Junior Class play 11, One Act play 12, Chorus 11-12, Boys Ensemble 11, Newspaper staff 10-11 and Class President 12. During the four years (1953-1956) Gary played football at the Campus High School, the teams won three Little Valley Conference championships, with a collective 21-1-1 record. He obviously was an important contributor to the team's success as he played all positions except center.

In 1956 his eight man team defeated the Dilworth team, which played in an 11 man league, however his most memorable thrill was defeating Moorhead High School in the sub-district basketball game in 1957. He also won two conference basketball scoring titles and participated in the shot put at the state track and field meet. Gary attended Concordia College and played both football and basketball, served in the Marine Corps and later played football for the Minnesota Vikings. A review of CAMHI Yearbooks over the Lommen Halls years reveals that many students, like Gary Larson, were active participants in the school's extracurricular program. The powerful influence the educational and extracurricular programs had on the school's students is aptly captured in words from Ragna Holen, longtime teacher (1938-1971) and department chairperson for the Home Economic Department:

One of the most rewarding things about teaching in the Campus School was to have witnessed the behavior of students who could adapt so well to the impact of change, whether it was one of classroom routine or a broad cultural one. The only thing we really know about tomorrow is that it will be different from today, and the students from the Campus School will be prepared to meet this challenge.

Given this overview to the Lommen Hall years, I think the best way to continue the story of this 40 year history is through the many wonderful photographs taken during this time period. These photographs will be chronologically organized in two areas: educational innovation with curriculum and instruction and the wide-reaching extracurricular program.
Education Innovation: 1930s
This Model School building photograph was taken following the February 9, 1930 fire which also destroyed Old Main.

A photograph of the new home to the Campus School—classes began March 1, 1932.

Between 1930 and 1932, all Campus School classes were held in six homes purchased by the Alumni Association. The six houses were owned by E. H. Pehrson, 1104 7th Avenue South; A. Swenson, 1108 7th Avenue South; A.O. Christianson, 1110 7th Avenue South; W.M. Nesheim, 604 11th St. South; C. Larimer, 606 11th St. South; and J. Sherman, 620 11th St. South. The house pictured was located at 1104 7th Avenue South, which is the current university mailing address.

Lommen Hall was considered a schoolhouse jewel when it opened in 1932. Featured in this photograph is the “Great Circle” which was a drivable road running around the perimeter of the campus mall.
A classroom in the new building that featured the classes’ pet bird, ample shelf space, and fireplace. The fireplace was cemented over during the summer of 1999. Directly opposite from the round table was a free standing fountain.

As students peek out the front door, Georginna Lommen poses for a photograph. The building was officially named Lommen Hall in 1969.

Costuming was an integral part of the curriculum at the Campus School. Marilyn White, class of 1943, remembers wearing Mexican costumes in fifth grade and Norwegian costumes in sixth grade. Barb Kiefer is the second student from the left in the front row.
A 1935 first or second grade classroom located on the first floor of the Campus School. The photograph was taken during a Health unit.
A student-created library corner using soap box crates. Reading was an integral part of the school’s curriculum; it was emphasized in various subjects across the curriculum.

Third grade students gathering by a tree they planted on the mall in 1938. The small building to the right of Weld Hall was a wooden dormitory built for men; it was taken down after WW II.
Education Innovation: 1940s
A PLAN OF THE COLLEGE CAMPUS

The shaded areas represent buildings in existence or approved for construction. The dotted areas represent college building needs in the future.

A detailed drawing of campus plans from the 1940s, including existing, approved, and future buildings.
A 1945 aerial campus photograph. Lommen Hall is the top left building, while the playing fields of the Baby Dragons were located behind MacLean Hall, bottom right.
This photograph was most likely taken at Hector Airport in 1945, possibly suggesting the military or war effort was part of the school's curriculum. During WW II, sacrifices were made by those working across campus and in Lommen Hall. The school's large gymnasium and part of its basement were used as barracks for some of the 1650 Air Corp Cadets living, studying, and training on campus.

One can only imagine what this young Campus School student was dreaming about.
A 1946 Science lesson about electricity in the sixth grade classroom. The curtains in this classroom were made in 1937 by Marilyn White and her sixth grade classmates.

Seventh grade history lesson in 1946. The furrier is Milo Marten from Moorhead Furs.
The Campus School infused a global perspective in its curriculum through effectively teaching World Geography. Many teachers would share stories with their students about their international travels. These student costumes were sewn by parents.
In 1940 students came from both the "town" and "countryside" of Moorhead. As a result bussing was important. Of the 420 students attending the school, 275 were from town, while 145 came from rural areas. This bus is parked on 6th Avenue South, between 12th Street and 13th Street, just behind Lommen Hall.
Education Innovation: 1950s
This photograph reveals the importance reading held at the Campus School.

Figure 104

Another example of how reading was integrated across the curriculum. In this 1955 photograph the connection is made to social studies.

Figure 105

Elementary students enjoying reading time in the first floor Campus School library. Of special interest is the table specially designed to make reading easier and the student using the card catalogue.
An example of an art activity that was enjoyed by students, teachers, and student teachers. This kind of activity was common in the 1950s—students making various kinds of connections with "their" school. Second from the left is long time art teacher Iletta Holman. She was strict, yet well respected by the students for her teaching abilities. These kinds of large scale murals were often painted in or near the commons area—a classroom filled with comfortable furniture that served as an informal gathering place for students.

The other industrial arts class was printing. In this class, Campus School students worked with college students to create the various school publications.

Campus School students really enjoyed their industrial arts classes in Weld Hall. Students used the same materials and equipment as college students. In this photograph students in wood shop are making bird houses.

Students, departing from the Fargo Great Northern Station, looking forward to a day trip to St. Paul in 1953. When parents were surveyed about what they liked about the Campus School, many indicated opportunities for their children to learn to be independent. Possibly, this was one of the reasons for trips such as this.
In Bookkeeping class, students learned about debits/credits, personal accounts, checking and savings, banking and investment accounts. From 1950 to 1962, Ralph Lee taught the Business-related classes at the Campus School.

This gymnastics lesson photograph was taken in the small gymnasium located on the second floor of MacLean Hall. Erling Johnson remembers playing basketball on the MacLean college floor as a "special gift"—his parents would sit in the third row balcony to watch him play.

Students practicing their shorthand skills during the 1950s. The class of 1957 dedicated the 1957 CAMHI to Ralph Lee because he taught them "valuable skills" and "was always ready to give help when needed."
An example of how the school's curriculum was extended and expanded beyond typical and traditional kinds of learning. Here, students are learning how to use a loom.

The Flora Frick pool was used by Campus School students (grades 8-12 had a 3 week unit) as well as university students for classes and recreation. Because it was the only indoor pool in the F-M area, it was also used by other K-12 schools and Concordia College. One drawback was that it could be very cold as it was not heated.

In 1951, this teacher is using what was considered "cutting edge technology" at the time—the film strip projector.
An aerial photograph of the MSTC campus in the 1950s. The Baby Dragons competed in football, track, and baseball on the fields behind MacLean Hall as well as using these fields for physical education classes. The buildings (9) located at the bottom of the photograph were WWII barracks converted to student and faculty housing after the war.

Campus School students typically did not use the front door as pictured here because the administration offices were located in the nearby hallway, as is the MSUM Early Education Center Director's office today. In 1957, a high school student jumped from the second floor balcony to escape the principal who was looking for him for breaking a school rule. The student escaped with a broken foot.
Orlow Nokken's mother being served tea at Parent Teacher's Conferences. It was typical during the Lommen Hall years for 80% to 90% of parents to attend these conferences. Orlow completed his K-12 education at the Campus School and undergraduate education on the same campus. He taught at the Campus School and after completing graduate degrees he also taught at the university.

A school calendar page from 1955-1956 highlighting early closing time for PT conferences and the eighth grade class giving a party for students in grades 7-10.
Friday, December 3
Seventh grade presents three one-act plays. Well done!

Thursday, December 16
Christmas parties in home-rooms and auditorium.
Mr. Ortner plays Santa!

Friday, December 17
Christmas vacation begins!

Monday, December 20
Charter night for Key Club.
Banquet sponsored by Kiwanis Club for nine charter members and their parents.

Monday, January 3
School opens. Miss Bartels falls and breaks her leg.
What will we do about the operetta?

Saturday, January 15
Finals of Little Valley Conference
Basketball Tournament held here. Baby Dragons win second place.

Tuesday, January 18

Thursday, January 27
P.T.A. puts on a buffet supper. Newly organized Key Club members help by washing dishes.

Friday, January 28
Sophomores put on program. Eugene Bannerman stars as Cupid.
Senior English class takes trip to Fergus Falls State Hospital as part of unit on mental health.

Saturday, January 29
Citizenship conference held at M.S. Best boy and girls citizens of junior and senior class attend. College High School represented by Rona Robbins, Glenn Nokken, Diane Reski, and Herman Holland.

Friday, February 4
Eighth grade presents its program.

Monday and Tuesday, February 21 and 22
Something new! A midwinter vacation. A welcome break!

Thursday, February 24
Chorus presents operetta, "Tune In."

Friday, February 25
Faculty and student teachers present program.
Friday, March 4
Ninth grade gives a party.

Friday, March 11
Ninth grade presents its program.

Thursday, April 11
School closes at noon for spring vacation.
Baseball season will begin soon.

Saturday, May 7
Dragon Relays.

Wednesday, May 11
Little Valley Track Meet.

Tuesday, May 17
Minn-Dak Track Meet.

Thursday, May 19
Awards program.

Friday, May 20
District Track Meet at Frazee.

Saturday, May 21
Big event of the year for the juniors.
Junior-Senior banquet at Gardner Hotel,
followed by the prom at the campus school.
Music by Duane Keith's orchestra.

Monday, May 30
Another vacation!
School closes for Memorial Day.

Sunday, June 5
Seniors share with college students in Baccalaureate services.

Tuesday, June 7
School picnic.

Wednesday, June 8
The day the seniors have been looking forward to—Commencement.
School's out!
Education Innovation: 1960s
A campus drawing from the 1960s.

LEGEN D
1 McLean Hall
2 Stagg Hall
3 Weld Hall
4 Weld Hall Addition
5 Campus School
6 Livingston Lord Library
7 Kline Commons
8 Comstock Memorial Union
9 Dahl Hall—Women’s Residence
10 Placement Office
11 Grazzini Hall—Women’s Residence
12 Neime Hall—Men’s Residence
13 Special Office Building
14 Maintenance
15 Health Center
16 Heat Plant
17 Neman Hall
18 Football Field
19 Baseball Field
20 Tennis Courts
21 Bear Residences Complex
22 Ballard Hall—Men’s Residence
23 Tennis Courts
24 Center For The Arts
25 Grier Hall
26 Flora Frick Hall
27 Classroom Buildings
(Parking Local)
A, B, C, D, E, K, M, N, T.

Female students also enjoyed Industrial Arts classes, c. 1966.

A 1960 classroom scene from Mrs. Nelson’s class. Students must have enjoyed the nature-theme bulletin board in their class.
Marilyn Hall, a junior calls her project "Teaching A Bird To Talk". She taught her parrot a few phrases and recorded his learning progress.

Science Projects Are on Display at Fair

Testing with different dyes is the subject of the projects of Mary Pfeifer, a senior, and Jill Briggs, a junior. In the displays are samples of these various tests.

Student teaching was another aspect of the Campus School that resulted in excellent opportunities for teacher education students to learn about teaching and for K-12 students to experience a quality education program. Thousands of K-12 teacher education students taught on the Moorhead campus, beginning in the Moorhead Normal School and ending in Lommen Hall in 1971. Today, early childhood education majors student teach in the MSUM Early Education Center.

These Campus High School projects were developed in the Science Lab which interestingly enough is where the author's office (Lommen Hall 214H) is now located—the most northeast second floor corner of the building. All Chemistry and Biology students were required to complete a project. Marilyn Hall's family owned the K-9 Pet Store in Moorhead, where the parrot most likely came from. Diane Andreason, class of 1971, recalls visiting the parrots at Marilyn's family owned pet store.
Education Innovation: 1970s
On Nov. 1, 1970, a band of adventurous carefree gypsies departed from Moorhead, Minn. 20 days and 5,000 miles later they returned: Weathered and exhausted, but wiser by the knowledge that only experience teaches.

Important objectives of the school, throughout its long history, were emphasizing discovery and the ability to learn and use information, not just to remember it. In this 1970 photograph, students are on a field trip experiencing their learning first hand with Social Studies teacher, Gerry Jacobs. During the 1971 Senior Trip, students experienced this kind of learning while traveling to Winnipeg.

Students and teachers participated in a “Geographic Traverse” project traveling to Gulf Port, Mississippi and back to campus in 1970. Students sampled various phenomenon (e.g., important cultural sites) while making this 20 day, 5,000 mile trek. This experience typified the active and engaged kind of learning provided to Campus School students.

Finding a quiet place to study, think and talk about your thoughts was a value of the Campus School. In this 1970 photograph, two boys share thinking about their reading.
Creative problem solving was an objective achieved by these Campus School primary grade students.

All kinds of learning can occur through game playing, including strategizing, negotiating, and getting along with peers. This kind of learning was valued at the Campus School.

Students visit the Cragness Elevator while on a school-sponsored summer camping trip in 1970.
Extra Curricular Activities: 1930s
Figure 133

An early version of the Baby Dragon basketball team. These students were coached by Mr. Gilpin, back row and third from the left. He was a Campus High School Science teacher and also the school's football and track and field coach.

Gold and the Blue
To College High we are true,
We're here to cheer them,
The foes all fear them,
Because our boys always
FIGHT! FIGHT! FIGHT!
We're always out for the fame,
We're sure to win every game
Foes do be careful
Of the Baby Dragons
Of our M. S. College High

Come on Baby Dragons
And plunge right through that line
You've got the stuff now show it
And show it all the time
RAH! RAH! RAH!
Keep the banner skyward
Were sure to win this game
Show the foes you've got it
And lead us on to fame.

During the 1987 Campus School Reunion, it was learned there were several variations of the School Song. Marilyn White, class of 1943, remembers singing this version while she attended the school from kindergarten through 12th grade, while Diane Andreason, class of 1971, remembers singing a different version of the School Song.
Dauny May Headland’s 1937 yearbook entry listing her participation in the life of the school. This number of activities was typical of most students throughout the Lommen Hall years.

The school’s drum majorette dressed in a wonderful outfit, c. 1930.
Extra Curricular Activities: 1940s
Twenty-five students preparing for a 1940 Campus School piano recital. Maude Wencrk taught piano to many students.

The 1947 inaugural homecoming event for the Campus High School. This would become one of the best loved events of the school. The queen sitting between her attendants is Bessie Tarwater. The football game was won by the Baby Dragons over a team fielded by the alumni, 28-12. In progressive fashion and in this same year, the twenty girls in the eighth grade indicated they wanted to have a basketball team.
Collages like this 1949 depiction of student life were typically used for the last few pages of the Campus High School yearbook.
Extra Curricular Activities: 1950s

\[\text{\ }\]
The 1955 Campus High School marching band on 7th Street near Island Park in Fargo as part of the WDAY May Day Band Festival. It was common for 50 to 60 local bands to participate in this event.

In 1951, the Campus High School band was reorganized and directed by Alice Bartels who also worked with the various choral groups. She taught music for the college as well. Alice was known for high levels of energy and commitment to her students. The band played at football and basketball games and various school assemblies.

An interesting photograph of 31 students who made up the school’s accordion band. They are pictured here performing on the Campus School stage located at the west end of the second floor of Lommen Hall.
The Campus School Christmas programs were grand events held in Weld Hall. Activities included home room parties, class plays, various musical events, and a visit from Santa Claus. The students enjoyed performing and watching programs in this site. Graduation, homecoming, plays, concerts and other important school events were scheduled for Weld Hall. This photograph was most likely taken from the balcony.

In 1958 this photograph was taken of the school’s Junior Academy of Science. It is interesting to note that of the 12 students pictured, five are female. Students were required to complete a Physics, Chemistry, or Biology project.

Assisting the school librarian, Marvel Wooldrik, these students completed tasks such as checking out books, shelving books, and helping elementary age students find their way around the library; they were required to work at least one hour per week. Library Club members were also expected to develop an understanding of the library and its uses. These 11 students made up the 1953 Library Club.
Setting up projectors, running film strips and completing audio-visual equipment repairs were responsibilities of the Service Club. In addition, students did an inventory of the school’s bookroom and painted and repaired the school’s bicycle racks. Here is a photograph of the 1953 club with Mr. Valent, their advisor; this club began in 1950.

The 13 members of the 1958 Student Council are pictured here. It was quite an honor to be elected to this prestigious group. Some typical issues included advocating for a grade level about an important issue (e.g., school dance) and organizing and putting on the All-School Carnival.
The 1955 Business Club with advisor Ralph Lee. The school was so committed to these kinds of clubs that sometimes they were held during the school day so rural students without transportation could attend. Also, arrangements were made with town students so rural students had a place to stay in case of inclement weather. With no phone service to his rural farm home, Erling Johnson stayed with Ronnie Dibble when travel was impossible.

**Figure 150**

_Tish_ by J. Haugh, D. Leedham, Muriel Thompson, B. Reski, J. Schoepferster, S. Ramstad, I. Boelker, and J. Olson.


**TISH**

Under the direction of Muriel Thompson a three act comedy, "Tish", was presented Feb. 5, 1951, in Weld Hall auditorium. The story centers around three old maids, Tish, Lizzie, and Aggie, who are unusually active for their age, manage to get themselves into many unusual and humorous escapades.

Another example of the important place the arts had at the Campus School. The three act comedy "Tish" was performed in 1951 and directed by Muriel Thompson.
The Campus High School baseball team wearing MSTC uniforms as they pose for a photograph in 1958.

The 1957 Varsity Cheerleader squad. Members include, from left to right, Jean Knauf, Gail Nokken (Orlow Nokken’s sister), Carol Slocum, and Lavonne Larson (Gary Larson’s sister).

This famous Campus High School Baby Dragon was Mary Lackmann.
The 1952 Homecoming court with Queen Janice Schoephoerster. Note the saddle shoes worn by cheerleaders Elaine Karlstrom and Joan Boelte. The 1952 football team finished the season with a 6-1 record and a share of the Little Valley Championship.
Extra Curricular Activities: 1960s
Writing for an audience was always valued at the Campus School. Here are covers from three issues of the High School’s Dragon’s Eye newspaper: 1970, 1951 and 1939. Being part of the Dragon’s Eye was important to high school students; it was considered a privilege to be on the staff. Advisors and English teachers Viola Petri (1945-1972) and Elmina Gibson made it possible for many students to participate. Elmina Gibson is remembered as an “awesome teacher,” while the senior class of 1962 CAMHI dedicated the 1962 to Viola Petri because of her “knowledge, help and guidance.”

Another part of the school’s literary emphasis was the yearbook. Here are pictured the 13 CAMHI staff members from 1969. For a small school, the yearbook demonstrated effective writing and good use of photographs.
A reading of Baby Dragon yearbooks details a school focused on innovative learning, a varied and successful extracurricular program, and teachers and administrators devoted to students and their families.

The 1969 school choir, Claudia Engstrom is in the first row and the fourth student from the right. She was one of more skilled singers. Elizabeth Brand, daughter of Campus School Director Dr. Werner Brand, is the first student from the right in the first row. Dr. Brand was a long time employee at the Campus School and MSU: 1944-1975. He served as a teacher, supervisor, principal and director at the Campus School; and placement director at the university. Each year the choir took a significant trip. During the 1970-1971 school year, the choir traveled to Chicago to perform.

Orchestra was also part of the Elementary Program. In 1969 these students performed at a school concert.
Elynn Trummer received the Betty Crocker Homemaker of the Year Award and the Citizenship Award.

This photograph suggests a school committed to all of its students and their varied interests and talents. Scoring high on a test and writing an excellent essay were necessary to receive these awards.

Key Club, the student organization of the Kiwanis, began in 1955 at the Campus School with Erling Johnson serving as its first president. Erling went onto earn a BS degree in teaching and MS degree in counseling. He was selected as the Moorhead Teacher of the Year (1971) and North Dakota Vocational Counselor of the Year (1983). This photograph shows officers for the 1966 club. The club's purposes were to develop responsibility for authority, leadership, pride in school, and love of country.

Many clubs were available for Campus School students; some like the Science Club reinforced academic concepts. Here are three members of the 1967 club with a drawing of a rocket ship. These students had the reputation for loving science and always doing interesting projects.

This photograph was taken in 1969 while elementary students participated in a Halloween Parade. At the 1987 Campus School Reunion, many alumni not only remembered parading for the high school students, but also sliding down this banister.
The seniors of Moorhead State College High School are preparing a “Roaring 20s Escapade” to be presented in the school gym at 8 and 10 p.m. Saturday. Among the principals in the cast are (left to right): Colleen Anderson, Route 1, Moorhead; Peter Johnson, 126 13th St. S., Moorhead; Ken Hulken, 918 11th St. S., Moorhead, and Kent Zimmerman, 1405 8th Ave. S., Moorhead. The production will be presented cabaret style, with refreshments and dancing.

The school’s informal theater events as well as the more formal events were well attended by the school, university, and F-M community.

The “Flapper” was a school-wide musical performed on the Weld Hall stage in the early 60s.
On February 21, 1963 the Campus High School presented three one act plays. One play, about the life of Joan of Arc, was titled, "The Lark." Students competed at the District level with this play, but did not make it into the Regional level. Pictured here (first student on left), is Roger K. Hamilton, brother of Doug Hamilton, current Executive Director for University Advancement.

In 1964 the Campus High School play "Madwoman of Chaillot" won first prize at the District Play Contest and third prize at the Regional Play Contest.

The Campus School sponsored dances for its students. "The Universal Joints" performed at the 1969 Prom under the theme of "Sunny."

Campus School students enjoying the 1969 Prom. Dr. Haukebo, Chair for Education, was the guest speaker. Chuck Wurzbacher is pictured with his back to the camera; he was one of the school's best basketball players.
The Senior Girls beat the Faculty Women in their game and the Faculty Men beat the Junior Boys for the championship in their division of the Faculty-Student Basketball Tournament.

The Winners!

An example of the positive relationships students and faculty had with each other are the various student-faculty basketball games held at the school. Here are the "Winners" from 1969. These games were well attended and considered major school events.

Campus High School outdoor track and field events were held on the track located behind MacLean Hall. Here is 1964 track athlete Rick Johnson who participated in several indoor and outdoor meets.

Tennis coach Orlow Nokken pictured with his 1964 Campus High School tennis team. He also coached the basketball team.
On Thursday, September 18, 1965, Karen Knutson was crowned the 1965 Homecoming Queen of M.S.C. The coronation was held at 7:15 in the Weld Hall Auditorium. Karen's attendants were Laura Baugh, Sue Geary, Nancy Haight, and Sharry Nelson. Escorting the Queen and her attendants were Dave Jellison, Terry Smith, Rod Amundson, Dave Holtgard, and Tom Quigley. Gary Nylander was the Master of Ceremonies. Gail Jellison and Dave Atchison were the flower girl and orange beater. Following the coronation, a reception and party were held in the gym. On Friday, Queen Karen and her court defeated the Lake Park Parkers 30 to 12.

Highlighting the week of festivities was the Homecoming Dance sponsored by the Student Council. The dance proved to be a wonderful climax to all the activities.

The 1965 Campus School Homecoming Court. Homecoming activities included coronation, reception, pep fest, football game, and the all important Homecoming dance. The Junior Royalty were typically elementary-age students from the Campus School whose older siblings were in the Homecoming Court.

An important part of Homecoming was the traditional burning of the "M." The "M" was built by faculty and ignited following the coronation.

Campus School majorettes had a long tradition at the school, with the first majorettes beginning in the early 1930s. Generating school spirit was typically not a problem for Campus School events.
A crafty Baby Dragon faking out a would-be tackler in a game played on October 18, 1963.

The other major sport at the Campus School was boys Basketball. Here is the 1966 team with their coaches.

The 1965 District 23 Basketball tournament was held at Concordia College. Three times in the history of the Campus High School did this small school of about 300 students defeat its much larger cross-town rival Moorhead High School: 1949, 1957, and 1965.

The 1967 A squad cheerleaders posing with the Baby Dragon's mascot whose costume was made by a parent.
Extra Curricular Activities: 1970s
Figure 183

The 1970 staff of the Dragon's Eye poses for a group photograph with their advisor, Elmira Gibson.

Figure 185

The purpose of the Pep Club, which began in 1961, was to assist the cheerleaders at games and during pep rallies. Here are the 38 students, representing various grade levels, who made up this club in 1970. Having students from various grade levels was not only a way to socialize students to value school spirit, but also to make connections among differing age students.
There were four different groups of cheerleaders at the school. Here pictured are the girls making up the 1970 D squad cheerleader group.

The 1971 Campus High School Volleyball team pictured with their coach, Mrs. Olson. This was the last volleyball team fielded by the school; it had a record of 1 win and 10 losses. The lone win came against Crookston. Prior to interscholastic competitions for girls, the school offered GAA or Girls Athletic Association which was quite popular. In 1962 the group had 40 members. This organization provided opportunities for sports participation as well as social interaction (e.g., picnic).

The 1970 A squad cheerleaders with the Campus High School dragon mascots.
Figure 189
The 1970 Campus High School Girls Basketball team pictured with their coach Mrs. Olson.

Figure 190
Seventh and eighth grade students having their own dance in the school's gymnasium in 1970.

Figure 191
Princess Janey
1970 Homecoming Princess Janey showing the beehive hair style. Diane Andreason remembers her as a "great gal."
With the Campus High School closing, students had little time to cheer on Baby Dragon sports teams. Because the school did not field a football team in 1971, the Homecoming event was held in conjunction with the Lake Park basketball game. Some students, upon hearing the school was going to close, transferred back to the surrounding public schools. Interestingly though, many students who transferred were those who had originally transferred themselves to the Campus School, while many of the students who had attended the Campus School for many years stayed until the school closed.

John Tandberg: Director
Jennifer Nelson: Assistant Director

Winners of the "One Act Play" & "Promethians" Awards

John Tandberg directed the award winning one act play, "The Informer." John Tandberg, who would later go onto serve as the college’s registrar, was a wonderful drama teacher who really connected with students and as a result was well respected.
CHAPTER FIVE: CLOSING OF THE CAMPUS SCHOOL
Center for Educational Development

In 1964, Campus School staff and Education department faculty discussed developing a new Center for Educational Development. This group would be known as the Committee on the Center for Educational Development. At this initial January 20, 1964 meeting, Dr. Glaydon Robbins (Figure 194), Dean of Education was energized by the idea of a new Education building and programs. In a report to faculty, he wrote:

The first meeting of the Committee on January 20 proved to be most helpful to me in that the imaginative and challenging possibilities for the proposed Center which were presented stimulated my own thinking and make it possible for me to structure to some degree my previously quite nebulous thinking in this regard.

Responding proactively to social and economic changes was at the heart of the rationale developed by Dean Robbins for developing a new educational center. Some of these changes included the impact of technology, the United States struggle for world leadership, the population explosion, and the space race. When thinking about social and economic changes as applied to education, the dean generated many initiatives. Some included: adjusting instruction to meet the needs of all learners, creating new approaches to teaching mathematics, using television as an instructional methodology, considering school size and location in regard to curriculum adjustments, and emphasizing new content areas in economic education and foreign languages.

The dean conceived the over-arching purpose of the Center for Educational Development to

...sponsor, stimulate, initiate, direct, supervise, and cooperate in research and experimentation pertaining to developments in school organization, curriculum, and instruction at the following levels: Childhood education, Secondary education, Vocational-technical education, Higher education, Adult education, Special education and Teacher education...and to establish and maintain close working relationships with educational establishments which will provide laboratory situations for the conducting of research and experimentation in education. For example, a new Laboratory School...To publish and distribute regularly the findings and conclusions of all research... [On campus] to stimulate and encourage institution-wide interest and involvement in the problems...of educational development...particularly teacher education.

A new Laboratory School, as part of the center, would be integral to the overall educational mission of the college. It would provide exemplary education for its P-12 students and an environment for observation, experimentation, research, and demonstration for campus faculty as well as the community’s teachers.

The dean not only dreamed of new and expanded programs, but also of a building that would match his forward thinking. The center would be housed in a new building, twice the size of the existing Lommen Hall (Figure 195), and imaginatively designed to achieve its purposes. For example, architecture would enhance learning freedom and flexibility through easily accessible electronic technology, closed and open circuit television, flexible scheduling, individualized and independent study, non-graded curricula, and increased face-to-face interactions between students, and students and teachers. Using air conditioning to support an extended school year was also part of the building plan. The theme dominating the architectural design would be one that would enable and expedite innovation, not create obstacles to overcome; for example, Laboratory School classrooms would allow for varying group sizes and avoid “classrooms in an ice-cube tray manner.” Additional ideas that could be actualized through the architectural design included movable walls and partitions, appropriate use of carpeting in instructional areas, language laboratories, outdoor instructional areas, modern...
Dr. Glaydon Robbins, Dean of Education, smiling in a photograph with President Knoblauch and Roy Sorenson, Director of Placement and In-service Education. Dean Robbins received his undergraduate and graduate degrees from the University of Minnesota. He served on the initial committee to create graduate education and would hood the first student receiving a graduate degree on the Moorhead campus, Shelda Ann Jackson, on August 25, 1955.

A new laboratory school, to be named the Child Development Center, was envisioned to replace the existing school which was named after the first director, Georgina Lommen, in 1969.
food services, functional observation facilities, and a library that would be the focal point of the building. There is no available evidence suggesting that staff and faculty did not support the dean’s ideas.

Child Development Center
In 1967, this plan was rejected because the administration did not share the faculty’s enthusiasm for its expanded mission and new dollars required to implement this plan. Ultimately, this decision would signal the beginning of the end for the Campus School. Because of the administration’s response, a majority of Campus School staff called for closing the high school so resources could be funneled to a Nursery School- grade 9 program, to be titled the Child Development Center (Figure 196). The center would provide education for approximately 320 students with a yearly operating budget of about $320,200 and a building renovation cost of about $450,000.

The newly-reconstituted school would focus on long term total school experimentation across several areas, a goal public schools could not accomplish. This school reform project would be characterized by components; such as:

1. Un-graded and individualized Primary School program.
2. Early Childhood Education readiness creativity program.
3. Education for children with exceptional learning capacities.
4. Teacher-advisor model for middle school advisory groups.
5. Varying minutes of instruction allocated to learning activities.
6. Major emphasis on peer teaching at all levels.
7. Center for Teacher Education.
8. Emphasis on research and innovation.
9. Teaching exchanges with public schools.

Closing the Campus School
In 1970 the Minnesota College Board requested a team of evaluators from Towson State College, Maryland, to recommend whether the states’ five campus schools should continue operating or be closed (Figure 197). According to then-President Roland Dille (Figure 198), Towson State was selected because of its president’s personal relationship with the Minnesota College Board’s Academic Vice-Chancellor. Reviewers used three questions to guide their work:

1) What is the function of the school and is the function understood and supported by all stakeholders?
2) Is the function important to meeting contemporary educational needs?
3) If the function is important, can the college perform the function with existing staff or are resources available to hire additional staff? Is there an overall financial commitment to support this function?

The consultant’s responsibility to accurately assess the MSC’s existing Campus School was made more difficult because of the decision to close the high school and use these resources to support a new Child Development Center. However, those involved with developing a plan for the new Child Development Center believed its goals were in concert with goals or functions associated with Campus Schools: research, exemplary educational programs for children and youth, experimentation, innovation and dissemination.

The evaluation team assigned to the Moorhead Campus School responded “Yes” to questions #1 and #2, but strongly recommended that the only way for the Campus School to continue its work (i.e., Question #3), either in the existing building with the current program (which would have to be drastically updated) or in the new Child Development Center with the proposed program, would be for new dollars to be allocated. Specifically, new dollars would be
The proposed Child Development Center would include a variety of multi-size and multi-purpose spaces for the intended instructional practices and programs such as thematic and multi-disciplinary teaching areas; early childhood education; Social Science, Reading, and Science laboratories; a diagnostic center; and a student Art display area.
The overall purpose of the consultant’s report “was to make recommendations concerning the continuance or the discontinuance of the campus laboratory schools.” The recommendation may have been made prior to campus visits given the last sentence in the report’s introduction: “...it may be concluded that there is wide-spread opinion that if laboratory schools are to survive it must be because they can serve better than any other institution or agency the functions related to the training of teachers.”

Roland Dille’s advancement from professor to president occurred in only four years. He came to the Moorhead campus in 1964 as an English professor and then served as Dean of the College from 1965 to 1968. In 1968, he succeeded John Neumaier as president and served for 26 years, until he retired on June 30, 1994. While Dr. Dille was an accomplished professor and President many local children remember him best as a believable Santa Claus.
needed for hiring additional personnel, remodeling the existing facility, purchasing new equipment and furnishings, and increasing teacher salaries. They also reported that the Campus School’s organizational structure was deficient in that departmental faculty and the school’s classroom teachers did not work together to achieve the stated functions of the school. Some reasons for this lack of cooperation were not enough faculty positions to manage the relationship, lack of existing faculty time to manage the relationship, and incongruent programmatic priorities. Interviews conducted with several Campus School students and teachers support the conclusion that a lack of cooperation existed between departmental faculty and Campus School teachers.

Additionally in a memo dated January 30, 1950, and written to the Campus School teachers, the school’s director not only called for closer coordination between the school and the teacher education program, but also expressed concern over the lack of curricular connections between methods courses and teaching in the Campus School. An idea that was suggested by the director was for English Education majors to read to Campus School children during lunch time.

In a document dated October 26-30, 1970, and titled Report of Consultants on the Minnesota State College Laboratory Schools, the following recommendations were made:

Without the addition of these two ingredients [improved working relationship between Campus School teachers and departmental faculty and increased budget allocation] it is the judgment of the consultant team that Moorhead State College cannot perform these functions in a manner that it and the state could view as adequate...In the final analysis, then, the decision as to the future of the Moorhead laboratory (child development center) is contingent upon a composite of the priority level set for it by both the state and college administrators. As presently staffed and supported the center cannot achieve a high level of contribution.

The state of Minnesota and university decided there would be no new spending on the Campus School, as a result the high school would close in 1971 and elementary school in 1972. However, new dollars and a lack of cooperation were not the only reasons for closing the school. Dr. Roland Dille indicated three other reasons for closing the school: growing resentment from local school districts about money they were losing by having their students attend the Campus School, increasing numbers of student teaching placements that were not able to be made at the Campus School, and a view shared by some campus administrators that the Campus School was not as progressive as it once was. Although some Campus School personnel protested the closure decision, these reasons, in addition to inadequate funding and a lack of cooperation, were obstacles that could not be overcome (Figure 199). Two (i.e., Bemidji State University and Winona State University) of the five state university campus schools received unfavorable evaluations and closed in 1974, while the other two state university campus schools received more favorable evaluations and were closed later in 1977 (i.e., Mankato State University) and 1983 (i.e., St. Cloud State University) (Figure 200). Although the Campus School closed, its legacy of innovation would live on through the existing teacher education program. In a memo written to Vice Chancellor David Sweet and dated December 11, 1970, MSU Dean Robert Hanson outlined a plan that would “...emphasize and expand imaginative and forward looking new approaches in teacher education.” Examples of this plan that would indeed live on through the teacher education program included teacher training across many areas of exceptionality, the PFY Elementary Education program, and the use of technology.

Maybe the best way to close this chapter of the Campus Schools, is to share words from one of its heroines, Alice Cornelissen:

I look back on my years at the Campus School as being a very special time in my professional career—like a close knit family with children, parents and teachers of the finest kind working together.
MSC Campus
Lab Schools
To Be Closed

By JERRY RUFF
Moorhead Editor

ST. PAUL — The campus laboratory schools at Moorhead State College will be closed no longer.

training in special education.
The MSC administration had already made a decision to close the junior and senior high school section, grades 7 through 12.

MSC Group to Protest 11/20/70

Campus School Proposal

Spokesmen from Moorhead State College will appear before the Educational Policy Committee of the State College Board in St. Paul Monday to speak against a recommendation that closed that the campus schools at Moorhead State, Bemidji State, and Winona State be closed at the end of the 1971-72 academic year. He recommends that closing the campus high school

Last July, MSC President Dr. Roland Dille backed an MSC faculty study committee recommendation calling for closing the campus high school and changing and expanding...
As a result of the "Report of Consultants on the Minnesota State College Laboratory Schools" all five of the State University System Campus Schools would be closed by 1983. This decision ended over 100 years (Winona Normal School opened September 1860) of rich and varied campus-based schooling for P-12 students and excellent placement sites for student teachers in which to learn the art and craft of teaching.
CHAPTER SIX: THE EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN
Education for young children has always been important on the Moorhead campus. Beginning in Old Main, classes for young children were included as part of the Campus School program. As described earlier, the Model School Building and Lommen Hall were specifically constructed with the needs of young children in mind. In 1923 a nursery school for children 15 months to three years was opened. It was the second such school in the state and 12th in the nation. In the 1910s, kindergarten began as a formal academic department at Moorhead Normal School.

A New Preschool Program
In 1971, a new Preschool Program was offered for children ages three, four, and five years (Figure 201). When I asked then-university President Roland Dille why a new preschool program opened at the same time the Campus School was closing, he indicated that the Preschool was not seen as part of the existing Campus School; that there was a new national focus, as part of LBJ's "The Great Society" to provide early childhood programs like Head Start, and that the university wanted to be a part of these initiatives; and the university was experiencing increased demand for childcare services from its students. Additional reasons included the need to provide education and training for Early Childhood teachers and to satisfy a growing demand by campus departments (e.g., Psychology) for an on-campus site to observe and study young children.

The new Preschool offered a 5-day a week program with full day and morning and afternoon sessions; it was staffed by a full-time director, teacher and paraprofessional, and college students needing experience with these age groups (Figure 202). Initially, two-thirds of the slots were for children of college students, with remaining slots available for children with special needs and faculty/staff children. Charges were $12.50 for full-time care and $7.50 for half-day care. The director was Dorothy Dodds, long-time director, Judy Johnson said this about Dorothy Dodds, "She was the most exciting teacher of young children I have ever seen in my life. She never raised her voice and had a special way with children" (Figure 204). Judy remembered Dorothy Dodds teaching a group of young children about how a television worked by disassembling it with the children.

Three important goals of this new program were to provide appropriate educational programs for children (Figure 205), quality pre-service experiences for college students, and observation and demonstration sites for community teachers. The program would provide students pursuing B.S. or A.A. degrees in Early Childhood Education experiences with young children. To support these new degree programs, several new courses were proposed: Orientation to Early Childhood Education and Child Development, Seminar and Practicum, Home and School, Para-professionals class, Creative Experiences for Young Children (Figure 206), and Curriculum in Nursery and Kindergarten.

The Children's House
Between 1972 and 1975 there was a second, but much smaller child care program in Lommen Hall. It was located across from what is now the Sociology department and staffed by Pat Pranke. In 1975, this program moved to a single family residence located at 817 16th St. South, Moorhead. Interestingly, this was the former residence of the John Neumaier family. Dr. Bobbe Shreve, program director from 1975 to 1982, used a contest to name this relocated program, with "Children's House" being the winning name. This program would be funded with monies from Student Services. College administrator Eileen Hume wanted the program to be specifically designed to meet the needs of single mothers who were attending Moorhead State University (Figure 207). This initiative was aligned with the nation-wide 1960s and 1970s movement to secure more opportunities for women.

This home-based program provided care for three groups of children: toddlers, three and four year olds, and five year
A new preschool program would carry on the fine tradition of quality education and care for young children that was started in Old Main on the Moorhead Normal School campus.

This exemplary program would allow Early Childhood Education majors to learn about the creative powers of young children.
As a 1945 graduating MSTC senior, Dorothy Dodds was nationally recognized as an outstanding student in the publication *Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities* and then later earned the M.A. from Colorado State College. She began teaching on the Moorhead campus in 1949 as a teacher of young children and retired from the Education department in 1985.

Promoting artistic expression and developing independence were two important outcomes of the new program.
Learning to appreciate the imaginative powers of children was an important aspect in preparing teachers of young children.
olds. Multi-age groupings of children were encouraged as staff believed there was much to be gained by the children when they interacted with different-aged children. An example of this kind of grouping was the daily gathering of all children and staff for some large group activities (e.g., music, story reading). This kind of community building resulted in positive student-student, student-teacher, and teacher-teacher relationships. These community building efforts, planned intentionally by Dr. Bobbe Shreve, resulted in particularly low staff turnover. During interviews with Coleen Roller and Marilyn Labrensz, Children’s House as well as Early Education Center teachers, they emphasized the importance of these relationships in their decision to continue working in these two settings.

Two bedrooms and a renovated garage provided classroom space, while the living and dining rooms provided large muscle (Figure 208) and group time spaces. Meals were prepared and served in the kitchen (Figure 209). Coleen Roller and Marilyn Labrensz recalled that meal preparation resulted in their work setting smelling “just like a home.” An important feature of the house was easy access to the large backyard where children enjoyed all kinds of outdoor play (Figure 210), a garden they tended, and a tree for climbing. Students enrolled in the Early Childhood Education A.A. degree program completed practicums and student teaching assignments at the Children’s House.

Much of the curriculum came from naturally occurring events associated with being in a home setting. One example was the children helping teachers wash their cars which led to a study of water and its many uses (Figure 211). Another example was the children being intrigued with the garbage truck that visited their ‘house’ on a regular basis. As a result of this curiosity, the children learned about the garbage truck and toured the neighborhood looking at and talking about the kinds of garbage people were throwing away. The children also enjoyed and cared for the many pets living in the Children’s House. These opportunities provided for important learning (Figure 212), which was particularly true when a pet died. Additional examples of the curriculum included a spring season study that featured the hatching of chick, duck, and goose eggs. This practice was begun by teacher Marilyn Labrensz and continues today in two of the Early Education Center’s older group classrooms.

When I asked Dr. Bobbe Shreve what made the Children’s House special, she stressed the idea of parental involvement. She thought the informal and home-like atmosphere of the Children’s House made it easier for parents to stop by and visit their children, talk with each other about the challenges of single parenting (Figure 213), or study for upcoming tests. The staff lounge, located in the basement, was always available for parents to use for any reason and at anytime. It is no wonder that parents felt welcomed (Figure 214), validated, and supported at the Children’s House. Parents must have also appreciated Dr. Bobbe Shreve when she would either pick up or take home children whose parents were not able to do this driving. The Children’s House was also the kind of nurturing place where children who had grown up in this center, and were attending nearby elementary schools, would stop by for help (e.g., materials needed for a school project) when it wasn’t available at their home.

As time passed the Children’s House would come to be staffed by a full-time director, two full-time and two part-time teachers, and several work-study students. In 1979, care was provided for 27 children, with 30 more children waiting for openings. Campus field trips were an important part of the curriculum, with the children visiting the library, gymnasium (Figure 215), motor pool, and swimming pool (Figure 216) regularly. The Children’s House enjoyed a reputation for providing a friendly family atmosphere (Figure 217), excellent staff to child ratios, nutritious food programs, low costs, and easy access to campus.

Perhaps the best way to sum up the Children’s House would be to quote Sara Bartley, (Figure 218) who wrote these words in The Fairmont East Gazette about time she spent with children and teachers from this center:
A mother taking time during her busy college day to spend time with her child.

Children enjoying playing in the "gym" living room.
Various age children enjoying eating lunch together in the Children's House kitchen.

Children enjoying the backyard while they cooperate with each other and play on a rocker.
This kind of activity promoted various outcomes: working together to accomplish a goal, language development, learning about water and its uses, and fun.

The children as well as the house’s pets played indoors and outdoors.
During a spring picnic, parents visit with each other about their busy lives and many responsibilities.

Under the careful eye of a college student, children enjoy large muscle activity on the bars in Nemzek Hall. Once the Children's House merged with the Lommen Hall-based Early Education Center, it became more difficult to use the Nemzek Hall gymnasium facilities.

Parents and their children enjoy time together playing with paper bag puppets.
With assistance, a child jumps into the pool. Note the ‘swimmies’ on the child arms. Over the years, swimming has been a favorite activity of young children enrolled in the various campus-based early childhood centers.

A photograph taken during a Christmas Family Night celebration at the Children’s House.

Sara Bartley visited the Children’s House regularly and provided grandmothering to the children.
It has been my pleasure to spend several hours a week with the three, four and five year old children at the Children's House...It's been a wonderful experience to see these children playing together, as well as learning to get along...everything possible that adds to a child's growing up is available...The furniture is even the size to fit small children...After eating, each child is taught to put his dirty dishes in a place provided, then sponge off the table where occupied...They are bundled up to go outside to play several times a day; there are slides and other outside activities to be enjoyed; not to forget a tame white rabbit with long ears and legs...All the teachers are excellent and very patient with the children.

Due to financial constraints the Children's House closed in 1986, and then in 1987, merged with the existing Lommen Hall-based Early Education Center whose mission was to provide an educational program for young children. Although it was sad to lose the Children's House, then-director Fran Mattson was quoted as saying, “Overall I think it will strengthen both programs. It's a stronger commitment from the university.” Beginning with the merger in 1987, the Early Education Center would no longer be 100% financially self-sufficient as the university would now begin to provide some financial assistance. The new combined center would be staffed by two part-time directors and six teachers and offer care to six groups of children, ages 16 months to 6 years.

In 1988, 79 children were enrolled in the center. In addition 12 education majors completed student teaching assignments and over 460 students completed observations during this same time.

A wide variety of experiences were offered to children including group time, field trips, free play, dramatic play, story time, large and small muscle practice in the gymnasium and outside play areas, art, two meals and a snack, and rest time. The program enjoyed an excellent reputation in the community with a long list of children waiting for admission. During the 1980s, the Clay County Coordinated Preschool Program was housed in Lommen Hall along with the center. This program provided inclusive education for young children with disabilities.

**The MSUM Early Education Center Today**

The program started by Dorothy Dodds is still in operation today in Lommen Hall and is named the Minnesota State University Moorhead Early Education Center. It serves the needs of about 60 children in four classes of about 15 children each. The program operates on a $230,000 budget with the university assuming $10,000 of these costs. Children range in age from 16 months to kindergarten age (Figure 219). Those children attending morning kindergarten classes in Moorhead are bused by the Moorhead district to the center for afternoon programming, which is a blend of academic readiness, large muscle activities and social skills learning. The center provides care and learning for children between the hours of 7:30 am and 5:30 pm, with breakfast, lunch, and an afternoon snack provided. Tuition ranges from $27 to $31/day/child with a sliding fee scale for students receiving Pell Grants.

This NAEYC-accredited program has four full-time teachers and a part-time director; the teachers and director belong to a state-level union for public employees and do not hold faculty rank. The Center continues the Moorhead Campus School tradition of providing exemplary programs for university students, faculty, and the community's children; experimentation with curriculum and instruction; excellent pre-service opportunities for education majors; engaging student teaching placements; and effective teaching demonstrations.

In all of the center's classrooms a somewhat common daily schedule exists, and includes free play; large group or circle time; stories; music; rest and relaxation time; breakfast, lunch and an afternoon snack; and outdoor and/or gymnasium play. The four teachers value curricula that emerge from naturally occurring events and build on the
children's curiosity. Additionally, the teachers strive to assess the children's learning level and then based on this information provide developmentally appropriate activities that help each child not only experience success, but grow as much as possible. Two teachers from the center were interviewed to gain further insight into the MSUM Early Education Program: Lee Grineski, teacher of three and four year old children (Figure 220) and Jessica Molstre, teacher of two and three year old children (Figure 221). However, most of the program ideas expressed by these teachers are representative of and illustrate the kinds of approaches taken by all the center's teachers.

**Teacher Lee**

Lee told me her thinking about teaching young children was influenced by many early childhood education theorists (e.g., Montessori) and her many years as a teacher. When I asked Lee about her program for three and four year old children, she emphasized the importance of such things as assisting children in making sense of what they currently know, connecting the children's new learning to prior learning, knowing children's interests and developmental levels so as to provide challenging and developmentally appropriate activities, creating engaging classroom environments, encouraging and supporting problem solving and creativity, and fostering the importance of learning to work together. She indicated that these ideas were applied through areas such as, dramatic play (Figure 222), discovery learning, community field trips, appropriate literacy (e.g., exposure to all kinds of written language) (Figure 223) and mathematical learning (e.g., two small square blocks making one larger rectangle block), thematic learning units, and open-ended art lessons. In addition, two or three stories are read to the children daily to expose them to L-R patterns, how to hold books, rhyming, comprehension, letter recognition, and learning to listen to and enjoy stories (Figure 224). Free choice time is also an important feature of her program (Figure 225). Lee told me that four out of 10 hours the center is open is devoted to free choice time. During this time, learning environments (i.e., classroom, gym, pool, outdoor play space) are designed to engage children with certain materials through participation in various open-ended activities (e.g., block play) (Figure 226). Of course, children are always free to create their own activities.

A unique activity in Lee's classroom is charting. Charts are placed in the hall outside the classroom door so they can be easily shared with parents. An added bonus is that individuals passing by can see what the children are learning. Some items charted by the children include favorite types of water, apples, and bread (Figure 227). This print-rich activity assists children in learning about decision-making, numeracy, (e.g., counting, concepts of more and less), and writing. Charting the kinds of residences the children live in and how the children arrive at school (e.g., car, bus) are two additional examples.

If asked, Lee's children would tell you that the weekly swimming time in the Nemzek Pool is their favorite activity (Figure 228), with Lee viewing the pool as an extension of her classroom. Important learning associated with swimming includes pre-swimming skills (e.g., blowing bubbles, kicking) (Figure 229), self-help skills (e.g., dressing), trusting adults (Figure 230), and physical fitness. Children are never forced to enter the water, although by the end of the semester almost all children do enter and enjoy their time in the pool (Figure 231). Great effort is expended by Lee to make connections to the children's prior learning and across various learning areas. Some examples include when children are learning about different kinds of balls and their different uses, balls are brought to the pool for experimentation; when water and the animals that live in water are being studied, the Nemzek pool makes for a great laboratory as water toy animals of all kinds are brought to the pool for playing with and learning about various concepts (e.g., sinking and floating) (Figure 232); and when holes are the topic of study, swim rings are used to reinforce and apply this new learning.

Lee and the children are assisted in the pool, and in many other aspects of their day, by MSUM Early Childhood Ed-
Three to five year old children, dressed in costume, ready to engage in dramatic play.

Some of Jessica Molstre's 2006 class of two and three year old children. Education and care for children 15 months to three years began on the Moorhead campus in 1923—quite a legacy.

Lee Grineski's 2006 class of three and four year old children standing on the steps of Lommen Hall. For more than 74 years, thousands of children, teachers, and college students have traveled these same Lommen Hall steps.
Two children engaged in dramatic play as they enjoy dolls in the dollhouse area.

At first glance this might not seem like a written language experience, but there are letters on the blocks located in the toy truck and written signs hanging in the background.

A student teacher and young child enjoy a good book together on the couch in the 'comfy' reading area. Reading and stories are important parts of quality early education programs with stories being read aloud to the whole group, individuals or small groups of children. Children are also encouraged to create their own books.
A photograph of Lee's classroom. Some things to notice are the print-rich environment, pet gerbil, learning games in boxes, story board center, children playing with the farm set, and a group of children listening intently to the teacher describe free choice-time options.

Two children learning about incline and decline planes with their trucks in the block area. Lee observes the children to learn the ways each child learns best and then structures the environment to take advantage of these strengths.

The "favorite" kind of water chart hanging outside Lee's classroom.
Children and helpers standing on the Nemzek Pool deck getting ready for the week's favorite activity.

Using an assistive device, three children practice kicking independently while they enjoy their time in the pool.

An example of how a student helper provides needed assistance to children in the pool.
As the photograph reveals, there are varying degrees of readiness for participating in swim time. Participation levels are individualized for each child with differing amounts of assistance provided.

Swimming with water toy animals is enjoyed by the children. Many times the Nemzek pool becomes a wonderful laboratory to learn and practice various language, motor, social, emotional, and cognitive skills.

Two student helpers assist children with putting on their Personal Flotation Devices. As with all activities, safety is a primary concern for the teachers.
ucation student teachers, practicum students, work-study students, volunteers, and occasionally by parents (Figure 233). These 'extra hands' allow for added individualization. Typically, about one-half of the children in Lee's classes jump off the low diving board located in the deep end of the pool (Figure 234), while about 20% learn to swim by the end of the school year. The other class of older children also swims weekly in the Nemzek Pool (Figure 235).

Another much loved activity is time in the Lommen Hall gymnasium. Lee's children visit the Lommen Hall gymnasium or the outdoor play area two times each day for a total of 2-3 hours as do the other groups of children in the center. They also use the outdoor play area, weather permitting. Lee provides many different kinds of equipment and challenges for the children to choose from, such as negotiating an obstacle course, rolling down a decline mat (Figure 236), walking on plastic cup-like stilts (Figure 237), or playing with a parachute in a small group (Figure 238). Children can also play with racquets, various sized and shaped balls, bean bags, hoops, tricycles (Figure 239), scooters and a large climber. As in the pool, the gymnasium setting is used to support the learning theme of the week: during a box unit, children run and leap over small cardboard boxes; and to practice various locomotor skills children follow paper bear tracks during a teddy bear unit.

Teacher Jessica

Jessica described her program for two and three year old children as being both play-based and academic with units of study emerging from the children's interests. Examples of this approach are a study of lady bugs that followed the children's interest in observing ladybugs on the playground and a fall unit that was inspired by the children's fascination with squirrels, acorns, and falling leaves (Figure 240). Jessica told me that the children really enjoy using the outside playground. This large rectangular space is enclosed by a fence and offers many opportunities for social interaction, language development, and large and small muscle play (Figure 241). In the middle of the space is a large piece of play equipment for climbing, sliding, and hanging. Jessica indicated that sand is a favorite medium of the children and they use it for digging with various implements (Figure 242), building sand castles (Figure 243), and as “hot chocolate” for pretend drinking out of a cup. Additionally, there is a steel bus, large tire, and several log stumps to engage the play behaviors of the children. Quite often the children role-play traveling by bus in this space. This kind of play enhances play skills, such as learning to be with others in a confined space, taking turns, and helping others. Similar to John Dewey's thinking about curriculum, occupational play is featured during outdoor play: bus drivers, firefighters, cooks (Figure 244), or construction workers. Jessica emphasized that children are never forced or required to participate in a lesson she might be providing, although most children make this choice (Figure 245).

When I asked Jessica about the importance of college students assisting her with the children, her response was similar to that of long time Campus School teacher and director Alice Cornelliussen: “The college students bring a freshness for me as well as the children” (Figure 246), (Figure 247). She added that it is important for the children to learn how to relate to many individuals and that this learning can be accomplished by the children getting to know the numerous students working in her room (Figure 248).

I was surprised to learn about the significance of the buggies used to transport the children around campus (Figure 249). Jessica sees the buggies as “outlets to the campus world—[we] go anywhere we want. [It is how] we do field trips...They are most essential.” She went on to tell me that the children really enjoy their riding time and miss it when they go home. Two major contributions the buggies make are saving time and keeping the children safe and in her sight while they are moving around campus. Jessica takes the children on walks every day, weather permitting, and uses this time to engage the children with the surrounding environment (e.g., construction vehicles, leaves, trees).
When a child is ready, he or she is invited to jump off the low board into the pool's deep end. Adult supervision is provided both on the board and in the water.

Many times children learn best through one-on-one instruction as evidenced by this photograph.

Performing the log roll is always easier when you are going down hill.
Feeling good about an accomplishment can occur through learning a novel skill.

Playing with the parachute can enhance listening, language, social, and motor skills.

Sometimes playing by oneself is needed and important. Dr. Susanne Williams, Assistant to President Barden and parent to a former Early Education Center student, painted the visually appealing murals on the gymnasium walls.
The water table is transformed into a holding place for leaves that can be studied, talked about, and enjoyed.

A Lommen Hall outdoor play space.

A young child enjoys playing in the sand with a toy truck.
Sand can be transformed into anything the imagination can dream up. Here a young child makes sand castles.

Playing house and cooking in the kitchen can be enjoyed indoors as well as outdoors.

When children choose not to participate in a planned activity, Jessica always honors these decisions.
Student helpers assume many important roles in the center. As noted in this photograph, the student is spending time with children and providing extra 'hands' when the need arises.

A student helper brings two children back to the outdoor play space after a visit to Lommen Hall for a drink.
A photograph taken by Lommen Hall on a beautiful fall day. Jessica’s buggie is filled with children ready to explore what the MSUM campus has to offer.

Meal time is usually enjoyed by the children. It is an important time to share stories, practice listening and turn taking, learn about healthy foods, develop healthy eating habits, and try new foods.
Jessica’s students are served breakfast, lunch and an afternoon snack while at the center, as are all the center’s children. Meals and snacks are served family style with the children and staff gathered together around a circular table (Figure 250). This setting provides numerous opportunities for conversation and development of language skills, like turn-taking. Because of Jessica’s interest in the children developing and practicing healthy eating habits, she visited with Director Judy Johnson and shared her thinking about implementing healthy eating policies—if a child wants seconds; she chooses a healthy food item before choosing a high fat and/or high calorie item. Jessica also suggested the center, whenever possible, provide nutritious food substitutions; such as yogurt, cottage cheese, grilled chicken, and raw vegetables. She also uses slogans to encourage healthy eating habits.

At the conclusion of our interview, I asked Jessica what were three principles important to her as a teacher of two and three year-old children. She responded with the importance of being consistent, providing safe and compassionate learning that results in high levels of comfort for children, and carefully monitoring the well-being of each child as children this age are many times not able to clearly communicate their feelings to adults (Figure 251).

Parent or guardian communication is an important and essential component of all the teachers’ programs (Figure 252). There are parent boards located outside each classroom where letters describing activities for the week are posted. Also, notes are posted for parents informing them about what their child did that day and what needs to be brought to school for upcoming activities. Parents or guardians are always invited to observe their child and/or participate with them in the classroom, playground, gymnasium, and/or pool. Various parent or guardian activities and bi-annual conferences are also provided. These current-day Campus School teachers are carrying out a legacy that has always been an important part of the Campus School program (Figure 253).

Although research projects are not frequently conducted on site, the center has provided faculty a place to conduct their research: how a teacher infused literacy into her work, the kinds of behaviors and skills that are reinforced when children use computers during free choice time, to what extent cooperative games affect social interactions, children’s original stories, names as a way to promote early literacy, the descriptive review process as a way to help student teachers assess their strengths and vulnerabilities, developmentally appropriate art for toddlers, how and why gender stereotyping occurs, the effects of electronic books on reading comprehension, and children’s perception of death. The study of children and death became the topic for Judy Johnson’s 1977 Master of Science degree thesis, *The Young Child’s Conception of Death*. When a fish died in the kindergarten’s fish pond, Judy flushed the fish down the toilet. Not knowing she was being observed by a child, this boy remarked, “If I died here, is that what you would do with me?” She assured him that would not be the case. Later that year the classes’ pet bird died, so Judy and the children placed the bird in a box and buried it under a tree near Lommen Hall. This same boy was intrigued with the burial and repeatedly asked Judy to dig up the bird to see if it was still there. After consulting the parents, Judy and the boy dug up the box. To their surprise, it was gone. The boy exclaimed, “See he went to heaven and took his coffin with him.” Later Judy would learn that a neighbor had dug up this tree and replaced it with a different and healthier one. These interactions resulted in Judy wanting to learn more about children and their perceptions of death. This is just another example of how children and their interests dominated decision making of all kinds at the center.

From this description of early childhood education on the Moorhead campus, it is easy to see why these programs, over the years, have enjoyed not only university, but also community support for their exceptional educational and caring programs for young children. When I asked Judy Johnson about the future of the MSUM Early Education Center, she indicated she was excited for what might unfold, but was concerned that the new focus of (i.e., overly academic, less child-centered, accountability driven) NAEYC accreditation might compromise the excellent education and care provided to the children by her staff.
Figure 251

A child is comforted by a student helper.

Figure 252

A photograph of the hallway outside Lee, Marilyn, and Jessica's classrooms. On the right are the parent bulletin boards and easel with center notices, and attached to the wall are the children's cubbies where they keep their coats and boots. Also, notice children's art work displayed on the wall.

Figure 253

A photograph of Dorothy Dodds, taken over 50 years ago, conferencing with a parent of one of her students.
Chapter Seven - Campus School Memories
Perhaps the best evidence proving that the Campus School played an important role in the lives of its students, teachers, and administrators has been the successful all-school reunions held on the Moorhead campus. In the past 20 years, three all-school reunions have been held with attendance exceeding 1500 participants: 1987 (Figure 254), 2000 (Figure 255), and 2005 (Figure 256).

The 1987 Reunion
Over 725 alumni attended the first all-school reunion held in 1987. When I asked Erling Johnson, reunion organizer and member of the class of 1955, why he created this event he told me, “With MSU celebrating its Centennial in 1985, I thought it would be great time for us to have a reunion because we were such a big part of the college.” Later he was quoted as saying, “They’re like family reunions, because the classes were so small, everyone seemed to know everyone’s name, maybe this is the reason why so many former students returned to campus for this event.” Erling added that “I don’t know if this sentiment was true for all small schools, but it was for this school” (Figure 257). Supporting the idea that it was important for alumni to come back to campus for reunions, in 1987 the furthest an alumni traveled to attend was 4,272 miles from Hawaii (at the all-school reunion banquet this individual received a gag gift of an oversized tube of Preparation H) and in 2000 it was from Norway—there were some alumni in attendance from countries other than the United States. Of course many attendees came from the immediate area, however there was a sizable group representing the eastern and western regions of the country.

The Alumni Association was very supportive of Erling Johnson’s efforts as they provided office space and support personnel to assist in contacting Campus School alumni and organizing the event (Figure 258).

Additionally, monies remaining from the 1985 MSU Centennial were made available to support the 1987 all-school reunion. The 1987 event was widely covered by local print and TV media. WDAY Program Director Al Amodt told Erling Johnson that he had covered many school reunions, but not one that had generated this much enthusiasm. Registration was held in the Campus School’s auditorium, which is now Lommen 202. In addition, numerous “memory items” were on display for alumni to enjoy. Some included copies of yearbooks and school newspapers, photographs, and local newspaper clippings. Also, commemorative t-shirts and hats were sold. A highlight of the 1987 reunion was a six foot long cake, designed and baked by the university’s food service, with replicas of the Campus School building, Baby Dragon mascot, and athletic “M” letter on it (Figure 259). The cake served 500 at the Saturday evening banquet. Another memorable event at the Saturday evening banquet was a style show featuring fashions from the 1930s through the 1970s. Fargo’s legendary piano player Hildegard provided piano music to match the fashions modeled for the audience. In addition a breakfast was hosted by Werner Brand and Elsie Lee for 30 faculty. One fun event at the breakfast was a test covering the history of the Campus School.

A lasting memory Erling had of the 1987 all-school reunion was of attendees touring the Fargo-Moorhead community in a double-decker bus. One rider told him, “You should have heard the stories about the Campus School, they were just incredible.” These stories chronicled the school’s early years as the majority of these riders graduated from the Campus School in the 1930s.

The 2000 Reunion
The second all-school reunion was held in 2000. Erling Johnson organized this second event to celebrate the ending of the twentieth century and beginning of the twenty-first century. He also felt it might be the last time many alumni could attend due to failing health. Again, Erling Johnson worked with the Alumni Foundation to contact alumni and organize the event—as in the past, Erling Johnson was provided office space and support personnel. President Barden and Doug Hamilton, from the University Advancement Office, shared Erling Johnson’s enthusiasm for the event and were very supportive of his efforts.
Figure 254

A copy of the All-School Reunion Directory first printed for the 1987 reunion. It included a brief history of the Campus School and contact and biographical information about faculty, staff, and students from the years 1930-1971.

Figure 255

Campus High School
All-School Reunion
1931-1971

August 17-18-19-20, 2000

2000 Campus High School All-School Reunion Brochure. It included a schedule of events, listing of class representatives from 1931 to 1971, lodging information, registration form, and information about purchasing souvenirs.

Figure 256

Campus School Reunion Brochure, 2005. It included similar information as the 2000 brochure.
Erling Johnson welcoming reunion attendees as they enter Lommen Hall.

Erling Johnson, wearing a reunion baseball cap, with two members of the 1987 Campus School Reunion support staff. He indicated that without the help that was provided the reunion would not have been possible.

A wonderful treat enjoyed by reunion attendees in 1987. The Campus School cake brought back many memories and served 500 at the evening banquet.
These Baby Dragon footprints were used to help 2000 attendees get in the mood for their reunion and direct them from Lommen Hall to the Comstock Memorial Union.

A photograph of long time Campus School and university teacher Dorothy Dodds as she talks with 2000 reunion attendees at the Campus School stone ceremony.
More than 65% of the 950 students who graduated from the Campus High School between 1931 and 1971 attended the 2000 reunion. To create a feeling of coming home, Erling Johnson used “Baby Dragon” footprints to direct reunion participants from Lommen Hall to the Comstock Memorial Union (Figure 260). A special treat for the 2000 reunion attendees was a table set up in Weld Hall featuring 11 x 14 inch photographs of all 24 Homecoming queens. Also featured were some Homecoming gowns and crowns worn by student royalty. Commencement and play programs were also displayed. Weld Hall was used for many reunion activities because of the positive memories it held for alumni: Homecoming Coronation, School and Class plays, Operettas, and Commencement. The Homecoming displays were thoroughly enjoyed by the alumni.

A wide variety of events were planned for alumni when they returned to the Moorhead campus. Some included a mixed scramble golf tournament (55 golfers participated in 1987), campus and community tours, ice cream social, lettermen’s luncheon (in a video produced about the 1987 reunion, an alumnus is seen wearing his highly decorated 1948 lettermen’s sweater), informal class get-togethers, formal presentations, banquet, dance, and picnic. An inscribed stone commemorating the Campus School in Lommen Hall was also part of the 2000 all-school reunion. The inscription read:

We came
We learned
We remembered

Ms. Dorothy Dodds, (Figure 261) Dr. Roland Dille, and Dr. Ken Smemo spoke at this ceremony.

In 2005, another all-school reunion was held on campus with 187 alumni in attendance. This reunion was organized by the MSU Alumni Foundation with help from Herm (Class of 1955) and Mike (Class of 1956) Holland. This event provided attendees with many of the same kinds of events as the 1987 and 2000 reunions. When I asked Erling Johnson if he was planning another all-school reunion, he told me he was thinking about another reunion in 2008, but was concerned about low attendance given the advancing age of many alumni.

An example of the gratitude expressed by many Campus School graduates for Erling Johnson’s efforts in organizing the 2000 all-school reunion was evident by a letter written by retired United States Air Force Colonel Julien Burkness, class of 1931 (Figure 263). When I asked Erling Johnson about Julien Burkness he recalled several telephone conversations prior to the 2000 reunion: “He [Julien] was as enthusiastic about being a Baby Dragon at 93 as he was at 15...Julien told me that the Campus School built a foundation for the rest of his life and really influenced him...He ranked his Campus School education among all his other professional accomplishments—which were many.” Julien was Class Valedictorian, member of the National Honor Society, captain of the football team as well as a participant in basketball and track.

He was also a MSTC alumnus with majors in Mathematics and Science. Julien remembered being co-captain of the 1934 undefeated football team; in his correspondence to Erling he made a special note that his team defeated NDSU. Colonel Burkness was obviously grateful for the years he spent on the Moorhead campus; in 1998 he pledged $500,000, thus creating the Colonel Julien M. Burkness Perpetual Scholarship Fund at Moorhead State University (Figure 264).

Positive Memories
As with the life of any school, not all alumni have fond memories. However a Follow-up Study of 1960-1966 graduates conducted by then-director Howard Freeberg, revealed that the majority of Campus School graduates responded positively to questions about their Campus School experiences. During this six year time period, the one-hundred and eighty students who graduated from the
Copy of the 1998 hand written letter from Colonel Julien Burkness to Erling Johnson.

MEMO:

TO: M SU att: Mr Erling Johnson.

1. Congratulations on the reunion.
2. I am sorry that I will be unable to attend. The bullet holes I have been grounded.
3. Mr and Mrs Burkness are living quietly in our apartment on the ocean beach here in Pampus.
4. I am enclosing a check for $50 to help you with the reunion.
5. A brief summary is attached.
6. Keep up the good work.

Colonel Burkness
CHS - 1931
M SU - 1935

A photograph of USAF Retired Colonel Julien Burkness. He graduated from the Campus High School in 1931, earned a BA degree from Moorhead State Teachers College in 1935, MS degree from University of Iowa in 1939, and the Ph.D. from the USAF Institute of Technology in 1950. Julien taught at Battle Lake High School from 1935 to 1937.
Campus School received a questionnaire, and of this number, 117 students or 65% responded. When asked if their Campus School educational experience prepared them for their educational or employment experiences, the majority of these alumni indicated their preparation was either very good or excellent. This finding supported the fact that 87% of the respondents chose some type of post-secondary education option. Of the 12 different post-secondary education options identified by the respondents, nine were two or four year higher education institutions. Anecdotal comments made by the respondents also reveals the majority of students had positive memories of their Campus School days.

A sampling of attendee comments from the 1987 reunion not only suggests a school with a positive legacy, but also supports the findings generated from Howard Freeberg’s 1966 Follow-up Study:

"An excellent education in a small school" (Class of 1933 alumni).

“Our teachers were so skillful in drawing out the good in each one of us. I’m ever so grateful” (Class of 1940 alumni).

“The Campus School was a warm friendly environment, the teachers were caring and concerned and there was a commitment to excellence” (Class of 1954 alumni).

“I have always felt that the Campus School was a great place to learn to live in the world” (Class of 1964 alumni).

“Every teacher was fabulous. One thing that struck me as unusual once I graduated and left was that nearly every Science and Math teacher there was female. I think that was fairly progressive” (Class of 1971 alumni).

Teacher Dorothy Dodds reinforced these thoughts when she told me: “My memories are so positive of the people I taught with; they were stimulating and really cared for education and children.” These thoughts also succinctly represent the stated Campus School objective “to live effectively and happy.”

As described throughout this book’s pages, the school on the Moorhead campus had a long and rich history that can be characterized in numerous ways. Some of its more outstanding characteristics were a strong sense of community, dynamic and innovative curriculum and instruction; student centered learning; classroom life that emphasized a cooperative spirit with “democracy in action;” an engaged teaching staff who valued the socio-emotional as well as cognitive needs of its students; and varied and inclusive after school programming. It is no wonder why so many students have such fond memories of the MSUM Campus School (Figure 264).
2000 Commemorative Candle with the inscription "An affair to remember." These words nicely sum up the feelings of many of the 2000 reunion attendees.
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