

“Some Reckoning of Gains Is Made”: Theories of Assessment in Alberta’s Child-Centred Curricula, 1936–1950

James Rempel

University of Lethbridge

Amy von Heyking

University of Lethbridge

ABSTRACT

Historians have suggested that Alberta’s child-centred curriculum known as the “Enterprise curriculum,” which was introduced in 1936, was not fully implemented because teachers struggled with assessment of students’ learning. This historical case study reveals that the program included a theory of assessment consisting of four major principles, consistent with a child-centred vision of curriculum and pedagogy. Moreover, it directed teachers towards resources and strategies that might have assisted them in shifting their assessment practices. In 1943, the Department of Education began to compromise this vision, resulting in revisions to the program that defined a role for traditional testing and grading practices within a pedagogically progressive paradigm.

RÉSUMÉ

Les historiens ont postulé que le programme d’étude albertain centré sur l’enfant introduit en 1936 et connu sous le nom de « *Enterprise curriculum* » n’a pas été entièrement mis en œuvre parce que les enseignants ont eu du mal à évaluer l’apprentissage des élèves. La présente étude de cas révèle que le programme comprenait une théorie d’évaluation reposant sur quatre grands principes en accord avec une pédagogie et une approche centrée sur l’enfant. De plus, cette théorie a orienté les enseignants vers des ressources et des stratégies susceptibles de les aider à changer leurs pratiques d’évaluation. En 1943, le département de l’Éducation a toutefois commencé à compromettre cette approche, ce qui a ouvert la porte à des pratiques traditionnelles d’évaluation et de classement dans un paradigme pédagogique progressif.

Progressive educators in the first half of the twentieth century used the term “child-centred” to describe their theories and curricula while contemporary progressive thinkers use “learner-centred” or “student-centred” to describe the same pedagogy: students interacting to help each other progress in largely self-directed

problem-solving through personally relevant projects. This congruity suggests that the implementation of child-centred curricula in the past can inform the implementation of current learner-centred reforms. One area of interest in curriculum reform involves the extent to which progressive revisions to curriculum and instructional practice have been supported by a commensurate revisioning of assessment. To better understand this relationship, we examine the role of assessment theory in historical progressive reforms.

In 2000, in her presidential address to the American Educational Research Association, Lorrie Shepard explained how theories of curriculum have come into conflict with assessment frameworks.¹ She argued that throughout the twentieth century, theories of curriculum and instruction increasingly drew on progressive understandings of learning, the child, and the role of education in society. By the end of the twentieth century, they clearly reflected new cognitive and constructivist learning theories. On the other hand, she argued, assessment has consistently been dominated by measurement practices grounded in a social efficiency paradigm. She illustrated how this dissonance results in instructional and assessment practices that work against each other: instruction often offering differentiated opportunities for interactive, exploratory sense-making of real-world problems, while assessment often measures students' mastery of a body of predetermined information. While it is clear that this disconnect between curriculum and assessment exists, the argument that this is the result of a failure to conceptualize assessment theories and practices consistent with progressive, child-centred curriculum is questionable. To better understand this disconnect, it is important to consider whether earlier progressive educators did indeed fail to develop assessment frameworks consistent with their pedagogical theories and practices.

Alberta's child-centred elementary curriculum revisions, beginning in 1936, provide a rich field of inquiry for considering the role of assessment in progressive curriculum implementation. The 1936 *Programme of Studies*, which introduced what became known as the Enterprise curriculum, was the hallmark of "Alberta's grand experiment with progressive education in the 1930s."² Under the leadership of a committed progressive educator, Supervisor of Schools Hubert C. Newland, the Department of Education introduced a new elementary school curriculum organized around an interdisciplinary project approach. The 1936 *Programme of Studies* curriculum document described enterprises as "social experiences" and explained that

activities should be of such a nature as to cultivate the natural disposition of the pupils to express their ideas by speech, free art, dramatization, construction, writing and movement. Their activities should be as life-like as possible, so that the learnings acquired through them will be integrated and unified.³

The enterprises that were initially recommended and later mandated for Alberta teachers revolved around nine themes: food; clothing; shelter; work; transportation and communication; recreation; expression; education; and government, health, and protection. Alberta's progressive educational leaders hoped that the program would

transform the province's teacher-centred, formalist, dull, and unpleasant classrooms into child-centred classrooms characterized by active, relevant, and collaborative learning. Alberta's enterprise vision inspired not only Ontario's progressive curriculum revision of 1937, but also the activity-oriented, child-centred programming of several other provinces.⁴ This strong intentionality in building a theoretical vision for its child-centred curricula, and the impact of its pedagogical vision on other Canadian provincial reforms, demonstrate Alberta's value for a historical case study of educational assessment.

Alberta's educators at the time and historians since have blamed a lack of appropriate teacher preparation and insufficient resources for deficiencies in program implementation. Teachers with two years of normal school training and little classroom experience struggled to understand and implement subject-integrated, project-based instruction, and within the context of the Great Depression and then the Second World War, the department and local school boards simply did not have the financial resources to provide all the supports required for implementation. But historians have also suggested that the Enterprise curriculum was not fully implemented, or implemented as intended, because teachers struggled with assessment of students' growth. For example, von Heyking says that "teachers who grasped the program and planned more active learning experiences, still faced difficulties in evaluating student progress."⁵ She argues that sample multiple-choice test items created by teachers demonstrate attempts to use assessment formats they were familiar with to inappropriately measure the skills and personal attributes related to good citizenship, which were important learning outcomes in the program. Lemisko and Clausen quote Newland as acknowledging that teachers could not figure out how to measure student achievement of "[progressive] program goals emphasizing habits, appreciations and the creation of responsible citizens."⁶ Given the common understanding among these historians about the difficulties of progressive curricular implementation at this time, to what extent were these difficulties due to the absence of a systematic, clear, and pragmatic assessment theory in Alberta? Did curriculum developers fail to provide teachers with suggestions of assessment practices consistent with Alberta's theory of teaching and learning?

At first glance, Alberta's first child-centred program, introduced in 1936, was vague about assessment practice. It explained: "An enterprise is an undertaking chosen, after careful consideration, for its interest and value; carefully planned in advance, carried out according to plan, and brought to a definite conclusion, after which some reckoning of gains is made."⁷ In this quotation, there is a central emphasis on enterprises, which were understood as exploratory activities or projects. These were the child-centred heart of this curriculum: projects emphasized a degree of individual choice in exploratory learning, where each child was actively engaged in building meaning through problem-solving in learning relevant to their lives. Enterprises were not intended to be haphazard playing with learning; rather, they were to be highly structured projects. Yet the role of assessment at the end of this summary is quite unclear: it is characterized as "some reckoning of gains... made." This raises questions. Was assessment unimportant to the writers of this new program? Did they not understand

that new child-centred instruction would require new understandings of assessment? Or was there some sense that assessment needed to be different in this new program but had not yet been properly articulated? The reference to "some reckoning" and to "gains... made," rather than a traditional reference to grading levels of student understanding, suggests that there may have been new thinking at work.

This study reveals that Alberta's progressive educational leaders did present a theory of assessment that was consistent with their child-centred vision of curriculum and pedagogy. Moreover, they directed teachers towards resources and strategies that might have assisted them in making this significant shift in assessment practices. However, officials in the Department of Education began in 1943 to compromise this vision as teachers struggled with implementation. This compromise resulted in revisions to the Enterprise program that sought to incorporate a role for traditional testing and grading practices within the pedagogically progressive paradigm.

In order to analyze Alberta Department of Education expectations for assessment in its child-centred Enterprise curricula, we examined all four iterations of the elementary program issued between 1936 and 1949, as well as supplementary bulletins the department produced in order to clarify curriculum requirements. This provided a detailed perspective on how the department developed and changed its assessment expectations over time. Curriculum support resources recommended by the Department of Education were also examined. The most important curriculum support document available to teachers was Donald Dickie's *The Enterprise in Theory and Practice*. Dickie was a normal school instructor and a key writer of the 1936 curriculum. Her book was vigorously practical, laden with specific classroom procedural examples and suggestions on assessment. The bibliography of Dickie's book included a range of other resources that were identified as valuable supports. These were also included in the reference lists of the elementary programs of study in 1936 and 1940. Given the program's foundation in project-based learning, it is not surprising to find William H. Kilpatrick's *The Essentials of the Activity Movement and the Social Philosophy of Progressive Education* on these lists. Harold O. Rugg and Ann Shumaker's *The Child-centered School: An Appraisal of the New Education* was also included. Marion P. Stevens' *The Activities Curriculum in the Primary Grades* was recommended in the 1936 *Programme* bibliography as being very helpful in practice. Samuel Burr's recommended book, *What Is the Activity Plan of Progressive Education?*, reflected his extensive work with implementation of progressive activity-based programs in American jurisdictions. *The Activity Program* by New York professor of education Arthur G. Melvin was also included. These resources, written by prominent progressive American educators, provided the theoretical foundations for Alberta's curriculum development and also recommended specific assessment practices. It is, however, notable that none of these resources recommended in 1936 and 1940 to support enterprise development appeared in the 1947 and 1949 program bibliographies.

We also examined publications and bulletins that supported Enterprise implementation issued between 1936 and 1948 by Department of Education officials. Some were articles or official bulletins published in the *ATA* (Alberta Teachers'

Association) *Magazine*, and some were circulars sent periodically to jurisdictions. Articles were written by departmental officials, some anonymously; a writer of the Enterprise curriculum, Donalda Dickie, contributed several. The *ATA Magazine* also published official government bulletins that appeared quite regularly to address aspects of the Enterprise curriculum, such as the department's assessment expectations. The department also periodically sent circulars to school boards to clarify and support initiatives related to curriculum and assessment. Circulars from after 1945 have been preserved at the Edmonton Public Schools Archives in the files of Supervisor of Elementary Schools A. G. Bayly of the Edmonton Public School Board. These periodical resources provide important information about the department's vision for the Enterprise curriculum, but also about the practical assistance provided to facilitate implementation in classrooms across the province.

In examining all of these source documents, it becomes clear that progressive curricular theorists in the 1930s and 1940s did not systematically present their understanding of assessment as an assessment theory; instead, they saw assessment as emerging where appropriate from within the broader child-centred instructional vision. This holistic thinking that entwined assessment ideas into the mix of instructional thinking, often without identifying assessment terminology, could lead one to assume that the writers of this progressive, child-centred curriculum failed to consider the profound shift in assessment their program would require. Coming to appreciate how these non-systematic and sometimes tacit understandings about assessment fit together into a theory guiding assessment practice is at the heart of this study.

Constructing a Child-Centred Assessment Theory: 1936–1943

The first child-centred Alberta curriculum was the 1936 *Elementary Programme of Studies*—the Enterprise curriculum. It tentatively framed a theory of child-centred assessment that was more fully developed in the 1940 program document. These documents identified four critical attributes of their child-centred assessment theory that contrasted with the traditional teacher-centred assessment prevalent at the time. This theory emerged from within their description of child-centred pedagogy; it was not presented separately. Although it was not systematic, it was discernible. Curriculum support documents corroborate these four attributes as embodying the child-centred theory of assessment.

The first attribute was using *non-graded guidance of individual student progress* in ongoing and end-point assessment to identify areas for future personal growth. Its guidance of individualized progress contrasted with the traditional assessment focus on graded end-point assessment of teacher-directed assignments and tests. Students were to be guided in setting their own standards through personalized problem-solving rather than being tested and graded using external, teacher-driven standards.

The second attribute was that this guidance was to support *growth of the whole child*. This concern with developing all areas of personal/individual growth was expressed through adding attitude and behaviour learning outcomes that were considered vital to the learning process. These were as important as knowledge and skill

development. This strong emphasis on assessment of attitudes and behaviours in addition to knowledge and skills contrasted with traditional teacher-driven assessment by opening up a whole new area in which students were to be guided in developing standards to help their problem-solving.

The third critical attribute was that the student was guided not only through *collaboration with teachers, but also with fellow students*. The idea of broad collaboration emerged from central tenets of child-centred learning: that learning occurs in response to social problem-solving needs, and we naturally collaborate with those in our environment to help us solve those problems in socially appropriate ways. Social interaction, as the medium through which self-generated standards are constructed, contrasted with traditional teacher-centred end-point assessment of how accurately each individual assimilated external standards.

A fourth attribute was the use of *diagnostic measurement of knowledge and skills to guide student progress*. This diagnostic testing was again called for with ongoing and end-point assessment of progress. This testing diagnosis of knowledge and skills was to enable remediation for student growth as students struggled with problem-solving. Diagnostic tests using teacher-driven standards to measure progress may seem contrary to the child-centred collaborative work of generating standards. However, since this was diagnostic assessment to identify areas in which students needed help as they worked through their projects, it was consistent with child-centred theory, in contrast to the teacher-centred use of testing for ranked, graded assessment.

These four attributes are evident in the Enterprise curriculum document of 1936. Its use of two "divisions" rather than six grades in elementary school, Divisions I (grades 1, 2, and 3) and II (grades 4, 5, and 6), meant that students were to be "promoted" only between the divisions, rather than through grade levels. The program document specified that "for one room schools, the grade will no longer serve as the basis of classification and promotion."⁸ While it acknowledged that urban schools might still need to use grade levels to organize student instruction, it explained that since "a pupil may advance more rapidly in one subject than in another, his grade status may differ for different subjects."⁹ The program document stressed that "in this programme the fact of individual differences is recognized,"¹⁰ so flexibility in classroom organization and individualized progress in curriculum became paramount.

This individualized progress was supported by assessment comments about teacher guidance of individual work. In enterprise work, the teacher was to keep "an eye on the changes produced in the child by the child's activity... [that] reside in the experience of the child; they must be worth-while in the eyes of the child."¹¹ Corroborating this sense of the teacher as an ongoing guide in activities desirable to the child, the curriculum writers stressed that "the teacher who is a genuine educator, rather than a mere animal-trainer, will watch carefully and patiently for the learning outcomes of social activities and experiences [enterprises]."¹²

Towards the end of the program document, there was also an indication of the need for end-point assessment in enterprises to focus on individual progress: "[at the end of the enterprise] some attempt to sum up the pupil's gains should be made" using the four enterprise outcomes of attitudes and appreciations, abilities and traits

of character, skills, and knowledge.¹³ This suggests an orientation towards individualized reporting of progress in outcomes rather than comparative grading of work resulting in final overall grades. Also, here we see assessment moving beyond traditional knowledge and skills to include the attitudes and behaviours of students. The growth of the whole child was clearly valued in the program. And the whole child's attitudes and behaviours were mainly focused on their social interactions, which were considered a natural part of their learning. Productive interactions with peers in ongoing enterprise work would allow each learner to contribute to the learning of the group.¹⁴

These curricular statements outlining the first three attributes of child-centred assessment were brief compared to the treatment of the fourth attribute. This document emphasized regularly that teachers must periodically use diagnostic measurement of growth in learning.¹⁵ Specific standardized tests in knowledge and skills were suggested throughout for checking individual growth and guiding remediation in what were called the skill subject areas—reading, spelling, writing, and arithmetic. For example, the reading section of the curriculum included periodic sections with diagnostic word recognition, comprehension, and reading speed tests for Division I and II.¹⁶ “Standards of Attainment” at different stages of Division I and II were specifically delineated to help assess students' reading skills.¹⁷ It follows that these diagnostic assessments in the skill subjects would also be used when their knowledge/skills were involved in the remaining subjects that this curriculum suggested be integrated within enterprise projects: history/geography (social studies), science, health, literature, music, and art.

This combination of separated skill subjects and subjects integrated within enterprises was a hybrid approach blending traditional teacher-centred instruction in skill subjects with child-centred projects in enterprises, and yet this program makes no mention of traditional teacher-centred assessment. Enterprise use was optional in this 1936 curriculum, and both teacher-centred and enterprise instruction were seen as serving a purpose.¹⁸ The curriculum stated that the skill subjects of reading, language and spelling, writing, and arithmetic were to be given special attention as discrete subjects, and stressed the importance of teacher-directed instruction to develop students' skills.¹⁹ Teachers were directed to plan for six child-centred enterprises during a year, integrating the remaining subjects—history/geography (social studies), science, health, literature, music, and art—where possible within these enterprises.²⁰ This acceptance of teacher-centred instruction as an accompaniment to project-based enterprise learning would seem to call for references to traditional assessment, and yet there were none in this curriculum. The only statements about assessment stress the importance of directing and evaluating child-centred, individualized progress.

The 1940 revision to the Enterprise curriculum went further in presenting a child-centred theory of assessment. It was more comprehensive in explaining the first three attributes, equally adamant in promoting the fourth attribute regarding diagnostic testing, and took the further step of mandating the use of enterprises along with a non-graded report card to report student growth. While the 1940 program maintained the same vision for assessment as the 1936 version, it is important to consider how this curriculum enhanced the 1936 vision.

The enhancement can immediately be seen in the provision of a mandated report card that embodied child-centred assessment. The curriculum stated unequivocally that children were not to be compared to others or to some standard. Children were never to be treated as "failures" and a new progress report would be used that is "not designed for the purpose of comparing the pupil with others of his class, but to inform the parents of the progress he is making in all-round development."²¹ The program stressed new thinking about the nature and purpose of assessment by explaining that this new "*Report on Progress...* makes no mention of 'grades,' 'tests,' 'examinations,' 'marks,' 'passing' or 'promotion'... [which were] traditional jargon... barring the way to better education for Alberta children."²² The strident tone taken about the elimination of grading and, thus, of any promoting or "passing" between grades, was characteristic of the document and central to its vision of child-centred assessment. The 1940 curriculum also mandated the use of the enterprise and downplayed the need for teacher-directed learning in the skill subjects. There was a clear directive that all learning was best accomplished within the context of problem-solving enterprises that naturally integrated relevant subject material, with discrete subject lessons playing a minor and supportive role.²³ This reluctant acknowledgement of occasional formal teacher-directed lessons was not accompanied by any allowance for traditional teacher-centred assessment. The 1940 curriculum clearly directed Alberta educators to embrace child-centred instructional and assessment practices.

Despite being able to discern this assessment thinking within the 1936 and 1940 curricula, neither contained systematic treatments of assessment. The 1936 document included brief statements about guidance-oriented assessment, but said very little about what it would look like, with the exception of diagnostic testing suggestions. No sections dealt systematically with evaluation or assessment; instead, ideas were embedded into discussions about pedagogy throughout the document. The 1940 document was more directive and extensive in its advocacy of child-centred assessment, its language somewhat more direct in using evaluation terminology. It included, as we have seen, some pragmatic talk of how non-promotion would look for students and teachers in the divisions, with methods of reporting in this non-graded system. And, like the 1936 program, it included specific assessment suggestions for the diagnostic testing of student growth. Nevertheless, the ideas were still not systematically presented in one section on assessment. They were found in various places, woven into descriptions of how teachers and students would work with enterprise learning.

This lack of an explicit and coherent treatment of assessment could be seen as the absence of a theoretical framework, an opportunistic assembly of ideas about guiding and measuring student growth that seem to fit with child-centred learning but which are without conceptual foundation. However, the same four attributes of child-centred assessment are discernible in both the 1936 and 1940 curricula, and they cohere around the concept of assessment for growth—a progress-oriented vision. What may seem to be a lack of systematic direction for assessment was, rather, a weaving of assessment expectations into child-centred curriculum theory, a natural embedding of assessment within the process of the learning growth it was meant to support. The means of assessing students was merged into the organic whole of

child-centred pedagogy, since in this conceptual vision assessing each child's progress was naturally done within the process of working with personalized problem-solving.

The lack of separated, systematic expectations regarding assessment might have made it difficult for teachers to discern a child-centred theory of assessment, particularly if they had not embraced child-centred pedagogy. This should not, however, lead to the assumption that the curriculum writers were unclear about their expectations. Other sources recommended in the curriculum documents and available to teachers further clarified the nature and purpose of assessment in child-centred pedagogy and provided specific examples and tools to assist them in implementation.

Various curriculum support documents issued between 1936 and 1943 identified the four attributes of child-centred assessment theory evident in the 1936 and 1940 program documents. The first attribute, emphasizing non-graded teacher guidance to encourage and strengthen the individual learner in their largely self-determined problem-solving, was emphasized in Dickie's *The Enterprise in Theory and Practice*, and in the other books written by progressive American educators. Dickie captured the nature of this teacher role when she said that

[f]inally, the teacher is critic in ordinary to the group, helping each worker to set up as a standard for his own work the very best that he can do, and to judge each piece, not so much by comparing it with the work of someone else, as by measuring it with his own best.²⁴

She went on to explain how teachers should facilitate student reflection on their learning during the final evaluation phase of their enterprise, encouraging them to record the gains they had made and identify future goals for their learning.

Kilpatrick stressed the student's worthy purposes that must be honoured as the teacher carefully works to guide, not direct, largely independent student exploration.²⁵ He contrasted this guided purposeful activity with the "subject-matter-set-out-to-be-learned" approach where the teacher is to "test the acquisition and promote or fail accordingly."²⁶ Rugg and Shumaker supported guidance of the individual with an emphasis on the "doctrine of growth" versus the "doctrine of discipline," stressing the children's work with the teacher to determine and monitor their own standards for growth in work they have helped to choose, rather than submit to the external standards and grading of teacher-directed subject matter.²⁷ Stevens devoted a chapter to a thorough consideration of child-centred anecdotal and checklist records that were prompts to effort rather than rewards or marks.²⁸ She also provided an example of a non-graded report card (see below), using a three-point descriptor scale of high, average, and low, to address outcome levels in attitudes, skills, and subject knowledge, stating that "we do not wish nor need to compare a... child with his fellows or with a standard grade."²⁹ The check boxes for the descriptor scale in the report card were not included in Steven's book illustration.

Melvin emphasized that teachers' feedback regarding outcomes should support the dominant role of the child in self-assessment. He explained that the teacher should check students' learning by constantly having curriculum goals ready in checklist

INDIVIDUAL SCORE CARD FOR USE OF PRIMARY GRADES	
Name _____ Grade _____ Teacher _____ Year _____ (Check 1, 2, or 3; 1 indicates High, 2 indicates Average, 3 indicates Low.)	
I. Speech <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Modulation of voice 2. Enunciation 3. Correct English 	5. Be prompt <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. In beginning to work b. In stopping work
II. Oral Expression <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ability to talk intelligently 2. Ability to reproduce 3. Ability to originate 	6. Use time without waste 7. Be helpful <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. To teacher b. To others
III. Written Expression <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Content 2. Form 3. Spelling 	8. Make response to teacher's request <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Quiet in elevator and hall b. Quiet in quiet period c. Quiet while others are talking 9. Play and work harmoniously
IV. Reading <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Love of reading 2. Comprehension 3. Mechanics 4. Vocabulary 	Attitudes <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Toward teachers and school standards <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is he <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Controlled <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) by teacher (b) by other children (c) by self b. Obedient c. Well-behaved with special teachers d. Well-behaved when no teacher is with him 2. Toward fellow pupils <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. How well does he <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) lead (b) participate (c) follow b. Does he cooperate with others c. Does he make friends
V. Arithmetic <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accuracy 2. Speed 3. Reasoning 4. Use 	
VI. Science and Nature <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interest 2. Information 	
VII. Fine Arts <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appreciation 2. Creativeness 3. Execution 4. Attitude 	
VIII. Manual Arts <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Handwork <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Planning b. Execution (crude or finished) c. Interest 2. Penmanship 	
IX. Dramatic Art <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Executive ability 2. Creativeness 3. Dramatic expression 	
X. Music. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ability to reproduce songs 2. Rhythmic response 3. Interest 	
XI. Social Conduct <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Learning to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Greet teachers 2. Care for personal belongings 3. Care for materials in room 4. Be orderly <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. In manner of working b. In care of materials c. In picking up work 	

Figure 1. *Individual score card, reproduced from Marion P. Stevens, The Activities Curriculum in the Primary Grades (New York: D. C. Heath and Company, 1931).*

form and assessing progress towards these goals, but stressed that these checklists were only to supplement students' key role, or "overruling judgment," in assessment.³⁰

Department of Education officials writing in the *ATA Magazine* during this period also stressed the importance of non-graded guidance of individual student progress. An official bulletin from February 1937 announced the removal of the department's promotional examinations in grades IV, V, and VI.³¹ Two years later, a school

inspector argued that “no other single change in this province has had such a tonic effect on classroom teaching as the large scale abandonment of... the external, written exam,”³² and explained that the drilling and grading of pre-ordained knowledge is antithetical to individual growth.³³ A bulletin published in March 1938 acknowledged that evaluation was not dealt with in a sufficiently explicit way in the 1936 curriculum and that there was a need to specifically “formulate [this]... final step for the enterprise procedure,” providing a synopsis of evaluation expectations for enterprise work that resoundingly affirmed non-graded teacher guidance of students’ largely self-directed progress.³⁴

The curriculum support documents also identified the second attribute of child-centred assessment theory, that student progress is assessed not just in the traditional areas of knowledge and skills, but also in their attitudes and behaviours. Kilpatrick argued that, in everything children learn, they are not learning just detached data, but a whole cluster of understandings and attitudes about “everything that enters significantly to them in whatever is then going on,” a holistic procedure that is like life itself.³⁵

Implicit in everything so far has been a regard for “the whole child.” The conception of “the whole child” carries two implications which at bottom agree: one, that we wish at no time to disregard the varied aspects of child life; the other, that the child as organism properly responds as one unified whole... He thinks, he feels, he acts... and at the same time his body is physiologically engaged... Whatever the child does carries some learning effect to all the connected aspects of his being that are engaged.³⁶

Kilpatrick explained that self-empowered learning was the goal of education, and so the students were to be guided in developing the necessary attitudes and practices that would empower them to choose, manage, and judge learning activities.³⁷ Methods for assessing this whole child were provided by several authors. Dickie stressed the use of anecdotal notes to assess not only students’ knowledge and skills, but also attitudes.³⁸ She said that “the thoughtful teacher keeps, in his record book, a private diary for each pupil.”³⁹ Stevens provided the score card or report card shown above for assessing knowledge, skills, and attitudes.⁴⁰ Burr offered practical suggestions for how teachers could gather information to guide growth in attitudes and skills, such as filming students at work, using the opinions of visiting parents, or using questionnaires given to parents.⁴¹ Melvin, to guide planning and assessment for each grade, provided a sample elementary curriculum progression that included outcomes for knowledge/understanding, abilities, and appreciations.⁴²

Education department officials writing in the *ATA Magazine* provided specific information for teachers to assist in their assessment of citizenship values that were considered central to the attitudes and behaviours promoted by the Enterprise curriculum. An appendix to the “Our Teachers’ Helps Department” section of the magazine provided a formal assessment tool from the normal schools that used a descriptor-based checklist delineating eight attitudes considered necessary in citizenship.⁴³

Normal Practice School					
Citizenship Attitudes Exhibited During Enterprises					
Date					
1. Initiative					
2. Industry					
3. Assuming responsibility for:					
(a) Completion of task					
(b) Care of materials					
4. Self-reliance					
5. Consideration for others					
6. Group spirit					
7. Self-discipline					
8. Tidiness about work, room and person					

Rating: Excellent. Satisfactory. Unsatisfactory.

Figure 2. *Citizenship outcomes, reproduced from the December 1936 issue of the Alberta Teachers' Association (ATA) Magazine.*

Another article provides an extensive two-column list of outcomes for attitudes, appreciations, and mental and physical habits, generated by normal school classes with the aim of supporting teachers in developing character and social education values within their enterprises.⁴⁴

The third attribute of a child-centred assessment theory, that peers support student self-assessment through collaborative guidance, also emerges in curriculum support documents. Dickie stressed the central role of collaboration in child-centred instruction and explained what peer assessment would look like within the evaluation period of the enterprise procedure:

Each member of the group presents his work and is commended or criticized. Sometimes the argument is heated; often there are gales of laughter. Some

pupils are given serious attention, others are joked about their shortcomings, and others scolded; all are helped by advice, suggestion, information, criticism, and even more by the comradeship, the sense of belonging to, and of having one's own place to fill and part to play in, the group.⁴⁵

Kilpatrick noted that collaboration is a wholly natural life process that classrooms must emulate:

[T]he true unit is not the organism alone, but the organism in its environment. Any proper study must include both in interactive relationship... The true unit of educative experience becomes then, so far as possible, some cooperative community enterprise, where young and old work together...⁴⁶

Stevens likewise emphasized collaborative reflection and provided assessment tools for self- and peer-assessment, stressing that “some [records] should be kept by and with children...”⁴⁷ For example, in grades 2 or 3 she suggested starting easy checks on reading and writing. The two record checks shown below were for this purpose, with the second “Writing Scores” record sheet being “suggested and made by the class.”⁴⁸ Stevens noted that the headings were simple things that students at this level could work with and improve on, aided by a basic descriptor scale with 1 being high and 4 being low.

VOICE AND READING SCORES				
Names	Has Good Voice	Speaks Carefully	Knows the Words	Makes Reading Interesting

WRITING SCORES				
Names	Form of Letters	Size of Letters	Spaces between Words	Looks of Page

Figure 3. *Peer assessments, reproduced from Marion P. Stevens, The Activities Curriculum in the Primary Grades, (New York: D. C. Heath and Company, 1931).*

While Department of Education articles and bulletins did not provide specific assessment suggestions or tools for peer assessments, one bulletin on enterprise evaluation indicated that assessment should be suggestive guidance among pupils and teacher, helping students’ self-evaluation of standards in their work, a sincere but “kindly mutual criticism” coupled with “candid self criticism.”⁴⁹

A number of the curriculum support documents addressed the fourth attribute of child-centred assessment, that tests of knowledge and skills should be used diagnostically to identify areas for remediation. Dickie explained that brief and focused testing at the outset of an enterprise helps the teacher identify students who may require targeted practice of specific skills. This results in more efficient classrooms, because “ten minutes with a teacher who understands the ‘elements’ of the skill, how to diagnose

difficulties and to give the necessary 'element' practice, may clear away the trouble of years."⁵⁰ Stevens and Burr also directly address the need for diagnostic testing to check on and guide progress, with Burr stressing that this objective measurement of learning outcomes to guide individuals in their growth must eventually include even the difficult measurement of attitudes.⁵¹ Articles by a normal school instructor and a department official recommend the use of standardized testing to support student growth, and this is suggestive of diagnostic use.⁵²

Child-Centred Assessment Theory Compromised: 1943–1950

The 1936 and 1940 Enterprise programs and the resources recommended to support implementation communicated a child-centred theory of assessment consistent with their vision for instruction. Curriculum documents from 1943 to 1950 moved away from exclusively endorsing child-centred ideas of assessment, integrating traditional testing into the program. A 1943 bulletin signaled a shift in the department's thinking about the enterprise approach. It called for accountability in covering the "minimum requirements" for knowledge and skills within the program and provided an explicit outline of required subject-based "minimum outcomes," using prescriptive language.⁵³ Furthermore, the bulletin recommended that teachers use formal repetition and drill, repeatedly emphasizing its importance in building mastery of knowledge and skills.⁵⁴ In contrast, the 1940 document was cautious about the drill method, and referred to facts/skills as only being important in the context of a meaningful enterprise purpose. The shifting emphases in the 1943 bulletin suggest changes in assessment theory. In this bulletin, assessment was about encouraging thorough competence and should never "condone sloppiness in skills and knowledge."⁵⁵ In a specific evaluation section, it called for a combination of child-centred and teacher-centred assessment. Attributes of the 1940 child-centred assessment remained, in that the bulletin stressed teacher and peer guidance of self-directing progress in enterprises, and it emphasized the attitudes and behaviours that would support their enterprise learning.⁵⁶ But formal teaching to support mastery and retention of knowledge and skills was also strongly emphasized in this evaluation section, suggestive of traditional testing of content and skills.⁵⁷

In the latter part of the 1940s, the Department of Education issued several Enterprise curriculum documents that further strengthened this blending of traditional and progressive assessment. In 1945, Newland, a prominent progressive educator who had been the inspiration and guide behind the Enterprise program from its inception in 1935, resigned his position as supervisor of schools. This resignation, likely combined with the department's evident concern about inadequate implementation of enterprises as seen in the department's annual reports,⁵⁸ led to a clarification of the progressive nature of the program under this new leadership. The new curriculum documents of 1947 and 1949 demonstrated a continued commitment to child-centred, project-based instruction but added considerably more implementation information to support this approach. The 1947 revision of the elementary curriculum asserted that "the programme is not a new one... it is an attempt to present

in clearer and more useful form the existing programme, being based on essentially the same fundamental principles.”⁵⁹ Another revision issued in 1949 addressed “the imperfections of the 1947 curriculum,”⁶⁰ but was essentially the same document, with occasional phrasing changes and additions. A departmental bulletin entitled *Foundations of Education*, also issued in 1949, provided a thorough treatment of the learning theories that supported its vision of progressive education.⁶¹ And while the 1947 and 1949 curricula articulated a commitment to the continuation of child-centred, progress-oriented assessment, with significantly enhanced implementation support, they also explained how traditional teacher-centred graded assessment should be integrated into the program.

The 1947 curriculum seemed open to compromising the progressive approach when it stated that subjects were “to be regarded as fields for correlation [within integrated enterprises],” and “treated in as close a conjunction to the Enterprise *as may be feasible*.”⁶² Moreover, the document included a section that elaborated on the “scientific” grounding of the program and drew on psychological theories to support both formalist and progressive approaches to instruction and assessment. In an introductory section devoted to the “Foundations of Education,” it focused on psychological theories of cognition, summarizing both “Connectionist,” or stimulus-response, and “Gestalt” theories. The connectionist theory explained how, through practice, connections become progressively stronger. Therefore, it emphasized “drill and testing, and the breaking down of subject matter into elements or parts.”⁶³ This endorsement of drill and testing of discrete subject-matter was balanced with the Gestalt approach to teaching “by whole rather than by part and to present clear over-all mental pictures.”⁶⁴ The enterprise activity program was, therefore, supported by Gestalt theory. The document seemed to advocate a compromise between these theories, acknowledging that the “practical classroom teacher may not subscribe exclusively to either theory but seeks whatever seems most valuable in each.”⁶⁵ The more thorough foundations document of 1949 was even more explicit in supporting some traditional assessment practices. While the 1940 program document was extremely critical of teachers’ use of grades to reward or punish students and of publicizing students’ rankings in class, the 1949 document explained that “from the practical point of view it appears that so long as marks and gradings are given educational acceptance by the public and the school alike, pupils will be justified in seeking to improve their mark standing.”⁶⁶

In a section of the 1947 program document that addressed “Subject Matter in Enterprise Work,” the department demanded that teachers attend to the adequate coverage of subject matter: “one of the most serious charges against the activity movement in education is that it lacks any guarantee of adequate coverage of what the traditional schools considered essential subject matter.”⁶⁷ Lest teachers still be confused about the role of content mastery within the Enterprise curriculum, the document included this comment in bold type: “There is no condonation in this programme for inaccurate and incomplete coverage of the basic knowledge concerning topics on which Enterprises have been attempted.”⁶⁸ That the document also acknowledged the importance of “an accurate and complete evaluation of facts”⁶⁹ seemed to signal the department’s return to traditional testing regimens within the enterprise context.

The 1947 curriculum also seemed to compromise guidance-oriented assessment of individualized student progress by changing the two-division structural focus of the 1940 curriculum into a three-division structure, with the option opened up for schools to choose individual grades as well.⁷⁰ In addition, there is no discussion of yearly promotion in this document, unlike the clear directive to stop promotions in the 1940 curriculum. Omitting the stipulation from 1940 to take out promotions is strongly suggestive that yearly promotion dependent on academic performance was now being allowed if districts chose that approach.

Finally, it is notable that the 1947 curriculum made no reference to the non-graded assessment reporting that was introduced in the 1940 curriculum. This was a pillar of the 1940 program, which included a new non-graded report card and the clear directive to Alberta teachers that there was to be no grading, no tests, and no sense of failure in the assessment of students. The implication of this omission seems clear: teachers could integrate traditional testing of subject matter into their enterprise teaching.

A careful reading of the 1947 document, however, confirms that the department was acknowledging a compromise rather than the abandonment of child-centred curriculum and assessment. There were references to child-centred assessment made in this document, such as a half-page section on keeping "Enterprise Records" that suggested that students and teachers compile progress notations on enterprises.⁷¹ There were also a few references to the role of child-centred assessment in Division I, grades I/II. In this first division, the teacher was to be a guide, assisting student independence in ongoing decision-making in enterprises, encouraging student self-evaluation, and helping students develop the proper attitudes and behaviours to support activity work.⁷² There was the added directive to avoid ranking in evaluation: "Evaluation... should, of course, be in terms of relative effort and ability rather than in comparable achievement."⁷³ It is interesting that these few assessment thoughts were not contained in a separate assessment section, were sometimes indirect, and formed the only references to child-centred assessment in this 127-page document. More importantly, it was only the first division that was directly instructed, however briefly, in child-centred assessment.

Therefore, the 1947 and 1949 curriculum documents presented a considerably different understanding of assessment than the two earlier Enterprise curricula. But the department did not negate the progressive assessment vision that Alberta had officially espoused for eleven years. Rather, these documents were a response to concerns about fuzzy thinking in poorly directed enterprise work. We have noted that the annual reports from this time made frequent mention of these departmental concerns, and the program documents include statements clearly responding to educator and public criticisms of child-centred pedagogy. The phrase "it appears that so long as marks and gradings are given educational acceptance by the public and the school alike"⁷⁴ seems a clear acknowledgement of the prevailing educator and parental values favouring traditional assessment. Another source from this time also indicates that many parents probably preferred a reporting system that expressed student achievement and promotion in terms they understood, that is, with marks

and standing in the class recorded. In a letter to the Medicine Hat divisional office, the principal of Irvine School requested that the school be allowed to use its own report cards, since the non-graded report cards required by the department “are not very useful in conveying information to the parents of the pupils... [whereas reports that I have made] allow us to give the parents much more information than do the prescribed reports.”⁷⁵ These pointed criticisms of the enterprise method resulted in curricular suggestions that teachers include tested, graded drill in their child-centred work to bolster knowledge and skill retention within enterprises. This reflects the department’s intention to maintain the child-centred approach in the face of criticism, by supporting it with traditional drill and testing assessment to augment knowledge and skill development. It was, in essence, a compromise that blended progressivism with some traditional supports and accountability.

Other Department of Education sources reflected its commitment to supporting progressive pedagogy along with traditional assessment techniques. A normal school instructor writing in the *ATA Magazine* argued that child-centred progressivism was not just a “passing phase” and countered the objection that enterprises were simply wide open, undirected activity, asserting instead that they required the professional judgment of teachers in guiding student learning.⁷⁶ One circular sent in 1947 explained that the department was reintroducing tests in elementary arithmetic, language, and reading, which they had eliminated a decade earlier.⁷⁷ The department acknowledged concerns with adequate skill development, but also clarified that, although these tests had traditionally been promotional tests, they were now “Achievement Survey Tests,” and teachers were directed not to use them for “promotion of individual pupils,” since their purpose was to improve instruction in the skill subjects. While the department avoided using province-wide testing for marked ranking, they did not extend the same caution to classroom-based testing. In 1947 the department issued an “Enterprise Plan Book” to assist teachers in organizing their enterprises. This included an evaluation section that provided room for anecdotal comments on “favorable pupil growth” in attitude, knowledge, and skill outcomes, and another for “tests given.”⁷⁸ Given that the testing section was separated from the section on growth-oriented assessment, it seems that both diagnostic and graded assessments were seen as appropriate. Furthermore, in 1947 the department distributed a teacher questionnaire on enterprises to jurisdictions that clearly demonstrated openness to blending child-centred and teacher-centred assessment. In an evaluation section, teachers were asked whether pupils rate their own work, and whether peers rated each other’s work. However, it also asked whether teachers gave tests in enterprises, if they assigned marks during the projects, and if they assigned final marks or “standing” in enterprises.⁷⁹ In 1949 the department distributed the text, with commentary, for a film they had produced on developing enterprises that demonstrated child-centred approaches to self, group, and teacher evaluation of ongoing and end-point growth, but also advocated evaluation through regular testing to measure growth in knowledge and skill.⁸⁰ It does not specify whether testing was to be used for diagnosis and/or grading, leaving open both uses for teachers.

Thus, in 1947 and after, the department had demonstrated how traditional testing and grading could be integrated into the enterprise approach in order to support students' learning and report their progress. This shift from the consistently child-centred approach of earlier curriculum iterations appeared to be a conscientious attempt to remediate the perceived deficiencies of the early approach by adding traditional assessment of knowledge and skills, within enterprise work where feasible, or with discrete, subject-based drill and testing. It was not an admission of the failure of the earlier program, although it did compromise the integrity of this program.

Conclusion

These findings indicate that problems with progressive curriculum and assessment implementation that have been recognized by educational historians studying Alberta's child-centred curricula in the 1930s and 1940s should not be attributed to a lack of assessment theory. From 1936 to 1943, a child-centred theory with four identifiable attributes focused on guiding the child's progress was clearly evident in curriculum documents and support documents the department recommended or issued. From 1943 to 1949, a blended theory emerged that added integration of traditional testing and grading into the pedagogically progressive framework of the earlier programs. Therefore, causes other than an absence of theory led to problems with assessment implementation, and these causes likely led the department to their curricular compromise in the late 1940s.

First, there was the unsystematic way in which assessment theory was treated in Enterprise curriculum documents. Teachers would have needed a thorough understanding of these reforms in order to piece together and effectively implement the ideas regarding assessment practice, ideas that were not only expressed sporadically but were often brief and allusive. This understanding of progressive reform may not have been widespread among teachers, given the radical reorientation called for by this progressive pedagogy. Even if they had had this understanding, the documents did not make it easy for busy teachers to glean thinking related to assessment practices. And while many specific strategies and assessment tools were included in the curriculum support resources, many teachers would not have sought out these resources. The department, not surprisingly, considered ways to incorporate more readily understood and managed traditional testing assessment into its later Enterprise curricula.

Second, given the relatively weak training and educational background of teachers during this period, the dramatic reorientation that child-centred learning called for would have been a struggle. Officials in the Department of Education were deeply bothered by the ineffective implementation of the enterprise approach, noting teachers' apparent inability to deal with the necessary knowledge and skill outcomes essential to the subject areas being integrated within enterprises. Teachers would have required a broad base of knowledge and skill to evaluate and guide various integrated projects throughout the year, projects that allowed for significant student independence. Many teachers were ill-prepared to address the pedagogical challenges of a

child-centred program and were compromised by their limited knowledge in the various subjects that were to be integrated within enterprises. Furthermore, short summer institutes offered by the Department of Education, typically lasting four weeks, would not have provided the systematic training and resource development needed to reorient teachers to the significant paradigm shift of child-centred pedagogy. Teachers at this time were more capable of applying the easily prepared for, easily controlled, easily evaluated structures of a familiar teacher-centred pedagogy than the open-ended project work of child-centred learning. Understandably, the department responded to this cause of ineffective implementation by allowing traditional pedagogy in order to try strengthening ineffective instruction and assessment of knowledge and skills.

Third, the apparently widespread educator and parental concerns with non-graded assessment of student progress resulted in a climate that would have made it difficult to implement these progressive changes. Understandably, teachers hesitated to embrace child-centred assessment due to unsystematic curricular treatments of assessment and a lack of teacher preparedness to deal with this demanding pedagogical shift. When looking at the broader social context of this time, we see further reasons for not only educator but also parental concern with progressive assessment. Educators and parents had long been used to assessments that provided comparative rankings, thinking that this enabled an accurate, analytic evaluation of a child's learning strengths and difficulties. Furthermore, this traditional system of graded rankings and promotions was an accepted means of social mobility, with school success leading to social recognition and employment opportunities. Parents and teachers, contrary to the progressive idea that no student should be compared to their peers, typically wanted precisely this kind of comparison, seeing it as a valid means of charting a child's future. They valued the traditional role of school as a social sorting mechanism. Given this climate, it is understandable that conservative tendencies existed even within the avowedly progressive Department of Education, and that Alberta's educational leaders would honour complaints about progressive reform through a compromised curricular blending of traditional and progressive pedagogy.

These three practical causes for ineffective assessment implementation have significant implications for informing current learner-centred reform. If educational reformers are committed to the successful realization of an authentic learner-centred pedagogy, they will need to be careful about opting for hybrids of teacher-centred and child-centred pedagogy in order to ease the pedagogical transition. Diluting the learner-centred vision with teacher-centred options will allow teachers uncommitted to this vision to regularly choose the more easily implemented teacher-centred approach. This will quickly compromise the realization of reformers' goals about growth-oriented assessment to support individual learning, slowing the pace of change. While there must always be an acknowledgement of transitional periods in any reform process, current reformers will need to stay committed to their belief that learner-centred pedagogy has the power to deeply address knowledge, skill, and attitude outcomes when properly implemented. And support for this effective implementation must then be rooted in empowering teachers to wean themselves from

the beguiling control of teacher-centred pedagogy and sustain their commitment to a significantly more demanding learner-centred pedagogy. The progressive ideas of these reforms will need to be clearly and systematically presented in curriculum and curriculum-support documents, with extensive illustrative explanations and exemplar resources, in order to empower teachers in considering and planning for this challenging transition. The curriculum support documents should no longer be discretionary but a mandated part of the library of every teacher. Also, ongoing in-servicing with embedded, sustained, and collaborative professional learning opportunities for teachers will be needed to build capacity for and commitment to learner-centred implementation, together with the support of intentional learner-centred teacher preparation courses in universities. Furthermore, wholeheartedly engaging with the parent community to help parents understand and appreciate learner-centred pedagogy is indispensable in building a learning culture supportive of growth-oriented assessment. A key part of this would be invitational classrooms where parents are not only welcomed but encouraged to become a part of the processes of project-based learning; this is learning that thrives on extensive formative interactions, a supportive role with which parents could be tremendously helpful. Instead of a marginalized community, wary and resistant to unfamiliar change, parents would become consulted and contributing parts of the change. We are under no illusions about the ease with which all of this can happen but believe that the difficulties of this reform process are more than warranted by the value of learner-centred pedagogy.

Notes

- 1 Lorrie A. Shepard, "The Role of Assessment in a Learning Culture," *Educational Researcher* 29, no. 7 (October 2000): 4–14.
- 2 Rebecca P. Coulter, "Getting Things Done: Donald J. Dickie and Leadership Through Practice," *Canadian Journal of Education* 28, no. 4 (2005): 684.
- 3 Alberta Department of Education (hereafter, AB Dept. of Ed.), *Programme of Studies for the Elementary School: Grades I to VI* (Edmonton: King's Printer, 1936), 287.
- 4 Amy von Heyking, *Creating Citizens: History and Identity in Alberta's Schools, 1905 to 1980* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2006), 60.
- 5 von Heyking, *Creating Citizens*, 73.
- 6 Lynn S. Lemisko and Kurt W. Clausen, "Connections, Contrarities and Convolutions: Curriculum and Pedagogic Reform in Alberta and Ontario, 1930–1955," *Canadian Journal of Education* 29, no. 4 (2006): 1110.
- 7 AB Dept. of Ed., *Programme of Studies* (1936), 288.
- 8 AB Dept. of Ed. (1936), 3.
- 9 AB Dept. of Ed. (1936), 3.
- 10 AB Dept. of Ed. (1936), 3.
- 11 AB Dept. of Ed. (1936), 4.
- 12 AB Dept. of Ed. (1936), 4.
- 13 AB Dept. of Ed. (1936), 289.
- 14 AB Dept. of Ed. (1936), 4.
- 15 See, for example, AB Dept. of Ed. (1936), 3, 85, 93, 97, 289.

- 16 AB Dept. of Ed. (1936), 13, where standardized “Gates” word list tests are recommended; see also 14–17 for Division I reading speed and comprehension tests taken from provincially authorized primers and readers and 26–35 for Division II reading speed and comprehension tests also taken from authorized readers.
- 17 AB Dept. of Ed. (1936), 10–26.
- 18 AB Dept. of Ed. (1936), 3, 5, 267.
- 19 AB Dept. of Ed. (1936), 5.
- 20 AB Dept. of Ed. (1936), 267, 287–289.
- 21 AB Dept. of Ed., *Programme of Studies for the Elementary School: Grades I to VI* (Edmonton: King’s Printer, 1940), 25, 26.
- 22 AB Dept. of Ed. (1940), 27.
- 23 AB Dept. of Ed. (1940), 6.
- 24 Donald J. Dickie, *The Enterprise in Theory and Practice* (Toronto: W. J. Gage, 1940), 133.
- 25 William H. Kilpatrick, *The Essentials of the Activity Movement and the Social Philosophy of Progressive Education* (New York: Progressive Education Association, 1934), 9–11.
- 26 Kilpatrick, 4.
- 27 Harold Rugg and Ann Shumaker, *The Child-centered School: An Appraisal of the New Education* (Yonkers-on-Hudson, NY: World Book Co., 1928), 34–37, 62–64.
- 28 Marion P. Stevens, *The Activities Curriculum in the Primary Grades* (Boston: D. C. Heath, 1931), 84–99. See an example further along in our article of Steven’s non-graded checklists (within the section on the third assessment attribute, note 48 below).
- 29 Stevens, 95; the report card appears on pages 97–99.
- 30 Arthur G. Melvin, *The Activity Program* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1936), 118–119.
- 31 AB Dept. of Ed., “Official Bulletin,” *ATA Magazine* 16, no. 6 (February 1937): 14.
- 32 A. B. Currie, “Some Considerations in Being an Effective Teacher Today,” *ATA Magazine* 18 no. 5 (January 1939): 7.
- 33 Currie, 8.
- 34 AB Dept. of Ed., “Official Bulletin,” *ATA Magazine* 18, no. 7 (March 1938), 7.
- 35 William H. Kilpatrick, “The Social Point of View in Professional Education,” in *The Educational Frontier*, ed. William H. Kilpatrick (New York: Appleton-Century, 1933), 260.
- 36 Kilpatrick, *The Essentials*, 14; see also 19.
- 37 Kilpatrick, *The Essentials*, 9, 10; see also Rugg and Shumaker, *The Child-Centred School*, 321–322, on the primacy of attitudinal dynamics in guiding the child.
- 38 Dickie, *The Enterprise*, 208.
- 39 Dickie, 133.
- 40 Stevens, *The Activities Curriculum*, 97–99.
- 41 Samuel E. Burr, *What Is the Activity Plan of Progressive Education?* (Cincinnati: C. A. Gregory Company, 1935), 168–170.
- 42 Melvin, *The Activity Program*, 77–98.
- 43 Our Teachers’ Helps Department, “Normal Practice School: Citizenship Attitudes Exhibited during Enterprises,” *ATA Magazine* 16, no. 4 (December 1936): 34.
- 44 Donald J. Dickie, “A Tentative List of Outcomes for Enterprise Education,” *ATA Magazine* 17, no. 2 (October 1937): 33. Other articles emphasizing the same citizenship assessments but without assessment checklists are: AB Dept. of Ed., “Official Bulletin” (March 1938): 7; H. B. Trout, “‘Democracy and Education’ in Alberta,” *ATA Magazine* 18, no. 10 (June 1939): 2.
- 45 Dickie, *The Enterprise*, 207–208.
- 46 Kilpatrick, *The Essentials*, 19.

- 47 Stevens, *The Activities Curriculum*, 84; assessment instruments are provided from 84–93.
- 48 Stevens, 91.
- 49 AB Dept. of Ed., "Official Bulletin" (March 1938): 7.
- 50 Dickie, *The Enterpriser*, 106.
- 51 Stevens, *The Activities Curriculum*, 84; Burr, *What Is the Activity*, 38–47; see also 168–170.
- 52 Donald J. Dickie, "Enterprise Procedure: A Brief Summary of how to Choose, Plan and Organize an Enterprise," *ATA Magazine* 17, no. 1 (September 1937): 7; AB Dept. of Ed., "Official Bulletin" 17, no. 3 (November 1937): 21.
- 53 AB Dept. of Ed., *Supplementary Bulletin on the Programme of Studies for the Elementary School with Directions to Teachers and Statement of Minimum Essentials* (Edmonton: King's Printer, 1943), 3.
- 54 AB Dept. of Ed. (1943), 4–7.
- 55 AB Dept. of Ed. (1943), 4.
- 56 AB Dept. of Ed. (1943), 6–7.
- 57 AB Dept. of Ed. (1943), 7.
- 58 The sense that the Department of Education was responding to the struggles and inadequacies surrounding enterprise implementation comes through strongly in various sections of the 1945 and 1947 annual reports of the department. AB Dept. of Ed., *Annual Report*. (Edmonton: Alberta Department of Education, 1906–1972). See also the department's 1946 annual report, 24, and the 1948 annual report, 30.
- 59 AB Dept. of Ed., *Programme of Studies for the Elementary Schools: Bulletin II* (Edmonton: King's Printer, 1947), 3.
- 60 AB Dept. of Ed., *Bulletin 2: Program of Studies for the Elementary School*, (Edmonton: King's Printer, 1949), 1.
- 61 AB Dept. of Ed., *Bulletin 1: An Introduction to the Program of Studies for the Elementary and Secondary Schools: Foundations of Education* (Edmonton: King's Printer, 1949).
- 62 AB Dept. of Ed., *Programme of Studies* (1947), 16; emphasis in original.
- 63 AB Dept. of Ed. (1947), 8.
- 64 AB Dept. of Ed. (1947), 8.
- 65 AB Dept. of Ed. (1947), 8.
- 66 AB Dept. of Ed., *Bulletin 1: An Introduction* (1947), 65.
- 67 AB Dept. of Ed., *Programme of Studies* (1947), 14.
- 68 AB Dept. of Ed. (1947), 15.
- 69 AB Dept. of Ed. (1947), 15.
- 70 AB Dept. of Ed. (1947), 19–20, 32–33.
- 71 AB Dept. of Ed. (1947), 20.
- 72 AB Dept. of Ed. (1947), 35–36.
- 73 AB Dept. of Ed. (1947), 35.
- 74 AB Dept. of Ed., *Bulletin 1: An Introduction*, 65.
- 75 H. E. Rosvold, principal of Irvine School, to F. G. McLaughlin, secretary treasurer of Cypress School Division #4, October 6, 1940. Irvine Correspondence, 1939–1942, M85.38.660.379, Box 56, Esplanade Arts and Heritage Centre Archives, Medicine Hat, AB.
- 76 I. H. Graham, "Whither, Progressive Education?" *ATA Magazine* 24, no. 4 (February 1945), 39.
- 77 D. T. Oviatt, on behalf of the AB Dept. of Ed., to Mr. G. Bayly, February 7, 1947. Bayly Files, 85.100.2, Edmonton Public Schools Archives and Museum, Edmonton, AB.

- 78 AB Dept. of Ed., Memorandum [to divisional and city superintendents in Alberta], issued October 1, 1947. Bayly Files, 86.234.1, Edmonton Public Schools Archives and Museum, Edmonton, AB.
- 79 AB Dept. of Ed., *Enterprise Report* [to divisional and city superintendents in Alberta], no month, issued 1947. Bayly Files, 85.100.4, Edmonton Public Schools Archives and Museum, Edmonton AB.
- 80 AB Dept. of Ed., Commentary to Accompany the Film "Developing the Enterprise" [to divisional and city superintendents in Alberta], June 1949. Bayly Files, 85.100.6, Edmonton Public Schools Archives and Museum, Edmonton AB.