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1. Purpose and scope of this overview

The Jenaplanschools in the Netherlands are probably one of the biggest organized groups of nongraded multiage schools in the world. One can describe the Dutch Jenaplan movement as a bottom-up social movement of teachers, schoolteams and parents, a movement that later was acknowledged by the government by being invited to contribute to a new legislature for primary schools. This also could develop on the scale it did, because of specific characteristics of the schoolsystem of the Netherlands (see below, chapter 5 and Skiera 1). This overview is not a systematic and ‘objectified’ review of the international connections of the Jenaplanschools in the Netherlands, e.g. from a perspective of comparative education or a sociological perspective. It has as a purpose to demonstrate the international orientation of the Jenaplan from the perspective of one nodal point in a network and without any doubt the perception from another nodal point partly shows another picture. Not only schools, groups, organizations and networks connected with the name ‘Jenaplan’ are reviewed, but also likeminded networks, etc. I call these ‘allies’ and ‘friends’.

I know there are pitfalls in communication between the ‘Pädagogik’ of continental Europe (e.g. German) and the ‘educational’ world of the anglosaxon world. ‘Education’ only deals with schools, while ‘Pädagogik’ has a much broader field of operation. The same kinds of problems arise with other concepts, like ‘Didaktik’ and ‘Methodik’ (= ‘pedagogy’). 2 I hope in this paper there are no problems in this sense. The quality of the English language this overview is written in is not very high, it’s certainly not ‘standard English’, but I guess that there will be no problems in understanding what is meant. If any reader thinks there could be problems in understanding, please let me know.

I hope this overview also can serve for bringing educational like-minded people together in an age education is threatened by being colonized by a - and anti-educational views on schooling, e.g. speaking about ‘quality’ only in economic terms of ‘effectiveness’, ‘efficiency’ and measurable ‘output’.

Learning from each other and supporting each other – that’s the ideal behind this overview, an ideal that also have its roots in the tradition of the ‘new school movement’.

2. Jenaplan – the New Education Fellowship – progressive education

The Jenaplan was a part of the international ‘new school movement’ after the First World War: the New Education Fellowship (NEF), later World Education Fellowship (Röhrs/Lenhart, eds, 1995) 4. From 1923 Peter Petersen(1884 - 1952), for the most of his lifetime professor at the education department of the university of Jena (Germany), developed the schoolconcept of what later - from the NEF -conference of Locarno in 1927 - was called the ‘Jenaplan’ 5. One can say safely that the name ‘Jenaplan’ has an anglosaxon origin, as an analogy to the Dalton Plan, Winnetka Plan and other educational ‘plans’ of that time, named

---

1 See the list of literature at the end of this paper.
2 See Hopmann/ Riquarts (Hrsg.(1995).
3 Howard Gardner speaks about ‘neo-progressive education’, which implies those movements today that stress teaching for understanding within and across the disciplines (and then all disciplines, e.g. including the arts), helping children develop as a whole person, in finding their own way in life and also becoming productive (in a broad sense) members of their community (Foreword in: Allen, ed., 1998)
4 Also both volumes of Seyfarth-Stubenrauch /Skiera (1996) are an indispensable source about the development of progressive education in Europe, but they are only in German language. See also Hein, 1975.
after their place of origin. Petersen established experimental multiage classrooms, did research in these classrooms, which grew out into a school for 4-15 year old children/youngsters, and developed his General Theory of Guidance in Education (‘Führungslehre des Unterrichts’). Before and after the Second Worldwar more Jenaplanschools developed in Germany. Petersens little book about the Jenaplan – ‘Der kleine Jenaplan’ - was translated into seven languages, recently also in Czech and Hungarian. The 62th (!) German edition was published in 2001 (P.Petersen, 2001). This concise text is after 65 years still amazingly actual and it’s a pity no English version is available. Other works of Petersen were translated into other languages too, but very little in English and those texts until now could not be found again. Petersen travelled a lot, gave lectures in London at King’s College (Oct. 1930) and in Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen (Oct. 1930). In 1928 he made a long trip to the USA, invited by Thomas Alexander of Teachers College / Columbia University in New York, visited schools in a.o. Chicago (the Francis Parker School), Philadelphia, Detroit, Milwaukee, Winnetka, Iowa City and Cleveland Ohio. He gave lectures (also in English) at many places in the USA, led the Summer School at Peabody College in Nashville (Tennessee), but until now these lectures too could not be found.

Foreign students went to Jena to study there and the Jenaplan became wellknown in the worldwide community of progressive educators. In 1949 the experimental school at the university of Jena (Jena belonged to the Soviet zone of Germany) was closed down by the Soviet authorities. Six years later a Dutch woman – Susan Freudenthal – active in the national and international movement for progressive education, discovered ‘Der kleine Jenaplan’ and became the ‘mother’ of the Jenaplan movement in the Netherlands, a movement that probably now is the biggest organized group of multiage – nongraded schools in the world.

From the 1950’s the Jenaplan inspired people in the Netherlands, especially people around Kees Boeke, founder and long chairman of the Dutch branch of the New (later: World) Education Fellow ship and, together with Jan Ligthart, one of the most important progressive educators of the 20th century in the Netherlands. The most important person in this Jenaplan movement was Susan Freudenthal. From 1960 Jenaplanschools were established, among the state-governed schools and the private -governed schools (also fully paid by the state, see chapter 4 of this paper). Now there are about 220 primary schools that are member of the Jenaplan Association of the Netherlands (Nederlandse Jenaplanvereniging, NJPV ). Besides this, the Jenaplan-, Montessori-, Dalton-, Freinet-, and Waldorf (Steiner) schools were invited by the government to make contributions to the new Primary Education Act of 1985 and by

---

6 It was the preparatory committee of the NEF-conference in Locarno – among them Mrs. Sooper and Mrs. Matthews – that attached the name ‘Jena Plan’ to the workingpaper Peter Petersen wrote for this conference. See King, 1967.

7 In the archive of the Peter Petersen Heritage Organization some of these translations can be found, e.g. those in Spanish, Polish and Swedish. Address: Dr. T. Petersen, Steinenkamp 11, D -51469, Bergisch Gladbach.

8 ‘Der Ursprung der Pädagogik’ was partly translated into English – see the overview of translations in P. Petersen, 1972, p. 78. Raymond King (1970, p. 173) writes: ‘Of his voluminous writings virtually nothing has appeared in English translation other than a Teachers’ Manual published many years ago by the Froebel Society (in the UK) and long out of print’. Could this ‘Teachers’ Manual’ be a part of the ‘Führungslehre des Unterrichts’?

9 See the overview of lectures abroad, made by Peter Petersen himself: Klüge (1992), p. 405

10 See the overview of the 1928 - trip and the themes of the lectures given, in Klüge (1992), pp. 209 –210

11 Dr. Robert Anderson, who grew up in Wisconsin, told that in Milwaukee and other cities in Wisconsin, where a lot of people with a German origin lived, students went to Jena, to study there. Hermann Röhrs described the interaction between progressive education in the USA and Europe in the 1920’s and 1930’s (Röhrs, 1998). See also Röhrs/Lenhart, 1995, p. 133, etc. In the national Jenaplan -archive in the Netherlands a report is to be found from Dr. Mae O’Brien, who studied with Petersen at Jena.

12 An important source about the original international orientation of the Jenaplan is the book that was a result of lectures Peter Petersen held in Copenhagen: Die neueuropäische Erziehungsbewegung, Weimar 1926
that reason they have more influence in the whole school landscape than their number would suggest. There is also a small, but growing number of secondary schools who are developing towards Jenaplan. The Jenaplan Association of the Netherlands (NJPV), is a lively group of schools and individual people, with a magazine, regional groups of schools, a teacher education program organized by different Teacher Training Colleges and leading towards a diploma acknowledged from the government, seeking cooperation with other reform groups (also internationally), being very critical towards what we call ‘the English disease in education’: the centralized and in our eyes devastating way the national curriculum in England worked out, with ‘league tables’ of schools in the newspapers. If we sense such developments in our country, we take action furiously (see below). Important for the Jenaplanschools in the Netherlands were influences from the UK and the USA too.

3. Inspiration from England and the USA

In the 1960’s and 70’s many Jenaplan people went to England to visit progressive infant and primary schools in the best Froebel-tradition, in e.g. the Bristol-area, London, Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire. We read and discussed publications about ‘family grouping’, the integrated day’, integration of curriculum, the language experience approach in learning to read, etc. Projects like Nuffield Junior Science and Science 5-13, the Ford Teaching Project and the Collaborative Action Research Network 13 (John Elliott, a.o), Place – Time – Society had some influence in the Jenaplanschools in our country. Authors like Doris Nash, Annabelle Dixon, Michael Armstrong, John Coe, Wynne Harlen, Brian Simon were read and sometimes translations of articles of these authors were published. With many of these people there were also personal contacts.

From the USA we were influenced by ‘The non-graded elementary school’ of Goodlad and Anderson (Goodlad/Anderson, 1963), the ‘language experience approach’ to the teaching of reading (Stauffer), the work of the Workshop Center of City College in New York (the late Lilian Weber, Hubert Dyasi, a.o.), the North Dakota Study Group on Evaluation (Hein, 1986), Linda Darling Hammond – Ann Lieberman – Kathe Jervis, and other people working on ‘authentic evaluation’ from Teachers College/Columbia University New York, David Hawkins and the Elementary Science Study (Hawkins, 1984) and its offspring the African Primary Science Study - especially by the personality and writings of the late Jos Elstgeest (see e.g. Elstgeest, 1971 and 1985), the Open Open Education Program of Education Development Center in Newton (Ma), the work of Patricia Carini and Prospect Center, Deborah Meier and the Coalition of Essential Schools, etc. Many of those relationships still exist, see below.

4. Educational freedom

It is not by accident that in the Netherlands there are so many ‘progressive’ schools: Montessorischools, Daltonschools, Freinet schools (called after the French educator Célestin Freinet), Steinerschools, Jenaplanschools. Among these the Jenaplanschool are the biggest group. The Netherlands have a very diverse educational landscape. There are ‘private’ schools, governed by private bodies (parents, religious groups, etc.) and schools of the national or local governments. The ‘private’ schools are fully financed by the state, on the same base as the government schools. Teachers in both groups of schools have the same salary. All must fulfill the same conditions for quality as the government schools have to fulfill, conditions that give room to a specific profile for each local school and a specific local school-curriculum. The

---

13 See: Heer, A. de/ H. van Tienhoven (1985)
national curriculum guidelines until now give also plenty room for that. This is the result of a struggle (end 19th and beginning 20th century) of religious organizations and groups of parents against the national school and for freedom of education of their children. Two freedoms were established:

- the freedom to found (as many groups of parents did) and mark a school with a particular world-view – freedom to determine the religious or secular ideological basis upon which a school is founded;
- the freedom to determine the curriculum – contents and way of instruction and organization in the school.

Parents have in most areas a free choice of schools. In such a climate also many schools with some specific educational philosophy could develop, a.o. Jenaplanschools. Jenaplanschools are and can be government-schools, religious inspired schools (protestant, roman-catholic, ecumenical) or ‘private schools’ on a secular base, mostly founded and governed by parents.

In the slipstream of the growing influence of economic ways of thinking about schools and education there are tendencies to undermine these freedoms and developing more external control on schools. This could be dangerous for progressive schools in the Netherlands and the Jenaplanschools are – together with other ‘reformschools’ – very alert. In January 2002 for that reason a Jenaplan-initiated national action was started, supported by all other progressive education groups (Daltonschool, Freinet-schols, Waldo-schols, etc.), against the end-test of the primary school, that is used evermore for ranking schools (Both, 2002a). See also the short article at the end of this overview. The same group is criticizing for the same reasons the new framework for the inspection of schools the inspectorate is developing.

For us contacts about ‘quality of education’ and ‘evaluation’ with likeminded groups and individual educators (a.o. researchers) in the UK, the USA and elsewhere is of vital importance.

See about Dutch primary education also the booklet of Boland/Letscher/Van Dijk 1999 (order by e-mail: info@slo.nl.).

5. Beyond dogmatism and relativism

The Jenaplanschools in the Netherlands are an undogmatic group of schools, that succeed rather well in finding a balance between a clear common school-concept and at the other side openness and diversity. All Jenaplanschools share the ‘Basic Principles for a good school’ (see below) and these are discussed and if needed reviewed every ten years, all are working with multiage-groups, have an integrated curriculum with ‘world orientation’ as heart, a rhythmic weekplan with the ‘basic activities’ like dialogue, (a.o. circle-discussions’), play, work and feast/celebration as building-stones. Recently ‘new’ developments like ‘cooperative learning’ en ‘constructivist learning’ are discussed and tried out.

There are a lot of problems in the schools, the NJPV is very concerned in stimulating the development of quality and good and appropriate ways of evaluation, it is not an educational heaven on earth, criticism from within and from outsiders is important. But good progressive practices can be found in many schools.

---

14 An overview was made by Kees Both about ‘Standards and tests: critical voices from abroad’, Schagen: Jenaplan Association of the Netherlands (NJPV) – Both (2002b). This text is in Dutch and there is a version in German too (Both, 2004), but the list of - mostly American and British - literature gives clues about what’s all about. Readers who want to get a copy of this paper can ask the author for it by e-mail.
6. International relationships now

Now a short actual overview (September 20 04) of the development of international relationships from the Dutch Jenaplanschools will follow:

6. 1. Europe

6.1.1. Germany

On the European continent interesting developments are going on. In Germany the interest in ‘Reformpädagogik’ is growing again, but the 'Bundesländer' are differing very much in the possibilities for changing schools in this direction. In Eastern Germany, especially Thuringia (also in Jena!), Sachsen and Brandenburg, interesting Jenaplanschools developed from 1989 on and most of them have some regional and national fame as being groundbreaking schools. In Bayern (Bavaria) is a very active Jenaplan-group - Jenaplan Initiative Bayern - with Hannes Hauptmann as chairman (Hannes.Hauptmann@t-online.de) and Oskar Seitz of Nurnberg University (OskarSeitz@aol.com) as an important cornerstone. In 2003 the first Jenaplanschool in Bavaria opended his doors, in Nurnberg. They also have a beautiful magazine - 'Kinderleben' and the first course for the Jenaplancertificate started here (see also 6.1.7). In Thuringia and Nordrhein -Westphalia -especially Cologn and its surroundings - Jenaplan is relatively strong. In the rest of the country Jenaplanschools are more dispersed, but the interest for the Jenaplan is growing. On the website www.jenaplan.de names and addresses of most Jenaplanschools and Jenaplan-inspired schools in Germany can be found.

There is a national Jenaplanorganization - the ‘Gesellschaft für Jenaplanpädagogik in Deutschland’ – with, besides the Bavarian group, also regional groups (‘Landesgruppen’) in Nordrhein-Westphalen and Berlin/Brandenburg. This ‘Gesellschaft’ can be reached at schnuppbaer@t-online.de (‘Schriftführerin’ Mrs. Felizitas Liemersdorf) and the president is Tassilo Knauf of Essen University (Tassiloknauf@aol.com). All members of this association get the magazine 'Kinderleben'. The Dutch Jenaplan -magazine 'Mensen-kinderen' and 'Kinderleben' cooperate in some way and it’s intended to improve this cooperation.

Important for us in the Netherlands are connections that were made to the tradition of the pedagogy of the late Martin Wagenschein, the grand old man of science education in Germany and other German-speaking countries, whose pedagogy and the view of education that is the basis of that pedagogy has an impact that reaches far beyond science education. He used socratic dialogues with children connected to first-hand observations of phenomena, telling stories about scientists -in-action and using selected and potentially fruitful examples (‘exemplarisches lernen und lehren’) as a contribution towards teaching for quality, that ‘less is more’ (see about Wagenschein also Both, 1997, p. 159-160). In ‘Mensen-kinderen’ a series of articles has been published, edited by Peter Buck from Heidelberg (buck@ph-heidelberg.de). The actual synthesis of the Dutch Jenaplan-concept, described some years ago in the book ‘Jenaplan voor de 21 e eeuw’ (‘Jenaplan for the 21st century’) has been published in German under the title: Jenaplan 21. Schulentwicklung als pädagogisch orientierte Konzeptentwicklung’ (Both, 2001, ISBN 3-89676-336-9). A next volume (‘Praxisband’) is in preparation.

In 2001 the first courses for a ‘Jenaplan-diploma’ started in Bavaria (see 6.1.7), as a follow-up of the pilot-course in Vienna, Austria (see 6. 1.2.) Very useful is also the website about discovery learning, developed by Freinet-people, among them Karin Ernst in Berlin, who was also inspired by the aforementioned ‘Workshop Center’ in New York City: www.entdeckendes-lernen.de
6.1.2. Austria and Italy
In Austria there are also Jenaplan -developments going on. From 1998 -2000 the first national Jenaplan -course (as pilot for an European course - see 6.1.7) took place in Vienna, with Oskar Seitz, Tom de Boer (from the Netherlands) and Kees Both as tutors. In 2000 the Jenaplan Initiative Austria was founded (e -mail -address: jenaplan_wien@surfeu.at). Most Jenaplan -activities take place in and around Graz (s.herker@utanet.at and www.jenaplan.at) and Vienna (marianne_wilhelm@utanet.at). In 2000 an important book on the Jenaplan had been published in Austria, edited by Harald Eichelberger and Marianne Wilhelm: Der Jenaplan heute - eine Pädagogik für die Schule von morgen (Eichelberger/ Wilhelm, ed, 2000 , ISBN 3-7065-1310-2). In Italy, in the autonomous region Süd -Tirol, also Jenaplan -inspired developments are taking place.

6.1.3. Central and Eastern Europe
In Central and Eastern Europe (Czech Republic, Hungary, Russia) after 1989 courageous people tried and try to change schools, including the Jenaplan as source of inspiration. Some projects failed because of very difficult circumstances, others survived.

In 1995 in Hungary (contactperson prof. Andras Németh: nemetha@gandalf.elte.hu) the ‘Association for Reform -pedagogics - Working -group Jenaplan’ was founded, which coordinates and documents Jenaplan -initiatives. This working -group also supports school -development. Guided by the association these projects are in progress:
1. A school for social disadvantaged children in a ghetto -like area of Bud apest.
2. A village -school with one classroom and one teacher.
3. A village -school with more classrooms, emphasizing cultural identity.
4. A primary school with a calvinistic - reformed religious identity
4. A private school with children of parents that lived for a long time in Western Europe and returned to Hungary.

The Workinggroup Jenaplan operates in close cooperation with the Research and Documentation Department of the professorate for Educational Studies of the Faculty of Education of the Eötvös -Loránd- University in Budapest. In the framework of international projects reseach takes place on the interaction of European Reformpedagogics (‘Reformpädagogik’/ progressive education) – in its historical and actual dimensions / projects – and innovation of schoo ls.

In Keshtely, at the Balatonlake, is also a Jenaplanschool for children from 6 -15, also with a Kindergarten. Director is Mrs. Gyongyi Komaromi. In this school there is a strong emphasis on the arts and learning about the cultures of the world. The school has connections to educators in Japan and is looking for connections with Jenaplanschools in the Netherlands too. On their website http://web.axelero.hu/eletfa2/photos of the school can be viewed.
E-mail Mrs. Gyöngyi Komáromi: gy.komaromi@mailbox.hu

In the Czech Republic some new Jenaplan -life can be discovered. Developments are coordinated from Pardubice University (Karel Rydl and Jan Capec) Contacperson is prof. Karel Rydl – rydl@cbox.cz.

6.1.4. United Kingdom
In England, as already stated in the 70s and 80s of the 20th century very important for the development of the Dutch Jenaplanschools, the actual situation of progressive education is very weak. We still have some contacts in England, but rather few. As far as we can see there are some ‘niches’, where progressive practices are still alive, e.g. in the network of ‘Learning
Through Landscapes’ (www.ltl.org.uk) and the ‘Collaborative Action Research Network’ (www.uea.ac.uk/care/carn), in isolated schools (e.g. The Coombes School, see www.thecoombes.com and Jeffrey/Wood, 2003) and some universities and Colleges of Education.

Very interesting were developments at the Faculty of Education of the University of Cambridge – especially the project ‘Learning without Limits’ - www.educ.cam.ac.uk/lwl/index.html. In close cooperation with a group of experienced teachers research took place on about the mindset and pedagogy of teachers who are using a non-deterministic approach of teaching: not thinking in terms of predictable and fixed abilities of children, but in terms of ‘transformability’ of actual abilities, working from a pedagogy of hope and high expectations of children, looking for strengths and potentials, in stead of weaknesses that must be repaired. Conventional uses of tests, especially standardized tests - working within a traditional psychometric paradigm of assessment - are being challenged. See about this promising, at the same time very fundamental and practical approach: Hart (1998) and Dixon, a.o. (2002a; a translation into Dutch was published too: Dixon, a.o. 2002b), and the book of Hart, S, a.o., (2004).

Important too is the research into the spirituality of children David Hay (at the time at Nottingham university) and Rebecca Nye (Cambridge University) did. Not only because spirituality is a very important facet of the Jenaplan – it could be argued it is one of the central concepts of the Jenaplan, from Peter Petersen onward to our time – but because the phenomenon of spirituality of children they discovered is described as ‘relational consciousness’ (Hay/ Nye, 1998). Jenaplan is a way of learning to live in relationships and learning about relationships, is a ‘relational pedagogy’. David can be reached by e-mail (David.Hay@nottingham.ac.uk) and Rebecca too (RMN21@cam.ac.uk). We translated and published a paper of David in our magazine ‘Mensen -kinderen.

We also have connections with people like John Elliott (University of East Anglia), Michael Fielding (University of Sussex) and other scholars, who are critical about the new ‘managerialism’ and emphasize education in stead of schooling/training.

In November 2000 in Northampton a conference took place about ‘Primary Progressivism: A Way Forward for the 21st Century?’, organized by Peter Cunningham of Homerton College, Cambridge, to take stock of the actual situation against a historical background. The papers of this conference have been published in a special edition of the journal History of Education (October or November 2001).

There are contacts with the network of ‘Human Scale Education’ - small schools, very diverse, working outside the public school system. Contactperson is Fiona Carnie (see Car nie, 2001), www.hse.org.uk, info@hse.org.uk. This network is also connected to the European Forum for Freedom in Education/ EFFE (see 6.1.7) and has connections with the Coalition of Essential Schools in the USA (see 6.2.1).

We hope some day there could be some more and renewed contacts with English people and schools again.

In Scotland the situation for ‘progressive developments’ is somewhat better than in England, but also difficult. There are contacts here too, especially with Strathclyde University in Glasgow - the people who developed the ‘Storyline Approach to Education’. Contactperson is Steve Bell: steve@storyline-scotland.com, website www.storyline-scotland.com

6.1.5. Scandinavia

The situation of progressive education in Scandinavia for us still is rather diffuse. Probably in Denmark, Sweden and Finland for us interesting developments are taking place. In Norway a
group of people, with Mosse Joergensen as a very central person – ‘Forum Nyskole’ – who after a hard struggle of some years succeeded in initiating Jenaplanschools in the Netherlands and their international relationships: in 2004 an independent school opened - see their website www.nyskole.org; email: post@nyskole.org.

6.1.6. Belgium
In Belgium (the Flemish part) a strong progressive movement is that of the ‘Experience Oriented Education’, based at Leuven -University and directed by Ferre Laevers. Their conception of ‘experience’ is very close to that of Carl Rogers and many people are attracted by it, also in the Netherlands (including Jenaplanschools) and in their way they are doing very good things. Concepts from this ‘Experience Oriented Education’ like ‘engagement’ (connected with the concept of ‘flow’), ‘wellbeing’ and ‘enrichment of the environment’ had some influence on the quality criteria of a modern Jenaplanschool formulated in Jenaplan 21. One of these is: ‘A Jenaplanschool is an experience-oriented school’ (Both, 1997/2001).

Information in English is available (email: cego@ped.kuleuven.ac.be). In Flanders there are some Jenaplanschools (contact by e-mail: acacia@gent.be), these schools chose to become a Flemish section of the Jenaplan Association in the Netherlands. There are also other signs of some new Jenaplan-inspired activities, also as the result of a national course about Jenaplan-education for schoolleaders in the spring of 2002 (email: Maxime.Trippas@wol.be).

Also at Leuven University is Geert Kelchtermans a professor on educational policy and school development. He studied the innovative aspects of the Dutch Jenaplan movement (in some way building on the study of Skiera, 1982) and discovered the crucial role of autobiographical factors in educational innovative movements, but also in the professional development of teachers and school teams (e.g. Kelchtermans, 1993 and 1999) Email: Geert.Kelchtermans@ped.kuleuven.ac.be. In the German-speaking part of Belgium Jenaplan has rooted somehow.

6.1.7. Europe general
We know little about developments in other countries. We know e.g. that in Switzerland there are small beginnings and we sometimes hear from other countries.

Interesting is the development of an Europewide inservice-course for a masters-degree for ‘progressive education’ (TRADE – Teaching, Reactivating, Progressive education, Accompanying, Developing, Evaluating) - people, schools and movements (for general information about TRADE: eichelb@pab.asn-wien.ac.at). The development-phase has been finished - and courses are in preparation or starting in the different countries. In Germany (Nurnberg University) in October 2001 the first inservice ‘Jenaplan-Diplomkurs’ started as an initiative of the Jenaplan Initiative Bayern and is also an offspring of TRADE. For more information about this course: www.jenaplan.de and Oskar Seitz: orseitz@ewf.uni-erlangen.de. In Munnich a course started too with student-teachers and there is a cooperation between this one and that in Nurnberg in the sense that for all the final part of the course takes place under resposnsiblity of Nurnberg University. Two tutors from the Netherlands – Hubert Winters and Freek Velthausz participate in Munnich. In other parts of Germany there is also interest in this course.

Within these courses actual developments in multiage- and nongraded education also should be studied. At the moment the language in this network is predominantly German, but English will be the second international language.

We need very much educational research - more fundamental and more practice-oriented small-scale research (‘action-research’). In Germany the University of Giessen had an important function in stimulating and documenting research, but the 'Jenaplan’ –
Forschungsstelle' has been closed down. We hope in the slipstream of TRADE research can be reactivated (teachers - students have to do some research too in this course) and that one or more other universities can take over the function of Giessen. We are for that reason very much interested in research in and about nongraded education worldwide!

An potential important organization is the European Forum for Freedom in Education (EFFE), in which also progressive organizations, schools and individual people are participating www.effe-eu.org.

A Consortium of Institutes for Development and Research in Education in Europe (CIDREE) published a book that is very important for Jenaplanschools and other progressive movements: Turning the Perspective. New outlooks for education (Bachmann, a.o. 2001 – orders at cidree@slo.nl). It contains essays on a.o. ‘school ethos’ (by Luc Stevens), the role of imagination (by Kieran Egan), school improvement as a process of problem solving (Uwe Hameyer), social learning, value orientation, quality development and a democratic school culture (Heinz Schirp), the integration of internal and external evaluation (Roger Standaert). The new perspective that the title mentions is explained in this way: ‘We look at education from a reversed perspective, focusing on the position of and the significance for the children. Education and development are about children. Systems, subject matter, teaching resources and evaluation instruments are subordinate to the development of children. In our society these attributes have gained such a dominant position that they almost seem to govern the development of the child. When we talk about turning the perspective, we are talking about restoring the central position and responsibility of children in learning and development processes.’

6.2. Outside of Europe

6.2.1. USA now

Some of the relationships we had are still there. Some years ago I made a new link with Robert Anderson, together with John Goodlad author of the book on ‘The nongraded elementary school’. He is president of an organization ‘Pedamorphosis’ in Tampa (Florida), that is concerned with leadership - development and supervision in education. They distribute a magazine – ‘Wingspan’ – with articles and with documentation of publications that came out. Wingspan has readers in about 20 countries. Many issues of Wingspan can be found in the national Jenaplanlibrary of the Netherlands. Some years ago Bob tried to organize an International Registration of Non Graded Schools (IRONS), but at that time did not succeed in it. Perhaps now there are new possibilities for something like that, that can develop from an international overview like this. Together with Barbara Pavan he wrote the book ‘Non-gradedness – making it happen’ (Anderson/Pavan, 1993). In the Phi Delta Kappan issue of January 2000 he took stock of the actual situation of school in the USA, saying that very little of the ‘big ideas’ for school - change are totally new. We cannot repeat the past, but it is very unwise forgetting the good ideas and experiences from the progressive tradition. We have to evaluate them critically and build on them (Anderson 2000). In January 2002 he visited the Netherlands – meeting Jenaplanpeople, visiting schools - and Germany - meeting Hermann Röhrs and Volker Lenthart in Heidelberg. By reading Wingspan the Australian organization of nongraded schools (see 7.2.2) was discovered. There are plans to publish about the Jenaplan in next issues of Wingspan.

The name ‘Pedamorphosis’ was taken over from the Dutch Jenaplan - magazine ‘Pedomorfose’, the forerunner of the magazine ‘Mensen - kinderen’. Bob Anderson was befriended with Susan Freudenthal and other Dutch Jenaplan - people.
The address of Pedamorphosis is P.O. Box 271669, Tampa FL 33688-1669, USA, Fax. -1-8139626598. Email of Robert Anderson: rh.anders@tampabay.rr.com

There are also still contacts with other people and groups mentioned above:

- Hubert and Rebecca Dyasi of the Workshop Center of City College, New York – a marvellous learning place for teachers, a ‘mother’ of many of such places in the world (Alberty, a.o. 1981), including ‘Lernwerkstätte’ in Germany (Karin Ernst, u.a., 1996) – ‘Workshops for discovery-learning’ (see under 6.1.1). Email of Hubert Dyasi: hubcc@cunyum.cuny.edu

- Nel Noddings and her pedagogy of care (Teachers College/Columbia University: Noddings, 1992) influenced our thinking about the structure of secondary schools – continuity (in stead of fragmentation) in space, teacher-pupil-relationship, time, but also seeing the contents of the curriculum in primary- and secondary schools as fields for learning to live in relationships and learning to think about these relationships. ‘World orientation’ in the Jenaplan has as very central aims learning to live in relationships and learning to think about these relationships (see e.g. Both, 2001 for the influence of this pedagogy of care).

- The North Dakota Study Group on Evaluation (NDSG) This ‘informal network of people – among them George Hein of Lesley College, Eleanor Duckworth of the Harvard Graduate School of Education (see Duckworth, 2002), Kathe Jervis and Patricia Carini (see below), to mention some of the people who inspired us – who share some of the same values and experiences, linking different progressive education persons in the USA, was founded as a reaction on the first beginnings of statewide testing in the 1970’s (Hein, 1986). The initiative came from Vito Perrone, then Dean of the Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of North Dakota (Grand Forks), later at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. At the moment Jay and Helen Featherstone are very prominent in the operation of the NDSG. This group also published a series of monographs and almost all of them are part of the Susan Freudenthal Library, the national Jenaplan-Library of the Netherlands. A list of these monographs can be obtained from Mrs. Beverley Solseng at the University of North Dakota, email: beverly_solseng@und.nodak.edu

- The network of the Prospect Center (Patricia Carini, a.o.). The first five basic -principles of Jenaplan Education – centred around the acknowledgement of uniqueness, authenticity, relationality, wholeness/integrity and creativity of the child – are also basic for the work of Carini and Prospect.

What’s more important: these basic principles are made ‘operational’ by the Prospect -people in procedures of documentation children’s development and the ‘Descriptive Review of the Child’. In these well -prepared sessions the participants study one child in depth, searching for the strengths of this child as a central aim. The result of these reviews of individual children is also sensitizing teachers for the capacities of children in general. Children can and do participate in these ‘reviews’ and also parents can participate.

The whole idea of ‘authentic learning’ and ‘authentic evaluation can be found in the work of Prospect.

The recent books ‘From Another Angle. The Prospect Center’s Descriptive Review of the Child’ (Himley/Carini 2000) and ‘Starting Strong: A Different Look at Children, Schools and Standards (Carini/Featherstone, 2001) are most welcome! And one is working on some more books, as Carini wrote.
The organization of Prospect, with emphasizing a network of local groups of teachers, who educate themselves in this kind of child-study, with regional and national conferences and courses is also an inspiring perspective for Jenaplan people. They also have a newsletter. Website: www.prospectcenter.org. Email: prospect@sover.net.

Recently Pat Carini wrote about her experience of the actual educational climate in the USA:

‘…. an era of regressiveness in education across the country on a scale never experienced in my lifetime. How hard it is for teachers to make room for children, their play and learning, when even 5 year olds are denied recess and testing has assumed maniacal intensity. So, of course, this is the time when what Prospect can offer is most needed.’ ……………

‘What I know is that we who have other visions must both persist and resist -- and continually commit and recommit ourselves to the hard, recursive work of keeping the door ajar so these visions of a humane education do not slip altogether from view and from practice’ (personal communication, December 2001).

-Kathe Jervis and other people of the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST) at Teachers College/ Columbia University, that are active in the area of authentic evaluation (kj29@pop.columbia.edu). Kathe wrote the book ‘Eyes on the Child: Three Portfolio Stories’ (Jervis, 1996). She has also a very active role in the North Dakota Study Group on Evaluation and there are close connections with the Prospect Network and the Coalition of Essential Schools (see below).

There is also a link between the work of Kathe Jervis and Germany – the work of Felix Winter at the Bielefeld University (felix.winter@uni-bielefeld.de and the website www.portfolio-schule.de) on authentic evaluation / portfolio.

-The Coalition of Essential Schools (CES), including the famous ‘Central Park East Schools’ in New York City, schools that are very like a Jenaplan school (Meier,1995, ISBN 0 –8070-3111-9). See for the ‘common principles’ of the Coalition on www.essentialschools.org. Kathy Simon summarized for this overview the vision of CES in this way: ‘CES stands for certain essential elements of good practice: Schools and classes have to be small enough so that teachers and kids have warm, trusting relationships and so that instruction can be personalized. Students should be engaged in authentic tasks and assessments should be directed at providing information to improve teaching. Schools should work actively to redress the inequalities that have plagued our educational system’.

Features are a.o. connecting (in secondary schools!) a small team of teachers to a small group – e.g. 80 - of pupils (teamteaching, ‘schools into schools’), authentic evaluation, pupil-participation in decisionmaking, etc.

A central concept in the Coalition of Essential Schools is ‘Habits of Mind’ – thinking habits like persisting, managing impulsivity, listening with understanding and empathy, questioning and posing problems, creating – imagining – innovating, finding humor. In a series of 4 booklets (Costa/ Kallick 2000 a -d) 16 of these types of intelligent behaviour are made accessible to teachers and schools.

Most interesting is here the concept of ‘disposition’ that is challenging current notions of intelligence, as “as a pervasive, monolithic mental ability summed up by IQ and Charles Spearman’s “g” factor, a statistical construct representing general intelligence …. “ … “High mental ability alone may serve us well when we’re sitting at a desk …. But good habits of mind keep us going in the rest of the world”. These intelligent behaviours can be learned. Many pupils do not lack intelligence, “but the habits of mind that provide for ongoing

16 See Allen, 1998. In a ‘ companion’ to this book (Blythe, a.o., 1999) assessment strategies are described that can be used by groups of teachers, among them the ‘ Descriptive review of a child’ and some other ways of examine and discuss student work, like the ‘ Tuning Protocol’ and the ‘ Collaborative Assessment Conference’. 
alertness to shortfalls in learning”. Important is ‘intelligent behaviour in the real world’ (Perkins in the foreword of Costa/Kallick, 2000a; also Perkins, 1995). Here is an interesting link possible with the work of the ‘Learning without Limits’ project in England (see 7.1.4).

The way the ‘Coalition’ is organized is very interesting for groups of schools who want to organize themselves on a national scale—sharing ‘common principles’ and safeguarding diversity, but also challenging each other.

By way of the internet (looking at ‘nongraded; education’ and ‘multiage; education’) other schools, organisations and websites in the USA were discovered that can have potential for us for a fruitful communication.

6.2.2. Australia

By way of Wingspan the existence of the Multi Age Association of Queensland (Australia) was discovered, a sister-organization of the Jenaplan Association of the Netherlands. This group is growing, also beyond Queensland, has an own magazine—Free to Learn—that is published two times a year, organizes a big conference for teachers once a year. In ‘Free to Learn’ of December 2001 the opening address of the Director General of Education of Queensland to the Free to Learn Conference of 2001 is published. Some citations from this address:

‘We all know that different students learn in different ways. And so through Queensland State Education 2010 strategies, we are creating pathways for students that are variable and take account of differing starting points and destinations. Part of this work involves supporting and promoting educational practices that are innovative and effective in delivering quality outcomes for students, practices such as multiage grouping.

Many of you are wary of the New Basics trial currently underway within Education Queensland. I think that this initiative holds enormous interest for those of us passionate about finding new and effective ways of learning.

We know that we need new skills in our rapidly changing world. The New Basics approach focuses on students developing critical thinking, problem solving and lifelong learning skills and applying them to real life tasks and activities. These are obviously concepts that are not new to advocates of multiage….

Increasingly schools are beginning to explore the advantages of nongraded and multiage approaches and it is through conferences such as this one that they are able to gather much valuable information and establish networks for future support and cooperation.’

See their website: www.maaq.org.au. They are now in a process of changing into an all-Australian Association: The Australian Association of Multiage Education (AAME).

At the School of Education of the University of New England in Armidale (New South Wales) Linley Llloyd works as a teacher educator and a researcher on nongraded and multiage education (Lloyd, 1999). During the summer of 2002 she came to the Netherlands, visited Jenaplanschools and also gave a lecture about multiage education for a group of German teachers from the Jenaplancourse in Nurnberg (see 6.1.7) who had a weeklong excursion to Jenaplanschools in the Netherlands and after her stay in the Netherlands also went to Jena. Her e-mail address is lloyd@pobox.une.edu.au.

7. Israel, Japan and elsewhere

In Israel the development of ‘democratic schools’ is interesting and important (see http://www.forward.com/issues/2004/04.01.23/education10.html). And the same is the interest for
nongraded education in Japan. The Japanese government supports research on alternatives in education, a.o. nongradedness. Mrs. Yukiyo Nishida (yukiyo.nishida@st-catherines.oxford.ac.uk) was sent to Oxford University to study nongradedness in different countries, including the Netherlands, leading to a doctoral thesis. And Mrs. Naoko Richters – Yasumoto, (naoko.yasumoto@planet.nl), living in the Netherlands, wrote a book about the educational system in the Netherlands that has been published in Japan (September 2004), in which she also writes about Jenaplanschools. She now started writing a book in Japanese that deals on Jenaplan education only.

It’s possible elsewhere there are also Jenaplan-like or – inspired developments. If so, please let me know! The basic principles of the Jenaplan are very inclusive – if schools, groups or people are recognizing themselves in these principles, I would be very grateful to hear about that.

8. The Netherlands

In some way developments taking place in the Netherlands are also connected to international developments. I summarize them very brief:

1. Concept-development.
   The theory about the role of conceptual models (Goodlad - Planning and Organizing for Teaching, 1963) in school-development helped us to keep the Jenaplan-concept dynamic. Suus Freudenthal described the Jenaplan as an open model - open for local varieties and open in time for enrichment from new developments in practice and research and from developments in society.

   The last eight years the NJPV concentrated its work in this area. The most important products are:
   a. The 20 Basic Principles - as a common ’platform’ for planning and evaluating and for acting in daily practice. All school-members of the Jenaplan-Association in the Netherland have to include them in their school-program and school development-plan. The ‘Gesellschaft für Jenaplanpädagogik in Deutschland’ has also these principles as basis.
   b. An open framework for helping schools to translate the basic-principles in their schools – described in the already mentioned book: Jenaplan 21. This work also defines criteria for the quality of Jenaplan-education, as an operationalisation of the Basic Principles. In some way these kind of publications serve as an integration of new developments into a ’creative synthesis’ (as Peter Petersen called it), as a help for the orientation of the schools and a framework for communication and learning from each other.
   c. A written image (like a written film) of a how school that is working and developing from the framework of ‘Jenaplan 21’ could be – its fiction, but fiction that, under some conditions, can be realized. Schools and individual teachers (and student-teachers) can use this image as a means for ’mirroring’ their own praxis - as a part of quality-development - often un- or half-conscious concepts and values can be revealed in this process.

2. Renewal of the pre- and inservice-education of teachers - based on a framework of the personal-professional development of teachers from their pre-service education till the end of their teaching-carreer. A fundamental metaphor for this development is living and working with children as a journey. The TRADE-Jenaplan-course is partly conceptualized in this way.

3. Developing strategies and means for documenting learning-processes of children and teachers, for evaluating and the development of quality consistent with the philosophy of the Jenaplan. There we are learning a lot of developments like ‘authentic evaluation’, the
‘descriptive review of children’ as Patricia Carini and the Prospect Network developed, portfolio, etc.

These are the most important projects that took and still take place for the primary phase in the Jenaplanschools in the Netherlands. Secondary schools as Jenaplanschools are in our country still in the beginning of their development.

2. Preservice education of teachers

The Teacher’s Colleges that have a Jenaplan-course, sometimes offer possibilities to students to work in schools abroad as part of their courses. I know about students going to Germany, Austria, Chech Republic, Russia, the USA, Australia (at that time not knowing about Jenaplan-related schools there), West-Africa. Relationships with schools and institutes in these and other countries should be maintained and developed further.

Several times students from abroad do study for some period at a Teacher’s College in our country, also specializing in some way in Jenaplan education. We need very much more materials about the Jenaplan in English, to sustain these kind of activities, because these foreign students mostly are very enthusiastic about Jenaplan and could do something in this direction in their own country.

8. Next steps

A difficulty for us in developing international relationships is the lack of sufficient good texts about the Jenaplan in English. We need pamphlets (there are some) and more systematic introductions and descriptions and analyses of practice. In the end some publication in English like ‘Jenaplan 21’ mentioned above would be fine.

It’s also important trying to find texts in English of Peter Petersen. As we saw he gave lectures in London and Scotland, a ‘Teachers Manual’ had been published by the Froebel Society in England, he visited in 1928 the USA and gave there lectures too, had as a visiting professor in Nashville (June-August 1928) a demonstration-class at Peabody College. Perhaps we can find some texts back.

We are also looking for professors and other people in the UK and USA, who are interested in the history of progressive education worldwide and in comparative education. Maybe they could help.

In the meantime we try to strengthen the relationships of the Jenaplan with the English-speaking world, by:

1. Improving the information in English on our website – www.jenaplan.nl
2. Making links on our website to websites about nongraded and multi-age education.

ADVICE ABOUT REAL GOOD SITES, ABOUT SCHOOL-PRACTICE AND RESEARCH IS VERY WELCOME!!

3. Linking the Dutch website with each other and with sites in English-speaking countries.
4. Asking the Germans and Norwegians to put information in English on their sites and also making links to schools in their countries.
5. Inviting people to come here, visiting schools and work with us and finding money for that.
6. Looking for Jenaplan-like developments in secondary education elsewhere and learning from that: collecting descriptions of experiences, research, etc., publishing about it. Inviting people if possible, making a study-tour, etc.
Several texts are collected into: Kees Both (ed.) (2001), Jenaplanschool in the Netherlands – A Reader: jenaplanbureau@planet.nl
National campaign against test

From the Frankfurter Rundschau, 3-01-02

Discontent is growing in Dutch primary schools (4-12-years-old) at the way both Education Inspectorate and press are figuring when it comes to safeguarding the quality of education and development of schools.

Very much importance is given to the so-called 'final test' at the end of primary school.

There is, however, no legal justification to make the schools use this test.

It used to be part of the advice given to parents on which type of secondary education would suit their child best. It used to function as a mere supplement to what the school itself held to be wise to advise.

This same test has gradually developed into an instrument assessing the 'quality of a school' by the Inspectorate.

On the Inspectorate's website anybody can find the data of the tests and some quality papers have published lists based on this information ('school-ranking'), labelling schools either 'good' or 'bad'.

There is a tendency for schools for secondary education to ignore the information given by the primary schools and only to take interest in the scores of the final testing.

Among the number of tests existing the final test of the Central Institute for Development of Tests (Cito) in Arnhem is used at about 90% of the schools.

Due to the unprofitable side-effects of this final test 7 cooperating organizations of alternative schools have raised their voice in a protest, indicating that they will no longer be party to this test. These are the Association of Jenaplan-, Dalton-, Steiner- and Freinet-schools and 3 other organizations.

On January 29th, more than 7000 primary schools received a letter in which they were asked to forestall this test.

Schools were asked to report whether they agreed with the contents of the letter and whether they would try and refuse to administer the test in their own specific situation.

They were offered the opportunity of entering their names and possible contributions to the discussion on a website, so that schools situated in the same area might contact each other. Brochures containing helpful hints for discussion could be ordered and the website provides them with model letters to parents, secondary schools and school board organizations.

The Department or Education, Parliament, Inspectorate and many other layers of governance in the educational field are kept informed about the campaign and its consequences.

The aforementioned brochure also contains a survey based on international data (U.S.A., Great Britain) on the negative consequences once the choice has been made for 'national standards' and 'standardized testing'.

By comparing teachers, neighbouring schools, school areas and counties, stimulating mutual competition, the individual school with its typical pedagogical performance, the authentic teacher with his or her professional experience and expertise and not in the least the individual child with its specific needs and its developmental potential will lose importance.

The pedagogical scope of the schools will be narrowed down, the discussion on children related to guidance will be reduced, even diversity in didactic principles can no longer be taken for granted.

Before the weeks 'the central test' is done subjects that are not relevant to the test are neglected.

The pedagogical and democratic involvement of teachers, parents ('ownership') and those interested in education is being destroyed and killed.

If the prevailing opinion and belief should be that everything can be moulded and measured to wish then surely what remains is that which is countable only.

Creativity, the social, emotional and affective, personal growth, are all left out of consideration.

Right now in Germany the PISA study has sharpened the discussion on 'the quality of the school'.

It is worthwhile to draw in experience from other countries and above all the comments of those that have a critical attitude towards leading opinions characterized by a strong belief in external evaluation of achievements, dictated by a technocratic and bureaucratic way of thinking.

Kees Both

National coordinator for the development of the Jenaplan-schools
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BASIC-PRINCIPLES FOR A GOOD SCHOOL

HUMANS
1. Everyone is a unique person, there is only one like this. Therefore each child and each adult has an inherent and inalienable value.
2. Everyone has the right to develop an own identity. This identity has to be characterized as much as possible by: independence, critical consciousness, creativity and a sense for social justice. All this has to be acknowledged, regardless race, nationality, gender, sexual disposition, social environment, handicaps, religion or life-view.
3. Everyone needs, for developing an own identity, personal relationships with the material, social, cultural and spiritual reality.
4. Everyone is always recognized as a total personality and, where possible, approached and acknowledged in this way.
5. Everyone will be recognized as an innovator of culture and, where possible, approached and acknowledged in this way.

SOCIETY
6. People have to work on a society that esteems everyone's inalienable value and dignity.
7. People have to work on a society that gives room to and is stimulating for the development of an own identity for everyone.
8. People have to work on a society in which differences (between individuals and groups) and changes are dealt with in just, peaceful and constructive ways.
9. People have to work on a society in which earth and space are managed with respect and care.
10. People have to work on a society in which natural and cultural resources are used in responsibility for future generations.

SCHOOL
11. School is a relative autonomous, cooperative organization of all people concerned and influenced by society as school also has influence on society.
12. In the school adults have to take fore-going principles about people and society as a pedagogical basis for acting.
13. In the school curriculum content is derived from the children's life-world and (inner) experience and from the cultural sources considered in our society as important means for the development of persons and society as described earlier.
14. In the school teaching takes place in pedagogical intended situations and with pedagogical teaching-learning materials.
15. In the school teaching and learning are shaped by a rhythmic alternation of the basic-activities dialogue, play, work and celebration.
16. In the school children are predominantly placed in heterogeneous groups, heterogeneous in age and level of ability, to stimulate learning from and caring for each other.
17. In the school independent playing and learning of children is alternated and supplemented by instruction and guided learning. Teaching is intended to stimulate reaching higher levels of development.
18. In the school exploring the world around ('world orientation') has a very central place, on the basis of experiencing, discovering and inquiring.
19. In the school the behaviour and achievement of the children are judged as much as possible from the personal development of this child and in consultation with this child.
20. In the school changes are seen as a never-ending process, guided by a consistent interaction of action and reflection.

Written in cooperation with and for the Jenaplan Association of the Netherlands by Kees Both and Kees Vreugdenhil, 1992
also accepted by the German Jenaplan Society