

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7918008

DEPASQUALE, DANIEL, JR.

THE ROLE OF THE CURRICULUM DIRECTOR IN
BRINGING ABOUT CHANGE IN SELECTED NORTH
CENTRAL ASSOCIATION SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA - LINCOLN, ED.D.,
1979

University
Microfilms
International 300 N ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

THE ROLE OF THE CURRICULUM DIRECTOR IN BRINGING ABOUT
CHANGE IN SELECTED NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION
SCHOOL DISTRICTS

by

Daniel DePasquale, Jr.

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College in the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Education
Department of Secondary Education

Under the Supervision of Professor Willis D. Moreland

Lincoln, Nebraska

May, 1979

TITLE

THE ROLE OF THE CURRICULUM DIRECTOR IN BRINGING ABOUT CHANGE

IN SELECTED NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION SCHOOL DISTRICTS

BY

Daniel DePasquale, Jr.

APPROVED

DATE

Willis Moreland

April 5, 1979

Larry K. Andrews

April 5, 1979

R. McLaran Sawyer

April 5, 1979

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

GRADUATE COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction.	1
Need for the Study.	4
Statement of the Problem.	5
Assumptions	5
Definition of Terms	6
Limitations	6
Procedures.	7
Organization of the Study	10
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	11
The Development of the Position of Curriculum Director.	11
National Committees	12
The School Supervisor	16
The Director of Curriculum.	25
The Responsibilities and Duties of the Curriculum Director.	33
Other Titles.	33
Role of the Curriculum Director	37
Teacher Involvement and Evaluation.	50
Summary	53
III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	57
Budget Responsibilities	58
Analysis of Budget Responsibilities	68
Community Relations and Dissemination	69
Analysis of Community Relations and Dissemination	77
In-Service Education.	78
Analysis of In-Service Education.	91
Curriculum Development.	92
Analysis of Curriculum Development.	112
Supervision	114
Analysis of Supervision	124
Personnel	124
Analysis of Personnel	132
Other Duties.	132
Analysis of Other Duties.	136
Involvement with Other People	136
Analysis of Involvement with Other People . . .	141

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	142
The Problem	142
Procedure	142
Summary	144
Budget Responsibilities	145
Community Relations and Dissemination	146
In-Service Education.	147
Curriculum Development.	148
Supervision	150
Personnel	152
Other Duties.	153
Involvement with Other People	154
Conclusions	154
Budget.	154
Community Relations/Dissemination	156
In-Service.	157
Curriculum Development.	159
Supervision	161
Personnel	162
Other Duties.	163
Involvement with Other People	164
Recommendations	164
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	166
APPENDIX A - Letter Sent to North Central Representative Response Form Completed by North Central Representative	173
APPENDIX B - Three North Central States Not Included in the Study.	177
APPENDIX C - Letter Sent to Nebraska Association for Super- vision and Curriculum Development Preliminary Questionnaire.	179
APPENDIX D - Letter Sent to Curriculum Directors Follow-up Letter Sent to Curriculum Directors Completed Questionnaire.	187

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Provided Money for Innovation in Regular Budget	59
II. Helped Obtain Unbudgeted Money for the Innovation from the Central Office	60
III. Helped Obtain Money from Sources Outside the District (State, Federal and/or Private Foundations). .	61
IV. Helped Obtain Money for Material Necessary for the Innovation.	62
V. Helped Obtain Money for the Assessment of the Innovation.	63
VI. Helped Obtain Money to Pay for Visiting Consultants . .	64
VII. Helped Obtain Money for Necessary Travel in Conjunction with the Innovation	65
VIII. Helped Obtain Money to Provide Released Time for Teachers Involved in the Innovation	66
IX. Helped Obtain Money for In-Service/Workshop Program(s) Related to the Innovation	67
X. Helped Obtain Money for Additional Staff.	68
XI. Helped Direct the Development of Parent and Community Publications Describing the Innovation.	70
XII. Helped Circulate Information About the Innovation for Dissemination Inside and Outside the School District. .	71
XIII. Talked and Listened to Parents and Other Lay People Concerning the Innovation	72
XIV. Helped Arrange Visitation(s) for Local Community Group(s) During Various States of Implementation of the Innovation.	73
XV. Helped Make Arrangements for Special Community Group(s) to Visit the Innovation in Other Settings Prior or During Implementation	74

TABLE	PAGE
XVI. Helped Direct a Program of Interschool Visitation for Dissemination of Innovation	75
XVII. Helped Encourage Teachers Not Involved in the Innovation to Discuss and Observe the Innovation.	76
XVIII. Helped Encourage Teachers to Discuss the Innovation with Members of the Community	77
XIX. Helped Organize and Direct the Overall In-Service Training Program for the Innovation	79
XX. Helped Assess the In-Service Needs of the Staff in Relation to the Innovation.	80
XXI. Helped Evaluate the In-Service Program for the Innovation Against the Criteria of Appropriateness, Adequacy and Relevance	81
XXII. Helped Develop Evaluation Devices to Measure the Success of the In-Service Activities.	82
XXIII. Helped Conduct In-Service Sessions, Workshops, or Conferences Related to the Innovation	83
XXIV. Helped Serve as a Consultant and Advisor for In-Service Activities Related to the Innovation.	84
XXV. Helped Approve Building and Area In-Service Conducted by Consultants.	85
XXVI. Helped Arrange for the Special Orientation of the Instructional Staff Involved in the Innovation.	86
XXVII. Helped in the Dissemination of Information to the Total Staff	87
XXVIII. Helped Arrange for the Staff to Attend Professional Meetings Related to the Innovation.	88
XXIX. Helped Provide Informal Opportunities for Teachers to Share Common Concerns.	89
XXX. Helped Develop a Professional Library of Materials and Media Related to the Innovation	90

TABLE	PAGE
XXXI. Helped Arrange for University Credit Course(s) for Staff Involved in the Innovation.	91
XXXII. Helped Plan the Innovation.	93
XXXIII. Helped Select or Construct a Measuring Device to Identify School District Needs.	94
XXXIV. Helped Determine the Goals and Objectives for the Innovation.	95
XXXV. Helped Develop Long- and Short-Range Plans for the Implementation of the Innovation.	96
XXXVI. Helped Obtain Information Concerning the Innovation Prior to Implementation	97
XXXVII. Helped Provide Opportunities for the Discussion and Investigation of Research and Information Related to the Innovation	98
XXXVIII. Helped Identify Problems Related to the Innovation. . . .	99
XXXIX. Helped Teachers Make Decisions About the Innovation During Various Stages of Implementation	100
XL. Helped Develop or Select Devices for Evaluation of the Innovation	101
XLI. Helped Evaluate the Innovation Throughout the Implementation Process.	102
XLII. Helped Plan a Pilot Program to Field Test the Innovation.	103
XLIII. Helped Develop Instructional Material for the Innovation.	104
XLIV. Helped Select Tests, Audio-Visual Aids, and Other Material Related to the Innovation.	106
XLV. Helped Select the Consultants that Would be Used.	107
XLVI. Helped Develop Specific Job Descriptions for the Consultants	108

TABLE	PAGE
XLVII. Helped Evaluate the Effectiveness of the Consultants. .	109
XLVIII. Helped Coordinate "Ad Hoc" and/or Advisory Committee(s) Related to the Innovation.	110
XLIX. Served as an Active Member of "Ad Hoc" and/or Advisory Committee(s) Related to the Innovation	111
L. Helped Serve as an Advisor to "Ad Hoc" and/or Advisory Committee Related to the Innovation.	112
LI. Helped Organize and Conduct Group Discussions with Teachers Concerning the Innovation.	115
LII. Helped Teachers Review Information on School District Needs Related to the Innovation	116
LIII. Helped Direct Teachers to Locate Information That Would Help Solve Problems or Improve the Innovation . .	117
LIV. Helped Teachers Select Appropriate Instructional Materials	118
LV. Helped Relate Information to Teachers Involved in the Innovation by Use of Memos and Bulletins.	119
LVI. Helped Provide Teachers with Recent Books, Pamphlets, Periodicals, or Other Material Dealing with the Innovation.	120
LVII. Helped Conduct One-to-One Supervisory Conferences with Teachers to Discuss the Innovation.	121
LVIII. Helped Serve as an Advisor to Teachers Involved in the Innovation	122
LIX. Helped Develop Tangible and Intangible Rewards and Recognition for Those Teachers Involved in the Innovation.	123
LX. Helped Plan for the Involvement of Other Administrators	125
LXI. Helped Keep Administrators, Not Involved, Informed About the Innovation.	126
LXII. Helped Confer with Principals, Involved, on the Process of the Innovation	127

TABLE	PAGE
LXIII. Helped Select Teachers to be Involved in the Innovation.	128
LXIV. Helped Arrange the Assignments of Teachers Involved in the Innovation	129
LXV. Helped Provide Support Staff to Assist with the Innovation.	130
LXVI. Helped Select the Members of the "Ad Hoc" and/or Advisory Committees	131
LXVII. Helped Initiate and Maintain a Decision-Making System for the Innovation	133
LXVIII. Helped Design or Redesign Available Facilities Necssary for the Innovation	134
LXIX. Helped Arrange Extra Clerical Help Needed for the Innovation.	135
LXX. Helped Duplicaate and Distribute Materials Related to the Innovation	136
LXXI. Extent Curriculum Director Was Involved with Superintendent and Principal(s)	137
LXXII. Extent Curriculum Director Was Involved with Department Heads, Teachers, and Instructional Specialists	138
LXXIII. Extent Curriculum Director Was Involved with Students, Parents, and Lay People	139
LXXIV. Extent Curriculum Director Was Involved with Consultants from Departments of Education, College/ University, and Inside the District	140

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

The past twenty-five years have produced many changes in education. During the 1950's America shifted to a more complex and specialized society. The "shock" of automation, nuclear power and the population explosion had taken hold. At the same time economists were forecasting economic recession and possibly depression.

Job obsolescence clouded the future. Unemployment in turn, threatened an individual's sense of worth. . . . Home, job, values--these and everything else one had known--were changing.¹

This was a period of uncertainty, concern and hidden turmoil that was brought to a focal point with the successful launching of Sputnik. Americans were moved from complacency to action with their attention on education. Education, during this period, came under close scrutiny and massive criticism. In an attempt to deal with this criticism and to respond to numerable demands for change, the schools began to modify their administrative structure. These modifications were an attempt to provide a corps of highly trained educational specialists who would have responsibility for providing leadership for designing and implementing new educational programs demanded by

¹John L. Goodland, "Rational Planning in Curriculum and Instruction," The Curriculum (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1967), p. 9.

society. One area in which new directions were needed was in curriculum planning and many schools began to add personnel who had direct responsibility for this area. The addition of a curriculum specialist would aid the school in striving toward excellence in education by (1) affording the superintendent more time on matters other than curriculum, and (2) having a full-time person in charge of a curriculum that was becoming increasingly complex.

An early study conducted by Doll identifies many duties that the curriculum director should perform. Some of these suggested duties were: helping to evaluate continuously both the appropriateness and quality of the curriculum; directing the development of curriculum material; coordinating activities of other special instructional personnel; and organizing and directing special in-service education projects.² Kiniski in his study identified a number of important duties: evaluation and revision of the instructional program; providing in-service education programs; working on program planning and development; supervision in the classroom and working with staff; and conducting research for improving instruction.³

These early studies indicate that the curriculum director

²Ronald C. Doll, et al., "What Are Duties of the Curriculum Director?" Educational Leadership, 15 (April, 1958), pp. 428-430.

³Walter Kiniski, "A Study of the Work of the Local Curriculum Director in the State of Illinois" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois, 1963), Abstract.

was in total command and actively involved in almost every aspect of educational programs, in-service development of future programs, and to an extent, supervision in the classroom. Recent literature now suggests that these former roles of the curriculum director have been modified.

New conditions on the educational scene have modified the role and placed into perspective the duties of the curriculum director.

Central office functions are apt to become more service and support oriented and less uniformly directive. No longer will there need be prescriptive curriculum materials for all activities throughout the district.⁴

Ogletree lists three reasons why the role of the curriculum director has changed: (1) teacher skills in a particular curriculum area may surpass those of the curriculum director; (2) in some instances professional organizations are becoming more influential in matters of curriculum and instruction via negotiation; and (3) principals are accepting more responsibility for developing new programs.⁵ In addition to these, there are other external factors which have influenced the character of the school's program which have resulted in new dimensions for the role of the curriculum director. These external factors include state legislatures, state departments of education, regional accrediting associations, national and state pressure groups,

⁴John Prasch, "New Roles for Educators," Educational Leadership, 29 (March, 1972), p. 501.

⁵James R. Ogletree, "Changing Supervision in a Changing Era," Educational Leadership, 29 (March, 1972), p. 507.

the federal government and local influences.

Even though curricular changes may come from sources other than the curriculum director, he is still the person responsible for curriculum change. The stances that the curriculum director takes, directly or indirectly, influence the extent and/or direction of these changes. Recognizing, therefore, that the curriculum director is only one factor in the movement toward excellence, an analysis of his role and responsibilities in a specific curriculum innovation would provide information helpful to other curriculum specialists and school districts seeking improvement.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

Research on the curriculum director has been of a generalized nature. That is, research has dealt with general perceptions of roles and duties. Little has been done in terms of how the curriculum director perceives his role and responsibilities in specific curriculum innovation.

Research on the curriculum director is needed that will provide the following information: (1) an understanding of the responsibilities of the curriculum specialist as they pertain to specific innovative changes; and (2) a more accurate and complete understanding of perceived and ideal duties as they relate to a specific innovative curriculum change.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The literature offers a variety of responsibilities and duties which the curriculum director should perform. However, much of the literature is of a generalizable nature that deals with the responsibilities and duties of the curriculum director rather than the actual tasks which he performs during the implementation of an innovation. The purpose of this study was to identify those tasks that the curriculum director performs in the implementation of an innovation.

The problematic questions of this study are:

1. What are the perceived actual responsibilities and duties which are common among curriculum directors as they implement a curriculum innovation?
2. What are the perceived ideal responsibilities and duties which are common among curriculum directors as they implement a curriculum innovation?

ASSUMPTIONS

Several assumptions are essential to a study of this type. They are as follows:

1. Certain school districts in the North Central Association can be classified as innovative schools as defined in this study.
2. The sample of innovative schools selected is representative of all innovative schools in the North Central Association.
3. The curriculum director does influence the extent and direction of the curriculum in school districts.

4. The direct impact of the curriculum director is diminished if there are more than four high schools in the district.

5. The instrument used in this study reflects those duties and responsibilities identified in the literature.

6. Curriculum directors have provided accurate responses to the information asked on the instrument provided them.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Curriculum director. A full-time public school employee, other than the superintendent, whose major responsibility is the planning and development of curriculum and/or instruction. He may be responsible for the curriculum, and/or instruction of the entire school system or only the secondary program in the school system.

Innovative schools. Any school district incorporating organizational, instructional and methodological practices, ideas, or devices into the school system and recognized by educational leaders and other school districts in the state as being an innovative district.

Adoption. The formal acceptance or choosing of a program.

Implementation. Putting the program into effect or actually carrying out the program.

LIMITATIONS

There are several limitations to this study. They are as follows:

1. Only those curriculum directors in innovative school districts that have an enrollment between 5,000 and 30,000 students

and no more than four high schools were selected.

2. Selection of the innovative school districts was determined by the North Central Association representative within the respective state departments of education.

3. Evidence gathered was restricted to that of a questionnaire sent directly to selected curriculum directors.

4. No private school districts were studied. The conclusions relate only to public school systems.

PROCEDURES

The major purpose of this study was to identify the responsibilities and duties of the curriculum director which are common to curriculum changes. In addition, the study identified the perceived and ideal responsibilities and duties of the curriculum director in the change process.

The first step in the study was to identify curriculum directors associated with "innovative" school districts in the North Central Association. Using the North Central Association Quarterly,⁶ a list of North Central representatives in various state departments of education was compiled. A letter was sent to each of the nineteen representatives explaining the study, and asking for a list of the five most "innovative" school districts in their state. They were also

⁶Norman Furns and John A. Stanavate (eds.), The North Central Association Quarterly (Chicago: The Association), Summer, 1973.

asked to identify the curriculum director in each of the school districts they listed.

The criteria for the selection of the school districts were:

1. The school district be innovative (i.e., incorporating new organizational patterns, instructional approaches, or methodological practices, ideas or devices into the curriculum). These districts are generally recognized by other school districts in the state as being innovative school districts.
2. The school district enrollment fall between 5,000 and 30,000 students.
3. There be no more than four high schools in the district.
4. Those schools listed be public schools.

A copy of the letter sent to the North Central representatives and the form upon which they responded can be found in Appendix A.

Sixty-two curriculum directors from sixteen states were identified by the North Central representatives. Three states from the North Central Region were not included in the study. (For information on the exclusion of the three states in this study, refer to Appendix B.)

The next step in the study was to construct a questionnaire that represented various responsibilities and duties of the curriculum director. Items for possible inclusion in the questionnaire were collected from many sources. The sources used were books, articles, school surveys and related research studies.

When all the items were collected, they were subjected to a refining process. First, they were grouped under the major responsibilities identified in the review of literature. They were then grouped

in several ways under the responsibilities to determine the best logical arrangement. Some items were combined, and others were omitted.

A further attempt to refine the items was made by constructing a preliminary questionnaire. The preliminary questionnaire, a cover letter and a stamped, self-addressed envelope were sent to twenty-eight members of the Nebraska Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (A copy of the cover letter and preliminary questionnaire can be found in Appendix C.) Eighteen individuals completed and returned the preliminary questionnaire. The writer's co-advisors were also invited to criticize the items. The above suggestions were taken into consideration before the questionnaire was finally printed and circulated.

The completed questionnaire, a letter explaining the study, and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope were sent to the sixty-two curriculum directors identified by the North Central representatives. Within four weeks, thirty-four completed questionnaires had been returned. A follow-up letter and an additional questionnaires were sent to those curriculum directors who had not responded to the first request. The returns increased. A total of fifty-four completed questionnaires were returned, of which two were not usable. This reduced the returns to fifty-two or 83 percent of the total sent. (The original cover letter, the follow-up letter, and the questionnaire can be examined in Appendix D.)

The treatment of the data was considered as it applied to the major purpose of the study as outlined in the statement of the problem. Classification of most information was made by use of the

frequency distribution and was reported in terms of means, medians and/or percentages.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter I included the Introduction, the Need for the Study, a Statement of the Problem, Definition of Terms, Limitations, and Procedures.

Chapter II is devoted to a review of literature regarding the curriculum director. The chapter is divided into two sections. Part I reviews the role of the supervisor as it evolved into the role of the curriculum director. The second section reviews the role of the curriculum director as viewed by educational authorities from the mid-nineteen-fifties to the present.

Chapter III presents the data gained through the questionnaire and an analysis of the data.

Chapter IV is a statement of conclusions and recommendations gained from the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The "modern" curriculum movement had its beginning early in the twentieth century. In this chapter, this movement is seen by (1) tracing the process of curriculum development and the eventual establishment of the position of public school curriculum director, and (2) reviewing the responsibilities and duties of the curriculum director. Because of the abundance of literature related to these topics, only those studies and related literature considered most significant are reported here.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE POSITION OF CURRICULUM DIRECTOR

In tracing the establishment of the position of public school curriculum director, it is essential to understand the examination and scrutiny education was undergoing during the first half of the twentieth century. As authorities associated with education wrestled with the problems of educating America's youth, the status quo in education became unacceptable. It was during this period that the "scientific movement," with its emphasis on human activity and experimentation, brought to bear upon curriculum development the need to establish aims and objectives, to develop appropriate learning activities, to systematically develop teaching units and to implement system-wide curriculum revision. The recommendations and methods that were formulated by those authorities actively involved in applying "scientific" methods to education greatly

influenced the development of the position of public school curriculum director.

National Committees

As America moved into the twentieth century, its educational system was in the midst of self-examination. This was a time when committees undertook the task of defining what they felt should be the direction of public education. Some of the most notable committees during this period were the Committee of Ten (on secondary education, 1893), the Committee of Fifteen (on elementary education, 1893), the reports of two Committees on Economy of Time (1908 and 1914-19), and the reports of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (1920).

Under the Committee of Ten, nine separate conferences were held dealing with nine areas of public school curriculum. Those areas were: (1) Latin, (2) Greek, (3) English, (4) modern language, (5) mathematics, (6) physics, astronomy, chemistry, (7) natural science, (8) history and (9) geography. These committees were greatly influenced by persons with vested interests and backgrounds in classical and academic subject areas. Of the ninety members who composed the above nine committees, forty-seven were college professors and college administrators, twenty-one were heads of private schools, while only fourteen were principals of public schools and two were school superintendents. The six remaining members came from other areas such as normal schools or government. The committee reports emphasized

standardization of subject matter requirements and uniform requirements for courses. Rugg suggests that public schools were greatly influenced by these committee reports and that curriculum-making entered an era of being formulated by college professors and college preparatory school administrators. Rugg further noted that there were vigorous debates, as reflected in the committee reports, between those educators who favored an emphasis on uniformity and standardization and those who favored selection and organization of the subject matter based on principles of learning and growth.¹

Although national committees were making recommendations for curriculum changes during the first decades of the twentieth century, the actual implementation of a change was closely scrutinized by individual school district administrators. It appears that public school administrators exercised strict control over the curriculum and closely supervised curriculum changes. The school supervisor was one administrator that helped give direction to curricular change. In analyzing the role of the supervisor, Evans, in 1905, noted there were three statements of supervision that emphasized the scope of the supervisors' duties in relation to curriculum development and the fact that quality control was an important function of supervision. Evans stated:

¹Harold Rugg, "Three Decades of Mental Discipline: Curriculum-Making via National Committees," Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1926), pp. 40-41.

1. The supervisor's field of vision must include all the classes and all the topics of the curriculum and must see relationships between them.
2. The supervisor should have a plan. He should know where he is going and add to it year by year.
3. One man power is essential in supervision. What the supervisor says should be the law and the gospel to the teacher under his supervision.²

During the second and third decades of the twentieth century, the scientific investigations of curriculum construction began to affect actual curriculum revision and the role of the supervisor in curriculum development. It appears that the "scientific movement" encompassed both how national committees arrived at pronouncements and how these educators that emphasized principles of learning arrived at their conclusions. The Committee on the Economy of Time in Education (1908) is an example of the fusion of national committees with curriculum based upon the stress of learning principles. The committee brought forth the need for an analysis of "life's needs" as a determiner for curriculum construction. During this same period, studies were being conducted in the area of life needs by Thorndike's investigation of handwriting in 1910; by W. N. Anderson's spelling vocabulary, based on actual correspondence in 1911; and by J. R. Clark and H. Rugg's worthwhile social elements in math, algebra and geometry between 1915 and 1918.³

²Lawton B. Evans, Lectures on School Supervision (Chattanooga: Southern Educational Review, 1905), pp. 15-17.

³J. Monor Gwynn, Curriculum Principles and Social Trends (3rd ed.; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960), pp. 143-44.

The period from 1910 to 1930 was a time when national committees conducted curriculum study surveys on a broad scale. The analysis of curriculum activities that took place during this period represented an advancement over earlier studies. While earlier studies focused upon "needs" that should be incorporated within the curriculum the emphasis during this period was an attempt to identify appropriate activities that reflect the aims and objectives derived from the study of those "needs."

The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (1920) serves as an example of the attempt to discover activities that should go into the curriculum. The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education was composed of ten separate subject matter committees. An examination of two of these subject matter committees, The Classical Investigation and The Modern Foreign Language Study, serves as an example to point out the attempt to find appropriate activities for the curriculum and the effect these committees had on the curriculum.

The Classical Investigation attempted to use the scientific method in examining classical languages. Although there is debate as to the appropriateness of the conclusions drawn by the committee, there is general agreement that the committee had a significant impact upon the public school curriculum.

The Classical Investigation gave impetus to several new series of textbooks for the teaching of Latin in line with the investigation: the teaching of Latin in

secondary schools has unquestionably profited from the study. . . .⁴

The Modern Foreign Language Study arrived at curriculum recommendations after three years of study. These conclusions covered the field of modern language teaching on both the high school and college level. The work of the committee dealt with the objectives of teaching, course content, organization of classes, and instructional methods. The committee recommendations were published by a major book company, and were used widely in secondary schools.

The School Supervisor

The scientific movement affected both the role of the public school supervisor and the methods that were used in bringing about curriculum change. Curriculum revision was moving from administrative fiat to a process where cooperation existed between the supervisor and the teacher. Barr and Burton acknowledged that the supervisor was the person in charge of quality control; however, they recognized the shift in the role of the supervisor. They noted that quality control can best be accomplished by working with teachers. They stated:

1. Supervision must inspire the teacher, must contribute to her insights and enthusiasm, and provide her with motive.
2. Supervision must assist and direct the teacher in the matter of organization.
3. Supervision must assist and direct the teacher in the matter of weighing values.

⁴Ibid., pp. 152-53.

4. Supervision must provide for and stimulate independence, initiative, and self-expression on the part of the teacher.⁵

Hellegas also noted the modification of the supervisor's role. In a speech at Columbia University in 1922, he acknowledged the development of cooperation between the teacher and supervisor. "Teachers and supervisors are more and more associated as co-workers, and the spirit of cooperation is replacing control. . . ."⁶

While the role of the supervisor was changing, it also was becoming an expanded position. Writing in the Educational Yearbook, 1924, Hellegas noted that the position of supervisor was expanding in many American schools.

Administrative details absorb a large proportion of the time of the principal, and the superintendent is likely to receive little assistance from the principal when he desires to make a change in the methods employed in the school. . . .

To meet this situation there have been brought into the school system newer officers known as general supervisors. . . .⁷

Another possible reason for the growth of the supervisor in many public schools is that the methods of curriculum revision had become more complex. The scientific movement had established the need

⁵A. J. Barr and W. H. Burton, The Supervision of Instruction (New York: Appleton and Company, 1962), p. 74.

⁶Milo Hellegas, "Supervision En Masse," Journal of Educational Method, 2 (October, 1922), pp. 86-87.

⁷Milo Hellegas, "The Problem of Method," Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College Columbia University, 1924, ed. I. L. Kandell (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927), p. 57.

to identify objectives, develop activities and formulate systematic teaching units. The teaching units or courses of study became increasingly complex and much time was devoted to their development. All of these contributed to the need for someone to coordinate curriculum revision. In many cases this was the role of the supervisor. Still another possible reason for coordination is that many school districts developed system-wide curriculum revision studies based on the principles of the scientific movement. The plan for developing courses of study utilized by the city schools of Detroit illustrates the complexity of system-wide curriculum revision based on the principles of the scientific movement. The Detroit plan called for a committee of teachers and supervisor to work through the following process in curriculum making:

1. Define the problem
2. Plan out an experimental solution
3. Actively experiment in a class setting
4. Formulate and develop a new course of study
5. Present material for administrative approval
6. Implement the course of study in regular school classrooms⁸

It appears that the modern curriculum movement had its origins in the curriculum revision committees of the second and third decades of this century. District-wide curriculum revision meant analyzing the problem, establishing goals, planning an experimental solution, formulating courses of study, and actually implementing the courses of study.

Some districts relied on supervisors to successfully carry out

⁸National Society for the Study of Education, The Twenty-Sixth Yearbook (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1926), pp. 199-201.

curriculum revision, while other districts tended to rely on outside consultants. The Los Angeles City School District serves as an example of a district that employed an outside consultant.

. . . . The Department of Educational Research of the Los Angeles city schools was asked to develop an organization for a program of course of study revision for junior and senior high schools in the city. This was done, and in the fall of 1921 Franklin Bobbitt was brought into Los Angeles to work as a consultant for the program.⁹

In addition to using an outside consultant, the Los Angeles program was recognized as having certain features that were similar to present day curriculum change procedures. Caswell aptly described these features when he noted the Los Angeles program was based on the belief that

. . . the program involved the entire curriculum, followed a comprehensive plan designed to achieve a common direction and internal consistency, large number of classroom teachers participated in the work, committees were used extensively, a director was provided, and a curriculum specialist served as a general consultant.¹⁰

The Denver City School District also embarked on a curriculum revision program. The Denver program closely resembled both the Detroit and the Los Angeles programs. It could be inferred that a curriculum revision "model" had been established and, to a degree, the Denver

⁹Marcella R. Lawler, Curriculum Consultants at Work (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958), p. 13.

¹⁰Hollis L. Caswell and Associates, Curriculum Improvement (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950), p. 462.

City School District both followed and added to the "model."

Hugh Wood, in discussing the Denver program mentioned some aspects of the program that resemble the Los Angeles and the Detroit programs. Wood noted that the Denver curriculum revision program consisted of the following:

Substantial appropriations were made for curriculum revision, directors were appointed, a comprehensive plan of curriculum work was followed, outside curriculum specialists were used as consultants, and teachers participated extensively in committee work.¹¹

In analyzing the Detroit, Los Angeles and Denver curriculum revision programs some common characteristics seem to stand out. These characteristics are:

1. Adequate appropriation of funds
2. Use of a project director
3. Use of curriculum specialist
4. An agreed upon plan to follow
5. Teacher participation in committee work

Not all educators agreed that teachers should participate in curriculum planning nor that the curriculum revision which was taking place was worthwhile. Snedden¹² felt that only specialists should work on the curriculum and Harap¹³ suggested that after the curriculum was constructed, work should be carried out to gain the support of the

¹¹ Ibid., p. 45.

¹² David Snedden, Foundations of Curriculum, Sociological Analysis (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927).

¹³ Henry Harap, The Techniques of Curriculum Making (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929).

instructional staff. The position of the opponents to the curriculum revision method of bringing about change was summarized by Whipple:

Too much present-day curriculum making is amateurish, trifling and a sheer waste of time--nay, worse than that, an injection of pernicious confusion in what should be orderly progress. The let-everybody-pitch-in-and-help method is ludicrous when applied to curriculum-building. It is too much like inviting a group of practical electricians to re-design a modern power plant.¹⁴

Although widespread teacher participation may have been lacking in many school districts, the Detroit, Los Angeles and Denver programs seem to have firmly established the need for teacher participation in curriculum revision.

The nineteen-thirties saw a new dimension added to the curriculum revision process. It had been noted by some educators that many desired curriculum changes had not noticeably changed the actual curriculum. Saylor provided a possible reason why some districts were not successful in implementing curriculum changes. He noted that:

While some systems claimed that they tried to bring all teachers into the program, the great majority of teachers were drawn in only slightly or not at all until the courses of study were printed and placed in their hands. Thus a small number of teachers prepared new or revised materials for the use of other teachers who had little understanding of the plans evolved or little insight into the basis and significance of the recommended procedures or content.¹⁵

¹⁴Guy M. Whipple, "What Price Curriculum-Making?" School and Society, 31 (March 15, 1930), p. 367.

¹⁵J. Galen Saylor, Factors Associated with Participation in Cooperative Programs of Curriculum Development (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941), p. 31.

To ensure that curriculum changes were properly implemented, some school districts began adding the dimension of in-service training. The in-service training served as an added step in the curriculum revision process. MacKenzie recognized the need for in-service training and gave an example of how far some districts carried the in-service concept. He stated:

. . . we became dissatisfied with the course of study approach and turned to in-service of teachers as a primary means for curriculum change. This tended to broaden in many communities to include the participation of parents and students on the assumption that involvement of all concerned with the curriculum was vital to the stability of change. We increasingly came to view the curriculum not as a subject matter, nor as the course of study, but as the experience of learners and their environment.¹⁶

Caswell and Campbell concurred with MacKenzie on the need for in-service training of teachers: ". . . . It seems evident that major considerations must be given to the problem of educating laymen, influencing the pre-service training of teachers and providing comprehensive in-service training opportunities."¹⁷

The added dimension of in-service education in the curriculum revision process complicated the role of the supervisor. The need to influence and work with teachers took on added significance. Fitzpatrick, in 1931, published what he considered principles of supervision.

¹⁶Gordon N. MacKenzie, "Politics of Curriculum Change," Curriculum Crossroads, ed. Harry Passow (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943).

¹⁷Hollis L. Caswell and Doak S. Campbell, Curriculum Development (Chicago: American Book Company, 1935), p. 62.

The principles were meaningful to the supervisor as he worked with teachers in the in-service education process. It would seem that the supervisor who followed Fitzpatrick's principles could indeed aid teachers, thus helping to ensure appropriate implementation of curriculum changes. A summary of his principles follows:

1. The supervisor should help, encourage, lead, inform, inspire, not dictate.
2. The major function of supervision is to improve classroom instruction, to recognize superior teaching and encourage it, and to recognize inferior teaching and eliminate it.
3. In judging the efficiency of teaching, the supervisor should select a few standards and make himself familiar with their use, such as: clearness of purpose, organization of subject matter, effective assignment, laws of learning, effective motivation, effective questioning, care of routine, and so forth.
4. Whatever principles are selected they should be trained to instruct with those principles in mind. This does not mean, however, that they should not have other principles in mind, also.
5. In measuring the results of teaching the supervisor should select a few of the most reliable standard tests and make himself familiar with their technique and use. He should also train his teachers in their use, in the treatment of results, in drawing conclusions, and in offering remedies.
6. The supervisor should keep his teachers informed as to the latest development in the field of classroom technique, the latest investigations in methods, the most reliable findings in the field of experimentation, the latest books and magazine articles, the newest and most effective devices, and the most helpful references.
7. The supervisor and his teacher should have the spirit of investigation and experimentation. They should work together at times in conducting surveys, in solving life problems, in developing projects and units of subject matter, and in testing the validity of different procedures.

8. Teachers should be led by their supervisor to rate themselves. Self-rating is a means of self-improvement. Clear recognition of one's deficiencies leads to clear and definite efforts at self-improvement.
9. Supervision should set up certain reasonable goals for the different subjects and the different grades and offer the best method and means for attaining them.
10. The supervisor should throw as much responsibility upon his teachers as possible.
11. The supervisor must make his teachers feel he is their friend and sympathizer.
12. Supervision should proceed upon the basis of a well organized program known to the teachers. As far as is practicable, this program should be worked out together by the supervisor and the teachers.¹⁸

Fitzpatrick's principles suggest that the supervisor must operate on a personal level with teachers and within the framework of an organized program. This program, he points out, should include helping to identify goals, keeping teachers informed, conducting experiments and judging the effectiveness of both teaching and teacher outcomes. Fitzpatrick's framework for curriculum revision closely resembles those of the Detroit, Los Angeles and Denver programs.

The Eighth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendent of the National Education Association dealt with the area of supervision. The yearbook outlined eight specific principles of supervision that should be followed in organizing the in-service part of the curriculum

¹⁸F. B. Fitzpatrick, Supervision for Elementary Schools (Danville: F. A. Owen Publishing Company, 1931), pp. 19-21.

revision program. While Fitzpatrick's principles emphasized the personal duties of the supervisor, the Eighth Yearbook focused on the framework of the in-service program. These principles stated in the yearbook were:

1. Centralization of executive responsibility
2. Definition of lines of authority
3. Delegation of authority and responsibility
4. Definite assignments of duties
5. Facility for cooperation and coordination
6. Flexibility of operation
7. Integration of educational outcomes
8. Democracy of spirit and operation¹⁹

The implementation of the above eight principles of an in-service program and the procedures suggested by Fitzpatrick seem to indicate the need for someone with special training who would be responsible for directing curriculum revision. This individual would need appropriate communication skills, leadership skills, organizational skills, the ability to understand (the function) and to carry out all aspects of the curriculum change process. The need to be able to perform a variety of functions led to a change in role of the supervisor from that of an "overseer" of the curriculum to that of a director of the curriculum.

The Director of Curriculum

As the supervisor's role in the school district changed, the title given to that person also changed. It was during the period

¹⁹ National Education Association, Eighth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendent of the National Education Association (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1930).

of the nineteen-thirties that the title of "Director of Curriculum" began to be associated with the individual who coordinated the curriculum. Cocking noted that many schools began creating this position and that the individual who assumed the role needed to have special skills. Cocking stated:

The direct responsibility of the curriculum program should be fixed in some one individual specially competent for the particular job. In recognition of the truth of this principle, progressive schools are creating a position known as "Director of Curriculum."²⁰

Research conducted by Caswell indicated that some large city school districts had developed administrative divisions under a school official whose direct responsibility was curriculum making. This school official was titled "Director of Curriculum" and was directly responsible to the superintendent of the district.²¹ It appears the "Director of Curriculum" shared many of the tasks and in some cases may have been a carry-over of the previously mentioned project director. However, the "Director of Curriculum" was a permanent position and his duties seem to go beyond those of the project director.

The Denver City School District was one of the first to provide a full-time director to coordinate ". . . the work in all grades and

²⁰Walter D. Cocking, Administrative Procedures in Curriculum Making for Public Schools (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928), p. 49.

²¹Hollis L. Caswell and Doak S. Campbell (eds.), Readings in Curriculum Development (Chicago: American Book Company, 1937), p. 693.

departments and . . . concerned with principles and procedures applicable to all fields."²² Other city school districts soon added a director of curriculum. Norton found that seven cities with a population of over 30,000 had a person directly responsible for curriculum. Those cities and the title given to this position were:

Chicago, Illinois, director of curriculum
 Denver, Colorado, director, department of curriculum
 Kansas City, Kansas, director of curriculum
 Long Beach, California, director of curriculum
 Los Angeles, California, director, course of study
 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, director of curriculum study,
 educational measurements and research
 Kenosha, Wisconsin, director, methods and curriculum²³

Norton goes on to state that many school districts had a person whose responsibilities approached that of a curriculum director:

While other school systems do not make a person in charge of curriculum revision, the director of a permanent department of curriculum, some nearly approach that title. For example, Detroit, Michigan, has a supervising director of instruction; Lakewood, Ohio, has an assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum construction; Minneapolis, Minnesota, has a director of instructional research; New York City has a chairman of the general revision committee of the board of superintendent of schools in charge of a central curriculum revision committee; Tulsa, Oklahoma, has an associate superintendent in charge of curriculum administration, and many other school systems have allocated the work of directing curriculum construction and revision more or less permanently to an assistant superintendent of schools'. . . .²⁴

²²National Society for the Study of Education, The Twenty-Sixth Yearbook (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1926), p. 231.

²³Margaret Alltucker Norton, "Leadership in Curriculum Building in 168 Large City School Systems," School and Society, 33 (January 3, 1931), pp. 7-21.

²⁴Ibid., p. 17.

Additionally, the Fort Worth Texas, public schools mentioned in its list of administrative principles for developing a course of study the position of curriculum director. The curriculum director was to work with teachers, supervisors and other administrators in constructing curriculum.²⁵

Although the position of curriculum director had been established in many large city schools, it was apparent that the position was not securely established as an integral part of the public school administrative staff. Caswell and Doaks took note of the fact that, "The number of curriculum programs headed by the curriculum director in the last two years had declined. Due to enforced economics this administrative office had been discontinued in a number of systems."²⁶

The nineteen-forties saw a reversal in the decline of curriculum programs headed by an administrator whose major responsibility was curriculum development. One of the possible explanations for this was that city school districts were increasing in size which resulted in a need for someone to work full-time in the curriculum area. Kandell spoke to the issue of problems associated with growth when he explained that:

An obvious result of the expansion of school systems and the multifarious ramifications of education . . . has been

²⁵Forth Worth Public Schools, Language Arts, A Tentative Course of Study for Grade Six, Curriculum Bulletin No. 146 (Fort Worth, Texas: The Public Schools, 1935), pp. ii-iii.

²⁶Caswell and Campbell, op. cit., p. 37.

an increase in the responsibilities of the superintendents of schools and with it the size of the administrative staff to whom he can delegate the supervision of the many duties now involved in the administration of education.²⁷

Reavis reinforced this idea by explaining that the school superintendent had to delegate part of his work because of the lack of time to perform it. He noted:

Because the superintendent, due to sheer lack of physical powers, is forced to delegate many of his duties to assistants, it is only natural that he will delegate those that he is least qualified to perform, among which, all too frequently will be his responsibility for the direction of instruction.²⁸

The complexity of curriculum revision, coupled with the growth in many city school districts, necessitated that the school districts re-evaluate both their administrative structure and their process of curriculum development. Illustrative of this, the Cambridge, Massachusetts, School Survey staff recommended that all phases of instruction be unified under one person. The report of the survey staff recommended that:

A new position should be created to be known as Director (or Assistant Superintendent in charge) of Curriculum Development and the Improvement of Instruction. Working in real unity with him and under his immediate direction, would be all instructional directors or supervisors attached to the central administration. This entire unit would work through and bring its leadership to bear

²⁷I. L. Kandell, Comparative Education (Chicago: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1933), p. 339.

²⁸William C. Reavis, "Responsibilities of the City Superintendent for the Direction of Instruction," School Review, 14 (November, 1946), p. 520.

upon head masters, masters or principals, chairman of departments or committees, and teachers in curriculum redirection and development and in the improvement of instruction, including the promotion of in-service growth of the teaching staff.²⁹

A survey was also conducted in the Little Rock City Schools which recommended that a director of instruction be appointed with the following responsibilities:

1. To coordinate the work of the supervisors and to bring about greater unity and balance in the total curriculum.
2. To furnish leadership in planning for a long-term program or curriculum development.
3. To arrange for conferences, inter-visitation among teachers, workshops, and other in-service education techniques.
4. To stimulate the personal and professional growth of all teachers.
5. To organize study groups leading to curriculum improvement.
6. To improve instruction in the classroom.
7. To help individual teachers to plan learning units.³⁰

The final report of the Co-operative Study of the Mobile Public Schools in 1949 contained a comprehensive list of duties that they believed should be assigned to the assistant superintendent in

²⁹Alfred D. Simpson (dir.), The Cambridge School Survey (Cambridge: School Committee, 1947), p. 14.

³⁰George Peabody College for Teachers, Division of Surveys and Field Studies, Little Rock, Arkansas, Public Schools, A Survey Report (Nashville, Tennessee: The College, 1948), pp. 86-87.

charge of development of curriculum and improvement of instruction.

Those duties were:

1. Curriculum Development
 - a. Guidance in the improvement of teaching and learning procedures
 - b. Guidance of curriculum improvement and revision
 - c. Aid in the selection, organization, and use of instructional materials
 - d. Guidance of course of study and curriculum bulletins
 - e. Coordination and articulation of the twelve-year instructional program
2. In-Service Growth of Teachers
 - a. Organization of system wide in-service activities
 - b. Consultative services to individual schools
 - c. Consultative services to individual teachers in improving their instructional program
3. Pupil Guidance Services
 - a. Services in study, diagnosis, and meeting pupil needs
 - b. Assistance in evaluating pupil programs
 - c. Assistance in developing policies relating to
 1. Classification and grouping of pupils
 2. Promotion
 3. Records and reports
 - d. Assistance with atypical children³¹

These school surveys indicated that the curriculum director should provide direction and leadership in bringing about curriculum change and improvement of instruction. This leadership was to be demonstrated by helping to select material, organizing curriculum studies, helping individual teachers, and assessing pupil needs as a basis for curriculum improvement. It was expected that more precise

³¹University of Alabama, College of Education, Bureau of Educational Research, Co-operative Study of Mobile Public Schools (University: University of Alabama, Bureau of Educational Research, Vol. IV, 1949), p. 20.

attention to these areas of responsibility would ultimately lead to improvement in the curriculum and the instructional practices in the schools.

By the early nineteen-fifties, the position of curriculum director was becoming an independently identified position in a number of large American school districts. Varney found in his study of city schools with a population of 100,000 or more that, "Slightly over half of the city schools had one person responsible to the Superintendent for the administration of all phases of the instructional program."³²

There were probably a number of reasons for the emergence of a curriculum director in the public schools. It was during these years of the nineteen-fifties that those children from the post-war baby-boom entered the public schools. This boom brought a significant increase in the number of students attending public schools. Also, the launching of Sputnik during this time frame brought education under close scrutiny and much criticism. In an attempt to deal with the massive enrollment increase, and the criticism, schools began to modify their administrative structure. This modification of the administrative structure appears to have accelerated the growth of the position of curriculum director.

³²James K. Varney, "The Responsibility of the Assistant Superintendent or Other Executive for Instructional Supervision and Curriculum Development" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1954), p. 179.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES OF THE CURRICULUM DIRECTOR

With the emergence of the position of curriculum director in public schools, it became necessary to identify the duties that this school officer was to perform. The historical development of the position indicates that the curriculum director was to provide leadership in coordinating the curriculum and in curriculum revision activities. Further, history suggests, in general, that he was to carry out these responsibilities by helping to formulate goals, helping to develop appropriate teaching units, and helping to conduct in-service programs for teachers. Understandably, if the purpose for the existence of the position of curriculum director was to give leadership in the area of curriculum improvement, it was important to define the duties that this person should perform in carrying out his responsibilities. This section, therefore, examines educational literature as it pertains to the curriculum director and identifies duties and responsibilities that he performs while carrying out his leadership role in curriculum improvement.

Other Titles

One of the problems associated with the examination of duties and responsibilities is the variety of titles given to the school officer in charge of curriculum. It would seem that giving various titles to school administrators who perform the same functions was not uncommon in many school systems. As early as nineteen-forty Moehlman had noted that many titles were used interchangeably in

American public schools. He proposed that titles should denote special responsibilities. Moehlman wrote:

It is more satisfactory to provide titles that carry a special connotation of responsibility. As differentiated from superintendent, deputy, division superintendent, district superintendent, and principal, which were definitely assigned to administrative personnel, the titles of assistant superintendent, director, supervisor, and the sub-classification of assistant director, and assistant supervisor may be considered as denoting staff responsibility. In practice these titles are today used interchangeably.³³

The educational literature makes repeated reference to the fact that the titles held by those responsible for curriculum change were both poorly defined and were overlapping to an extent. Babcock, in examining the various titles of the school official in charge of curriculum, noted that:

As we consider the matter of defining the role of the curriculum supervisor or curriculum director, we immediately encounter the problem of terminology. No well developed taxonomy exists in this area to assist us. The individual who is assigned the broad responsibility of leadership in the curriculum program is identified by many titles.³⁴

Pittenger wrote concerning the various titles conferred upon school officials in the early nineteen-fifties:

The most common of these (school officials) is an officer who is responsible for instruction, and who may

³³Arthur B. Moehlman, School Administration (New York: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1940), p. 292.

³⁴Chester D. Babcock, "The Emerging Role of the Curriculum Leader," Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director in a Climate of Change, 1965 Yearbook, ed. Robert E. Leeper (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Development, 1965), p. 58.

be called the "chief supervisor," or the "director of instruction," or the "assistant superintendent" in charge of instruction, or by some other title. Trends seem to favor the title of "coordinator."³⁵

Furthermore, Pittenger stressed that in districts where there is only one intermediary officer responsible for instruction, he is likely to be called assistant superintendent or associate superintendent.³⁶

The variation in titles may have meant that individuals who filled these positions had a variety of responsibilities to perform, although the literature seems to suggest that this may not be the case. A concerted attempt to find a title which would aptly describe the responsibilities of the individual in charge of curriculum took place. The Commission for the nineteen fifty-two Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators recommended that if one person were delegated for curriculum responsibilities, he should be called either "assistant superintendent, a director, or a general supervisor."³⁷

The use of the title "assistant" or "associate" superintendent was not, however, uniform in all school systems. Although the title may not be significant, there may have been reasons why school systems were reluctant to adopt these titles as explained by the February, 1962, National Education Association Research Bulletin:

³⁵B. F. Pittenger, Local Public Schools Administration (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1951), p. 201.

³⁶Ibid., p. 202.

³⁷American Association of School Administrators, The American School Superintendency (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1952), p. 209.

Use of a title other than assistant superintendent may represent an effort of the local school board to keep central office administrative salaries down or to avoid becoming administratively top-heavy with assistant superintendents. Some students of administrative organizations in recent years have observed a reluctance on the part of local school boards to establish assistant superintendencies and a concomitant preference for positions with other titles.³⁸

Doll noted, "What a curriculum leader is called should have no real effect on his professional behavior."³⁹ The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development concurred with Doll. The Association stated:

In defining Curriculum Director one immediately becomes tangled in a maze of wordage. A person involved in the curriculum leadership role may be identified by many different titles. He may be called an assistant or associate superintendent in charge of curriculum and/or instruction. . . . What is important is the function that the curriculum director performs.⁴⁰

Moehlman, Babcock and Doll all recognized that the individual in charge of curriculum was given many different titles among school districts. However, they also recognized that the curriculum director, though his specific title may vary, performs a unique function as a school administrator. The fundamental distinction between curriculum directors and other school personnel appears to be the director's primary concern for curriculum. Indeed, the literature seems to be

³⁸ National Education Association, NEA Research Bulletin, 40(1) (1962), p. 25.

³⁹ Ronald C. Doll, et al., "What Are Duties of the Curriculum Director?" Educational Leadership, 15 (April, 1958), p. 249.

⁴⁰ Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Directors in a Climate of Change (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1965), p. 58.

in agreement that the one unique responsibility of this school administrator is curriculum development. As the position of the curriculum director underwent further study, other areas of responsibility such as budgeting, community relations/dissemination, in-service education, supervision, and personnel were also recognized as other important responsibilities of the person in charge of curriculum.

Role of the Curriculum Director

One of the first studies dealing with the curriculum director was done in 1955 by a seminar of graduate students in New Jersey. The seminar was led by Sharp and focused on the role of the curriculum director. The seminar used two separate questionnaires and nine school visitations to arrive at their results. According to the conclusions of their study, the activities of the curriculum director seemed to fall into five major areas. Those areas, arranged in descending order of significance as rated in the study, were:

1. Curriculum improvement activities
2. Activities to facilitate the curriculum improvement program
3. Personal-professional growth
4. Preparation and provision of resources
5. Community relations⁴¹

In a follow-up of Sharp's New Jersey study, the organization of New Jersey Curriculum Directors formed a committee to propose a list of duties and related competencies of the curriculum director. The

⁴¹George M. Sharp, "Curriculum Coordinators Study Their Jobs," Educational Leadership, 12 (May, 1955), p. 465.

committee consisted of Ronald C. Doll, Harold T. Shafer, Sarah Christie, and Jerome C. Salsbury. The ensuing study involved 386 curriculum directors and focused on how the curriculum director should spend his time. The duties of the curriculum director considered to be among the most important by this committee were:

1. Planning for improvement of the curriculum and of the curriculum development program
2. Helping evaluate continuously both the appropriateness of the curriculum and the quality of the curriculum development program
3. Directing the formation of point of view, policies and philosophy of education
4. Directing the development of curriculum materials
5. Using ready-made research data and promoting local research
6. Coordinating the activities of other special instructional personnel, e.g., supervisors, librarians
7. Working with guidance personnel to integrate curriculum and guidance functions
8. Providing for lay participation in curriculum improvement
9. Arranging time, facilities and materials for curriculum improvement
10. Serving school personnel as technical consultant and advisor
11. Organizing and directing special in-service education projects
12. Interpreting the curriculum to the public and, in certain situations, to the Board of Education
13. Encouraging articulation among levels of the school system⁴²

⁴²Doll et al., op. cit., p. 430.

The New Jersey study listed a number of broad duties important for the curriculum director to perform. An analysis of that list reveals that the major responsibilities seem to be in the areas of curriculum planning (including the evaluation of the curriculum and a curriculum development program), coordinating other personnel, organizing and directing an in-service program and public relations.

Freese's study concerning the function and the degree of responsibility of the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction agreed with the New Jersey study on the major responsibilities of the curriculum director.

The duties and responsibilities of the position were clearly defined in writing in only 45.4 per cent of the districts. . . .

Those in this position carried heavy responsibilities in the areas of in-service training of teachers, instructional materials, curriculum development, and supervision of instruction. They did not carry as heavy responsibilities in the area of educational personnel. . . .

Those in the position rated curriculum development as their most important responsibility, with supervision of instruction second, in-service training third, educational personnel fourth, instructional materials fifth, and public relations sixth.⁴³

Sharp, Doll and Freese concurred that the curriculum director was involved in curriculum development activities and in coordinating resource help in the form of other personnel or material. They also brought to the foreground the responsibility of community relations as

⁴³Theron Freese, "A Study of the Position of Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Instruction" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Southern California, 1955), pp. 218-19.

an additional role important for the curriculum director to perform. The implication of this responsibility appears to be grounded in the belief that information disseminated to lay people and other district staff personnel would result in support for curriculum change and help in the curriculum development process.

Trump and Miller also recognized the importance of community relations/dissemination in the curriculum development process. They indicated that for community relations/dissemination to be effective, the school should provide materials for individuals to read, view, or hear. It was further suggested that small-group discussions would produce questions that could be generalized to large-group concerns.⁴⁴

Varney made a study of the actual duties performed by the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction. His list supports the areas of curriculum development, coordinating both resource people and material, and community relations/dissemination as areas of responsibilities that were performed by the curriculum director. In reporting the list of duties and the percentage of assistant superintendents who indicated that each of these duties was an integral part of their position, a specific list of tasks performed by individuals in this position can be seen.

1. Publicizes and interprets educational programs to teachers and laymen (22.53%)

⁴⁴J. Lloyd Trump and Delmas F. Miller, Secondary School Curriculum Improvement (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1968), pp. 369-73.

2. Gives final approval to textbooks recommended by textbook selection committee (18.31%)
3. Makes actual assignments of personnel to committee (28.16%)
4. Gives approval of curricula programs of study developed by committee (28.16%)
5. Suggests subject content or units of work (25.35%)
6. Suggests pupil activities and experiences (21.12%)⁴⁵

Hass noted a number of responsibilities generally accepted as those of the curriculum director. His list of responsibilities places emphasis upon planning and coordinating curriculum change, providing in-service training for teachers, and budget development for both curriculum change and in-service training. Those responsibilities noted by Hass were:

1. Instructional program improvement. Planning, developing, recommending, interpreting and administering major policies procedures for the over-all instructional program of the schools.
2. Instructional staff leadership. Coordinating the activities of all groups of instructional workers and leaders so that a unified instructional program may be achieved.
3. In-service education. Coordinating and planning for the in-service education of all staff members including teachers, principals, supervisors and members of the superintendent's staff.
4. Instructional and in-service education budget. Coordinating the development of the budget for

⁴⁵Varney, op. cit., p. 180.

the instructional program and for the program of in-service education.⁴⁶

Hass is explicit in noting that if the curriculum director were to be successful in carrying out his responsibilities and duties, then he must be active in helping to coordinate financial consideration associated with curriculum making.

The literature suggests that activities for which the curriculum specialist may help provide money are:

1. Time for curriculum work
2. Intervisitation of teachers
3. Purchase of professional materials
4. Attendance at professional meetings
5. Local workshops and conferences
6. Publications
7. Employment of outside consultants⁴⁷

Conner and Ellena also listed a number of items the curriculum worker should plan for in the budget. These items, in part, reflect many of the ideas stated in previously discussed studies.

The school budget must include provisions not only for an adequate supply of new materials, but also for adequate inservice activities required by the proposed change. . . . There is no substitute for study, which requires much time; but to provide this time for teachers, it will be necessary to arrange for

⁴⁶C. Glen Hass, "Role of the Director of Instruction," Educational Leadership, 18 (November, 1960), p. 101.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 107.

substitutes, travel to innovative schools and conferences, outside curriculum consultants, and outside subject matter specialists.⁴⁸

Gilchrist provided another list of actual duties which the curriculum director should perform. His list is helpful in that he states specific duties which serve as examples of various tasks that can be subsumed under those responsibilities identified by Sharp, Doll, Freese and Hass. Those tasks described by Gilchrist are:

1. Investigating reports of research, innovations, materials, and of other curriculum development projects, and communicating information about the projects to those associates concerned.
2. Organizing and leading curriculum planning and evaluation groups in assessing local practices and planning needed program modifications.
3. Developing proposals and experimental programs to meet local needs when no adequate programs are available.
4. Assisting specialists in various curriculum areas in the introduction of new programs and the exchange of information about such programs.
5. Arranging for tryouts of new plans and materials with adequate provision for careful experimental designs.
6. Organizing in-service education activities to assist the personnel involved in introducing new programs.
7. Communicating with school boards and citizen groups information about current curriculum needs, innovations and issues in the community.

⁴⁸Forrest E. Connor and William J. Ellena, Curriculum Handbook for School Administrators (Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1967), p. 317.

8. Preparing for appropriate duplication and distribution materials which will aid his associates in curriculum improvement efforts.⁴⁹

Neagley and Evans also listed actual duties that they believed the curriculum director should perform. An edited list of those duties are as follows:

1. Assist in the development of a consistent philosophy. . . .
2. Work . . . in the development of goals
3. Aid . . . in the organization of instruction, teaching procedures, and experimentation
4. Aid . . . in curricular needs and in formulating and administering the budget in the areas of curriculum and instruction
5. Aid . . . in determining the needs for instructional staff
6. Aid . . . in the establishment of a district wide curriculum, materials, audio-visual, and professional library center
7. Assist in the editing and publishing of curriculum bulletins, guides, courses of study, and pamphlets
8. Aid in the preparation of adequate reports and material. . . .
9. Aid in the preparation of material relative to the instructional program for distribution to lay groups⁵⁰

A study of curriculum directors in the state of Illinois revealed those duties and responsibilities that were perceived as most important. The Illinois study reinforced previous research in concluding that curriculum workers were involved in curriculum improvement, personnel, in-service and supervision. The study found that curriculum

⁴⁹Robert S. Gilchrist, Using Current Curriculum Developments Washington, D.C.: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1963), p. 6.

⁵⁰Ross L. Neagley and N. Dean Evans, Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), pp. 81-82.

workers identified eight duties as being most important. Those duties are:

1. Evaluating and revising the instructional program
2. Providing for in-service education and programs
3. Working on program planning and development
4. Supervising in the classroom and working with staff
5. Conducting research for improving instruction
6. Working with curriculum committees to develop the curriculum and also to improve the course of study
7. Conferring with principals and individual teachers on instructional matters
8. Selecting textbooks and instructional materials for the district⁵¹

In studying 106 superintendents, 66 curriculum directors and 94 secondary principals, Moll found what he considered the eleven most important duties of the curriculum director. His list expands somewhat the duties that were identified as being important by previous studies.

1. To plan for improvement of the curriculum and development of the pilot program
2. To continuously evaluate both the appropriateness and quality of the curriculum
3. To implement changes in the curriculum when conditions warrant change
4. To serve the school personnel as a consultant and advisor regarding curriculum problems
5. To select alternatives with consequences on curriculum problems and present them to the superintendent for his decision
6. To make decisions of priority in the curriculum department

⁵¹Walter K. Kiniski, "A Study of the Work of the Local Curriculum Director in the State of Illinois" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1963), Abstract.

7. To promote, direct, report, and use local research for curriculum development
8. To promote articulation between levels of the school system
9. To arrange time, facilities, and materials for curriculum improvement
10. To organize and direct special in-service education projects
11. To use national and state research data on curriculum improvement⁵²

Link, after studying workers in Virginia, concluded that they were involved in five major responsibilities:

1. Planning, coordination, and evaluation of the instructional program
2. Personnel administration
3. Instructional related services and activities
4. In-service and workshop programs
5. School and community relations⁵³

From an analysis of the role of the curriculum director in the state of Washington, Beggs concluded the director should be involved in the responsibilities of curriculum development, community relations/ dissemination, personnel, in-service and budgeting. Beggs stated the following duties should be performed by the curriculum director:

⁵²Loren Allen Moll, "An Analysis of the Role of the Curriculum Director" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Colorado State College, Greeley, 1965), p. 41.

⁵³Daniel Cruzen Link, Jr., "A Study of the Role of Personnel Responsible for Curriculum Development in the Local School Division in Virginia" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, 1971), Abstract.

1. Plan, coordinate, and evaluate the curriculum development program in the district
2. Plan and direct in-service training programs for teachers in the district
3. Serve as a resource person on curriculum matters for teachers, principals, superintendents, and citizens
4. Provide guidance in the selection of instructional equipment and materials
5. Provide for evaluation of the district instructional program and affect needed changes
6. Communicate matters related to curriculum to teachers, administrators, the school board, and the lay citizenry
7. Provide relevant data to guide budget decisions related to curriculum⁵⁴

A number of responsibilities have been assigned to the curriculum director. However, it was evident from the examination of literature that there was general agreement with regard to certain responsibilities. The attention given to the role of the curriculum director by research studies and investigations seems to indicate that the director's role consists of seven major responsibilities. They are: (1) budgeting, (2) community relations/dissemination, (3) in-service, (4) curriculum development, (5) supervision, (6) personnel, and (7) other duties.

The literature further suggests that certain tasks which the curriculum director should perform can be subsumed under the seven

⁵⁴Harold Oliver Beggs, "An Analysis of the Role of the Curriculum Administrators in First Class School Districts in the State of Washington" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Washington State University, Pullman, 1972), Abstract.

areas of responsibility.

The tasks that seemed to be relative to the budget responsibilities were:

1. To provide money for assessment
2. To provide money for purchase of materials
3. To provide money for teacher release time
4. To provide money for in-service

The tasks that seemed to be relative to the community relations/ dissemination responsibility were:

1. To communicate with staff and lay people
2. To publish information about school program(s)
3. To provide lay participation
4. To work with lay groups
5. To arrange travel to other districts (to view school programs)

The tasks that seemed to be relative to the in-service responsibility were:

1. To direct the in-service program
2. To evaluate the in-service program
3. To conduct in-service sessions
4. To serve as a consultant and advisor
5. To arrange for staff to attend meetings

The tasks that seemed to be relative to the curriculum development responsibility were:

1. To plan the curriculum development program

2. To determine goals for the program
3. To investigate reports and research about innovations
4. To evaluate the program continuously
5. To plan a pilot program
6. To select material
7. To work with "ad hoc" committees

The tasks that seemed to be relative to the supervision responsibility were:

1. To serve as a resource person
2. To confer with teachers
3. To assist teachers
4. To provide material relative to the program

The tasks that seemed to be relative to the personnel responsibility were:

1. To keep administrators and staff informed
2. To coordinate activities of support staff

The tasks that seemed to be relative to other duties were:

1. To duplicate and distribute material
2. To arrange clerical help

The above responsibilities and duties do not represent a job description for curriculum directors nor are they all-inclusive in pointing out responsibilities and duties. However, they do represent efforts that may be made to improve a school district's curriculum.

Teacher Involvement and Evaluation

The areas of teacher involvement and evaluation in the curriculum development process had their origins in the scientific movement. These two areas were often dealt with explicitly or were implied as being important in many of the studies cited in this review of literature. It was noted that without teacher involvement and without proper evaluation the chance for success in curriculum development programs would be limited.

In bringing about change, Turner recognized that curriculum director must also insist upon involvement of teachers from within the district. "A quality program is possible only when teachers, involved from the outset, are permitted and encouraged to join in the deliberation."⁵⁵ Anderson concurred, "The teacher should have an important part in making decisions concerning curriculum policies and practices."⁵⁶

Herrick agreed that teachers must be involved in any curriculum change. He felt that teachers need to know what the goals are, the plans for curriculum change and participate actively in groups working on the change.

All learning programs are concerned with people. Programs of curriculum improvement are primarily the concern of teachers and staff personnel. If teachers and

⁵⁵Harold E. Turner, "Curriculum Development--Process and People," Education, 90 (November-December, 1969), p. 173.

⁵⁶V. E. Anderson et al., Principles and Practices of Secondary Education (2nd ed.; New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1962), p. 119.

staff are to profit from this opportunity for learning, they must be involved both as individuals and in groups. . . . Good planning in a curriculum program is facilitated also when everyone knows what the object of planning is, who is going to do it and what the ultimate goal may be.⁵⁷

Norris found that cooperative planning is generally a part of curricular change.

Cooperative curriculum planning is normally an integral part of curriculum change, although exceptions are found in situations of autocratic administration and under conditions of drift or decay. The way people are involved in curriculum planning, how strategies develop, and how processes are employed are significant. . . . since these procedures positively or negatively affect curriculum change.⁵⁸

Sergiovanni and Starratt concluded that teachers' involvement would be enhanced if the change process had a built-in evaluation. In addition, staff sharing sessions, staff bulletins for sharing information, having accurate information when decisions are to be made and rewarding teachers for participation are necessities for successful change.⁵⁹

Doll, like Norris, Herrick, Sergiovanni and Starratt felt that evaluation of the change process is important. Doll urged that evaluation procedures be built into each change process. Lippitt

⁵⁷Virgil E. Herrick, "Evaluating Curriculum Improvement Programs," Educational Leadership, 8 (January, 1951), p. 235.

⁵⁸Audrey B. Norris, "An Analysis of Selected Curriculum-Change Agents in Developing a Model of Curriculum Change" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, 1969), Abstract.

⁵⁹Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Robert J. Starratt, Emerging Patterns of Supervision (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), p. 167.

concluded that evaluation is essential if one is to know if success has been attained. Without evaluation, "There is a lack of clear feedback to reinforce the change efforts, to tell the educator whether his tryouts are being successful in directions that he had hoped for."⁶⁰ Unruh and Turner, speaking about the instructional program, put forth what they considered criteria for evaluation. Their criteria are as follows:

1. Appropriateness of the curriculum and of the instructional materials
2. Adequacy and relevance
3. Variety
4. Balance in the curriculum⁶¹

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development recognized the importance of evaluation procedures. The Association developed a list of difficulties faced in the evaluation of a school program. Among the difficulties listed are the following:

1. Failure to gather data about the present status of the program
2. The lack of evaluative instruments for many types of goals
3. Reliance upon subjective judgment

⁶⁰Ronald Lippitt, "Roles and Process in Curriculum Development and Change," Strategy for Curriculum Change, ed. Robert R. Leeper (Washington, D.C.: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965), p. 75.

⁶¹Adolph Unruh and Harold E. Turner, Supervision for Change and Innovation (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970), p. 279.

that a full-time school official would be needed to coordinate these changes. Early curriculum development programs in the city school districts of Detroit, Los Angeles and Denver utilized a person full-time to coordinate curriculum changes. Because of the success of their curriculum revision programs the Detroit, Los Angeles and Denver schools served as models for other districts.

Many school districts began assigning a full-time school official to coordinate the curriculum. Often this official was designated "director of curriculum." The late nineteen-thirties and early nineteen-forties witnessed a decline in the position because of economic conditions in the country. However, as the economic conditions improved and school districts increased in size, the position of curriculum director expanded once again. The late nineteen-forties and the nineteen-fifties saw this position become an integral part of many school districts.

The major function of the curriculum director was to provide leadership in coordinating the curriculum and in the curriculum revision activities. A number of studies were conducted to help determine the actual responsibilities and duties of this administrative position. It was found that the curriculum specialist had a variety of titles, such as assistant superintendent, associate superintendent, curriculum director, and coordinator. Although the curriculum director had different titles from school district to school district, it was generally recognized that what was important was not the title, but rather the functions that he performed while providing leadership in

4. Lack of clerical aid
5. Difficulties in communication of findings
6. Dearth of funds for evaluation⁶²

It would seem that both teacher involvement and proper assessment would add to the possibility of successful curriculum changes. These two areas would ensure understanding and participation by those teachers affected and a means of knowing if, indeed, the goals and objectives of the curricular change had been met.

SUMMARY

The "scientific movement" promoted the need for public schools to establish objectives, develop appropriate learning activities, systematically develop courses of study and engage in system-wide curriculum revision. The implementation of these tasks by school districts affected both the role of the school supervisor and the methods that were used in bringing about curriculum change. The supervisor's role shifted from that of an "overseer" to that of a school officer who provided help and support for teachers. Changes in the curriculum that were once brought about by administrative mandate became more complex as schools began to establish objectives, create learning activities and develop courses of study as a part of curricular change.

As curriculum development became more complex it became apparent

⁶²Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Leadership for Instruction (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1960), p. 114.

that a full-time school official would be needed to coordinate these changes. Early curriculum development programs in the city school districts of Detroit, Los Angeles and Denver utilized a person full-time to coordinate curriculum changes. Because of the success of their curriculum revision programs the Detroit, Los Angeles and Denver schools served as models for other districts.

Many school districts began assigning a full-time school official to coordinate the curriculum. Often this official was designated "director of curriculum." The late nineteen-thirties and early nineteen-forties witnessed a decline in the position because of economic conditions in the country. However, as the economic conditions improved and school districts increased in size, the position of curriculum director expanded once again. The late nineteen-forties and the nineteen-fifties saw this position become an integral part of many school districts.

The major function of the curriculum director was to provide leadership in coordinating the curriculum and in the curriculum revision activities. A number of studies were conducted to help determine the actual responsibilities and duties of this administrative position. It was found that the curriculum specialist had a variety of titles, such as assistant superintendent, associate superintendent, curriculum director, and coordinator. Although the curriculum director had different titles from school district to school district, it was generally recognized that what was important was not the title, but rather the functions that he performed while providing leadership in

the curriculum change process.

Consensus has not been reached among educators as to specific responsibilities and duties that should be performed by the curriculum director; however, numerous responsibilities and duties have been identified. Research studies and investigations seem to indicate that there are certain responsibilities and duties that are generally accepted as important for the curriculum director to perform. Those responsibilities that may be performed in efforts to improve the curriculum seem to be budgeting, community relations/dissemination, in-service, curriculum development, supervision, and personnel. It was further implied in the literature that evaluation of both the curriculum and the curriculum process coupled with teacher involvement would be helpful in curriculum revision.

PLEASE NOTE:

**This page not included with
original material. Filmed as
received.**

University Microfilms International

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The curriculum director's responsibilities and duties in the implementation of an innovation are many and varied. His work in the implementation of a curriculum change affects a number of people and covers many different areas. These areas encompass the following: budget, community relations and dissemination, in-service education, curriculum development, supervision, personnel and other administrative duties. In this chapter each of these major categories will be explored as they relate to the implementation of a curriculum change. In the questionnaire (see Appendix D) which was completed by selected curriculum directors in the North Central Association, a series of statements was presented which described the duties in each of the above categories. The responding person was asked to what extent he performed the duty. He was also asked to what extent he should perform the duty. Each statement could be marked to show the degree of involvement: 1 for never; 2 for seldom; 3 for occasionally; 4 for frequently; and 5 for extensively. Each item could be marked to indicate the actual degree the duty was performed and the ideal degree it should have been performed.

Additionally, each curriculum director was asked to indicate the degree of his involvement with the superintendent, principal, department heads, teachers, students, parents, specialists and consultants during the implementation of the innovation. Each respondent could

rate their involvement on a one to five (1-5) scale with one (1) being limited involvement and five (5) being high involvement.

BUDGET RESPONSIBILITIES

Curriculum directors obtain money for the implementation of an innovation from various sources. These sources are budgeted funds earmarked for the innovation, unbudgeted money from the central office, and/or money from outside sources. The first three items discussed in this section explore where the curriculum director obtained and should have obtained money for the innovation. Other items in this area explore where the curriculum director helped and should have helped funnel the money. Specifically, did the director help obtain money for material, assessment, travel, released time, in-service, additional staff, and for visiting consultant(s)?

It appears that in planning for a curriculum change, thirty-four (65.7 percent) of the curriculum directors indicated that they, extensively or frequently, provided money for the innovation in the regular district budget. Six (11.7 percent) of the curriculum directors reported that they seldom or never provided money for the innovation in the regular district budget, while only two directors (3.9 percent) stated that ideally they should seldom be engaged in this task. Table I illustrates that forty-seven (92.1 percent) of the respondents felt they, ideally, should have performed this task extensively or frequently. All of the curriculum directors indicated that they, ideally, to some extent, should provide money for the innovation in

the regular district budget.

TABLE I
PROVIDED MONEY FOR INNOVATION IN REGULAR
DISTRICT BUDGET

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	23	44.1	27	52.9	50	49.0
Frequently	11	21.6	20	39.2	31	30.4
Occasionally	11	21.6	2	3.9	13	30.4
Seldom	4	7.8	2	3.9	6	5.9
Never	2	3.9	0	0.0	2	2.0
Total	51	100.0	51	100.0	102	100.0

According to Table II, thirty-four (66.7 percent) of the curriculum directors frequently or extensively helped obtain unbudgeted money for the innovation from the central office. This compares with thirty-nine (79.6 percent) of the directors that indicated, ideally, they should have performed this task either frequently or extensively. Only two respondents (3.9 percent) indicated they seldom obtained unbudgeted money, while one (2.0 percent) indicated, ideally, that he should seldom obtain unbudgeted money.

TABLE II
HELPED OBTAIN UNBUDGETED MONEY FOR THE INNOVATION
FROM THE CENTRAL OFFICE

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	24	47.1	28	57.1	52	52.0
Frequently	10	19.6	11	22.5	21	21.0
Occasionally	15	29.4	9	18.4	24	24.0
Seldom	2	3.9	1	2.0	3	3.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	51	100.0	49	100.0	100	100.0

Table III indicates that curriculum directors were almost as active in helping to obtain money from sources outside the district. Thirty-nine (81.2 percent) of the respondents felt they should help obtain money from sources outside the district either extensively or frequently. Thirty-three (68.7 percent) of the respondents reported they performed this function, extensively or frequently. Nine (18.8 percent) of the respondents seldom or never helped obtain money from sources outside the district and four (8.4 percent) indicated they should seldom or never obtain outside money.

TABLE III
HELPED OBTAIN MONEY FROM SOURCES OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT
(STATE, FEDERAL AND/OR PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS)

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	18	37.5	25	52.1	43	44.7
Frequently	15	31.2	14	29.1	29	30.2
Occasionally	6	12.5	5	10.4	11	11.5
Seldom	2	4.2	2	4.2	4	4.2
Never	7	14.6	2	4.2	9	9.4
Total	48	100.0	48	100.0	96	100.0

It appears that curriculum directors were equally active in helping to provide money from budgeted funds, from unbudgeted money via the central office, and from outside sources. A vast majority (92.1 percent) of the directors indicated they should help provide money for the innovation in the regular budget. This compares with 79.6 percent that indicated they should help provide unbudgeted money from the central office and 81.2 percent who stated they should have helped obtain money from outside sources.

In implementing an innovation, money is used for a variety of reasons. Tables IV through X explore to what extent curriculum directors helped obtain money for material, consultants, travel, released time, in-service/workshops and additional staff. Also explored is to what extent the directors should help obtain money for the

above areas.

It was found (see Table IV) that thirty-nine (76.5 percent) of the total group extensively or frequently helped obtain money for material pertaining to the innovation, while six (11.7 percent) of the curriculum directors reported they seldom or never performed this duty. Forty-two (85.7 percent) of the respondents indicated that this duty ideally should extensively or frequently be performed. All the respondents agreed that they should, to some extent, help obtain money for material.

TABLE IV
HELPED OBTAIN MONEY FOR MATERIAL NECESSARY FOR
THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	21	41.2	24	49.0	45	45.0
Frequently	18	35.3	18	36.7	36	36.0
Occasionally	6	11.8	4	8.2	10	10.0
Seldom	4	7.8	3	6.1	7	7.0
Never	2	3.9	0	0.0	2	2.0
Total	51	100.0	49	100.0	100	100.0

It appears that curriculum directors were less active in helping obtain money for the assessment of the innovation. Table V illustrates that slightly more than one-half of the respondents helped

obtain money extensively or frequently for assessment. Conversely, it can be seen that thirteen (25.4 percent) of the curriculum directors seldom or never performed this task. Over three-quarters of the curriculum directors indicated they should extensively or frequently help obtain money for the assessment of the innovation. The majority of the directors, to some extent, stated they should be involved in this task.

TABLE V
HELPED OBTAIN MONEY FOR THE ASSESSMENT
OF THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	18	38.3	24	49.0	42	42.0
Frequently	8	15.7	16	32.7	24	24.0
Occasionally	12	23.5	5	10.2	17	17.0
Seldom	9	17.6	2	4.1	11	11.0
Never	4	7.8	2	4.1	6	6.0
Total	51	100.0	49	100.0	100	100.0

The information in Table VI illustrates that the respondents were somewhat more active in helping to obtain money to pay for visiting consultants.

Thirty-six (73.4 percent) of the curriculum directors helped obtain money to pay for consultants either extensively or frequently, while five (10.2 percent) indicated that this was seldom or never a

task performed. Thirty-eight (77.6 percent) reported they should have been involved either frequently or extensively in this task. Only three, representing 6.1 percent of the total group, indicated this should seldom or never be a task they performed.

TABLE VI
HELPED OBTAIN MONEY TO PAY FOR VISITING CONSULTANTS

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	23	46.9	24	49.0	47	48.0
Frequently	13	26.5	14	28.6	27	27.6
Occasionally	8	16.3	8	16.3	16	16.3
Seldom	3	6.1	1	2.0	4	4.1
Never	2	4.1	2	4.1	4	4.1
Total	49	100.0	49	100.0	98	100.0

The respondents were just as active in helping to obtain money for necessary travel in conjunction with the innovation as they were in helping to obtain money for outside consultants. The information in Table VII shows that thirty-seven (74.0 percent) of the curriculum directors participated either extensively or frequently in this activity. This compares with four (8.0 percent) that never or seldom helped obtain money for travel. Only three (6.0 percent) responded they should never or seldom help obtain money for travel.

TABLE VII
HELPED OBTAIN MONEY FOR NECESSARY TRAVEL IN
CONJUNCTION WITH THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	22	44.0	24	48.0	46	46.0
Frequently	15	30.0	15	30.0	30	30.0
Occasionally	9	18.0	8	16.0	17	17.0
Seldom	3	6.0	3	6.0	6	6.0
Never	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

The data in Table VIII reveal that curriculum directors were slightly more active in helping obtain money to provide released time for teachers involved in the innovation than they were in the four previous tasks. Thirty-nine (79.6 percent) answered that they performed this task either frequently or extensively. Correspondingly, forty-two (85.7 percent) of the curriculum directors responded this was a task they should engage in extensively or frequently. Only two (4.0 percent) curriculum directors stated they ideally should seldom or never be involved in this task.

TABLE VIII
HELPED OBTAIN MONEY TO PROVIDE RELEASED TIME FOR
TEACHERS INVOLVED IN THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	29	59.2	30	61.2	59	60.2
Frequently	10	20.4	12	24.5	22	22.4
Occasionally	7	14.3	5	10.2	12	12.2
Seldom	2	4.1	1	2.0	3	3.1
Never	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	2.0
Total	49	100.0	49	100.0	98	100.0

Data in Table IX show that a substantial majority of the curriculum directors reported they helped obtain money for in-service/workshop program(s) related to the innovation. Forty-three (86.0 percent) of the total group answered that they helped extensively or frequently in obtaining money for in-service/workshop programs. An even larger majority (90.0 percent) reported they should be involved in helping obtain money for in-service/workshop programs either extensively or frequently.

TABLE IX
HELPED OBTAIN MONEY FOR IN-SERVICE/WORKSHOP PROGRAM(S)
RELATED TO THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	33	66.0	35	70.0	68	68.0
Frequently	10	20.0	10	20.0	20	20.0
Occasionally	5	10.0	3	6.0	8	8.0
Seldom	2	4.0	2	4.0	4	4.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Thirty-seven (75.8 percent) of the respondents reported they should extensively or frequently help obtain money for additional staff. This compares with twenty-eight (56.0 percent) who indicated they had helped obtain money for additional staff either frequently or extensively. Ten (20.0 percent) responded they seldom or never were involved in this task and eight (16.3 percent) said they should never or seldom involve themselves in this task.

TABLE X
HELPED OBTAIN MONEY FOR ADDITIONAL STAFF

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	15	30.0	21	42.9	36	36.4
Frequently	13	26.0	16	32.7	29	29.3
Occasionally	12	24.0	4	8.2	16	16.2
Seldom	5	10.0	6	12.2	11	11.1
Never	5	10.0	2	4.1	7	7.1
Total	50	100.0	49	100.0	99	100.0

Analysis of Budget Responsibilities

Sources of money for the implementation of an innovation are budgeted funds ear-marked for the innovation, unbudgeted funds from the central office and funds from outside sources. Slightly over two-thirds of the curriculum directors indicated they actually obtained money from all three sources either extensively or frequently. Over ninety-two percent of the curriculum directors reported that ideally they should have obtained money from budgeted funds ear-marked for the innovation extensively or frequently. Ideally, this was selected as the main method of obtaining money.

It appears that over three-fourths of the curriculum directors provided money for in-service/workshop programs, providing released time for teachers, and for obtaining necessary material. All of

these areas ranked high both actually and ideally; however, most directors indicated that helping provide money for in-service/workshop programs was most important.

The largest gap between the actual and the ideal practice seems to be in the task of helping obtain money for the assessment of the innovation. Fifty-four percent of the curriculum directors reported they actually were involved in the task extensively or frequently, while almost eighty-two percent stated they ideally should have been involved in this task extensively or frequently.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND DISSEMINATION

Although curriculum directors indicated that community relations and dissemination should be a major responsibility for implementing a curriculum change, items in this area were, in general, given a lower ranking for actually being done than items listed under other responsibilities. Table XI shows that twenty-nine (56.9 percent) of all the directors extensively or frequently helped direct the development of parent and community publications describing the innovation. This compares with thirty-eight (74.6 percent) of the curriculum directors who indicated this was a task they should have been involved in either extensively or frequently. While eight (15.6 percent) indicated they seldom or never helped direct the development of parent and community publications only three (5.9 percent) expressed the opinion they should seldom be involved in this task. All curriculum directors indicated they should be involved in this area to some extent.

TABLE XI
HELPED DIRECT THE DEVELOPMENT OF PARENT AND COMMUNITY
PUBLICATIONS DESCRIBING THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	18	35.3	21	41.2	39	38.2
Frequently	11	21.6	17	33.3	28	27.5
Occasionally	14	27.5	10	19.6	24	23.5
Seldom	4	7.8	3	5.9	7	6.9
Never	4	7.8	0	0.0	4	3.9
Total	51	100.0	51	100.0	102	100.0

The respondents were slightly more active in helping to circulate information about the innovation for dissemination inside and outside the school district. Thirty-one (60.8 percent) reported they were involved in this task frequently or extensively. Five (9.8 percent) of these administrators said they seldom or never performed such duties. Forty (78.4 percent) indicated this item was important enough that it should be performed extensively or on a frequent basis.

TABLE XII
HELPED CIRCULATE INFORMATION ABOUT THE INNOVATION FOR
DISSEMINATION INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE SCHOOL DISTRICT

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	18	35.3	23	45.1	41	40.2
Frequently	13	25.5	17	33.3	30	29.4
Occasionally	15	29.4	8	15.7	23	22.5
Seldom	2	3.9	2	3.9	4	3.9
Never	3	5.9	1	2.0	4	3.9
Total	51	100.0	51	100.0	102	100.0

Somewhat over one-half of the administrators surveyed stated they talked and listened to parents and other lay people concerning the innovation. Only two (3.9 percent) of the respondents seldom performed this task. All those surveyed agreed that this task ideally should be performed. Table XIII shows that thirty-eight (74.5 percent) believed they should have performed this task either frequently or extensively.

TABLE XIII
TALKED AND LISTENED TO PARENTS AND OTHER LAY PEOPLE
CONCERNING THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	19	37.3	25	49.0	44	43.1
Frequently	9	17.6	13	25.5	22	21.6
Occasionally	21	41.2	11	21.6	32	31.4
Seldom	2	3.9	2	3.9	4	3.9
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	51	100.0	51	100.0	102	100.0

The task of helping arrange visitations for local community groups during various stages of implementation of the innovation was not a high priority item of those directors that responded to the survey. Nineteen (38.0 percent) performed this task extensively or frequently, while thirteen (26.0 percent) seldom or never performed the task. However, a majority of the curriculum directors indicated that this was a task that should have been performed. Six (12.0 percent) indicated it should seldom be done and only one (2.0 percent) stated it should never be performed.

TABLE XIV
HELPED ARRANGE VISITATION(S) FOR LOCAL COMMUNITY GROUP(S)
DURING VARIOUS STAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	9	18.0	18	36.0	27	27.0
Frequently	10	20.0	11	22.0	21	21.0
Occasionally	18	36.0	14	28.0	32	32.0
Seldom	9	18.0	6	12.0	15	15.0
Never	4	8.0	1	2.0	5	5.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Helping make arrangements for special community groups to visit the innovation in other settings prior or during implementation also received a low rating by the respondents. Twenty-three (47.9 percent) stated they did this extensively or frequently. This compares with nine (18.8 percent) that seldom performed this task and five (10.4 percent) who indicated they never were involved with this task. Table XV shows ideally that twenty-nine (60.4 percent) indicated this should be done either extensively or frequently. Seven (14.6 percent) of the total group expressed the opinion that the curriculum director should seldom or never help make arrangements for special community groups to visit the innovation in other settings prior or during implementation.

TABLE XV
HELPED MAKE ARRANGEMENTS FOR SPECIAL COMMUNITY GROUP(S)
TO VISIT THE INNOVATION IN OTHER SETTINGS PRIOR
OR DURING IMPLEMENTATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	12	25.0	13	27.1	25	26.0
Frequently	11	22.9	16	33.3	27	28.1
Occasionally	11	22.9	12	25.0	23	24.0
Seldom	9	18.8	5	10.4	14	14.6
Never	5	10.4	2	4.2	7	7.3
Total	48	100.0	48	100.0	96	100.0

It can be readily seen in Table XVI that thirty (60.0 percent) of the respondents replied they were extensively or frequently involved in helping direct a program of interschool visitation for dissemination of the innovation. Correspondingly, thirty-four (68.0 percent) reported this task was one that should be done extensively or frequently. While seven (14.0 percent) seldom or never performed this task, only one (2.0 percent) indicated that it was a task that should never be performed.

TABLE XVI
HELPED DIRECT A PROGRAM OF INTERSCHOOL VISITATION
FOR DISSEMINATION OF THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	15	30.0	17	34.0	32	32.0
Frequently	15	30.0	17	34.0	32	32.0
Occasionally	13	26.0	12	24.0	25	25.0
Seldom	5	10.0	3	6.0	8	8.0
Never	2	4.0	1	2.0	3	3.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

It appears the most active task of curriculum directors in the area of dissemination was helping encourage teachers not involved in the innovation to discuss and observe the innovation. Data in Table XVII show that thirty-four (68.0 percent) of the directors performed this task either extensively or frequently. Only two (4.0 percent) seldom performed the task and all the directors indicated they had been involved in this task to some degree. Ideally, thirty-eight (76.0 percent) believed they should have been involved in the task extensively or frequently. One (2.0 percent) indicated that he should have been seldom involved in the task.

TABLE XVII
HELPED ENCOURAGE TEACHERS NOT INVOLVED IN THE INNOVATION
TO DISCUSS AND OBSERVE THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	17	34.0	19	38.0	36	36.0
Frequently	17	34.0	19	38.0	36	36.0
Occasionally	14	28.0	11	22.0	25	25.0
Seldom	2	4.0	1	2.0	3	3.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Table XVIII shows that curriculum directors were slightly less active in helping encourage teachers to discuss the innovation with members of the community. Thirty-one (62.0 percent) participated in this task extensively or frequently, while thirty-eight (77.6 percent) indicated that they should have engaged in this task either extensively or frequently. There were seven (14.0 percent) of the curriculum directors that seldom and two (4.0 percent) that never performed the task. Four (8.2 percent) stated this task should seldom be performed and none indicated that the curriculum director should never be involved in this task.

TABLE XVIII
HELPED ENCOURAGE TEACHERS TO DISCUSS THE INNOVATION
WITH MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	14	28.0	17	34.7	31	31.3
Frequently	17	34.0	21	42.9	38	38.4
Occasionally	10	20.0	7	14.3	17	17.2
Seldom	7	14.0	4	8.2	11	11.1
Never	2	4.0	0	0.0	2	2.0
Total	50	100.0	49	100.0	99	100.0

Analysis of Community Relations and Dissemination

It appears that curriculum directors ideally viewed six of the eight tasks in community relations and dissemination as somewhat important. With the exception of helping to arrange visitations for the local community during various stages of implementation and visiting the innovation in different settings, all other items were rated as tasks that should be performed by curriculum directors.

The task of helping to circulate information about the innovation for dissemination inside and outside the school district received the highest (78.4 percent) ranking of all tasks that ideally should be done either extensively or frequently. This was closely followed by the task of helping encourage teachers to discuss the innovation with members of the community (77.6 percent) and the task of helping encourage

teachers not involved in the innovation to discuss and observe the innovation. Curriculum directors also indicated they were actually more involved in the above three tasks. Table XVII shows that 68.0 percent of the respondents were involved in helping encourage teachers not involved in the innovation to discuss and observe the innovation. Table XVIII indicates that 62.0 percent of the curriculum directors either extensively or frequently helped encourage teachers to discuss the innovation with members of the community. Table XII shows that 60.8 percent of the directors helped circulate information about the innovation for dissemination inside and outside the school district either extensively or frequently.

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

The questionnaire contained thirteen items in the area of in-service education. The main thrust in this area is the planning, conducting and assessing of the in-service program.

Curriculum directors reported that thirty-eight (76.0 percent) helped organize and direct the overall in-service training program either extensively or frequently. This compares with forty-three (84.3 percent) who indicated they should have performed this task either extensively or frequently. According to Table XIX, only one (2.0 percent) stated that this task should be seldom done. All the respondents indicated that they should help organize and direct the overall in-service training program to some extent.

TABLE XIX
HELPED ORGANIZE AND DIRECT THE OVERALL IN-SERVICE
TRAINING PROGRAM FOR THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	26	52.0	27	52.9	53	52.5
Frequently	12	24.0	16	31.4	28	27.7
Occasionally	10	20.0	7	13.7	17	16.8
Seldom	2	4.0	1	2.0	3	3.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	50	100.0	51	100.0	101	100.0

Helping assess the in-service needs of the staff in relation to the innovation was the next statement on the questionnaire. Ideally, this was the most popular task in the area of in-service education. According to Table XX, no one rejected this as an ideal responsibility. Forty-seven (92.0 percent) of the respondents said they should have performed this task either extensively or frequently. Actual practice indicates that thirty-nine (78.0 percent) extensively or frequently performed this task. It would appear that eight percent of the curriculum directors ideally felt they should have participated more in helping assess the in-service needs of the staff.

TABLE XX
HELPED ASSESS THE IN-SERVICE NEEDS OF THE STAFF IN
RELATION TO THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	26	52.0	27	54.0	53	53.0
Frequently	13	26.0	19	38.0	32	32.0
Occasionally	8	16.0	3	6.0	11	11.0
Seldom	3	6.0	1	2.0	4	4.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	50	100.0

Over two-thirds of the curriculum directors included in this study reported they extensively or frequently helped evaluate the in-service program against the criteria of appropriateness, adequacy, and relevance; however, a minority of those in this position replied they seldom or never helped evaluate the in-service program for the innovation against the criteria of appropriateness, adequacy, and relevance.

All the curriculum directors, as Table XXI indicates, stated they should help evaluate the in-service program against the identified criteria. Thirty-nine (78.0 percent) responded they ideally should have been involved in this task either extensively or frequently.

TABLE XXI
HELPED EVALUATE THE IN-SERVICE PROGRAAM FOR THE INNOVATION
AGAINST THE CRITERIA OF APPROPRIATENESS, ADEQUACY
AND RELEVANCE

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	24	48.0	28	56.0	52	52.0
Frequently	10	20.0	11	22.0	21	21.0
Occasionally	9	18.0	8	16.0	17	17.0
Seldom	6	12.0	3	6.0	9	9.0
Never	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
Total	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.0

The task of helping develop evaluation devices to measure the success of in-service activities showed the greatest discrepancy between what was actually done and ideally what should have been done in the area of in-service education.

The responses about the actual involvement reveal that twenty-five (50.0 percent) of the curriculum directors were involved in helping develop evaluation devices to measure the success of the in-service activities. As noted in Table XXII, nine (18.0 percent) of the directors seldom performed the tasks and one (2.0 percent) never performed the tasks.

Correspondingly, responses about ideal involvement show that thirty-five (70.0 percent) of the curriculum directors indicated they

should have been involved in the task either extensively or frequently. Five (10.0 percent) stated they should seldom be involved, while two (4.0 percent) stated they should never be involved in the task.

TABLE XXII
HELPED DEVELOP EVALUATION DEVICES TO MEASURE THE
SUCCESS OF THE IN-SERVICE ACTIVITIES

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	17	34.0	24	48.0	41	41.0
Frequently	8	16.0	11	22.0	19	19.0
Occasionally	15	30.0	8	16.0	23	23.0
Seldom	9	18.0	5	10.0	14	14.0
Never	1	2.0	2	4.0	3	3.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Less than two-thirds of the respondents indicated they helped conduct in-service sessions, workshops, or conferences related to the innovation. The data in Table XXIII show that thirty-one (62.0 percent) participated in this activity extensively or frequently, while thirty-eight (76.0 percent) stated they should have participated extensively or frequently. Seven (14.0 percent) of the directors stated they seldom or never helped conduct in-service sessions, workshops, or conferences. Only four (8.0 percent) reported that ideally they should seldom or never engage in this task.

TABLE XXIII
 HELPED CONDUCT IN-SERVICE SESSIONS, WORKSHOPS, OR
 CONFERENCES RELATED TO THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	22	44.0	24	48.0	46	46.0
Frequently	9	18.0	14	28.0	23	23.0
Occasionally	12	24.0	8	16.0	20	20.0
Seldom	5	10.0	3	6.0	8	8.0
Never	2	4.0	1	2.0	3	3.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Curriculum directors were even less involved in helping serve as a consultant and advisor for in-service activities related to the innovation. While thirty-six (72.0 percent) said ideally they should be more involved, only thirty (60.0 percent) actually participated in the task extensively or frequently and seven (14.0 percent) seldom or never participated in the task. Only one (2.0 percent) director indicated he should never serve as a consultant and advisor for in-service activities.

TABLE XXIV
HELPED SERVE AS A CONSULTANT AND ADVISOR FOR IN-SERVICE
ACTIVITIES RELATED TO THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	21	42.0	23	46.0	44	44.0
Frequently	9	18.0	13	26.0	22	22.0
Occasionally	13	26.0	9	18.0	22	22.0
Seldom	5	10.0	4	8.0	9	9.0
Never	2	4.0	1	2.0	3	3.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

The respondents were active in helping approve building and area in-service conducted by consultants. Table XXV indicates that the actual and ideal amount of involvement by the respondents in this activity is quite close. It can be seen that twenty-four (48.0 percent) performed this task extensively and fourteen (28.0 percent) were frequently involved in the task for a total of thirty-eight (76.0 percent). This was close to the ideal, where thirty-nine (78.0 percent) of the directors indicated they should have been involved to a great extent. All the respondents agreed they ideally should be involved in the task.

TABLE XXV
HELPED APPROVE BUILDING AND AREA IN-SERVICE
CONDUCTED BY CONSULTANTS

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	24	48.0	25	50.0	49	49.0
Frequently	14	28.0	14	28.0	28	28.0
Occasionally	7	14.0	9	18.0	16	16.0
Seldom	4	8.0	2	4.0	6	6.0
Never	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

According to Table XXVI, curriculum directors were as active in helping arrange for the orientation of the instructional staff involved in the innovation as they were in approving in-service sessions conducted by consultants. Of all the curriculum directors, twenty-three (46.0 percent) actually performed the task extensively and fifteen (30.0 percent) were frequently involved in the task. Ideally, twenty-three (46.0 percent) indicated they should extensively and sixteen (32.0 percent) said they should frequently have been involved in the task. Only one (2.0 percent) stated he should never be engaged in helping arrange for the orientation of the instructional staff.

TABLE XXVI
HELPED ARRANGE FOR THE SPECIAL ORIENTATION OF THE
INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF INVOLVED IN THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	23	46.0	23	46.0	46	46.0
Frequently	15	30.0	16	32.0	31	31.0
Occasionally	10	20.0	10	20.0	20	20.0
Seldom	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
Never	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	2.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Helping in the dissemination of information to the total staff is a task that can also be cross-listed under community relations and dissemination. Possibly because of this cross-listing capability, more curriculum directors identified the task as the one actually performed more than any other task listed in the categories of in-service education and community relations/dissemination. It should be noted, however, that ideally this task did not rank as the most important task that should be accomplished in the in-service category.

The information in Table XXVII indicates that forty-one (82.0 percent) of all the respondents were involved in helping disseminate information to the total staff either extensively or frequently. Ideally, forty-three (86.0 percent) of the respondents indicated they should have been involved in this task extensively or frequently. Two

(4.0 percent) felt they should seldom or never perform the task, while in actuality four (8.0 percent) seldom or never performed the task.

TABLE XXVII
HELPED IN THE DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION TO
THE TOTAL STAFF

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	25	50.0	28	56.0	53	53.0
Frequently	16	32.0	15	30.0	31	31.0
Occasionally	5	10.0	5	10.0	10	10.0
Seldom	3	6.0	1	2.0	4	4.0
Never	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	2.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Curriculum directors reported as a group that they were active in helping arrange for the staff to attend professional meetings related to the innovation. Additionally, the directors indicated this function should rank second only to helping assess the in-service needs of the staff, in importance.

The data in Table XXVIII show that forty-three (87.7 percent) of the respondents felt they should have been involved extensively or frequently. All the respondents further indicated they should be involved in this task to some extent.

TABLE XXVIII
HELPED ARRANGE FOR THE STAFF TO ATTEND PROFESSIONAL
MEETINGS RELATED TO THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	27	55.1	30	61.2	57	58.2
Frequently	11	22.4	13	26.5	24	24.5
Occasionally	8	16.3	3	6.1	11	11.2
Seldom	3	6.1	3	6.1	6	6.1
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	49	100.0	49	100.0	98	100.0

Helping provide informal opportunities for teachers to share common concerns was not a high priority item, either actually or ideally, when it was compared with other functions in the in-service education category.

Although not a high ranked item, twenty-nine (58.0 percent) of the curriculum directors, according to Table XXIX, reported they performed this task extensively or frequently. The curriculum directors responded further that four (8.0 percent) seldom engaged in the task and no director ignored the task completely. Ideally, thirty-five (70.0 percent) replied they should have been involved in the task either extensively or frequently and all concurred they should perform the task to some degree.

TABLE XXIX
HELPED PROVIDE INFORMAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR TEACHERS
TO SHARE COMMON CONCERNS

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	19	38.0	24	48.0	43	43.0
Frequently	10	20.0	11	22.0	21	21.0
Occasionally	17	34.0	13	26.0	30	30.0
Seldom	4	8.0	2	4.0	6	6.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Less than two-thirds of the respondents indicated they helped develop a professional library of materials and media related to the innovation. Slightly less than three-quarters of the respondents indicated this task should be done.

It can be readily seen in Table XXX that thirty-five (71.4 percent) of all the directors rated this item as a task they ideally should have performed extensively or frequently. Four (8.1 percent) indicated they ideally should seldom or never perform the task. Thirty (61.2 percent) curriculum directors reported they actually were involved in the task extensively or frequently. Five (10.2 percent) stated they seldom or never were involved in the task.

TABLE XXX
HELPED DEVELOP A PROFESSIONAL LIBRARY OF MATERIALS
AND MEDIA RELATED TO THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	18	36.7	23	46.9	41	41.8
Frequently	12	24.5	12	24.5	24	24.5
Occasionally	14	28.6	10	20.4	24	24.5
Seldom	4	8.2	3	6.1	7	7.1
Never	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	2.0
Total	49	100.0	49	100.0	98	100.0

As a group, curriculum directors reported that, actually and ideally, helping arrange for university credit course(s) for the staff involved in the innovation was a low priority item. Since this task is not directly related to the success or failure of an innovation, it is not surprising that it received a low ranking. This is the only item in which less than one-half of the curriculum directors were actually involved in the in-service category. It should be noted that well over half of the curriculum directors indicated they should perform this task extensively or frequently.

The information in Table XXXI shows that only twenty-one (47.8 percent) of the curriculum directors were actually involved in the task of helping to arrange for university credit, either extensively or frequently. Over one-third (36.4 percent) of the directors stated

they seldom or never performed the task. Ideally, twenty-four (58.5 percent) responded they should have performed this task extensively or frequently. However, eight (19.5 percent) indicated they ideally should seldom or never perform the task.

TABLE XXXI
HELPED ARRANGE FOR UNIVERSITY CREDIT COURSE(S)
FOR STAFF INVOLVED IN THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	12	27.3	13	31.7	25	29.4
Frequently	9	20.5	11	26.8	20	23.5
Occasionally	7	15.9	9	22.0	16	18.8
Seldom	9	20.5	5	12.2	14	16.5
Never	7	15.9	3	7.3	10	11.8
Total	44	100.0	41	100.0	85	100.0

Analysis for In-Service Education

Helping in the dissemination of information to the total staff was the task performed extensively or frequently by most curriculum directors. Ideally, this task was ranked third in the in-service category.

The task of helping assess the in-service needs of the staff was actually performed by seventy-eight percent of the directors while, ideally, ninety-two percent stated they should have been involved in

this task extensively or frequently. Helping assess the in-service needs of the staff ranked number one, ideally, in the area of in-service.

The largest gap between the actual and the ideal appears to be in the task of helping develop evaluation devices to measure the success of the in-service activities. While fifty percent of the curriculum directors were actually involved in the task, seventy percent indicated they should have performed the task.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Curriculum development responsibilities are many and varied. The questionnaire contained nineteen statements related to this area. The statements in this section ranged from goal setting, planning, evaluating, conducting, and coordinating various tasks. In general, the tasks listed in this category received higher rankings than the items listed in other categories. Over ninety percent of the curriculum directors indicated that ideally they should have performed six of the listed tasks either extensively or frequently, and over eighty percent of the curriculum directors identified eleven tasks that ideally should have been performed either extensively or frequently.

As expected, helping plan the innovation was the task curriculum directors ranked number one for both actually being involved and ideally should have been involved in. The information in Table XXXII illustrates that curriculum directors were more often involved in helping plan the innovation than any other task. The directors reported that forty-six

(92.0 percent) actually performed the task either extensively or frequently. Further, only one (2.0 percent) indicated that he seldom helped plan the innovation. In the ideal situation, forty-eight (96.0 percent) said this should be done extensively or frequently. None of the curriculum directors indicated they should seldom or never help plan the innovation.

TABLE XXXII
HELPED PLAN THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	33	66.0	33	66.0	66	66.0
Frequently	13	26.0	15	30.0	28	28.0
Occasionally	3	6.0	2	4.0	5	5.0
Seldom	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

When all curriculum directors were considered, less than two-thirds helped select or construct a measuring device to identify school districts' needs. Table XXXIII reveals that thirty-two (64.0 percent) were actually engaged in this task extensively or frequently. All the curriculum directors were involved in helping select or construct a measuring device to some degree. Six (12.0 percent) stated they seldom performed the task. It was indicated by the directors that ideally

they should have been more involved in the task. Thirty-eight (76.0 percent) thought they should be involved extensively or frequently, while six (12.0 percent) thought ideally they should seldom be involved in helping select or construct a measuring device. None of the curriculum directors thought they should be completely excluded from the task.

TABLE XXXIII
HELPED SELECT OR CONSTRUCT A MEASURING DEVICE TO
IDENTIFY SCHOOL DISTRICT NEEDS

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	23	46.0	29	58.0	52	52.0
Frequently	9	18.0	9	18.0	18	18.0
Occasionally	12	24.0	6	12.0	18	18.0
Seldom	6	12.0	6	12.0	12	12.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Well over three-quarters of the directors indicated they were involved in helping determine the goals and objectives for the innovation. Ideally, this was a high-ranked item by the directors. As the data in Table XXIV show, forty-two (84.0 percent) of the curriculum directors were actually involved in the task extensively or frequently. It is worth noting that none of the respondents indicated they seldom

or never help determine the goals and objectives for the innovation. Forty-five (90.0 percent) of the directors agreed that they ideally should perform this task extensively or frequently.

TABLE XXXIV
HELPED DETERMINE THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
FOR THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	30	60.0	30	60.0	60	60.0
Frequently	12	24.0	15	30.0	27	27.0
Occasionally	8	16.0	5	10.0	13	13.0
Seldom	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

In addition to determining the goals and objectives for the innovation, curriculum directors were greatly involved in helping develop long- and short-range plans for the implementation of the innovation. Data in Table XXXV illustrate that forty-two (87.6 percent) of all the curriculum directors actually performed this task extensively or frequently. Two (4.2 percent) of those in this position seldom helped develop long- and short-range plans. Ideally, forty-five (93.7 percent) thought they should have been extensively or frequently involved in the task. All the directors felt they should be involved in the task to a degree,

with one (2.1 percent) indicating that he should seldom be involved in helping develop long- and short-range plans for the innovation.

TABLE XXXV
HELPED DEVELOP LONG- AND SHORT-RANGE PLANS FOR
THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	33	68.8	34	70.8	67	69.8
Frequently	9	18.8	11	22.9	20	20.8
Occasionally	4	8.3	2	4.2	6	6.3
Seldom	2	4.2	1	2.1	3	3.1
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	48	100.0	48	100.0	96	100.0

Another task that curriculum directors were extensively involved with was helping obtain information concerning the innovation. Actual involvement by the directors ranked second in helping plan the innovation. Ideally, this task also garnered much support from the respondents.

Of all the curriculum directors, forty-five (90.0 percent) helped obtain information concerning the innovation either extensively or frequently prior to implementation. None of the curriculum directors indicated they never or seldom performed this task. Forty-five (91.9 percent) of the respondents said ideally they should perform the task on an extensive or frequent basis. Additionally, no one indicated

he should seldom or never be involved in helping obtain information concerning the innovation prior to implementation.

TABLE XXXVI
HELPED OBTAIN INFORMATION CONCERNING THE
INNOVATION PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	34	68.0	36	73.5	70	70.7
Frequently	11	22.0	9	18.4	20	20.2
Occasionally	5	10.0	4	8.2	9	9.1
Seldom	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	50	100.0	49	100.0	99	100.0

The data in Table XXXVII show that curriculum directors were not involved in helping provide opportunities for the discussion and investigation of research and information as they would like to be. It is worthy to note that, ideally, curriculum directors ranked this item second to helping plan the innovation in the curriculum development category.

It is readily seen that only thirty-nine (76.7 percent) of the directors actually provided opportunity for the discussion and investigation of research and information either extensively or frequently, while forty-six (95.8 percent) indicated that ideally they should have been

involved in this task extensively or frequently. Two (4.1 percent) of the directors seldom performed the task and ideally no director indicated that this task should be done either seldom or never.

TABLE XXXVII
HELPED PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE DISCUSSION AND
INVESTIGATION OF RESEARCH AND INFORMATION
RELATED TO THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	24	49.0	30	62.5	54	55.7
Frequently	15	30.6	16	33.3	31	32.0
Occasionally	8	16.3	2	4.2	10	10.3
Seldom	2	4.1	0	0.0	2	2.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	49	100.0	48	100.0	97	100.0

The respondents were very active in helping identify problems related to the innovation. Since this task is an extension of helping plan the innovation, it is only natural that curriculum directors ranked the statement high in both the actual and ideal areas.

The information in Table XXXVIII shows that forty-one (82.0 percent) of the directors either extensively or frequently helped identify problems related to the innovation. Conversely, it can be seen that only one (2.0 percent) seldom engaged in the task. Ideally, it

was found that forty-six (93.9 percent) of the total group indicated they should have been extensively or frequently involved in helping identify problems related to the innovation.

TABLE XXXVIII
HELPED IDENTIFY PROBLEMS RELATED TO
THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	26	52.0	31	63.3	57	57.6
Frequently	15	30.0	15	30.6	30	30.3
Occasionally	8	16.0	3	6.1	11	11.1
Seldom	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	50	100.0	49	100.0	99	100.0

Curriculum directors were less involved in helping teachers make decisions about the innovation during various stages of implementation. Less than two-thirds of the directors actually engaged in the task while slightly more than two-thirds indicated that ideally they should have done this extensively or frequently.

It is reported in Table XXXIX that thirty-two (64.0 percent) of the respondents actually were involved extensively or frequently in the task. It is further reported that five (10.0 percent) seldom performed the task and one (2.0 percent) never helped teachers make

decisions about the innovation during various stages of implementation. Ideally, thirty-three (67.4 percent) of the directors indicated they should have been involved in the task extensively or frequently. Three (6.1 percent) said they should seldom be involved in the task.

The respondents indicated they were even less involved in helping develop or select devices for evaluation of the innovation. However, over three-quarters of the directors indicated the importance of this task by ranking it high in the ideal area. It is interesting to note that the task discussed in Table XXXII (helped select or construct a measuring device to identify school district needs) garners almost the same response from the curriculum directors. Both items are concerned with the curriculum directors' role in selecting evaluation devices.

TABLE XXXIX

HELPED TEACHERS MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT THE INNOVATION
DURING VARIOUS STAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	20	40.0	21	42.9	41	41.4
Frequently	12	24.0	12	24.5	24	24.2
Occasionally	12	24.0	13	26.5	25	25.3
Seldom	5	10.0	3	6.1	8	8.1
Never	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
Total	50	100.0	49	100.0	99	100.0

Table XL illustrates that thirty-one (62.0 percent) of the respondents either extensively or frequently helped develop or select devices for evaluation of the innovation. Five (10.0 percent) seldom and two (4.0 percent) never performed the task. It was found that thirty-seven (75.5 percent) of the curriculum directors indicated ideally that they should have been involved in the task extensively or frequently. Three (6.1 percent) said they should seldom perform the task and, surprisingly, two (4.1 percent) indicated they should never help develop or select devices for evaluation of the innovation.

TABLE XL
HELPED DEVELOP OR SELECT DEVICES FOR
EVALUATION OF THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	20	40.0	22	44.9	42	42.4
Frequently	11	22.0	15	30.6	26	26.3
Occasionally	12	24.0	7	14.3	19	19.2
Seldom	5	10.0	3	6.1	8	8.1
Never	2	4.0	2	4.1	4	4.0
Total	50	100.0	49	100.0	99	100.0

Helping evaluate the innovation throughout the implementation process was performed either extensively or frequently by over two-thirds of the respondents. Curriculum directors were more active in evaluating the innovation than in developing or selecting devices to evaluate the

innovation. A possible explanation for this may be that evaluation devices were readily available and/or the selection of the evaluation devices were delegated to other individuals.

As shown in Table XLI, thirty-five (70.0 percent) of the curriculum directors stated they actually were involved in helping evaluate the innovation throughout the implementation process either extensively or frequently. This compares with five (10.0 percent) who stated they seldom or never performed the task. Curriculum directors, in general, ranked this task high, as forty (81.7 percent) indicated that ideally they should have performed the task extensively or frequently. Two respondents stated they should seldom be involved in the task and one (2.0 percent) reported he should never help evaluate the innovation throughout the implementation process.

TABLE XLI
HELPED EVALUATE THE INNOVATION THROUGHOUT
THE IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	21	42.0	24	49.0	45	45.5
Frequently	14	28.0	16	32.7	30	30.3
Occasionally	10	20.0	6	12.2	16	16.2
Seldom	4	8.0	2	4.1	6	6.1
Never	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	2.0
Total	50	100.0	49	100.0	99	100.0

Curriculum directors indicated ideally they should help plan a pilot program to field test the innovation. It is interesting to note that the directors were actually involved in this task in many different degrees. When all the curriculum directors were considered, over two-thirds (68.7 percent) either extensively or frequently were involved in helping plan a pilot program to field test the innovation. Six (12.5 percent) reported they seldom or never were involved in the task. Conversely, it can be seen in Table XLII that thirty-eight (80.0 percent) of the curriculum directors reported they ideally should have been involved in the task either extensively or frequently. Although none of the curriculum directors responded they ideally should seldom be involved, it is worth noting that five (10.6 percent) of the directors stated they ideally should never help plan a pilot to field test the innovation.

TABLE XLII
HELPED PLAN A PILOT PROGRAM TO FIELD TEST
THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	23	47.9	26	55.3	49	51.6
Frequently	10	10.8	12	15.5	22	23.2
Occasionally	9	18.8	4	8.5	13	13.7
Seldom	2	4.2	0	0.0	2	2.1
Never	4	8.3	5	10.6	9	9.5
Total	48	100.0	47	100.0	95	100.0

Curriculum directors were far less involved in the task of helping develop instructional material for the innovation. Less than one-half of the directors engaged in this task extensively or frequently. Furthermore, somewhat over one-half of the directors indicated ideally they should have performed the task extensively or frequently. As stated in Table XLIII, twenty-two (44.9 percent) of the curriculum directors responded they helped develop instructional material either extensively or frequently; however, Table XLIII further indicates that twelve (24.5 percent) of the directors seldom were involved in the task, while six (12.2 percent) never were involved in the task.

Ideally, twenty-seven (56.3 percent) of the directors reported they should have been involved in helping develop material extensively or frequently. This compares with five (10.4 percent) that stated

TABLE XLIII
HELPED DEVELOP INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL
FOR THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	15	30.6	15	31.3	30	30.9
Frequently	7	14.3	12	25.0	21	21.6
Occasionally	9	18.4	12	25.0	21	21.6
Seldom	12	24.5	5	10.4	17	17.5
Never	6	12.2	4	8.3	10	10.3
Total	49	100.0	48	100.0	97	100.0

they should seldom perform the task and four (8.3 percent) who indicated ideally they should never help develop instructional materials.

Curriculum directors were slightly more active in helping select texts, audio-visual aids, and other material than helping develop instruction materials for the innovation. The directors, however, registered a wide difference of opinion as to the extent they ideally should have been involved in helping select texts, audio-visual aids and other material related to the innovation.

The data in Table XLIV show that fourteen (29.2 percent) of the directors performed the task extensively, while twelve (25.0 percent) performed the task frequently for a total of twenty-six (54.2 percent) who were actively involved in the task. A total of fourteen (29.2 percent) were not highly involved in the task, with eight (16.7 percent) indicating they seldom engaged in the task and six (12.5 percent) reporting they never helped select texts, audio-visual aids, and other material related to the innovation.

Ideally, a total of thirty (63.8 percent) of the curriculum directors indicated they should have been more involved in the task, with sixteen (34.0 percent) stating they should be extensively involved and fourteen (29.8 percent) stating they should be frequently involved in the task. Nine (19.2 percent) of the respondents indicated that ideally they should seldom or never be involved in helping select texts, audio-visual aids, and other material related to the innovation.

TABLE XLIV
HELPED SELECT TEXTS, AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS, AND
OTHER MATERIAL RELATED TO THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	14	29.2	16	34.0	30	31.6
Frequently	12	25.0	14	29.8	26	27.4
Occasionally	8	16.7	8	17.0	16	16.8
Seldom	8	16.7	6	12.8	14	14.7
Never	6	12.5	3	6.3	9	9.6
Total	48	100.0	47	100.0	95	100.0

Curriculum directors, in general, indicated they should help select the consultant that would be used for the implementation of the innovation. Almost three-fourths of the respondents stated they actually helped select the consultants, according to Table XLV.

Twenty-three (46.0 percent) of the directors reported they helped select consultants extensively, while thirteen (26.0 percent) frequently performed this task for a total of thirty-six (72.0 percent) who were actively involved in the task regularly. Four (8.0 percent) of the curriculum directors seldom performed the task, while four (8.0 percent) indicated they never were involved in the task.

Forty (80.0 percent) of the respondents reported that ideally they should have helped select the consultants either extensively or frequently. Two (4.9 percent) stated that ideally they should seldom

perform this task, while only one (2.0 percent) indicated he should never perform the task.

TABLE XLV
HELPED SELECT THE CONSULTANTS THAT
WOULD BE USED

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	23	46.0	26	52.0	49	49.0
Frequently	13	26.0	14	28.0	27	27.0
Occasionally	6	12.0	7	14.0	13	13.0
Seldom	4	8.0	2	4.0	6	6.0
Never	4	8.0	1	2.0	5	5.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Although curriculum directors were willing to help select consultants, they indicated they were less likely to help develop specific job descriptions for the consultants. Only twenty-nine (60.4 percent) of the curriculum directors reported they were either extensively or frequently involved in this task, while four (8.3 percent) indicated they were seldom involved. Another four (8.3 percent) of the directors reported they were never involved in the task. Table XLV shows that ideally thirty-seven (77.1 percent) of all the directors indicated they should have been involved in helping develop specific job descriptions for the consultants either extensively or frequently.

Only one (2.1 percent) director reported that he should seldom be involved, while two (4.2 percent) indicated they should never be involved in the task.

TABLE XLVI
HELPED DEVELOP SPECIFIC JOB DESCRIPTIONS
FOR THE CONSULTANTS

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	18	37.5	20	41.7	38	39.6
Frequently	11	22.9	17	35.4	28	29.2
Occasionally	11	22.9	8	16.7	19	19.8
Seldom	4	8.3	1	2.1	5	5.2
Never	4	8.3	2	4.2	6	6.3
Total	48	100.0	48	100.0	96	100.0

It can be readily seen in Table XLVII that curriculum directors were far less involved in helping evaluate the effectiveness of the consultants. Only twenty-eight (57.1 percent) of the directors reported they were involved in this task extensively or frequently. Seven (14.3 percent) stated they were seldom or never involved in the task.

Ideally, thirty-seven (75.6 percent) indicated they should have been involved either extensively or frequently in this task. Three (6.1 percent) of the directors stated they seldom or never should participate in helping evaluate the effectiveness of the consultants.

TABLE XLVII
HELPED EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS
OF THE CONSULTANTS

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	15	30.6	21	42.9	36	36.7
Frequently	13	26.5	16	32.7	29	29.6
Occasionally	14	28.6	9	18.4	23	23.5
Seldom	4	8.2	1	2.0	5	5.1
Never	3	6.1	2	4.1	5	5.1
Total	49	100.0	49	100.0	98	100.0

A large majority of curriculum directors indicated they were in some way involved with "ad hoc" or advisory committee(s) related to the innovation. Helping coordinate "ad hoc" and/or advisory committee(s) was identified by directors as a task they ideally should have performed regularly. However, this task was performed regularly by less than two-thirds of the curriculum directors. Specifically, it was found that thirty-one (62.0 percent) of the total respondents were involved in this activity extensively or frequently, while five (10.0 percent) reported they seldom engaged in this activity.

As can be seen in Table XLVIII, forty (80.0 percent) of the curriculum directors indicated they ideally should have engaged in this activity extensively or frequently, while only two (4.0 percent) of the directors indicated they should seldom or never engage in this

activity.

TABLE XLVIII
HELPED COORDINATE "AD HOC" AND/OR ADVISORY
COMMITTEE(S) RELATED TO THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	20	40.0	22	44.0	42	42.0
Frequently	11	22.0	18	36.0	29	29.0
Occasionally	14	28.0	8	16.0	22	22.0
Seldom	5	10.0	1	2.0	6	6.0
Never	0	0.0	1	2.0	1	1.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Although serving as an active member of an "ad hoc" and/or advisory committee was not ranked, ideally, as high as the task of coordinating an "ad hoc" or advisory committee, more curriculum directors regularly engaged in the aforementioned capacity. More than two-thirds of the curriculum directors responded they served as an active member of an "ad hoc" and/or advisory committee related to the innovation. As Table XLIX indicates, thirty-four (69.4 percent) of the directors participated in the task either extensively or frequently, while six (12.3 percent) seldom or never participated.

Ideally, only thirty-four (69.4 percent) of the directors reported they should have been involved in the task extensively or

frequently. Seven (14.3 percent) of the respondents indicated they should seldom or never perform the task.

TABLE XLIX
SERVED AS AN ACTIVE MEMBER OF "AD HOC" AND/OR ADVISORY
COMMITTEE(S) RELATED TO THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	20	40.8	22	44.9	42	42.9
Frequently	14	28.6	12	24.5	26	26.5
Occasionally	9	18.4	8	16.3	17	17.3
Seldom	4	8.2	5	10.2	9	9.2
Never	2	4.1	2	4.1	4	4.1
Total	49	100.0	49	100.0	98	100.0

In working with an "ad hoc" or advisory committee, curriculum directors indicated ideally that serving as an advisor should rank as most important. This task was also the one most performed by the directors.

Table L indicates that thirty-five (72.9 percent) of the curriculum directors actually served as an advisor either extensively or frequently. Conversely, four (8.3 percent) of the directors seldom and one (2.1 percent) never served as an advisor. Forty-two (87.5 percent) of the curriculum directors reported that ideally they should have served as an advisor extensively or frequently, while three

(6.3 percent) stated they should seldom or never be an advisor.

TABLE L
HELPED SERVE AS AN ADVISOR TO "AD HOC" AND/OR
ADVISORY COMMITTEE RELATED TO THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	22	45.8	28	58.3	50	52.1
Frequently	13	27.1	14	29.2	27	28.1
Occasionally	8	16.7	3	6.3	11	11.5
Seldom	4	8.3	2	4.2	6	6.3
Never	1	2.1	1	2.1	2	2.1
Total	48	100.0	48	100.0	96	100.0

Analysis of Curriculum Development

Helping plan the innovation was the one task curriculum directors overwhelmingly indicated they were involved with. The directors indicated they were very active in helping obtain information, develop long- and short-range plans, determine the goals and objectives, and identify problems related to the innovation. It should be noted that all the above tasks directly relate to helping plan the innovation.

Less than two-thirds of the curriculum directors actually helped select or construct a measuring device either to identify school district needs or for the evaluation of the innovation. Directors were slightly more active in actually helping evaluate the innovation

throughout the implementation process than helping select or construct evaluation instruments. Ideally, more than three-quarters of the directors indicated they should have been involved in the above three tasks to a higher degree.

It is interesting to note that less than one-half of the directors reported they helped develop instructional material and slightly more than one-half helped select texts, audio-visual aids and other materials related to the innovation. These two tasks would require curriculum directors to work directly with teachers, yet less than two-thirds of the directors indicated they ideally should perform these tasks to a high degree.

In working with consultants, curriculum directors stated the most important task, and the task more than two-thirds performed, was helping select the consultants who would be used. Although directors reported that helping develop specific job descriptions and helping evaluate the effectiveness of the consultants were ideally important, less than two-thirds of the directors actually performed the tasks.

Helping serve as an advisor to an "ad hoc" or advisory committee(s) was ranked high both ideally and actually by curriculum directors. Although less than two-thirds of the directors helped coordinate an "ad hoc" or advisory committee(s), more than three-quarters indicated they should have been involved to a greater extent. Slightly more than two-thirds of the directors reported, actually and ideally, that they served or should have served as an active member of an "ad hoc" or advisory committee(s).

SUPERVISION

The questionnaire contained nine items in the area of supervision. The items in this part were aimed specifically at determining the curriculum directors' involvement, actual and ideal, with teachers working on the innovation. In general, the tasks listed in this category did not receive a high ideal ranking. Additionally, it is noted that no item was performed by more than two-thirds of the curriculum directors.

Data in Table LI show that only twenty-nine (58.0 percent) of the directors actually helped organize and conduct group discussions with teachers concerning the innovation, either extensively or frequently. This compares with nine (18.0 percent) that indicated they seldom or never performed the task. Ideally, thirty-four (68.0 percent) of the curriculum directors reported they should have performed the task extensively or frequently, while eight (16.0 percent) stated they should seldom or never help organize and conduct group discussions with teachers.

Of all items listed in the area of supervision, curriculum directors indicated that, ideally, helping teachers review information on school district needs related to the innovation was the task they should have been involved in to a greater degree than any other task. Although well over three-quarters of the curriculum directors reported ideally they should be involved in the task to a large degree, less than two-thirds of the directors actually performed the task.

TABLE LI
HELPED ORGANIZE AND CONDUCT GROUP DISCUSSIONS
WITH TEACHERS CONCERNING THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	14	28.0	19	38.0	33	33.0
Frequently	15	30.0	15	30.0	30	30.0
Occasionally	12	24.0	8	16.0	20	20.0
Seldom	7	14.0	7	14.0	14	14.0
Never	2	4.0	1	2.0	3	3.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

As can be seen in Table LII, thirty-two (64.0 percent) of the curriculum directors stated they actually helped teachers review information on school district needs either extensively or frequently. This compares with forty (80.0 percent) of the curriculum directors who indicated they ideally should have performed the task either extensively or frequently. Only four (8.0 percent) of the directors stated ideally they should seldom perform the task, while none indicated they should never perform the task. In actuality, six (12.0 percent) of the respondents seldom engaged in the task and one (2.0 percent) never performed the task.

TABLE LII
HELPED TEACHER REVIEW INFORMATION ON SCHOOL
DISTRICT NEEDS RELATED TO THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	19	38.0	27	54.0	46	46.0
Frequently	13	26.0	13	26.0	26	26.0
Occasionally	11	22.0	6	12.0	17	17.0
Seldom	6	12.0	4	8.0	10	10.0
Never	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	0.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Curriculum directors were slightly more active in helping direct teachers to locate information that would help solve problems or improve the innovation than any other task in the supervision area. This task, however, was not ideally a high ranked item by the reporting curriculum directors.

The information in Table LIII illustrates that thirty-two (65.3 percent) of the directors helped direct teachers to locate information either extensively or frequently, while only thirty-three (67.4 percent) of the directors indicated that ideally they should have been more involved in the task. Nine (18.4 percent) of the respondents seldom or never performed the task and seven (14.3 percent) stated that ideally they should seldom or never be involved in the task.

TABLE LIII
HELPED DIRECT TEACHERS TO LOCATE INFORMATION
THAT WOULD HELP SOLVE PROBLEMS OR
IMPROVE THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	13	26.5	19	38.8	32	32.7
Frequently	19	38.8	14	28.6	33	33.7
Occasionally	8	16.3	9	18.4	17	17.3
Seldom	7	14.3	5	10.2	12	12.2
Never	2	4.1	2	4.1	4	4.1
Total	49	100.0	49	100.0	98	100.0

Less than one-half of all the curriculum directors indicated they were not highly involved in helping teachers select appropriate instructional materials. Slightly more than one-half reported they ideally should be more involved.

Table LIV illustrates the low ranking of this item. A total of twenty-three (47.9 percent) of the curriculum directors stated they extensively or frequently helped teachers select appropriate instructional materials, while eight (16.7 percent) indicated they seldom and three (6.3 percent) reported they never were involved in the task.

Ideally, only twenty-seven (56.0 percent) of the directors indicated they should be involved to a greater extent. Ten (20.9 percent) stated they should seldom or never be involved in the task

of helping teachers select appropriate instructional materials.

TABLE LIV
HELPED TEACHERS SELECT APPROPRIATE
INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	12	25.0	16	33.3	28	29.2
Frequently	11	22.9	11	22.9	22	22.9
Occasionally	14	29.2	11	22.9	25	26.0
Seldom	8	16.7	7	14.6	15	15.6
Never	3	6.3	3	6.3	6	6.3
Total	48	100.0	48	100.0	96	100.0

Curriculum directors in the area of supervision ideally ranked high the task of relating information to teachers involved in the innovation by use of memos and bulletins. In actuality, the directors were not overly involved in the use of memos and bulletins to teachers.

As Table LV shows, thirty-one (62.0 percent) of the curriculum directors actually were involved extensively or frequently in the task, while nine (18.0 percent) of the directors reported they seldom or never engaged in the task. Correspondingly, thirty-five (70.0 percent) of the directors indicated ideally they should have related information to teachers by use of memos and bulletins either extensively or frequently. Six (12.0 percent) reported they should seldom

or never be involved in the task.

TABLE LV
HELPED RELATE INFORMATION TO TEACHERS INVOLVED
IN THE INNOVATION BY USE OF MEMOS
AND BULLETINS

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	15	30.0	19	38.0	34	34.0
Frequently	16	32.0	16	32.0	32	32.0
Occasionally	10	20.0	9	18.0	19	19.0
Seldom	8	16.0	5	10.0	13	13.0
Never	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	2.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Curriculum directors were even less involved in the task of helping provide teachers with recent books, pamphlets, periodicals, or other material dealing with the innovation. Although less than two-thirds performed the task, more than three-quarters of the directors indicated they should have been involved to a greater extent.

The data in Table LVI reveal that thirty (61.3 percent) of the directors actually helped provide teachers with recent books, pamphlets, periodicals, or other material either extensively or frequently, while, ideally, thirty-eight (77.5 percent) of the directors reported they should have been involved in the task extensively or frequently. Four

(8.2 percent) of the directors reported they seldom engaged in the task and only one (2.0 percent) stated he never performed the task. Ideally, two (4.1 percent) of the directors reported they should seldom perform the task, while only one (2.0 percent) stated he should never have been involved in the task.

TABLE LVI
HELPED PROVIDE TEACHERS WITH RECENT BOOKS,
PAMPHLETS, PERIODICALS, OR OTHER MATERIAL
DEALING WITH THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	16	32.7	20	40.8	36	36.7
Frequently	14	28.6	18	36.7	32	32.7
Occasionally	14	28.6	8	16.3	22	22.4
Seldom	4	8.2	2	4.1	6	6.1
Never	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	2.0
Total	49	100.0	49	100.0	98	100.0

Curriculum directors were far less involved in the task of helping conduct one-to-one supervisory conferences with teachers to discuss the innovation than any other task in the supervision area. The directors, in general, were also in agreement that one-to-one supervisory conferences ideally should not be a task in which they are highly involved.

It was found that of the total group, only nineteen (38.8 percent) of the directors actually conducted one-to-one conferences with teachers either extensively or frequently. An even larger number of curriculum directors reported they were not active in the task. Table LVII rather surprisingly indicates that twenty (40.9 percent) of the directors seldom or never were involved in the task. There is not much difference between the actual and ideal responses concerning the task, as only twenty-five (51.0 percent) of the directors indicated the task was one they ideally should be involved in to a greater extent. Thirteen respondents stated ideally they should seldom or never be involved in one-to-one conferences with teachers.

TABLE LVII
HELPED CONDUCT ONE-TO-ONE SUPERVISORY CONFERENCES
WITH TEACHERS TO DISCUSS THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	10	20.4	14	28.6	24	24.5
Frequently	9	18.4	11	22.4	20	20.4
Occasionally	10	20.4	11	22.4	21	21.4
Seldom	16	32.7	9	18.4	25	25.5
Never	4	8.2	4	8.2	8	8.2
Total	49	100.0	49	100.0	98	100.0

As Table LVIII shows, curriculum directors were more involved in the task of helping serve as an advisor to teachers working on the innovation. However, less than two-thirds of the curriculum directors ranked this task as one that should often be performed.

It can readily be seen in Table LVIII that this task was performed extensively or frequently by twenty-nine (59.2 percent) of the curriculum directors. Twelve (24.4 percent) of the directors stated they seldom or never were involved in helping serve as an advisor to teachers. It appears that thirty-two (65.3 percent) of the directors indicated they ideally should have been involved in the task either extensively or frequently, while nine (18.3 percent) reported they should seldom or never be involved in the task.

TABLE LVIII
HELPED SERVE AS AN ADVISOR TO TEACHERS
INVOLVED IN THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	20	40.8	23	46.9	43	43.9
Frequently	9	18.4	9	18.4	18	18.4
Occasionally	8	16.3	8	16.3	16	16.3
Seldom	11	22.4	8	16.3	19	19.4
Never	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	2.0
Total	49	100.0	49	100.0	98	100.0

More than two-thirds of the respondents indicated that ideally they should have been involved to a greater extent in the task of helping develop tangible and intangible rewards and recognition for those teachers involved in the innovation. In actuality, slightly more than one-half the directors were involved in the task.

Data in Table LIX show that twenty-seven (55.1 percent) of the curriculum directors actually helped develop tangible and intangible rewards and recognition for teachers, while eight (16.3 percent) seldom or never were involved in the task. It was found that thirty-three (67.3 percent) of the total respondents stated they ideally should have been involved in the task either extensively or frequently. Four (8.2 percent) of the curriculum directors indicated they should seldom be involved, while only one (2.0 percent) stated he should never participate in the task.

TABLE LIX

HELPED DEVELOP TANGIBLE AND INTANGIBLE REWARDS AND RECOGNITION
FOR THOSE TEACHERS INVOLVED IN THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	16	32.7	18	36.7	34	34.7
Frequently	11	22.4	15	30.6	26	26.5
Occasionally	14	28.6	11	22.4	25	25.5
Seldom	5	10.2	4	8.2	9	9.2
Never	3	6.1	1	2.0	4	4.1
Total	49	100.0	49	100.0	98	100.0

Analysis of Supervision

Only the tasks of helping teachers review information on school district needs and helping provide teachers with recent books, pamphlets, periodicals, or other materials were ranked high, ideally, by curriculum directors. The task which ranked number one for actual involvement was helping direct teachers locate information; however, this task was not ranked high ideally.

In general, it appears that curriculum directors were not actively involved in helping supervise teachers working on the innovation. Less than thirty-nine percent of the directors actually conducted one-to-one supervisory conferences with teachers to any great extent and less than forty-eight percent actually helped teachers select appropriate instructional materials with any regularity. The data gathered in the supervision category seem to indicate that slightly more than one-half of the curriculum directors were working directly with teachers.

PERSONNEL

The personnel category covers the range of professional educators, within the district, that the curriculum director may come in contact with. This section attempts to clarify the involvement of the curriculum director with other professionals, as they relate to specific tasks in the implementation of an innovation.

The first three tasks considered rank highest in both the actual and ideal area. Percentage-wise they vary only slightly from

one another. It is worth noting that the first three tasks deal with the curriculum director and his involvement with other administrators.

As Table LX shows, curriculum directors were very much involved in the task of helping plan for the involvement of other administrators. It was found that forty-two (84.0 percent) of all the directors who responded either extensively or frequently, were engaged in this task. Only three (6.0 percent) indicated they seldom performed the task and none of the directors indicated they were never involved in the task. Ideally, all the curriculum directors reported they should be involved in the task to some extent. Forty-seven (94.0 percent) of the directors stated they ideally should have been involved either extensively or frequently, while only one (2.0 percent) reported he should seldom be involved in the task. Ideally, not one director indicated he should never be involved in the task.

TABLE LX
HELPED PLAN FOR THE INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER ADMINISTRATORS

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	29	58.0	36	72.0	65	65.0
Frequently	13	26.0	11	22.0	24	24.0
Occasionally	5	10.0	2	4.0	7	7.0
Seldom	3	6.0	1	2.0	4	4.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Curriculum directors were even more active in the task of helping keep administrators, not involved, informed about the innovation. The directors indicated the importance of this task by giving it a high ideal ranking. It can be seen in Table LXI that forty-four (86.3 percent) of the curriculum directors engaged in the task either extensively or frequently, while two (4.0 percent) indicated they seldom or never engaged in the task. Ideally, forty-eight (94.1 percent) of the respondents indicated they should help keep administrators, not involved, informed about the innovation. None of the curriculum directors said they should seldom perform the task and only one (2.0 percent) said he should never be involved in the task.

TABLE LXI
HELPED KEEP ADMINISTRATORS, NOT INVOLVED,
INFORMED ABOUT THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	28	54.9	35	68.6	63	61.8
Frequently	16	31.4	13	25.5	29	28.4
Occasionally	5	9.8	2	3.9	7	6.9
Seldom	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
Never	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	2.0
Total	51	100.0	51	100.0	102	100.0

It appears that curriculum directors were more involved in the task of helping confer with principals, involved, on the progress of the innovation. Additionally, this task received the highest rank in the ideal area.

The information in Table LXII illustrates that forty-four (86.3 percent) of the total group were involved in this activity extensively or frequently, while only one (2.0 percent) reported that he seldom engaged in this educational function. All the curriculum directors helped confer with principals to some degree.

Of all the curriculum directors, forty-eight (94.2 percent) reported, ideally, they should have been involved in the task either extensively or frequently. None of the directors indicated they should never engage in the task, while one (2.0 percent) reported he should seldom perform the task.

TABLE LXII
HELPED CONFER WITH PRINCIPALS, INVOLVED, ON THE
PROGRESS OF THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	26	51.0	29	56.9	55	53.9
Frequently	18	35.3	19	37.3	37	36.3
Occasionally	6	11.8	2	3.9	8	7.8
Seldom	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	2.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	51	100.0	51	100.0	102	100.0

Curriculum directors were far less active in the task of helping select teachers to be involved in the innovation. The information in Table LXIII shows that twenty-eight (56.0 percent) of the directors were involved in this task either extensively or frequently. Nine (18.0 percent) of the respondents indicated they were seldom involved, while two (4.0 percent) reported they were never involved in the task.

Ideally, only twenty-nine (58.0 percent) stated they should have been involved in selecting teachers either extensively or frequently. This compares with six (12.0 percent) of the curriculum directors who indicated they should seldom perform the task and one (2.0 percent) who stated he should never perform the task.

TABLE XLIII
HELPED SELECT TEACHERS TO BE INVOLVED IN THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	18	36.0	19	38.0	37	37.0
Frequently	10	20.0	10	20.0	20	20.0
Occasionally	11	22.0	14	28.0	25	25.0
Seldom	9	18.0	6	12.0	15	15.0
Never	2	4.0	1	2.0	3	3.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

The curriculum directors were even less active in the task of helping arrange the assignments of teachers involved in the innovation. Less than one-half of the directors indicated they performed this task and, ideally, less than one-half indicated they should have been more involved in the task.

Data in Table LXIV show that twenty (40.8 percent) of the respondents actually helped arrange the assignments of teachers involved in the innovation either extensively or frequently, while sixteen (30.6 percent) seldom or never were involved in the task. It was reported that ideally twenty-four (49.7 percent) of the curriculum directors stated they should have been involved extensively or frequently and conversely, thirteen (27.1 percent) reported they should seldom or never have been involved in the task.

TABLE LXIV
HELPED ARRANGE THE ASSIGNMENTS OF TEACHERS
INVOLVED IN THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	11	22.4	15	31.3	26	26.8
Frequently	9	18.4	9	18.4	18	18.6
Occasionally	13	26.5	11	22.9	24	24.7
Seldom	11	22.4	10	20.8	21	21.6
Never	5	10.2	3	6.3	8	8.2
Total	49	100.0	48	100.0	97	100.0

More than one-half (64.0 percent) of the curriculum directors responded they helped provide support staff to assist with the innovation extensively or frequently; however, as Table LXV indicates, thirty-eight (76.0 percent) of the directors stated they ideally should have been involved in this task extensively or frequently. Seven (14.0 percent) reported they seldom or never were involved in the task, while only five (10.0 percent) stated ideally they should seldom have been involved in the task. All the curriculum directors reported they should help provide support staff to some extent.

TABLE LXV
HELPED PROVIDE SUPPORT STAFF TO ASSIST WITH
THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	19	38.0	22	44.0	41	41.0
Frequently	13	26.0	16	32.0	29	29.0
Occasionally	11	22.0	7	14.0	18	18.0
Seldom	5	10.0	5	10.0	10	10.0
Never	2	4.0	0	0.0	2	2.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Curriculum directors were somewhat more active in the task of helping select the members of the "ad hoc" and/or advisory committees. As Table LXVI shows, thirty-four (70.8 percent) actually performed this task either extensively or frequently, while three (6.3 percent) seldom performed this task and two (4.2 percent) never were involved in the task. Ideally, well over three-fourths, or thirty-eight (79.2 percent), reported they should have been involved extensively or frequently. One (2.1 percent) director indicated he should seldom have been involved and one (2.1 percent) director stated he should never been involved in the task.

TABLE LXVI
HELPED SELECT THE MEMBERS OF THE "AD HOC"
AND/OR ADVISORY COMMITTEES

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	16	33.3	19	39.6	35	36.5
Frequently	18	37.5	19	39.6	37	38.5
Occasionally	9	18.8	8	16.7	17	17.7
Seldom	3	6.3	1	2.1	4	4.2
Never	2	4.2	1	2.1	3	3.1
Total	48	100.0	48	100.0	96	100.0

Analysis of Personnel Responsibilities

It appears that curriculum directors were more involved with administrators than any other personnel. Those tasks relating to other administrators and administrators not involved in the innovation received higher rankings both actually and ideally. Slightly more than one-half of the curriculum directors actually helped select teachers to be involved in the innovation. Less than one-half of the directors helped arrange the assignments of the teachers involved in the innovation. It should be noted that the actual and the ideal responses were not far apart on the preceding two items. Although less than two-thirds of the curriculum directors actually helped provide support staff, more than three-fourths reported they should have been involved in the task. More than two-thirds of the directors helped select members of "ad hoc" and/or advisory committees, while almost eighty percent stated they should have helped in this task.

OTHER DUTIES

This category covers four widely varied tasks that did not fit in any of the previous categories. The data on Table LXVII concern the first of these tasks--helping initiate and maintain a decision-making system for the innovation. Forty-one (82.0 percent) of the curriculum directors answered they were involved in this task extensively or frequently. Correspondingly, forty-eight (96.0 percent) of the directors responded this was a task they ideally should have been involved in extensively or frequently. Three (6.0 percent) indicated they were seldom involved to some degree in helping initiate and maintain a

decision-making system. Ideally, all the respondents reported they should be involved in the task more than just seldomly.

TABLE LXVII
HELPED INITIATE AND MAINTAIN A DECISION-MAKING
SYSTEM FOR THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	30	60.0	33	66.0	63	63.0
Frequently	11	22.0	15	30.0	26	26.0
Occasionally	6	12.0	2	4.0	8	8.0
Seldom	3	6.0	0	0.0	3	3.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

Less than two-thirds of the curriculum directors indicated they were involved in the task of helping design or re-design available facilities necessary for the innovation either extensively or frequently. Ideally, thirty-seven (65.3 percent) reported they should have been involved either extensively or frequently. Twelve (24.5 percent) of the directors stated they seldom or never were involved in the task. Table LXVIII shows ideally that eight (16.3 percent) of the directors stated they should seldom or never have been involved in the task.

TABLE LXVIII
HELPED DESIGN OR REDESIGN AVAILABLE FACILITIES
NECESSARY FOR THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	17	34.7	24	49.0	41	41.8
Frequently	13	26.5	13	16.3	21	21.4
Occasionally	7	14.3	9	18.4	16	16.3
Seldom	7	14.3	5	10.2	12	12.2
Never	5	10.2	3	6.1	8	8.2
Total	49	100.0	49	100.0	98	100.0

The task of helping arrange extra clerical help needed for the innovation received a low ranking, both actually and ideally, by the respondents. Twenty-two (44.8 percent) stated they were involved in this task extensively or frequently. This compares with thirteen (26.6 percent) who seldom or never were involved in the task. Table LXIX shows, ideally, that twenty-seven (55.1 percent) indicated the task should be done extensively or frequently. Fourteen (28.6 percent) of the curriculum directors expressed the opinion that they ideally should seldom or never have been involved in the task.

TABLE LXIX
HELPED ARRANGE EXTRA CLERICAL HELP NEEDED
FOR THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	14	28.6	18	36.7	32	32.7
Frequently	8	16.3	9	18.4	17	17.3
Occasionally	14	28.6	8	16.3	22	22.4
Seldom	9	18.4	9	18.4	18	18.4
Never	4	8.2	5	10.2	9	9.2
Total	49	100.0	49	100.0	98	100.0

Curriculum directors were slightly more active in the task of helping duplicate and distribute materials related to the innovation; however, less than one-half of the directors indicated they ideally should be involved in the task on a regular basis. As noted in Table LXX, twenty-six (50.9 percent) of the curriculum directors were involved in the task either extensively or frequently. Seventeen (33.3 percent) of the directors stated they seldom or never were involved in the task. Ideally, twenty-five (49.0 percent) indicated they should have been engaged in the task extensively or frequently, while fifteen (31.5 percent) stated they should seldom or never have been involved in the task.

TABLE LXX
HELPED DUPLICATE AND DISTRIBUTE MATERIALS
RELATED TO THE INNOVATION

	Actual		Ideal		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extensively	17	33.3	18	35.3	35	34.3
Frequently	9	17.6	7	13.7	16	15.7
Occasionally	8	15.3	11	22.1	19	18.6
Seldom	10	19.6	9	17.6	19	18.6
Never	7	13.7	6	11.8	13	12.7
Total	51	100.0	51	100.0	102	100.0

Analysis of Other Duties

The task ranked highest, both ideally and actually, was helping initiate and maintain a decision-making system for the innovation. Curriculum directors indicated, overwhelmingly, they should have been involved in this task. Arranging for extra clerical aid and duplicating and distributing materials were ranked low, both in the actual and ideal responses.

INVOLVEMENT WITH OTHER PEOPLE

Each curriculum director was asked to rate his involvement with a number of different people during the adoption of the innovation. This information is presented somewhat differently in this

category since the information gathered is concerned only with the actual extent of involvement between the curriculum director and other people.

Table LXXI reports the extent of involvement between the curriculum director and the superintendent and principal(s). It would seem that the directors were highly involved with both the superintendent and principal(s). Thirty-six (77.0 percent) of the respondents indicated they were highly involved with the superintendent during the innovation, while only four (8.0 percent) reported low involvement.

It seems that directors were far more involved with principals than any other people. The responses of the directors indicate that forty-five (90.0 percent) of them were highly involved with principals and none indicated low involvement.

TABLE XLLI
EXTENT CURRICULUM DIRECTOR WAS INVOLVED WITH
SUPERINTENDENT AND PRINCIPAL(S)

		Superintendent		Principal(s)	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High	5	25	50.0	31	62.0
	4	11	22.0	14	28.0
	3	10	20.0	5	10.0
	2	3	6.0	0	0.0
Low	1	1	2.0	0	0.0

It can be seen in Table LXXII that curriculum directors were less active in working with department heads, teachers, and instructional specialists such as a librarian, counselor, or media person. Thirty-six (75.0 percent) of the respondents indicated they were highly involved with department heads, while five (10.5 percent) reported low involvement.

It was found that thirty-four (65.3 percent) of the curriculum directors were involved with teachers to a high degree and five (9.6 percent) reported low involvement with teachers. As was true with teachers, thirty-four (65.3 percent) of the curriculum directors reported they were highly involved with instructional specialists, while only three (5.7 percent) indicated low involvement.

TABLE LXXII
EXTENT CURRICULUM DIRECTOR WAS INVOLVED WITH
DEPARTMENT HEADS, TEACHERS, AND
INSTRUCTIONAL SPECIALISTS

		Department Heads		Teachers		Instructional Specialists	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High	5	17	35.4	15	28.8	15	28.8
	4	19	39.6	19	36.5	19	36.5
	3	7	14.6	13	25.0	15	28.8
	2	2	4.2	4	7.7	1	1.9
Low	1	3	6.3	1	1.9	2	3.8
Total		48	100.0	52	100.0	52	100.0

It appears that curriculum directors were less involved with students, parents, and lay people than with any other group of individuals. Table LXXIII shows that directors were far less involved in working with students. Only five (9.6 percent) indicated they were highly involved with students, while thirty (57.7 percent) reported low involvement.

Curriculum directors were slightly more active in working with parents; however, as a group, this area did not rank high. The responses of the directors show that only eleven (21.2 percent) were extensively involved with parents. Twenty (38.4 percent) indicated they were not highly involved with parents.

The respondents reported they were even less involved with lay people than with parents. Ten (19.3 percent) of the curriculum directors stated they were highly involved with lay people and nineteen

TABLE LXXIII
EXTENT CURRICULUM DIRECTOR WAS INVOLVED WITH
STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND LAY PEOPLE

		<u>Students</u>		<u>Parents</u>		<u>Lay People</u>	
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
High	5	4	7.7	3	5.8	3	5.8
	4	1	1.9	8	15.4	7	13.5
	3	17	32.7	21	40.4	23	44.2
	2	22	42.3	14	26.9	11	21.2
	1	8	15.4	6	11.5	8	15.4
	Total	52	100.0	52	100.0	52	100.0

(36.6 percent) reported low involvement.

The information in Table LXXIV illustrates that curriculum directors, in general, were not as actively involved with consultants from colleges/universities and from the departments of education as they were with consultants from inside the district. Thirty-nine curriculum directors reported they were highly involved with consultants from inside the district and only 2 (3.9 percent) reported low involvement. A considerable difference was reported for consultants from the departments of education, where twenty-two (42.3 percent) of the directors reported high involvement and sixteen (30.8 percent) indicated low involvement. The respondents were not much more involved with college/university consultants. Twenty-two (44.0 percent) of the directors reported high involvement, while sixteen (32.0 percent) indicated low involvement.

TABLE LXXIV

EXTENT CURRICULUM DIRECTOR WAS INVOLVED WITH CONSULTANTS
FROM DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION, COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY,
AND INSIDE THE DISTRICT

		<u>Departments of Education</u>		<u>College/ University</u>		<u>Inside the District</u>	
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
High	5	7	13.5	6	12.0	22	43.1
	4	15	28.8	16	32.0	17	33.3
	3	14	26.9	12	24.0	10	19.6
	2	5	9.6	6	12.0	2	3.9
Low	1	11	21.2	10	20.0	0	0.0
	Total	52	100.0	50	100.0	51	100.0

Curriculum directors were free to add and rank additional people they were involved with during the course of the innovation. Many curriculum directors took advantage of the opportunity and listed other people with whom they worked. One stated the district had an evaluation department and he was highly involved with the director of evaluation, while three other curriculum directors stated they worked extensively with "external" and/or other evaluators. Two curriculum directors responded they were highly involved with other districts. One director stated he worked with an "out of state consultant in similar programs." Still other curriculum directors indicated they were highly involved with a publisher representative, the U.S. Office of Education, commercial firms, business and industry, pressure groups and consultants familiar with McREL.

Analysis of Involvement with Other People

It appears that curriculum directors were more involved with principals, superintendents, inside district consultants and department heads than any other individuals. At least seventy-five percent of the curriculum directors indicated they were highly involved with the above people.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In many of the nation's schools the curriculum director is responsible for curriculum change. The stance that curriculum directors take, directly or indirectly, influences the extent and/or direction of these changes. An analysis of specific duties that he performs in the implementation of an innovation would provide information helpful to other curriculum specialists and school districts seeking improvement.

THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this investigation was to identify the perceived actual responsibilities and duties which are common among curriculum directors as they implement a curriculum innovation and to identify the perceived ideal responsibilities and duties which are common among curriculum directors as they implement a curriculum innovation.

PROCEDURE

The initial phase of the study was a review of the selected literature and research in the area of curriculum development, with specific reference to the development of the role of the curriculum director. Duties for possible inclusion in the questionnaire were developed from a review of books, articles, school surveys, and related

research studies. When all the items were collected, they were grouped under major responsibilities which seemed to appear as special duties of the curriculum director. Next, a preliminary questionnaire was developed and sent to twenty-eight of the thirty members of the Nebraska Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Of the two remaining members, one was identified to participate in the actual study and the other was the author of this study. Eighteen individuals completed and returned the preliminary questionnaire. The writer's co-advisors were also invited to criticize the items. The purpose of this was to help refine items for possible inclusion in the final questionnaire. After additional refinement, a completed instrument was developed which would be used as a method for gathering data.

The final questionnaire contained seventy duties grouped under seven major areas of responsibilities that appear as functions of the curriculum director today. Those areas were: budgeting, community relations/dissemination, in-service, curriculum development, supervision, personnel, and other duties. The last section of the questionnaire dealt with other people with whom the curriculum director worked in the implementation of an innovation.

The study was limited to North Central Association states. North Central Association representatives in various state departments of education were asked to submit a list of no more than five of the most "innovative" school districts in their state. They were also asked to identify the curriculum director in each school district

they listed.

The criteria for the selection of the school district were that:

1. The school district be innovative
2. The school district enrollment fall between 5,000 and 30,000 students
3. There be no more than four high schools in the district
4. Those schools listed be public schools

Each of the representatives in the nineteen state departments of education responded to the request. A copy of the letter sent to the North Central representatives and the form upon which they responded can be found in Appendix A. Three states from the North Central Region could not be used in the study. (For information on the exclusion of the three states, refer to Appendix B.) From the remaining sixteen North Central states, sixty-two curriculum directors were identified.

The questionnaire was sent to the sixty-two curriculum directors identified by the North Central representatives. The research data for the study were collected from fifty-two of these curriculum directors. The treatment of the data was considered as it applied to the major purpose of the study. Classification of most information was made by use of the frequency distribution and was reported in terms of percentages.

SUMMARY

This study was structured to identify the actual responsibilities and duties of curriculum directors that were common in the implementation

of a curriculum innovation and to identify the perceived ideal responsibilities and duties deemed most important by curriculum directors in the implementation of a curriculum change. This section presents those responsibilities and duties, both actual and ideal, that curriculum directors performed in the implementation of an innovation.

Information in this section is organized into seven major areas. These areas are as follows: budget, community relations and dissemination, in-service education, curriculum development, supervision, personnel, and other administrative duties.

Budget Responsibilities

Money for the implementation of an innovation was derived from three major sources: (1) budgeted funds earmarked for the innovation, (2) unbudgeted money from the central office, and (3) money from outside sources. Curriculum directors helped obtain money about equally from all three sources.

Thirty-four curriculum directors indicated they had provided money for the innovation in the regular district budget. Additionally, thirty-four directors reported they helped obtain unbudgeted money for the innovation from the central office. Thirty-three respondents stated they helped obtain money from sources outside the district. Although money for the innovation was derived about equally from all three sources, it appears that curriculum directors overwhelmingly favored providing money for the innovation in the regular district budget. Forty-seven curriculum directors stated that, ideally, they

should provide money in the regular district budget, while thirty-nine directors felt they should help obtain both unbudgeted money and money from sources outside the district.

Curriculum directors identified the areas of in-service/workshops, providing teacher release time, and providing material as the main reasons for which they helped obtain funds. These same three areas were identified as the ones for which, ideally, they should help to obtain funds.

A total of forty-three directors helped obtain money for in-service/workshop programs related to the innovation. Forty-five directors indicated that they, ideally, should help provide money for in-service/workshop programs. Thirty-nine directors reported they helped to obtain money to provide released time for teachers involved in the innovation, and thirty-nine directors helped obtain money for materials necessary for the innovation.

The greatest difference between what the curriculum directors said they did and, ideally, what they should do, occurred in the area of assessment. Twenty-six directors indicated they helped obtain money for the assessment of the innovation. Forty respondents agreed they should have helped obtain money for the assessment of the innovation.

Community Relations and Dissemination

In general, the curriculum directors' concern with community relations and dissemination ranked lower in both the actual and ideal

responses than any other category in the study. Only nineteen directors helped arrange visitations for local groups, and twenty-three curriculum directors engaged in helping make arrangements for special community groups to visit the innovation in other settings prior to or during implementation. Ideally, only twenty-nine respondents stated these were tasks they should perform. It seems that curriculum directors did not perform, or feel the need to perform, the above tasks.

Helping encourage teachers not involved in the innovation to discuss and observe the innovation was performed by thirty-four curriculum directors. This task received the most involvement of any task in the area of community relations and dissemination. Thirty-eight directors stated, ideally, that they should have been engaged in this task.

Two other tasks which ranked high in the area of community relations and dissemination, both actually and ideally, were helping encourage teachers to discuss the innovation with the community and helping to circulate information about the innovation for dissemination inside and outside the school district.

In-Service Education

It appears that curriculum directors were active in the area of in-service education. Forty-one respondents stated they helped in the dissemination of information to the total staff, while thirty-nine directors reported they helped assess the in-service needs of the staff in relation to the innovation. Curriculum directors were also highly involved in helping organize and direct the overall in-service training program for the innovation, helping approve building and area in-service

conducted by consultants, helping arrange for the special orientation of the instructional staff involved in the innovation, and helping arrange for the staff to attend professional meetings related to the innovation.

It is worth noting that all the above tasks, with the exception of helping assess the in-service needs of the staff, were closely related to what curriculum directors indicated they should be doing in the implementation of an innovation. It appears that the curriculum directors surveyed were performing many duties which they felt were important in this category.

Two tasks with the largest differences between the actual and ideal responses related to assessing the in-service needs of the staff and helping develop evaluation devices. While thirty-nine directors reported they helped assess the in-service needs of the staff in relation to the innovation, forty-six stated they should have been involved in this task. Only twenty-five directors indicated they helped develop evaluation devices to measure the success of the in-service activities; ideally, thirty-five respondents stated they should have performed this task.

Curriculum Development

The respondents reported they were highly involved in a number of tasks in this area. Forty-six directors stated they helped plan the innovation, while forty-eight directors stated that, ideally, they should have helped plan the innovation.

In examining specific tasks related to helping plan the innovation, it was found that more curriculum directors helped obtain information concerning the innovation prior to implementation than they did with any other task. This task was engaged in by forty-five directors. Additionally, forty-five curriculum directors indicated it was a task that they, ideally, should perform.

The respondents were also actively involved in both goal setting and helping plan for the implementation of the innovation. Forty-two directors helped determine the goals and objectives for the innovation and also helped develop long- and short-range plans for the implementation of the innovation. Both tasks were ranked high, ideally, by forty-five curriculum directors.

A task closely related to goal setting and actual planning of the innovation is the task of identifying problems. Forty-one directors reported they helped identify problems related to the innovation. A large number of curriculum directors, forty-six, stated they, ideally, should have performed this task.

Curriculum directors indicated that helping provide the opportunity for the discussion and investigation of research and information related to the innovation was a task they, ideally, should perform. Forty-six respondents indicated they should have performed this task. This task received one of the highest ideal rankings in the area of curriculum development.

In working with an "ad hoc" and/or advisory committee, curriculum directors, ideally, preferred to be an advisor rather than an active

member or coordinator. Ideally, forty-two directors indicated they should have been an advisor, while forty reported they should be a coordinator and thirty-four stated they should serve as an active member of an "ad hoc" and/or advisory committee. The actual involvement of curriculum director with "ad hoc" and/or advisory committees appeared to be almost equally divided between serving as an advisor, coordinator and active member.

Many curriculum directors were not involved to any great extent in helping develop instructional materials related to the innovation. Only twenty-two directors performed this task. In conjunction with this, it was found that only twenty-six directors helped select texts, audio-visuals, and other material related to the innovation.

In the area of consultants, only twenty-nine directors helped develop specific job descriptions for consultants. Twenty-eight directors reported they helped evaluate the effectiveness of the consultants. Thirty-seven curriculum directors stated they, ideally, should be involved in these tasks.

It needs to be pointed out that only thirty-one directors were engaged in helping develop or select devices for evaluating the innovation. Related to this, thirty-two directors helped select or construct a measuring device to identify school district needs.

Supervision

This area examined the curriculum directors' involvement with teachers and the support they provided to teachers. In general, the

tasks listed in this category did not receive a high ranking ideally or in actuality. The highest ranked items, ideally, were helping teachers review information on school district needs and helping provide teachers with recent books, pamphlets, periodicals or other materials dealing with the innovation. These tasks were identified as those that should have been performed ideally by forty directors, and actually by thirty-eight curriculum directors. Thirty-two directors reported they helped teachers review information on school district needs, while thirty directors stated they helped provide teachers with recent books, pamphlets, periodicals or other materials related to the innovation.

The lowest ranked item in both the actual and the ideal responses was the task of helping conduct one-to-one supervisory conferences with teachers to discuss the innovation. Only nineteen directors actually performed this task, while twenty-five reported they, ideally, should perform the task.

A second task that many curriculum directors did not perform to a large extent was helping teachers select appropriate instructional materials. Twenty-three directors reported they were engaged in this task, while twenty-seven stated they, ideally, should have performed this task.

Twenty-seven directors stated they helped to develop tangible and intangible rewards and recognition for those teachers involved in the innovation, and twenty-nine helped to serve as an advisor to teachers involved in the innovation. Thirty-three and thirty-two

directors, respectively, reported they, ideally, should have performed these tasks.

Another opportunity for curriculum directors to work directly with teachers was examined relating to the task of helping organize and conduct group discussions with teachers concerning the innovation. Only twenty-nine directors performed this task, while thirty-four indicated it to be a task they should have performed.

Personnel

Curriculum directors surveyed in this study indicated, in general, that they were more involved with other administrators than with teachers. An equal number of administrators (forty-four) indicated they helped to confer with principals who were involved in the progress of the innovation and helped to keep administrators who were not involved informed about the innovation.

Another task ranking high, both actually and ideally, was the task of helping plan for the involvement of other administrators. Forty-two administrators stated they performed this task, while forty-seven reported they should have performed the task. These tasks ranked higher than any other task in the personnel category in both the actual and ideal responses.

The two tasks which ranked lowest in this category dealt with the curriculum directors' involvement with teachers. Twenty respondents stated they helped arrange the assignments of teachers involved in the innovation, while twenty-four reported this was a task they should have performed. The task of helping select teachers to be involved in

the innovation was engaged in by twenty-eight curriculum directors. Twenty-nine directors indicated they should have performed this task.

Curriculum directors were more active in helping provide support staff to assist with the innovation and helping select members of the "ad hoc" and/or advisory committees. Thirty-two directors helped provide support staff, while thirty-four helped select members of the "ad hoc" and/or advisory committees. Ideally, thirty-eight respondents stated they should have performed both of these tasks.

Other Duties

Curriculum directors indicated they were actively involved in helping initiate and maintain a decision-making system for the innovation. Forty-one respondents stated they performed this task, while forty-eight indicated, ideally, they should have performed the task.

Other tasks in this category were not performed by a large number of curriculum directors, nor did a large number of directors perceive these as tasks they should have performed. Thirty respondents stated they helped design or redesign available facilities necessary for the innovation, and thirty-seven said this was a task they should have performed. Even less, twenty-six directors, indicated they helped arrange extra clerical help needed for the innovation. Twenty-seven directors responded they, ideally, should perform this task. Finally, twenty-six respondents stated they helped to duplicate and distribute materials related to the innovation, while even less, twenty-five respondents, reported they should not have been involved in the task.

Involvement with Other People

It appears that curriculum directors worked more closely with building principals than any other people during the implementation of a change. Forty-five directors indicated they had high involvement with principals. This compares with thirty-nine directors who reported high involvement with consultants from within the district. Slightly less, thirty-six respondents, stated they were highly involved with the superintendent and with department heads. It appears that curriculum directors were not highly involved with parents, lay people or students during the change process. Eleven directors reported high involvement with parents, while ten and five respondents indicated high involvement with lay people and students respectively.

CONCLUSIONS

Budget

There was general agreement on the importance of providing money for curriculum change between the educational literature and those curriculum directors surveyed. It was found that curriculum directors overwhelmingly supported the idea of providing money for the curriculum change. It is worth noting that the directors preferred to use district funds specifically budgeted for the innovation rather than money from sources outside the district or unbudgeted money from the central office. A possible reason for this preference may be that the director has more control over specific budget allocations when the money is budgeted for the innovation. By having more control,

the director is more at liberty to shift money from one budget line to another. Additionally, he has more freedom to make monetary decisions within his budget should unexpected expenses arise. It is strongly suggested that, if possible, money for a curriculum change be specifically budgeted in the regular district budget.

There exists a close similarity between the literature and the curriculum directors' responses as to the areas for which money should be allocated. Both noted that the areas of in-service/workshops, materials, and teacher released time deserved budgeted money. The curriculum directors, however, indicated that of all the various areas for which money could be allocated, the area of in-service/workshops was, ideally and actually, the most important area for which to budget money. They recognized that if teachers were to understand and carry out curricular changes, it was imperative they receive the opportunity to learn about and participate in the change process. The best way to facilitate this involvement is through in-service and workshop training. Apparently, curriculum directors, aware of the value of in-service/workshops, provided needed funds for this area.

Educational authorities expressed the need to evaluate curriculum change so that the degree of success of the change can be determined. One of the difficulties noted in the evaluation of a change was the "dearth of funds" to carry out a successful assessment program. Ideally, curriculum directors agreed they should provide funds for assessment. But in actuality, many directors did not, to any large extent, specifically budget money for assessment. The dissonance

expressed by the gap between the number of directors that actually performed the task and the number who stated they ideally should have performed the task indicates that, indeed, curriculum directors should budget money specifically for assessment of the curriculum change.

Community Relations/Dissemination

Ideally, curriculum directors tended to agree with educational authorities on the importance of community relations/dissemination as a responsibility of the curriculum director. Those tasks included in this responsibility that were most frequently performed, in descending order, were (1) encourage teachers not involved in the innovation to discuss and observe the change, (2) encourage teachers to discuss the innovation with the community, (3) circulate information about the innovation for dissemination inside and outside the school, and (4) direct a program of inter-school visitation. Ideally, curriculum directors recognized the task of circulating information about the innovation for dissemination inside and outside the school as the task they should have performed more than any other.

While the above areas were identified as the tasks performed more than others within the community relations/dissemination responsibility, it is noted that none of the tasks under this responsibility ranked high when compared to other responsibilities examined in the study. In practice, many curriculum directors did not perform, to a high degree, the tasks associated with the responsibility of community relations/dissemination.

A possible reason for not being more active in the tasks may be that curriculum directors simply did not have the time to perform them. When faced with a choice of tasks to perform, the director would often choose tasks not associated with this responsibility. Another possible explanation could be that curriculum directors were less sure of their skills in this area and consequently tended not to perform the tasks.

The non-performance of these tasks, it seems, did not greatly diminish the success of the curriculum change program. In light of the findings associated with this responsibility, it appears that community relations/dissemination can help gain support and acceptance for a specific change; however, this responsibility is not necessarily essential for the success of a curricular change.

In-Service

Educational authorities historically have been in general agreement that the responsibilities of providing for in-service education were important functions of the person directing the implementation of an educational change. There appears to be a diversity of opinion expressed in the literature in an attempt to be more specific as to what roles should be associated with this responsibility. According to the literature, the curriculum director could serve in any or all of the following areas: a consultant for the in-service program, a conductor of in-service sessions, an evaluator of the in-service program, and a director of the in-service program. It appears,

from this study, that curriculum directors were generally involved, to some degree, in all of the above roles. Although many directors served as a consultant and many actually conducted in-service sessions, they were more involved in the directing and evaluating of the in-service program.

In discussing the role of the curriculum director as a leader in the in-service program, the literature often refers to him as the individual who coordinates, plans, and/or organizes the in-service program. For example, Hass¹ noted that the curriculum director should coordinate and plan in-service activities, while Gilchrist² stated that the director should organize in-service activities, and Kinishi³ concluded that the curriculum director should provide in-service education programs. This study somewhat extended the examination of the role of the curriculum director by identifying tasks the director should perform to help ensure success in coordinating and planning an in-service program. A closer examination of the curriculum director's role seems to reveal that he should be actively involved in not only organizing, directing, and evaluating, but specifically he should also assess the needs of the staff, arrange for the staff to attend the in-service

¹C. Glen Hass, "Role of the Director of Instruction," Educational Leadership, 18 (November, 1960), p. 101.

²Robert S. Gilchrist, Using Current Curriculum Developments (Washington, D.C.: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1963), p. 6.

³Walter K. Kinishi, "A Study of the Work of the Local Curriculum Director in the State of Illinois" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1963), Abstract.

meetings, disseminate information to the total staff, approve in-service conducted by consultants, and arrange for the special orientation needed by those teachers involved in the curriculum change program. It would seem that the chance for an effective in-service program would be enhanced if the curriculum director performed the specific above-named tasks.

Curriculum Development

There is a great deal of literature concerning the role of the curriculum director as he works in developing the school curriculum. This is not surprising, since curriculum development is historically identified as the major concern of the curriculum director. Some educators have indicated that the role of the curriculum director has changed. However, it appears that this may not be the case. While it is apparent that influences from inside and outside the school affect the role of the curriculum director, it seems that he is still important as a leader in curriculum change. An abundance of literature and the findings of this study seem to suggest that the curriculum director was active in (1) planning the curriculum development program, (2) determining goals, (3) conducting research, (4) evaluating the curriculum development program, and (5) working with "ad hoc" committees associated with the curriculum program.

Curriculum directors appear to be overwhelmingly involved in various aspects associated with planning an innovation. A clear pattern is discerned as the curriculum director helps conduct research, helps

determine goals, helps plan, and helps evaluate the innovation. Within this pattern, it would seem that the director also needs to help develop short- and long-range plans, provide the opportunity for discussion of the innovation, and evaluate the program throughout the implementation process. The performance of these tasks, indeed, indicates a director involved in and providing leadership for curriculum change.

The literature also suggests that the curriculum director was expected to help select appropriate material and help plan a pilot for the innovation. However, there seems to be considerably less support for these two tasks among curriculum directors. Surprisingly, many curriculum directors did not help, nor perceive the need to help, in the selection of texts, audio-visual aids, and other material. An even greater number of directors did not help develop instructional materials for the innovation. Since the curriculum directors were budgeting money specifically for materials, it would seem this task was being carried out by other administrators or consultants. It appears that it is no longer necessary for the curriculum director to be extensively involved in helping select or develop instructional materials. This task is still one that he can coordinate; however, the actual selection or construction of materials can be delegated to others.

Since a pilot study serves as a "controlled experiment" from which to observe both the good and the bad aspects of a curriculum or teaching revision, it was somewhat surprising to note that only

slightly more than one-half of the curriculum directors actually used a pilot study. It appears that a large number of school districts were successful in implementing a change without a pilot study. Evidently, these school districts were able to correct problems associated with an innovation during the implementation process. A possible explanation for this could be that curriculum directors were thorough in planning implementation strategies, and those people involved were prepared to handle their responsibilities. As a result, various staff members were better able to adjust and change as the need arose.

Supervision

The responsibility of supervision appears to be an area in which the curriculum director is becoming less active. While the literature suggests the director perform his supervision duties by serving as a resource person, in conferring with and assisting teachers, it was noted that the director was not highly involved in the latter two areas. Further, many curriculum directors indicated that, ideally, they should not be involved in these areas.

This would seem to indicate that the curriculum director's role in this responsibility may be changing. If, indeed, the director's role is changing, then this responsibility may have served as a basis upon which some individual authors' views expressed in the literature concluded that the curriculum director's position has been significantly modified. If the role of the curriculum director only consisted of supervision, then a case for this position being significantly modified

could be made. However, since this position consists of a variety of roles, it is doubtful that changes in certain aspects of one role can be interpreted as a modification of the position. The aspect that seems to be changing most is the director's personal contact with teachers. The curriculum director traditionally was clearly expected to provide assistance to teachers and to confer with teachers, although neither of these tasks was given a high priority by curriculum directors in this study. Less than one-half of the directors actually helped conduct one-to-one supervisory conferences with teachers or helped teachers select appropriate instructional materials. Slightly more than one-half helped organize and conduct group discussions with teachers and helped serve as an advisor to teachers. It is highly probable that the curriculum director relied on other personnel to carry out a part of the supervision responsibility.

Personnel

An analysis of the tasks performed by curriculum directors related to the area of personnel supports the contention that curriculum directors did not rank this area as highly. The findings in this area seem to suggest that almost one-half of the curriculum directors were not highly active in helping select the teachers who were to be involved in the innovation. Further, the directors generally were even less active in helping arrange individual assignments of teachers involved in the innovation. It is reasonable to assume the director would not be as familiar with teachers in the school district as individual principals or perhaps other personnel. Consequently, it would seem he

had relied on others to provide staffing needs and to determine teacher assignments.

While curriculum directors were less active in working with teachers, they appeared to be more active in working with administrators. Specifically, it would seem that directors must help plan for the involvement of administrators, confer with principals on the progress of the change, and keep those administrators, not directly involved, informed on the progress of the change.

The high involvement with administrators and the low involvement with teachers would seem to indicate the curriculum director did not often serve as a supervisor. His stance in this responsibility appeared to be that of a coordinator of the supervision program. The coordination was carried out by delegating supervisory tasks to other administrators and then working closely with these administrators in a planned program of implementing a change.

Other Duties

A task that should be performed by the curriculum director is that of initiating and maintaining some type of decision-making system. The possibility exists that without a decision-making system, a curriculum revision could be modified in such a manner that it would not be beneficial or perhaps helpful to the change being implemented. It seems that the curriculum director would depend on other administrators who would have an important role in helping maintain the decision-making system as they work with teachers.

Involvement with Other People

In this study it would seem that curriculum directors worked more closely with other administrators and supervisory personnel than with teachers involved in the implementation of the change. It appears that curriculum directors were highly involved with school principals. Additionally, they were involved with the following personnel in descending order: in-district consultants, department heads, superintendent, instructional specialists and teachers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The curriculum directors used in this study were related to one another in that they were associated with school districts recognized as innovative districts. Further, each director was active in implementing a curriculum change in his district. To what extent they performed, or ideally felt they should perform, various duties can help serve other curriculum directors as possible guides in the implementation of a curriculum change. While the recommendations made in this section may not be all inclusive, nor represent a job description, they do represent efforts that can be made to improve a school district's curriculum. Based on the response of the above curriculum directors, the following recommendations are made:

1. The curriculum director should provide money for the innovation in the regular district budget. Money should specifically be "ear-marked" for in-service/workshop programs, for providing teacher released time, for providing necessary material, and for assessment of

the curriculum change.

2. The curriculum director should organize and direct the in-service program. Specifically, he should assess the needs of the staff, arrange for the staff to attend professional meetings, and disseminate information to the total staff. Further, the curriculum director should help approve in-service conducted by consultants, help arrange for the special orientation needed by teachers, and help evaluate the in-service program.

3. The curriculum director should help plan the innovation. Specifically, he should help provide the opportunity for the discussion and investigation of research and information, help identify problems, help develop long- and short-range plans, help obtain information, help determine the goals and objectives, help evaluate the innovation throughout the implementation process, and serve as an advisor to "ad hoc" and/or advisory committees.

4. The curriculum director should confer with principals involved in the innovation, help keep administrators, not involved, informed about the innovation, and help plan for the involvement of other administrators.

5. The curriculum director should coordinate the supervisory program associated with the curriculum change.

6. The curriculum director should help initiate and maintain a decision-making system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- American Association of School Administrators. The American School Superintendency. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1952.
- Anderson, V. E. et al. Principles and Practices of Secondary Education. 2nd ed. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1962.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Leadership for Instruction. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1960.
- Babcock, Chester D. "The Emerging Role of the Curriculum Leader," Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director in a Climate of Change, 1965 Yearbook, ed. Robert E. Leeper. Washington, D.C.: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965.
- Barr, A. J. and W. H. Burton. The Supervision of Instruction. New York: Appleton and Company, 1962.
- Briggs, Thomas H. and Joseph Justman. Improving Instruction Through Supervision. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952.
- Caswell, Hollis L. and Associates. Curriculum Improvement. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950.
- Caswell, Hollis L. and Doak S. Campbell. Curriculum Development. Chicago: American Book Company, 1935.
- Caswell, Hollis L. and Doak S. Campbell (eds.). Readings in Curriculum Development. Chicago: American Book Company, 1937.
- Cocking, Walter D. Administrative Procedures in Curriculum Making for Public Schools. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928.
- Conner, Forrest E. and William J. Ellena (eds.). Curriculum Handbook for School Administrators. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1967.
- Doll, Ronald C. Curriculum Improvement. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970.

- Fitzpatrick, F. B. Supervision for Elementary Schools. Danville: F. A. Owens Publishing Company, 1931.
- Forth Worth Public Schools, Language Arts. A Tentative Course of Study for Grade Six. Bulletin No. 146. Fort Worth, Texas: The Public Schools, 1935.
- Fowler, Marcella R. Curriculum Consultants at Work. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950.
- Furns, Norman and John A. Stanavate (eds.). The North Central Association Quarterly. Chicago: The Association, Summer, 1973.
- George Peabody College for Teachers, Division of Surveys and Field Studies. Little Rock, Arkansas, Public Schools, A Survey Report. Nashville, Tennessee: The College, 1948.
- Gilchrist, Robert S. Using Current Curriculum Developments. Washington, D.C.: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1963.
- Goodlad, John F. "Rational Planning in Curriculum and Instruction," The Curriculum. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1967.
- Gwynn, J. Minor. Curriculum Principles and Social Trends. 3rd ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960.
- Harap, Henry. The Techniques of Curriculum Making. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929.
- Harris, Ben M. "Role of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers," Toward Professional Maturity of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1967.
- Hellegas, Milo. "The Problem of Method," Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University, 1924, ed. I. L. Kandell. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.
- Kandell, I. L. Comparative Education. Chicago: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1933.
- Kirk, Dwight T. The Role of the Curriculum Director in the Administration of American Public School Systems. Austin: University of Texas, 1953.

- Lippitt, Ronald. "Roles and Process in Curriculum Development and Change," Strategies for Curriculum Change, ed. Robert R. Leeper. Washington, D.C.: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965.
- Lovell, John T. "A Perspective for Viewing Instructional Supervisory Behavior," Supervision: Perspectives and Propositions. Washington, D.C.: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1967.
- MacKenzie, Gordon N. "Politics of Curriculum Change," Curriculum Crossroads, ed. A. Harry Passow. New York: Macmillan Company, 1943.
- Moehlman, Arthur B. School Administration. New York: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1940.
- National Education Association. Eighth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendent of the National Education Association. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1930.
- National Society for the Study of Education. The Twenty-Sixth Yearbook. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1926.
- Neagley, Ross L. and N. Dean Evans. Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Pittenger, B. F. Local Public Schools Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1951.
- Rugg, Harold. "Three Decades of Mental Discipline: Curriculum-Making via National Committees," Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1926.
- Saylor, J. Galen. Factors Associated with Participation in Cooperative Programs of Curriculum Development. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Robert J. Starrett. Emerging Patterns of Supervision. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.
- Simpson, Alfred D. (dir.). The Cambridge School Survey. Cambridge, Massachusetts: School Committee, 1947.
- Snedden, David. Foundations of Curriculum, Sociological Analysis. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927.

Trump, J. Lloyd and Delmas F. Miller. Secondary School Curriculum Improvement. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1968.

University of Alabama, College of Education, Bureau of Educational Research. Co-Operative Study of the Mobile Public Schools. University: University of Alabama, Bureau of Educational Research, Vol. IV, 1949.

Unruh, Adolph and H. E. Turner. Supervision for Change and Innovation. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1970.

Wilson, Robert E. Educational Administration. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1966.

PERIODICALS

Bostwick, Prudence. "The Hazards of Supervision," Educational Leadership, 19 (November, 1961), 123-129.

Cox, Johnnye V. "Supervisors Gain Skills of Action Research," Educational Leadership, 12 (May, 1955), 480-488.

Doll, Ronald C. "What Are Duties of the Curriculum Director?" Educational Leadership, 15 (April, 1958), 428-430.

Guss, Carolyn. "How Is Supervision Perceived?" Educational Leadership, 19 (November, 1961), 99-102.

Hass, C. Glen. "Role of the Director of Instruction," Educational Leadership, 18 (November, 1960), 101-108.

Hellegas, Milo. "Supervision En Masse," Journal of Educational Method, 2 (October, 1922), 86-87.

Herrick, Virgil E. "Evaluating Curriculum Improvement Programs," Educational Leadership, 8 (January, 1951), 234-239.

Hunkins, Francis P. "New Identities for New Tasks," Educational Leadership, 29 (March, 1972), 503-506.

Jennings, Robert E. "The Politics of Curriculum Change," Peabody Journal of Education, 49 (July, 1972), 295-299.

Laaks, Charles W. "The Principal as Supervisor of Instruction," The Clearing House, 43 (December, 1968), 198-202.

Mackenzie, Gordon N. "Role of the Supervisor," Educational Leadership, 19 (November, 1961), 86-90.

- National Education Association. NEA Research Bulletin, 40(1) (1962), 25.
- Norton, Margaret Alltucker. "Leadership in Curriculum Building in 168 Large City School Systems," School and Society, 33 (January, 1931), 7-21.
- Ogletree, James R. "Changing Supervision in a Changing Era," Educational Leadership, 29 (March, 1972), 507-510.
- Prasch, John. "New Roles for Educators," Educational Leadership, 29 (March, 1972), 499-502.
- Reavis, William C. "Responsibilities of the City Superintendent for the Direction of Instruction," School Review, 14 (November, 1946), 520.
- Sharp, George M. "Curriculum Coordinators Study Their Jobs," Educational Leadership, 12 (May, 1955), 464-466.
- Telfer, Richard G. "Dynamics of Change," The Clearing House, 41 (November, 1966), 131-135.
- Tiffany, Burton C. "Working with School Personnel," Educational Leadership, 19 (November, 1961), 91-94.
- Turner, Harold E. "Curriculum Development--Process and People," Education, 90 (November-December, 1969), 170-173.
- Whipple, Guy M. "What Price Curriculum-Making?" School and Society, 31 (March 15, 1930), 367.
- Youch, Wilbur A. "Resolving Conflicts in Supervision," Educational Leadership, 12 (February, 1955), 265-268.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Beggs, Harold Oliver. "An Analysis of the Role of Curriculum Administrators in First Class Schools Districts in the State of Washington," Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Washington State University, Pullman, 1972.
- Freese, Theron. "A Study of the Position of Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Instruction." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Southern California, 1955.

- Kiniski, Walter K. "A Study of the Work of the Local Curriculum Director in the State of Illinois." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The University of Illinois, Urbana, 1963.
- Link, Daniel Cruzen, Jr. "A Study of the Role of Personnel Responsible for Curriculum Development in the Local School Division in Virginia." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, 1971.
- Moll, Loren Allen. "An Analysis of the Role of the Curriculum Director." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Colorado State College, Greeley, 1965.
- Norris, Audrey B. "An Analysis of Selected Curriculum Change Agents in Developing a Model of Curriculum Change." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, 1969.
- Varney, James K. "The Responsibility of the Assistant Superintendent or Other Executives for Instructional Supervision and Curriculum Development." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1954.

APPENDIX A

Letter Sent to North Central Representative

Response Form Completed by North Central Representative

.

1943 Norman
Crete, NE 68333

March 7, 1974

Dear _____:

I am in the process of doing research for a doctoral dissertation in the field of Secondary Education at the University of Nebraska. I am seeking to establish the responsibilities, duties, and activities of curriculum directors in relation to the adoption of innovations within a school district.

In order to complete this work I need your assistance. From the school districts in your state I would like you to select those school districts that you feel are the most innovative. I will then submit a letter and questionnaire to the curriculum director in those districts to ascertain their responsibilities, duties, and activities as these relate to the implementation of an innovation.

Please observe the following criteria when making your selection(s):

1. That the school district be innovative (i.e., incorporating new organizational patterns, instructional approaches, or methodological practices, ideas or devices into the curriculum). These districts are generally recognized by other school districts in the state as being innovative school districts.
2. That the school district enrollment fall between 5,000 and 30,000 students.
3. That there be no more than four (4) high schools in the district.
4. That those school districts be public schools.
5. That the school districts employ a curriculum director (i.e., a person other than the superintendent, whose major responsibility is the planning and development of curriculum and/or instruction).

Please use the enclosed form to record as many innovative districts as you believe exist up to a maximum of five. A quick response would be most helpful.

Your cooperation in the compilation of this list is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

/s/ Daniel DePasquale, Jr.

Daniel DePasquale, Jr.

Daniel DePasquale, Jr.
1943 Norman
Crete, Nebraska 68333

Innovative School Districts

State of _____

SCHOOL DISTRICTS:

1. Name of School District _____
Address of School District _____
Name of Curriculum Director _____
2. Name of School District _____
Address of School District _____
Name of Curriculum Director _____
3. Name of School District _____
Address of School District _____
Name of Curriculum Director _____
4. Name of School District _____
Address of School District _____
Name of Curriculum Director _____
5. Name of School District _____
Address of School District _____
Name of Curriculum Director _____

APPENDIX B

Three North Central States Not Included in the Study

Three states of the nineteen in the North Central Association were not included in the study.

State number one was not included because the North Central representative was not able to identify curriculum directors in the school districts. The North Central representative replied,

I will be unable to provide you with this information because many districts do not identify the curriculum director, nor the specific person assigned this responsibility. In addition, many school districts are experimenting with various types of innovative programs of one type or another which are not easily identified.

After further correspondence, the representative stated, "In a state as large and diverse as _____, it is simply not possible to gather the kind of information you seek."

In state number two the North Central representative wrote,

Unfortunately, I am not in a position to select the most innovative school districts in _____. I have enclosed a list of _____ school districts meeting your requirements which constitutes the total number of school districts falling in that category.

The representative in state number three replied,

I am taking the liberty of sending the names of some of the school districts here in _____ which do not measure up to the criteria which you suggest. . . . Only _____ districts have more than 5,000 students! For various reasons [sic] I am not including them. I trust that although the four districts which I do list do not live up to your criteria, they may be of some help in your study.

APPENDIX C

**Letter Sent to Nebraska Association for Supervision
and Curriculum Development**

Preliminary Questionnaire

ROY C. PRESSLER
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT

DR. JACK G. ELLIOTT
SUPERINTENDENT

GENE RANDELL
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

North Platte Public Schools

180

PHONE 308/532-3300

1101 WEST FIRST STREET
NORTH PLATTE, NEBRASKA 69101

December 12, 1974

Dear _____:

I am in the process of doing research for a doctoral dissertation in the field of Secondary Education at the University of Nebraska. I am seeking to establish responsibilities and tasks of curriculum directors that are deemed important in bringing about meaningful change.

As a member of the Nebraska A.S.C.D. your help is solicited in accomplishing this task. Would you please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the stamped self-addressed envelope.

Your cooperation and early reply in completing the enclosed questionnaire will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dan DePasquale
Director of Secondary Education

DD:mhc
Enclosure

Dan DePasquale, Director of Secondary
Education
North Platte Public Schools
P. O. Box 1227
1101 West First Street
North Platte, Nebraska 69101

INFORMATION: This "questionnaire" is designed to help determine those areas of curriculum development considered important by the Nebraska Association of Curriculum Directors.

DIRECTIONS: To register a very strong favorable opinion circle (5) on the form. To register a very weak or unfavorable opinion, you should circle (1) one in the column to the left. If you think the item should not be on the list, you should circle the (0) zero.

EXAMPLE: 0 1 2 3 4 (5) Coordinate clerical help

The circle indicates that you consider coordination of clerical help to be very important in curriculum development.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM BUDGET

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Allocating money spent for material related to the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2. Developing budget for the in-service program related to the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3. Determining the amount of money spent for material related to the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4. Determining the amount of money spent to pay for visiting consultants. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5. Determining the amount of money spent to cover expense of "ad hoc" and standing committees(s). |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. Other (please list and rate) _____ |

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Speaking to parents and other laymen concerning the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2. Arranging public visitation(s) of the innovation during various stages of implementation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3. Preparing "releases" about the innovation for newspapers, radio, television, etc. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4. Encouraging teachers to discuss the innovation with members of the community. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5. Arranging active involvement of adults (lay assistance). |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. Other (please list and rate) _____ |

PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Organizing and conducting discussion(s) for sharing common concerns and for exchange of ideas. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2. Serving as a technical consultant and advisor for in-service programs. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3. Planning in-service, workshops, or conferences related to the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4. Actively conducting in-service sessions, workshops, or conferences related to the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5. Selecting who would direct or help direct the pre-service and in-service sessions. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. Developing evaluation devices to measure the success of pre-service, in-service, workshops, etc. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7. Other (please list and rate) _____ |

PLANNING AND COORDINATION OF THE OVERALL CURRICULUM

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Helping determine the objectives of lay participation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2. Coordinating lay advisory committee(s) related to the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3. Serving as a member of the lay advisory committee. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4. Arranging active involvement of students. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5. Selecting teachers to be involved in the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. Encouraging teachers to join in the deliberations and decisions concerning the innovation. |

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7. Identifying problems related to the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8. Serving as a technical consultant and advisor during the implementation of the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9. Organizing "ad hoc" and standing committee(s) related to the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10. Making constructive use of teacher opinions about the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 11. Arranging activities in which teachers, administrators, and lay people could better understand innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 12. Making available to interested persons, when decisions had to be made, the most adequate and accurate information. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 13. Developing the objectives or goals for the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 14. Deciding at what point consultants would be used. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 15. Determining the role of the consultants. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 16. Other (please list and rate) _____ |

SUPERVISION OF TEACHERS

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Giving recognition for work of teachers involved with the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2. Observing the work of teachers. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3. Assisting teachers in resolving difficulties in carrying out innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4. Arranging one-to-one conference with teachers to discuss innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5. Delivering personally and discussing with teachers recent books, pamphlets, periodicals, and materials dealing with the innovation. |

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. Personally performing demonstrations for teacher(s). |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7. Directing teacher(s) to where information could be found. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8. Other (please list and rate) _____ |

COORDINATE RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Giving assistance in diagnosis of school district needs. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2. Selecting, constructing, or using a measuring device for identifying school district's needs. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3. Organizing and leading groups in assessing local practices. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4. Assisting others in search for data concerning the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5. Directing the use of consultants. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. Arranging a pilot study of the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7. Developing devices for evaluation of the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8. Evaluating the innovation throughout the adoption process. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9. Personally studying practices and procedures to gather pertinent information about the innovation prior to it being proposed. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10. Other (please list and rate) _____ |

OTHER DUTIES

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Arranging time and facilities for meetings concerning the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2. Duplicating and distributing materials related to the innovation. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3. Arranging for extra clerical help. |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4. Other (please list and rate) _____ |

APPENDIX D

Letter Sent to Curriculum Directors

Follow-up Letter Sent to Curriculum Directors

Completed Questionnaire

ROY C. PRESSLER
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT

DR. JACK G. ELLIOTT
SUPERINTENDENT

GENE RANDELL
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

North Platte Public Schools

188

PHONE 308/532-3300

1101 WEST FIRST STREET
NORTH PLATTE, NEBRASKA 69101

October 21, 1975

Dear _____:

I am in the process of collecting data for a doctoral dissertation in the field of Secondary Education at the University of Nebraska. This study seeks to identify the responsibilities and duties of curriculum directors in relation to the adoption of an innovation within a school district.

You have been identified as a curriculum director in an innovative district. Because of your unique position, I need your assistance in completing this study. Please complete the enclosed questionnaire. The questions in the questionnaire have been compiled from various sources in educational literature. The essence of this study is to determine the responsibilities and duties that you have performed and those duties and responsibilities that ideally should be performed to bring about significant change in secondary schools.

Your responses coupled with those of other curriculum directors in innovative school districts will aid both present and future curriculum directors as they move to bring about change.

Your cooperation and early reply in completing the enclosed questionnaire will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Daniel DePasquale, Jr.
Director of Secondary Education

DD:mc
Enclosure

ROY C. PRESSLER
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT

DR. JACK G. ELLIOTT
SUPERINTENDENT

GENE RANDELL
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

North Platte Public Schools

189

PHONE 308/532-3300

1101 WEST FIRST STREET
NORTH PLATTE, NEBRASKA 69101

December 9, 1975

Dear _____:

Recently I sent a letter and questionnaire to you concerning my doctoral study at the University of Nebraska. My study attempts to identify those duties and responsibilities that curriculum directors perform in bringing about change.

Your reply has not yet been received. I would like to include you school district in my study so that the results will be as complete as possible. Would you please help me with this study by supplying the information requested in the questionnaire. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation in this study.

Sincerely,

Daniel DePasquale, Jr.
Director of Secondary Education

DD:mc
Enclosure

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CURRICULUM DIRECTOR IN IMPLEMENTING AN INNOVATION

NAME _____
 SCHOOL DISTRICT _____

Information: This questionnaire is designed to gather information concerning: (1) the responsibilities of the curriculum director, and (2) specific tasks that the curriculum director should perform in the implementation of an innovation.

Review the important innovations in your school in the last three years and indicate in the space below the one innovation that you feel has had the most beneficial impact upon students:

Directions: Column I: Before each task statement place a circle around the number that most closely represents the extent to which you WERE INVOLVED in the task.

Column II: After each task statement place a circle around the number that most closely represents the extent to which you feel you SHOULD HAVE BEEN INVOLVED in the task.

Degree of involvement: 1--NEVER involved 4--FREQUENTLY involved
 2--SELDOM involved 5--EXTENSIVELY involved
 3--OCCASIONALLY involved

Example:

TO WHAT EXTENT WERE YOU
 INVOLVED IN THIS?

1 ② 3 4 5

1. Coordinated clerical help.

TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD YOU HAVE
 BEEN INVOLVED IN THIS?

1 2 3 4 ⑤

These circles show that you seldom did this and that you feel you should have done this extensively.

Rate each of the following items in these two ways.

****REMEMBER, ALL QUESTIONS CONCERN THE INNOVATION YOU IDENTIFIED AS THE MOST BENEFICIAL TO STUDENTS****

**TO WHAT EXTENT WERE
YOU INVOLVED IN
THIS?**

- 1--NEVER
2--SELDOM
3--OCCASIONALLY
4--FREQUENTLY
5--EXTENSIVELY

**TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD
YOU HAVE BEEN INVOLVED
IN THIS?**

Budget

1 2 3 4 5	1.	Provide money for innovation in regular district budget.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	2.	Helped obtain unbudgeted money for the innovation from the central office.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	3.	Helped obtain money from sources outside the district (state, federal and/or private foundations).	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	4.	Helped obtain money for material necessary for the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	5.	Helped obtain money for the assessment of the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	6.	Helped obtain money to pay for visiting consultants.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	7.	Helped obtain money for necessary travel in conjunction with the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	8.	Helped obtain money to provide release time for teachers involved in the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	9.	Helped obtain money for in-service/workshop program(s) related to the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	10.	Helped obtain money for additional staff.	1 2 3 4 5

Community Relations and Dissemination

1 2 3 4 5	1.	Helped direct the development of parent and community publications describing the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	2.	Helped circulate information about the innovation for dissemination inside and outside the school district.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	3.	Talked and listened to parents and other lay people concerning the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5

TO WHAT EXTENT WERE YOU INVOLVED IN THIS?	1--NEVER 2--SELDOM 3--OCCASIONALLY 4--FREQUENTLY 5--EXTENSIVELY	TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD YOU HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN THIS?
---	---	---

- | | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 4. Helped arrange visitation(s) for local community groups during various stages of implementation of the innovation. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 5. Helped make arrangements for special community group(s) to visit the innovation in other settings prior to or during the implementation. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 6. Helped direct a program of interschool visitation for dissemination of the innovation. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 7. Helped encourage teachers not involved in the innovation to discuss and observe the innovation. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 8. Helped encourage teachers to discuss the innovation with members of the community. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

In-Service Education

- | | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 1. Helped organize and direct the overall in-service training program for the innovation. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 2. Helped assess the in-service needs of the staff in relation to the innovation. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 3. Helped evaluate the in-service program for the innovation against the criteria of appropriateness, adequacy, and relevance. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 4. Helped develop evaluation devices to measure the success of the in-service activities. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 5. Helped conduct in-service sessions, workshops, or conferences related to the innovation. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 6. Helped serve as a consultant and advisor for in-service activities related to the innovation. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

TO WHAT EXTENT WERE YOU INVOLVED IN THIS?	1--NEVER	2--SELDOM	3--OCCASIONALLY	4--FREQUENTLY	5--EXTENSIVELY	TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD YOU HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN THIS?				
7. Helped approve building and area in-service conducted by consultants.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8. Helped arrange for the special orientation of the instructional staff involved in the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
9. Helped in the dissemination of information to the total staff.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
10. Helped arrange for the staff to attend professional meetings related to the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
11. Helped provide informal opportunities for teachers to share common concerns.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
12. Helped develop a professional library of materials and media related to the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
13. Helped arrange for university credit course(s) for staff involved in the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Curriculum Development

1	2	3	4	5	1. Helped plan the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5		
1	1	2	3	4	5	2. Helped select or construct a measuring device to identify school district needs.	1	1	2	3	4	5
1	1	2	3	4	5	3. Helped determine the goals and objectives for the innovation.	1	1	2	3	4	5
1	1	2	3	4	5	4. Helped develop long- and short-range plans for the implementation of the innovation.	1	1	2	3	4	5
1	1	2	3	4	5	5. Helped obtain information concerning the innovation prior to implementation.	1	1	2	3	4	5
1	1	2	3	4	5	6. Helped provide opportunity for the discussion and investigation of research and information related to the innovation.	1	1	2	3	4	5
1	1	2	3	4	5	7. Helped identify problems related to the innovation.	1	1	2	3	4	5

TO WHAT EXTENT WERE YOU INVOLVED IN THIS?		TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD YOU HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN THIS?	
		1--NEVER 2--SELDOM 3--OCCASIONALLY 4--FREQUENTLY 5--EXTENSIVELY	
1 2 3 4 5	8. Helped teachers make decisions about the innovation during various stages of implementation.	1 2 3 4 5	
1 2 3 4 5	9. Helped develop or select devices for evaluation of the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5	
1 2 3 4 5	10. Helped evaluate the innovation throughout the implementation process.	1 2 3 4 5	
1 2 3 4 5	11. Helped plan a pilot program to field test the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5	
1 2 3 4 5	12. Helped develop instructional materials for the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5	
1 2 3 4 5	13. Helped select texts, audio-visual aids and other materials related to the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5	
1 2 3 4 5	14. Helped select the consultants that would be used.	1 2 3 4 5	
1 2 3 4 5	15. Helped develop specific job descriptions for the consultants.	1 2 3 4 5	
1 2 3 4 5	16. Helped evaluate the effectiveness of the consultants.	1 2 3 4 5	
1 2 3 4 5	17. Helped coordinate "ad hoc" and/or advisory committee(s) related to the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5	
1 2 3 4 5	18. Served as an active member of "ad hoc" and/or advisory committee(s) related to the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5	
1 2 3 4 5	19. Helped serve as an advisor to "ad hoc" and/or advisory committee(s) related to the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5	
<u>Supervision</u>			
1 2 3 4 5	1. Helped organize and conduct group discussions with teachers concerning the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5	
1 2 3 4 5	2. Helped teachers review information on school district needs related to the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5	
1 2 3 4 5	3. Helped direct teachers to locate information that would help solve problems or improve the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5	

TO WHAT EXTENT WERE
YOU INVOLVED IN
THIS?

1--NEVER
2--SELDOM
3--OCCASIONALLY
4--FREQUENTLY
5--EXTENSIVELY

1	2	3	4	5	4.	Helped teachers select appropriate instructional materials.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	5.	Helped relate information to teachers involved in the innovation by use of memos and bulletins.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	6.	Helped provide teachers with recent books, pamphlets, periodicals, or other materials dealing with the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	7.	Helped conduct one-to-one supervisory conferences with teachers to discuss the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	8.	Helped serve as an advisor to teachers involved in the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	9.	Helped develop tangible and intangible rewards and recognition for those teachers involved in the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5

Personnel

1	2	3	4	5	1.	Helped plan for the involvement of other administrators.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	2.	Helped keep administrators, not involved, informed about the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	3.	Helped confer with principal(s), involved, on the progress of the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	4.	Helped select teachers to be involved in the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	5.	Helped arrange the assignments of teachers involved in the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	6.	Helped provide support staff to assist with the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	7.	Helped select the members of the "ad hoc" and/or advisory committee.	1	2	3	4	5

TO WHAT EXTENT WERE YOU INVOLVED IN THIS?	1--NEVER 2--SELDOM 3--OCCASIONALLY 4--FREQUENTLY 5--EXTENSIVELY	TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD YOU HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN THIS?
---	---	---

Other Duties

1 2 3 4 5	1. Helped initiate and maintain a decision-making system for the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	2. Helped design or redesign available facilities necessary for the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	3. Helped arrange for extra clerical help needed for the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	4. Helped duplicate and distribute materials related to the innovation.	1 2 3 4 5

Using a scale of 1 to 5, rate each item in terms of how involved you were with each during the adoption of the innovation by placing a circle around the number that most closely represents your extent of involvement.

1--indicates LIMITED or NO involvement
2--indicates HIGH involvement

LIMITED	HIGH
1 2 3 4 5	Superintendent
1 2 3 4 5	Principal(s)
1 2 3 4 5	Department Heads
1 2 3 4 5	Teachers
1 2 3 4 5	Students
1 2 3 4 5	Parents
1 2 3 4 5	Lay People
1 2 3 4 5	Instructional Specialist(s) (library, counselor, media, etc.)
1 2 3 4 5	Consultant(s) from the state department of education
1 2 3 4 5	Consultant(s) from a college or university

1--indicates LIMITED or NO involvement
 5--indicates HIGH involvement

LIMITED HIGH

1	2	3	4	5	Consultant(s) from inside the school district
1	2	3	4	5	Other consultant(s) (please specify) _____
1	2	3	4	5	Other (please list each and rate them) _____
1	2	3	4	5	Other _____
1	2	3	4	5	Other _____

Dan DePasquale
 Director of Secondary Education
 North Platte Public Schools
 P. O. Box 1227
 North Platte, Nebraska 69101