

1981

Curriculum articulation in the Cedar Falls, Iowa, secondary schools

Elaine Linda Rasmussen
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1981 Elaine Linda Rasmussen

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/etd>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rasmussen, Elaine Linda, "Curriculum articulation in the Cedar Falls, Iowa, secondary schools" (1981).
Dissertations and Theses @ UNI. 1460.

<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/etd/1460>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses @ UNI by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

CURRICULUM ARTICULATION IN THE CEDAR FALLS,
IOWA, SECONDARY SCHOOLS

An Abstract of a Thesis
Submitted
In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Specialist in Education
University of Northern Iowa

by

Elaine Linda Rasmussen

July 1981

ABSTRACT

Continuity of educational experiences and activities from grade to grade and classroom to classroom has been acknowledged as a primary factor in the development of a sound educational program. The diverse aspects of the American educational system serve to obstruct rather than assist schools in the attainment of such continuity, and philosophical differences about the role and function of the schools serve to further obfuscate the curriculum articulation process.

The Cedar Falls, Iowa, Community Schools have recognized the problems inherent in the absence of a vertical articulation structure and their detrimental effect upon the educational process. This study has attempted to evaluate the degree of success the Cedar Falls System has experienced in its attempt to meet the challenge of maintaining a basically stratified system (a six-three-three arrangement) while seeking to promote the maximum coordination and articulation between grade levels and curricular offerings.

The study was done through the use of surveys to determine the effectiveness and general comprehension of the Cedar Falls model of curriculum articulation as utilized in the secondary levels of the system. Populations surveyed were the teaching staff, the curriculum chairpersons, and the secondary administrators. Related literature was reviewed to find generally accepted problems in the articulation process as well as those solutions common to most writers when

addressing the identified problems. The setting in the Cedar Falls School System was viewed historically, and the articulation model was examined to determine from the opinions of teachers, curriculum chairpersons, and coordinating administrators the extent to which it was effective.

Because of the clearly defined nature of the populations to be surveyed during the course of the study, it was determined that a written questionnaire would most adequately provide the type of information needed. Three surveys were designed to measure various aspects of curriculum coordination through specific population questioning. Survey A was designed to provide input from all participants in the articulation model and was prepared in three variations: Form 1 was administered to the entire teaching staff of both junior high schools and the senior high school; Form 2 was administered to curriculum chairpersons in all three buildings; and Form 3 was administered to administrators serving in the capacity of coordinators in the curriculum structure.

Survey B was designed to investigate the perceptions held by the curriculum chairpersons of their role and its success in the structure. Survey C was constructed in response to administrative input to Form 3 of Survey A and designed to define more clearly the administrative role in the curriculum coordination structure at Cedar Falls.

The general consensus of opinion was that the model in use was effective in that it permitted cross-level articulation to take

place, and involved both faculty and administration in its operation. Areas of general agreement were found in role definition and task significance, as well as in over all satisfaction with the model as it was functioning. Several suggestions were offered to ensure continued understanding, the most significant being amplification of roles and job description, more systematic communication between participants, and further investigation of release time consideration. The results of the surveys were then conveyed to the Board of Education and to the members of the Cedar Falls system that participated in the study.

CURRICULUM ARTICULATION IN THE CEDAR FALLS,
IOWA, SECONDARY SCHOOLS

A Thesis

Submitted

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Specialist in Education

University of Northern Iowa

by

Elaine Linda Rasmussen

July 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem	4
Delimitation of Problem	4
Definition of Terms	5
Procedures	6
2. SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE	8
Obstacles to Effective Articulation	9
Approaches to Improving Curriculum Articulation	13
3. THE SETTING	18
Survey A	22
Surveys B and C	38
4. SUMMARY	47
Generalizations Extrapolated From the Staff	
Survey A-1	50
Generalizations Extrapolated From the Curriculum	
Chairpersons and the Coordinating Administrators	
Surveys A-2 and 3	52
Generalizations Regarding the Rank Order Question	
Common to all Forms of Survey A	53
Generalizations Extrapolated From Survey B	54
Generalizations Extrapolated From Survey C	56

	Page
4. SUMMARY (continued)	
Conclusions	57
Recommendations	59
FOOTNOTES	62
BIBLIOGRAPHY	65
APPENDICES	70
A. STAFF SURVEY, MAY 1978	71
B. SECONDARY CURRICULUM AREA STRUCTURE PROPOSAL	72
C. JOB DESCRIPTION: BUILDING CURRICULUM CHAIRPERSON	75
D. SURVEY A: FORM 1	77
E. SURVEY A: FORM 2	78
F. SURVEY A: FORM 3	79
G. SURVEY B	80
H. SURVEY C	81
I. CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY RANKING: ITEM 1	82
J. CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY RANKING: ITEM 2	83
K. CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY RANKING: ITEM 3	84
L. CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY RANKING: ITEM 4	85
M. CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY RANKING: ITEM 5	86
N. CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY RANKING: ITEM 6	87
O. CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY RANKING: ITEM 7	88
P. CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY RANKING: ITEM 8	89

TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 Percentage of Respondents by School Survey A	24
3.2 Teaching Experience of Respondents and Years of Experience Within the Cedar Falls School System Survey A	25
3.3 Composite Staff Ranking on Individual Survey Items Survey A	27
3.4 Composite Curricular Chairperson Ranking on Individual Items Survey A	28
3.5 Composite Coordinating Administrator Ranking on Individual Items Survey A	29
3.6 Understanding of Role and Duties of Building Chairpersons and Administrative Coordinators Survey A	31
3.7 Accessibility of Building Chairperson to Staff Survey A	32
3.8 Staff Response to Frequency of Department Meetings Survey A	33
3.9 Comparison of Services of Curriculum Articulation Structure by Staff and Coordinating Administrators Survey A	34
3.10 Adequacy of Released Time for Building Chairpersons Survey A	35
3.11 Adequacy of Compensation for Building Chairpersons Survey A	35
3.12 Meeting Structure Preference of Building Chairpersons and Coordinating Administrators Survey A	37
3.13 Effect of Coordinating Administrators in Articulation Structure According to Building Chairpersons Survey A	38

Table	Page
3.14 Percentage of Respondents by School to Surveys B and C by Building Chairpersons and Coordinating Administrators	40
3.15 Chairpersons' Concept of Their Authority and Responsibility to Initiate Curriculum Change Survey B	40
3.16 Coordinating Administrators' Concept of Residence of Responsibility to Initiate Curriculum Change Survey C	41
3.17 Curricular Change Involvement of Building Chairpersons Survey B	42
3.18 Relative Amount of Chairperson Time Spent on Identified Responsibilities Survey B	43
3.19 Survey Items Regarding the Structure of Curriculum Meetings Surveys B and C	45
4.1 Comparison of Ranked Responses by Curriculum Chairpersons from Survey A with Indications of Time Consumed from Survey B	55

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In 1973 Good defined articulation as:

(1) The organization of classroom instruction, curricular activities, and other interdependent and interrelated services of the school system so as to facilitate the continuous and efficient educational progress of students from grade to grade and from school to school; also the interrelation of the school's instructional program with the educational programs of other available institutions or with work opportunities;

(2) communication and cooperation between two or more groups in developing their guidance programs so that quick and easy orientation of individual shifting from one program to another is facilitated (1).

In practice this implies that a student's work in a particular grade level and subject area would be built upon completed work in a previous experience or grade level, that a high school student's work would flow in a smooth continuum from previous junior high school work, and that the educational process be a continuous one, free of unnecessary interruption or duplication.

Further, there should be a smooth transition for a student when leaving one school to progress to the next higher level of education. The student should find in the new environment a familiar strain in the curriculum content that reaches back into his or her previous experiences and builds upon them. In keeping with educational growth, it is to be expected that more demands should be placed upon a student's maturity, but that it would also be true that expectations would continue to be geared to the student's abilities.

While adjusting to differing administrative organizations, a student should have the right to expect an obvious continuity between preceding educational experiences and those which he or she is about to encounter (2).

Research has shown that this desired continuity is difficult to identify in curricular structure. Curriculum articulation all too often remains an idealistic concept that educators pay lip service to, but have not systematically and successfully implemented in the educational environment. The bulk of the literature dealing with the problems of articulation is evidence that in far too many instances the comforting and familiar curriculum content referred to previously has become a disjointed, interrupted or repetitious experience to students as they move from one educational experience to another.

In order to facilitate the task of teaching large numbers of children the total educational continuum has been broken into administrative units, subject matter departments, and separate school districts. These factitious subdivisions, organized more for administrative convenience than for assistance to the individual child, have resulted often in a high degree of specialization with few links among the several segments (3).

Stone points to the widely dissimilar heritage of the educational system as we know it. It would appear to have been assembled from various philosophical and geographical areas that had little similarity to one another (4). The American child begins his formal education in a German kindergarten, then moves into the Prussian elementary school, then progresses to the essentially American junior and senior high schools, and possibly on to the originally English college, and finally the German graduate school.

Add to this the plethora of arrangements of these levels: eight-four, six-two-four, six-three-three, ungraded, unit structure, each with its own set of vocabularies and philosophies, and the problem becomes more clearly evident.

Americans have been eager to adopt what seems to be the best from other systems in the world and to adapt and shape it to meet their own unique set of circumstances, while steadfastly resisting any kind of centralized control of curriculum, particularly at the federal level. What has resulted from this eclectic heritage, however, is not without great advantage; desirable qualities of established and tested systems can be selected and refined, without precluding the divergence required to satisfy unique and developing conditions.

However, when ineffective or inadequate articulation is added to this aggregate of educational units, its impact serves to compound the vertical jumble and produces a course of education that more closely resembles an obstacle course than a continuum. For in a very real sense, every student experiences transition in the school system almost continuously, at the end of each school term and, most importantly, each school unit (5).

Philosophical diversity is also a compounding factor in this progression of transitions. As the student moves from classroom to classroom, building to building, or campus to campus, he or she encounters varying educational philosophies, missions and approaches. Schools differ on several levels in their multiplicity of purpose, in their more or less selective nature, in their diverse viewpoints toward function, and in their physical conduct of the environment.

The self-contained elementary classroom, with one teacher responsible for a particular group of students differs markedly from the highly departmentalized secondary school class where the teacher must know and teach a large number of students in a specialized subject area (6).

For many students this juxtaposition of diverse elements serves to interject obstacles into their normal continuous pattern of intellectual growth. Ironically, the structure of the organization has introduced obstacles to the achievement of its responsibilities.

Statement of Problem

The Cedar Falls, Iowa, Community School System has long recognized the problems inherent in the absence of a vertical articulation structure, and their detrimental effect upon the educational process. This study evaluated the degree of success the Cedar Falls System has experienced in its attempt to meet the challenge of maintaining a basically stratified system (a six-three-three arrangement) while seeking to promote the maximum coordination and articulation between grade levels and curricular offerings.

Delimitation of Problem

The primary focus of this investigation was to analyze the curriculum articulation model utilized by the Cedar Falls, Iowa, Community School System, and to ascertain the degree of effectiveness this model has provided in meeting major problems discussed in the

literature regarding curriculum articulation. Although articulation philosophy must necessarily encompass the elementary school level (grades K-6), this investigation was directed to the secondary level (grades 7-12).

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions of terms were applicable:

Articulation - the relationship of the various organizational parts of the educational program and the facility with which transition occurs among these parts (7).

Junior High School - an organizational structure encompassing grades seven through nine.

High School - an organization structure encompassing grades ten through twelve.

Staff - members of the teaching staff at both the junior high school and the high school levels.

Administration - building principals, associate principals, and the directors of elementary and secondary education.

Curriculum chairperson - an appointed staff member in each departmental grouping in each building who serves as the curriculum leader for that population.

Curriculum - subject content being taught in the Cedar Falls Community School District.

Procedures

Because of the clearly defined nature of the populations to be surveyed during the course of this investigation, it was determined that a written questionnaire would most adequately provide the type of information needed. Therefore, the investigative tools utilized in this study included three surveys designed to measure various aspects of curriculum coordination through specific population questioning. The first instrument, Survey A, was designed to provide input from all participants in the articulation model and was prepared in three variations: Form 1 was administered to the entire teaching staff of both junior high schools and the high school, excluding the curriculum chairpersons; Form 2 was administered to curriculum chairpersons in all three buildings; and Form 3 was administered to administrators serving in the capacity of coordinators in the curriculum structure.

Surveys B and C were single form instruments. Survey B was designed to investigate the perceptions held by the curriculum chairpersons of their role and the success of that role in the structure. Survey C was constructed in response to the administrative input extrapolated from Form 3 of Survey A and designed to define more clearly the administrative role in the curriculum coordination structure at Cedar Falls.

Other sources of information were the 1979 North Central Association Report on the evaluation of the high school, and school policies and materials provided by the district. Direct interviews

with the directors of elementary and secondary education, coordinating administrators, and guidance counselors working at the secondary schools in the district were conducted throughout the study.

Chapter 2

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

Upon surveying the literature related to curriculum articulation, it was immediately apparent that a substantial portion of early discussion and investigation had been directed toward articulation concerns between high schools and colleges. While this area was certainly deserving of attention, curriculum decision-makers in the public school sector have decried the lack of attention to smooth transitions between elementary and secondary schools, and in recent years the literature devoted to their concerns has increased.

Authors of curriculum articulation models and proponents of articulation theory were in agreement regarding the necessity to approach education as an articulated process. Many felt that the single-most valid evaluative measure of an educational structure was the degree to which it provided continuity from level to level and from program to program. The conviction that theory in articulation rests essentially on the practice of good communication between the units involved was reflected consistently throughout the literature. Approaches to accomplishing that objective were predictably varied but always faithful to the primary goal of developing a structure that provided those involved in each unit the opportunity and incentive to interact with each other.

Some practices stood out as most frequently and effectively used to coordinate programs. Communication by means of conferences

and meetings was widely employed as an articulation practice. Another common practice was the delegation to a single individual of responsibility for a program or activity over a range of experiences or grade levels (8). Cross-visitation of both teachers and learners, the sharing of textbooks and teaching materials, comparisons of work quality and content by learners at different levels were also mentioned as possible ways to facilitate the communication necessary for articulation to take place. It was frequently suggested that any long range approach to articulation must consider in-service training of teachers to modify attitudes which block effective coordination efforts.

Obstacles to Effective Articulation

Problems that prevent schools from formulating and successfully implementing models for articulation seemed to fall with four general aspects of school organization. Those four areas were philosophical understandings, the thrust of instructional and guidance programs, organizational and administrative structures, and public understandings of the educational system (9).

In the area of philosophical understandings there were at least two concerns. The first was the nonexistence of a similarity of purpose among the levels of the educational system. Even though the purposes of the elementary and secondary schools at one time were clear and distinct, societal demands for more response to special interest and pressure groups have significantly altered the clarity of purpose of each level of the instructional program. The

introduction of special classes for career education, conservation, family living, health education, leisure time activities, and special instruction for the slow and gifted students bear witness to the increasing complexity of the curricular structure.

As the scope of the curriculum became more complex, the learner became the only common element extending throughout the twelve-year program of instruction of the public schools. Acknowledgement of that fact was relatively common in the literature, but much more difficult to deal with in a curricular structure, the tendency having been to deal with the environment around the learner rather than to focus on the experiences within the learner through which articulation can be measured (10).

The second philosophical concern dealt with the point of view of the teaching staff at each of the levels of instruction. In order for articulation to be effective, the inclination to resist change in order to protect "territory" must be overcome. Teachers must avoid the attitude that subject matters are ends in themselves, and must be encouraged to view their endeavors as continuous learning activities which enhance the intellectual capacity of the learner. A process of acquiring facts without related meanings has not contributed to intellectual growth nor to articulated curricula.

Meaning is a continuum, always capable of being extended or having gaps, perhaps unperceived at first, filled in. This expansion of one's understandings and insights develops as one perceives similarities, analogies, and relationships between new concepts and ones which have been met earlier. This growth takes

place, then, as one meets old principles and processes in new situations, sees new applications for old ideas, observes old ideas as special cases of new, or finds that a new and apparently distinct concept has connections with one learned earlier (11).

In the area of instructional programs, problems have become apparent when students advanced from one segment of the educational ladder to another; i.e., from elementary to junior high school, or from junior high school to senior high school. The administrative structure and organization of the school system can be contributing factors in creating articulation problems. The typical elementary school was set up on a self-contained basis, giving one teacher responsibility for one group of students; the typical secondary school was highly departmentalized. The former placed a significant emphasis upon the teacher's need to know the individual student, while the latter placed an equally significant emphasis upon the teacher's need to know the subject matter, and provided little opportunity to interact with students outside a limited classroom experience. In the elementary setting a teacher could logically have been expected to be cognizant of the total educational development of a learner, while such an expectation was unreasonable in the secondary setting. It was not surprising that practices growing out of either of these curriculum organizations were not understood by the other (12).

Differences in size of attendance centers and class sizes also presented opportunities for misunderstandings to occur in curricular matters. Buildings housing elementary and junior high school populations were typically smaller and therefore had fewer

staff members than their high school partners which absorbed populations from several feeder attendance centers. The opportunity for thirty or forty staff members to get together to discuss instructional objectives was much greater than it was for a staff of one hundred or more teachers speaking from a highly departmentalized frame of reference.

Another factor that often hindered the implementation of curricular articulation was the lack of clarification of administrative roles and responsibilities. In school settings where position responsibilities were only vaguely defined or described, the expectations by the central office of a building principal with regard to curriculum improvement and supervision were confusing to all (13).

Even when role responsibilities were well-defined, curriculum articulation often fell short of being effective due to a lack of preparation and experience on the part of the principals, and an unclear perception of how schools, at other levels than their own, were operating. Because administrators operated in the same kind of horizontal structure that their staffs did, they often did not recognize the seriousness of poorly articulated curriculum and were not motivated to attempt remediation of the situation.

Inadequate teacher preparation was cited by many authors as a critical factor in articulation problems. At issue was the failure of teacher-training institutions to emphasize the broad scope of all education and educational institutions, and the subsequent lack of sensitivity on the part of many teachers to the teaching-learning problems of levels other than their own (14). The teacher's approach

to all education was likely to be structured by the approach to the level for which they were prepared to teach. A secondary teacher was likely to think primarily in terms of a subject-matter oriented program, regardless of level. The elementary teacher often had a strong feeling for the student-centered approach, frequently with too limited an appreciation for subject matter strengths (15).

A final obstacle to effective articulation dealt with public understanding of the function and importance of each of the stratified levels of education. Campbell (16) felt that in the mind of the average citizen, teaching in the high school was a more important job than teaching in the elementary school. Often teachers perpetuated this idea by adopting the attitude that the route of promotion was from elementary to junior high school to high school teaching positions. These beliefs had impact upon the articulation problem in that the inference was drawn that each level existed to prepare the student for the next, more important, level, thereby relieving the secondary levels of any feeling of obligation to know what was happening to the students before they arrived in high school. This had the effect of placing all responsibility for coordination on the lower levels, if responsibility existed at any level. There was a subsequent tendency resulting in secondary dominance of the curriculum.

Approaches to Improving Curriculum Articulation

There were several common threads of remedial measures running through the fabric of the related literature, irrespective

of the philosophies and beliefs of the writers. There were ten suggestions for curriculum improvement which were addressed by a majority of the writers, but which were covered most completely by Brimm in his paper for the North Central Association (17). These suggestions were:

1. Teachers and administrators should be organized into vertical study committees under the direction of a system-wide curriculum coordinator. The perspective of curriculum needs to be from a viewpoint that encompasses the school's instructional activities from kindergarten through grade twelve. There must be adequate and frequent dialogue between teachers of all levels.

2. The school district must prepare and use course of study and curriculum guides, after having developed a common philosophy of instruction throughout the entire school experience. The goals of the system must be consensual among buildings and levels, and teachers must be aware of the intent of those goals and how they are individually expected to attain them.

3. Transition activities between levels should be planned so that students have exposure to the next vertical level of instruction before they are expected to function within it. Activities following a change in vertical level should be geared to a phase-in approach for the new student, gradually moving from the attitudes and expectations of the previous level to those of the present situation.

4. There should be liberal exchange of teachers between levels to facilitate greater understandings of the student's difficulties at a given level. Opportunities should be provided for

classroom observations and extended conferences between teachers of each level with those of preceding and succeeding levels. Written reports regarding students' achievements, abilities, and problems should be provided and specifically designed to assist the teacher in the area or level that the student is approaching.

5. Orientation programs should be provided for students prior to a move between levels. Students should be given the opportunity to experience a physical presence in the setting to which they will move, in order to alleviate anxieties about the building and physical plant itself. An opportunity should also be provided for them to meet and interact with the teachers they will be working with after the move has taken place, while they retain the security of the teachers they are accustomed to at the previous level.

6. The role of the junior high school should be reassessed. Care should be taken to ensure that the unique needs and development of adolescents are taken into consideration when curricula is established for that level.

7. The district should recognize that curriculum articulation is the direct responsibility of the administration. Administrators must provide the impetus, the setting, and the catalytic influence that assures those involved that articulation is important. A positive approach to departmental meetings, efforts to coordinate experiences, and textbook selection are all part of the systematic approach needed by the administrative hierarchy in a school setting. The superintendent bears this responsibility for the district, and each principal bears it for the building over which he or she holds

responsibility. Without insistence that curriculum is significant and administrative support for articulation efforts, articulation will not be an effective goal within the district.

8. The guidance program throughout the levels of education should be coordinated. Purposeful communication should cross horizontal and vertical strata and be directed at effective student, parent, and teacher orientation to each major shift in structure, as well as to the educational program and philosophy of the school system.

9. A philosophical shift in emphasis is desirable. There needs to be greater emphasis on learning and how it takes place and relatively less emphasis on the act of teaching. Students should be encouraged to assume more and more responsibility as they progress through the school setting. More individualized work should be provided outside a rigid curricular pattern, to allow the student to structure his or her curriculum in keeping with perceived needs.

10. The school system should provide ample in-service training for all teachers so they may have the opportunity to increase their understanding of the total program. Institutions of higher education should also feel the obligation to provide educational program emphases that will allow this understanding to take place. Teachers must accept their own responsibility to improve their professional competencies and to look beyond the immediate perspective of their classroom assignments to the total program of the district and how that program works to the benefit of each student.

There does not seem to be a need to ascribe a sequential order to the solutions presented above in order to make them most efficient or feasible for any one school system, but the use of any portion of that list would indicate that the district involved has made a commitment to become involved in curriculum articulation. Curriculum articulation is a deliberate and thoughtful process that does not merely happen in any setting, but must be purposefully and carefully structured with involvement by administrators and teachers alike.

Chapter 3

THE SETTING

The Cedar Falls School System is located in a midwestern community with a population of thirty-three thousand. The district is comprised of eight elementary schools, kindergarten through grade six, two junior high schools, grades seven through nine, and one high school, grades ten through twelve. The total school population at the time of this study was approximately five thousand students.

Prior to September 1979, the Cedar Falls School System was utilizing a curriculum articulation model that employed department heads whose scope of service included Cedar Falls High School, Peet Junior High School, and Holmes Junior High School. The department heads were selected by the administration and could be members of the staffs of any one of the three schools mentioned. Most department heads were selected from the high school staff. A building chairperson was assigned to each attendance center that did not have a resident department head in that curricular area. Curriculum committee members were a part of the membership of the designated curriculum staff of each teaching area of each building. The responsibilities of the department heads were to coordinate the curriculum improvement efforts of the member schools, provide administration with information for budgetary planning, and assist with the writing of goals and objectives for their department. For these services, department heads were compensated beyond the normal

salary schedule and were allowed a certain amount of released time from normal teaching duties, usually on an hourly basis per day; i.e., an additional planning period.

During the 1976-77 school year, discussions were initiated concerning recommendations to improve that structure to meet some deficiencies that were being identified. Those areas discussed were related to the perceived dominance of the junior high school program by high-school oriented department heads, and the concern that the junior high schools were not receiving value for cost under that structure. A secondary concern was one of cost to the district under the arrangement of providing supplementary pay as well as released time for the duties of department head.

Further investigation of this area was done in the following school year, and in April of 1978 a goal involving the presentation of suggestions for improvement of the articulation structure to the Administrative Council and eventually to the Cedar Falls Board of Education was established. The target date for this presentation to the Board was November 1978. A task force, composed of an administrator from each junior high school and one from the high school, as well as the directors of elementary and secondary education, and the superintendent of schools, was established. During April and May of that year discussions continued with the main topic concerned with services being rendered in the area of curriculum improvement and articulation within the present structure of department heads and building chairpersons.

Cost figures were presented on the approximate amount of money expended for the existing structure. Considerable time was spent discussing how comparable school districts organized their curriculum programs. Another point of discussion centered around the question of what duties the department heads assumed, beyond the regular school day, for the performance of department head functions. Some time was spent reviewing communications from administrative colleagues and department heads regarding the matter of authority in carrying out the responsibilities. The degree of involvement of department heads and building chairpersons in the areas of professional growth and the initiation of curricular changes were also matters of concern to the task force. Some time was spent at this juncture discussing job descriptions from these roles. The question of how the staff perceived the role of the department head was discussed and a decision was made to solicit staff input into the evaluation process of the structure.

A survey of the staff was undertaken in May of 1978 which had as its intent, not the evaluation of the individuals serving in these roles, but the evaluation of the structure under which these individuals were operating. Results of this survey were used in follow-up work by the task force in the summer of 1978. At the time of the survey, the following possible options for the direction of this task force's efforts were suggested:

1. Continue the existing structure.
2. Do away completely with the existing structure.

3. Establish the positions of consultants K-12 in the curriculum areas.
4. Establish the position of coordinator at each junior high school.
5. Replace the structure with an additional administrator in charge of curriculum at each building.
6. Combine departments so that approximately 20-25 teachers would be under the direction of a single department head.

The original survey instrument, Appendix A, contained four open-ended questions which dealt with the areas of services received, understanding of the duties and responsibilities of the department heads and building chairpersons, suggestions for enhancing the understanding of these duties, and recommendations for improvements that the task force might consider.

Responses to this survey indicated an affirmation of the concerns previously considered by the task force. Responses indicated an acceptable level of understanding of the structure as it had existed and also identified some concerns among junior high school department heads.

As the task force progressed with its work, using the information compiled, the following structural possibilities emerged as relevant to the completion of the task force goal:

1. Each building should have a department chairperson or head in designated curricular areas.
2. Administrators could become involved in a select number of committees as coordinating figures, thereby eliminating some communication problems, as well as ensuring their involvement.
3. Released periods during the day might be discontinued, considering the larger number of department heads, in

favor of a designated number of days per year per department chairperson.

4. A job description, available to all, for department chairpersons could be provided.
5. Some quasi-administrative duties might be given the department chairpersons, i.e., in the areas of evaluation, budget and the calling of substitute teachers.

Following analysis of the information and subsequent task force meetings, a proposal was drafted to be submitted to the Cedar Falls Board of Education in November of 1978. The proposal (Appendix B) and its attendant job description (Appendix C) were adopted at that time, and became the curriculum articulation structure that was evaluated as the primary thesis of this paper.

Upon adoption of the proposal by the Cedar Falls Board of Education, application forms were distributed to all staff members interested in applying for the position of department chairperson for each building. Job descriptions were also made available to the entire staff. By March of 1979, final selection of the building chairpersons for the school year 1979-80 was completed and the new structure was ready for implementation in the fall of 1979. As indicated in the proposal to the Board of Education, the entire structure was scheduled for review and evaluation at the end of that school year. That evaluation comprises the remaining pages of this document.

Survey A

A questionnaire was constructed in three forms designed to survey the total secondary staff (Appendix D), the chairpersons in

each department in both junior high schools and the high school (Appendix E), and the coordinating administrators in each area (Appendix F). Some questions were common to all three forms of the questionnaire and others were specifically aimed at information possessed by only one or two of the groups.

The questionnaires were examined and approved for use within the Cedar Falls School District by the Director of Curriculum for the secondary level. In all cases, the survey was designed to be no more than one page in length with a selection response format. One series, regarding the duties of the curriculum chairpersons as described in the job description, involved a ranking response from all three populations. Space was allowed for additional non-structured comments on all forms. There were a total of fifty-eight respondents who chose to express some additional feelings or suggestions in this space.

The surveys were distributed to all populations during regularly scheduled meetings of faculties, curriculum chairpersons, and administrators. Because the responses were anonymous in nature, no individual follow-up was possible, although follow-up reminders were placed in building publications two weeks after the initial distribution of the questionnaires.

Table 3.1 shows the percentage of respondents, by school, to Survey A. The percentage of return from all three schools was very similar and adequate representation of all the populations involved was provided. Overall, the rate of return was slightly higher in the high school setting than in the junior high schools for this

Table 3.1
Percentage of Respondents by School
Survey A

School	Staff			Bldg. Chairs			Coord Admin			Total		
	Poss	Ret	%	Poss	Ret	%	Poss	Ret	%	Poss	Ret	%
Peet	42	29	69	9	8	89	2	2	100	53	39	74
Holmes	47	30	64	8	5	63	2	2	100	57	37	65
CFHS	81	58	72	14	12	86	3	2	67	98	72	73
Central Admin	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	50	2	1	50
TOTALS												
Jr. High	89	59	66	17	13	76	4	4	100	110	76	69
High Sch	81	58	72	14	12	86	3	2	67	98	72	73
Grand Total	170	117	69	31	25	81	9	7	78	210	149	71

survey. A total return of seventy-one percent of all populations was considered to be sufficient to provide meaningful data for the purposes of this study (18).

Table 3.2 provides an indication of the educational experience of the staff members and the curriculum chairpersons, as well as the amount of experience gained within the Cedar Falls system and in positions of curriculum leadership, respectively.

Table 3.2

Teaching Experience of Respondents and
Years of Experience Within the
Cedar Falls School System
Survey A

Staff					Curriculum Chairpersons				
Years	Teach #	Exp %	C F #	System %	Teach #	Exp %	Years	Curr #	Leadshp %
1-5	14	12	34	29	0	0	1-3	9	35
6-10	26	22	26	22	3	12	4-6	3	12
11+	77	66	56	48	23	88	7+	14	54

The rationale for determining the relative experience of the respondents was to determine their contact with the Cedar Falls system and their curricular background in light of the evaluation they assigned to the curriculum structure. The fact that nearly two-thirds of the staff respondents were veterans of eleven or more years of teaching experience lent the weight of past practice and maturation in the profession to the survey results. Similarly, the number of staff respondents with more than six years of experience in the Cedar Falls system, in the setting where the structure had been in existence in its previous form, allowed the evaluation to gain a historical perspective. Survey results indicated that at least seventy percent of the responding staff members had experienced the previous curriculum articulation model, as well as the one being submitted.

The curriculum chairpersons' responses also indicated a depth of teaching experience, with the majority having eleven or more years of experience. Their experience in roles of curriculum leadership was more diverse, with a slightly more than one-third indicating one to three years experience in that capacity, and slightly more than half indicating seven or more years in a leadership role. This difference was expected due to the larger number of curriculum chairpersons utilized by this model, particularly at the junior high school level. It was anticipated that some polarity of opinion might result from these groups, depending upon time in service in that role. However, the unanimity of responses received regarding role perceptions, suitability of benefits, opportunities for curriculum leadership, and perceived importance of responsibilities failed to document this anticipated polarity.

All of the populations surveyed were asked to rank the identified responsibilities of the curriculum chairpersons in order of importance, from one through eight. The responses to each item, by school, are presented in Appendices I-P. Each page represents one item, and responses may be observed by category, i.e., staff responses presented by building and level, chairpersons' responses presented by level, and coordinating administrators' responses compiled separately.

Tables 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5 provide composite rankings of each of the populations, indicating the number of respondents and the percentage represented by each ranking.

Table 3.3

Composite Staff Ranking on Individual
Survey Items
Survey A

Response	Rank																			
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		N.R.			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Dev. of New Program	17	15	21	18	15	13	10	9	18	15	3	36	9	8	10	10	9	14	12	
Coord of Ex Program	55	47	26	22	15	13	10	9	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	3	3	3	
Report Budget	23	20	24	21	25	21	13	11	10	10	9	9	8	1	1	4	3	8	7	
Call/Ch Dp Meetings	12	10	11	9	20	17	16	14	12	12	10	15	13	10	9	4	3	17	15	
Class Visits	12	10	11	9	20	17	16	14	12	10	15	13	10	9	4	3	24	21	21	
Asst with Prog Obj	10	9	8	7	13	11	24	21	10	10	9	13	11	10	9	14	12	15	13	
Secure Subs	13	11	10	9	12	10	13	11	15	13	10	9	8	7	21	18	15	13	13	
Eval of Teachers	2	2	5	4	7	6	7	6	11	11	9	21	18	14	12	26	22	24	21	

Table 3.4
 Composite Curricular Chairperson Ranking
 on Individual Items
 Survey A

Response	Rank																			
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		N.R.			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Dev. of New Program	1	4	6	23	8	31	2	8	4	15	1	4	3	12	1	4	0	0		
Coord of Ex Program	20	77	2	8	2	8	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Report Budget	2	12	4	15	7	27	2	8	4	15	2	8	3	12	1	4	0	0		
Call/Ch Dp Meetings	1	4	4	15	1	4	7	27	5	19	4	15	1	4	3	12	0	0		
Class Visits	1	4	1	4	2	8	6	23	3	12	8	31	4	15	0	0	1	4		
Asst with Prog Obj	3	12	6	23	6	23	2	8	3	12	4	15	1	4	1	4	0	0		
Secure Subs	0	0	4	15	1	4	4	15	2	8	1	4	4	15	8	31	2	8		
Eval of Teachers	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4	15	5	19	7	27	6	23	0	0		

Table 3.5
 Composite Coordinating Administrator
 Ranking on Individual Items
 Survey A

Response	Rank															
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Dev. of New Program	0	0	0	0	2	29	0	0	3	43	1	14	0	0	1	14
Coord of Ex Program	5	71	0	0	0	0	1	14	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
Report Budget	0	0	1	14	1	14	0	0	1	14	0	0	4	57	0	0
Call/Ch Dp Meetings	0	0	2	29	1	14	1	14	0	0	1	14	1	14	1	14
Class Visits	1	14	2	29	0	0	0	0	1	14	1	14	2	29	0	0
Asst with Prog Obj	0	0	1	14	1	14	1	14	1	14	2	29	0	0	1	14
Secure Subs	1	14	0	0	1	14	2	29	0	0	1	14	0	0	2	29
Eval of Teachers	0	0	1	14	1	14	2	29	0	0	1	14	0	0	2	29

There was a great deal of agreement, across the populations surveyed, about the importance of the duties of a curriculum chairperson. The largest percentage of all three groups selected "coordination of existing programs at the building level" as the most important duty of the chairperson. "Reporting budgetary needs to the administration," "assistance with program objectives," and "development of new programs" were also ranked highly by those surveyed. Comments about these areas reflected some degree of frustration at having insufficient time to adequately pursue curriculum development, and frustration at dealing with the budget and understanding the various forms and procedures utilized in that area.

The curriculum responsibilities deemed to be of least importance were also generally agreed upon by respondents from all three populations. These areas were: "securing substitutes," and "evaluation of teachers by curriculum chairpersons." Comments from staff and chairpersons alike reflected negative feelings about being evaluated by or evaluating a peer. Administrators felt that these tasks were significant to the position, but not as important as the duties discussed in the first group.

All populations were asked of roles and responsibilities under the modified curriculum structure. Staff members and curriculum chairpersons were questioned about the role and duties of the curriculum leaders, and coordinating administrators were asked to provide an indication of their understanding of their own role and responsibilities. Responses are presented in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6

Understanding of Role and Duties of Building
Chairpersons and Administrative
Coordinators
Survey A

	#	Staff %	Building Chairs #	Building Chairs %	Coordinating #	Admin. %
Yes	84	72	23	88	6	86
No	30	26	3	12	1	14
N.R.	3	3	0	0	0	0

As indicated in Table 3.6, a majority of all groups responded affirmatively. Most participants in the curriculum articulation model felt that the roles and responsibilities of the model had been defined to the level of understanding. The largest expression of uncertainty was found in the responses of staff members in reference to the role and responsibility of curriculum chairpersons.

Since the daily planning period release of curricular leaders had been discontinued in favor of a designated number of department days released per year, there was concern that the availability of the chairperson to the department served might be seriously affected. This concern prompted a question to staff members about that availability. The responses to that question are presented in Table 3.7.

As seen, the responses were weighted toward the "always" and "often available" range, and confirmed that no serious damage had

been done to availability as a result of the modified structure. Only two individuals of the one hundred ten who responded felt that their department chairperson was not accessible to them at any time.

Table 3.7

Accessibility of Building
Chairperson to Staff
Survey A

	Always		Often		Seldom		Never		N.R.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Junior High	34	58	15	25	5	8	0	0	5	8
High School	35	60	12	21	7	12	2	3	2	3
Total	69	59	27	23	12	10	2	2	7	6

The number of released days varied between departments and was dependent upon the number of teachers served by each chairperson. Some high school chairpersons retained a portion of the daily released time allowed in the previous structure. This determination was also made on the basis of department size.

The question in Survey A which dealt with frequency of department meetings was included as a further check on availability and communication opportunities within each departmental unit under the altered structure. The responses to that question are presented in Table 3.8.

According to Table 3.8, responses were weighted toward a feeling of satisfaction with the practices of the departments in this area. Frequency of departmental meetings was not mandated by the

curriculum structure, thereby allowing each chairperson to schedule his or her department meetings as the need was felt. The data produced by this item indicated that staff members were satisfied with the operation of their departments in this matter.

Table 3.8

Staff Response to Frequency of
Department Meetings
Survey A

	Should Meet More Often		Meet Often Enough		Should Meet Less Often		N.R.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Junior High	9	15	43	73	3	5	4	7
High School	10	17	45	78	2	3	1	2
Total	19	16	88	75	5	4	5	4

Table 3.9 contains the information produced by asking all three populations to compare the services of the modified structure with those of the previous structure.

Both junior high school and senior high school staff members gave responses that indicated no substantial change in service under the two models. A fairly large sub-group of junior high school staff members felt that they had no basis for comparison of the two models. This response may be attributable, in part, to staff turn-over prior to the implementation of the modified structure.

Coordinating administrators indicated the strongest positive response to this item. The majority of respondents from this popu-

lation felt that service had improved in curriculum articulation over that of preceding years. The increased participation by administrators in the articulation model may have been a contributing factor in this response.

Table 3.9

Comparison of Services of Curriculum
Articulation Structure by Staff
and Coordinating
Administrators
Survey A

	Improved Service		No Change In Service		Less Service		No Basis for Comparison		N.R.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
J.H. Staff	8	14	37	63	1	2	11	19	2	3
H.S. Staff	12	21	26	45	9	16	6	10	5	9
Coord Admin	5	71	1	14	0	0	1	14	0	0
Total	25	20	64	52	10	8	18	15	7	6

There were two items surveying all three populations which asked respondents to make value judgments about the benefits, offered to individuals serving as curriculum chairpersons, by the district. Table 3.10 indicates responses regarding the adequacy of released time provided curriculum chairpersons, and Table 3.11 shows responses regarding the adequacy of compensation provided to the same individuals.

Table 3.10

Adequacy of Released Time for
Building Chairpersons
Survey A

	Very Adequate		Adequate		Barely Adequate		Inadequate		N.R.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Staff	32	27	43	37	11	9	15	13	16	14
Curr. Chairs	1	4	11	42	5	19	6	23	3	12
Coord Admin	2	29	5	71	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	35	23	59	39	16	11	21	14	19	13

Table 3.11

Adequacy of Compensation for
Building Chairpersons
Survey A

	Very Adequate		Adequate		Barely Adequate		Inadequate		N.R.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Staff	29	25	43	37	18	15	8	7	19	16
Curr. Chairs	2	8	14	54	6	23	0	0	4	15
Coord Admin	4	57	3	43	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	35	23	60	40	24	16	8	5	23	15

Staff members generally judged both of these benefits to be adequate. Nearly the same percentage selected "very adequate" as selected the two categories that indicated anything less than "adequate". Comments by staff members reflected concern about the quality of educational activities that transpired in the chairpersons' classrooms during released days. It was the practice of the district to place a substitute teacher in classrooms when chairpersons were involved in curricular activities.

Curriculum chairpersons rated the adequacy of compensation higher than the adequacy of released time. (An equal number of responses were distributed between the choices in the less than adequate range as those responses indicating "adequate"). One chairperson felt that the time provided was better than adequate. Comments by curriculum chairpersons directed to this question reflect some discontent with the loss of daily time to work in curricular matters.

Coordinating administrators reacted conversely to the chairpersons with regard to time. None of the administrators judged the released time to be less than adequate, and most felt it was adequate or better. Administrators were in agreement with chairpersons about compensation, judging it to be adequate or better.

Both of these questions proved to be controversial in nature and both produced a sizable sub-group of non-respondents among staff members. Some chairpersons chose not to respond to the questions as well. Comments reflect the feeling that items that

were negotiable under the master contract were out of place in such a survey. The questions were intended to measure as closely as possible the degree of satisfaction felt by the various populations with the district's reward system for this task. It was possible to make comparisons with the previous structure only in the matter of released time, as no significant change in financial structure had occurred between the two models. The difference in the perspectives of the populations is most apparent in Table 3.10.

At the time the survey was administered all curriculum chairpersons were meeting once a month, with the format of the meeting divided between a large group general session and smaller group sessions divided by curricular areas. The information in Table 3.12 was solicited to determine the preferences of administrators and chairpersons for meeting formats. The responses were indicative of general satisfaction with the meetings as they were structured.

Table 3.12

Meeting Structure Preference of Building
Chairpersons and Coordinating
Administrators
Survey A

	Large Group Only		Area Level Only		Combination Large Group/Area	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Bldg. Chairs	3	12	5	19	18	69
Coord Admin	0	0	0	0	7	100
Total	3	9	5	15	25	76

Building chairpersons were asked to assess the impact made by the interjection of an administrative figure into the curriculum articulation model. The perceptions of effect are presented in Table 3.13.

Table 3.13

Effect of Coordinating Administrators in
Articulation Structure According to
Building Chairpersons
Survey A

	Significant Beneficial Effect		Some Beneficial Effect		No Effect		Some Negative Effect		Significant Negative Effect	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Jr. High	4	29	3	21	6	43	1	7	0	0
High Sch	1	8	5	42	5	42	1	8	0	0
Total	5	19	8	31	11	42	2	8	0	0

Exactly half of the junior high school chairpersons and half of the high school chairpersons reported at least some beneficial effect on the operation of the model. Only two chairpersons reported some degree of negative impact, and the remainder expressed no awareness of either beneficial or negative effect. The item was included to check for levels of anxiety or resentment on the part of the chairpersons as a result of an administrator being present. Neither reaction appeared to influence the responses significantly.

Surveys B and C

Following the completion of Survey A, it was decided to investigate more thoroughly the views held by the curriculum

chairpersons about their various responsibilities and the amount of time they felt they were devoting to them. It was also decided to investigate the perceptions of relative authority vested in the curriculum leadership position, as well as the degree of autonomy from direct administrative influence perceived under the modified articulation structure. Survey B was developed for those purposes (Appendix G).

A parallel survey, Survey C, was designed to provide further input from coordinating administrators about relationships between administrators and curriculum chairpersons. Since the altered structure represented the administrators' first experience at working with curriculum committees on a specified, multi-building scope of operation, the evaluator felt some effort should be made to determine if they felt more comfortable or knowledgeable about the process as a result of their increased participation (Appendix H). Both Surveys B and C were approved for use within the Cedar Falls Schools by the Director of Curriculum for the secondary level.

The percentage of respondents by school to Surveys B and C is shown in Table 3.14. As was the case in Survey A, the percentage of return from both populations was high, with a total of eighty-three percent return.

The information contained in Table 3.15 was obtained to assess the degree of autonomy perceived by a curricular leader working within an articulation model that included administrative personnel as part of the structure.

Table 3.14

Percentage of Respondents by School
to Surveys B and C by Building
Chairpersons and Coordinating
Administrators

	Building Chairs			Coordinating Administrators			Total		
	Poss	Ret	%	Poss	Ret	%	Poss	Ret	%
Peet	9	7	78	2	2	100	11	9	82
Holmes	8	7	88	2	2	100	10	9	90
CFHS	14	11	79	3	2	67	17	13	76
Cent Admin	-	-	-	2	2	100	2	2	100
Total	31	25	81	9	8	89	40	33	83

Table 3.15

Chairpersons' Concept of Their Authority
and Responsibility to Initiate
Curriculum Change
Survey B

	Yes		No		Not Sure		N.R.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Peet	3	43	0	0	4	57	0	0
Holmes	6	86	0	0	1	14	0	0
CFHS	9	82	0	0	1	9	1	9
Total	18	72	0	0	6	24	1	4

The underlying concern addressed was that such proximity of administration would diminish the incentive or willingness of the chairperson to initiate changes in curriculum. There was no basis

apparent for that concern in two of the three schools, but a noticeable lack of direction was evidenced by the number of "not sure" responses received from Peet Junior High School.

Coordinating administrators were then asked to indicate where they felt the primary responsibility for the initiation of curricular change should rest. The responses they produced are presented in Table 3.16.

Table 3.16

Coordinating Administrators' Concept of
Residence of Responsibility to
Initiate Curriculum Change
Survey C

Responsibility of:	#	%
Coordinating Administrator	0	0
Building Chairperson	4	50
Building Principal	0	0
Equal Responsibility	4	50

The answers were divided between the assignment of that primary responsibility to curriculum chairpersons, and the equal division of responsibility between curriculum chairpersons, coordinating administrators, and building principals.

To pursue the concern about the involvement of the chairperson as a prime mover in curricular change, chairpersons were asked to describe their role in changes made within their departments, whether initiated by themselves or by the district. The results are shown in Table 3.17.

Table 3.17

Curricular Change Involvement of
Building Chairpersons
Survey B

Change Initiated by Chairpersons									
	Yes		No		No Opportunity		N.R.		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Peet	6	86	1	14	0	0	0	0	0
Holmes	6	86	0	0	1	14	0	0	0
CFHS	6	55	3	27	1	9	1	9	9
Total	18	72	4	16	2	8	1	4	4

Change Initiated by District									
	Yes		No		No Opportunity		N.R.		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Peet	2	29	1	14	4	57	0	0	0
Holmes	1	14	2	29	4	57	0	0	0
CFHS	4	36	5	45	1	9	1	9	9
Total	7	28	8	32	9	36	1	4	4

The data indicated that most chairpersons felt they had been personally responsible for moving their department toward curricular change. They felt considerably less involved in change initiated by the district, indicating that they had experienced no opportunity to become involved in many cases. The responses to these items could be interpreted to mean that chairpersons saw themselves as the central figure in the impetus for curriculum change.

The eight identified responsibilities of curriculum chairpersons that had been ranked in Survey A were presented again in .

Survey B. Chairpersons were asked to mark on a continuum the average amount of time spent per week on each item. The intent of the question was to draw a comparison between the relative importance of a duty as determined by Survey A, and the relative amount of time spent in accomplishing it. The responses of the curriculum chairpersons are presented in Table 3.18.

Table 3.18

Relative Amount of Chairperson Time Spent
on Identified Responsibilities
Survey B

Response	Time Spent									
	1 hour or Less		2 hours or Less		3 hours or Less		More than 3 hours		N.R.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Dev of New Prog	14	56	8	32	2	8	1	4	0	0
Coord of Ex Prog	5	20	6	24	7	28	5	20	2	8
Report Budget	15	60	6	24	4	16	0	0	0	0
Call/Ch Dpt Mtgs	13	52	8	32	3	12	1	4	0	0
Class Visits	15	60	5	20	4	16	0	0	1	4
Asst w/ Prog Obj	14	56	7	28	3	12	1	4	0	0
Secure Subs	17	68	2	8	4	16	1	4	1	4
Eval of Teachers	15	60	7	28	2	8	0	0	1	4

The curriculum chairpersons clearly felt that their highest priority of the items ranked was the "coordination of existing programs at the building level." Their indication of time spent on this task was consistent with that determination. Twenty-eight percent of them indicated up to three hours per week spent on this aspect of their job, twenty-four percent spent up to two hours, and twenty percent spent less than one hour per week. This was the only one of the eight responsibilities to which the majority of respondents dedicated more than one hour per week. The other identified duties that ranked high in importance; i.e., "development of new programs," "reporting budgetary needs to administration," and "assistance with program objectives" were ranked correspondingly high in time spent upon their completion.

In other survey items, as indicated in Table 3.19, coordinating administrators were equally divided in the matter of past receipt of agendas for building curriculum meetings, but unanimous in their desire to be provided with them. Seventy-five percent of the responding administrators felt that they had a greater understanding of curriculum areas other than those of their coordinating responsibilities as a result of the altered articulation structure, and eighty-eight percent felt that department meetings had functioned satisfactorily under the new structure.

Further investigation by the Cedar Falls School District of the curriculum articulation model evaluated is recommended. The concern expressed in the original survey by the junior high school participants was still expressed in the evaluation instruments

after structure modification had taken place. There also appeared to be an inordinate number of respondents from the same level who claimed to have no basis for the comparison of services from this year to past years.

Table 3.19
Survey Items Regarding the Structure of
Curriculum Meetings
Surveys B and C

	Yes		No		Sometimes		N.R.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Curriculum Chairpersons:								
Meet with Bldg. Prin. on Regular Basis	13	52	11	44	0	0	1	4
Coord. Admin. provided with Mtg. Agenda	8	32	9	36	8	32	0	0
Coordinating Administrators:								
Agenda Provided	3	38	5	67	0	0	0	0
If not, should be Provided	5	67	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greater Understanding of Curricular Areas	6	75	2	25	0	0	0	0
Dept. Mtgs. Functioned as Expected	7	88	1	12				

Other areas of interest for further study include an exploration of the relationship between years of experience in teaching and curriculum leadership roles and job perception as a curriculum leader. As curriculum chairpersons move away from the practice of a daily released period for curriculum work and mature in the current articulation model, another inquiry might be made as to the adequacy of the released time for the accomplishment of their tasks.

Some exploration of the understanding gained by the participants from a carefully constructed job description might be made. The areas of interest in this matter include both the existing job description of the curriculum chairpersons, and the possibility of a newly constructed description of the role of the coordinating administrators. The question of whether the existence of such a document plays a significant part in the overall perception of the role might be addressed by further studies.

In conclusion, although problems were discovered through this evaluative instrument, they were not so great as to discount the value of the articulation effort of the Cedar Falls School System. The effort appeared to be valid and the results indicative of perceived positive growth in the area of curriculum articulation.

Chapter 4

SUMMARY

This study was undertaken to obtain quantifiable data regarding the degree of acceptance of one school district's approach to curriculum articulation by its staff and administration, and to identify perceived strengths and weaknesses of this approach at the conclusion of a one-year trial period. The school district that served as the subject of this study was the Cedar Falls Community School District of Cedar Falls, Iowa.

The Cedar Falls School System is located in a midwestern community with a population of thirty-three thousand. The district is comprised of eight elementary schools, kindergarten through grade six, two junior high schools, grades seven through nine, and one high school, grades ten through twelve. The total school population at the time of this study was approximately five thousand students.

The Cedar Falls Community Schools have consistently supported the belief that effective curriculum articulation is a major factor in the development of a learning environment that maximizes the continuous progress of students as they move from level to level through the instructional sequence within the district. This district has, therefore, directed a great deal of energy toward the development of a curriculum articulation model that would facilitate that development, and would permit the district to improve and update curricular areas within the context of routine operation of the district.

At the beginning of the 1979-80 school year, a modification of the district's curriculum articulation model was introduced at the secondary level. The original model had been altered in an effort to involve staff and administration more effectively, and to provide more opportunities for articulation to occur horizontally as well as vertically.

One primary component of the change was to place department chairpersons in each department in each building of the secondary system. This allowed for an on-site chairperson for each department, replacing a system-wide chairperson for each curricular area, serving all buildings. A second major component was the structured inclusion of line administrators in the articulation process, by assigning each of them a specific role as a coordinator between several committees and levels.

At the time of the implementation of this modified structure, the district determined that an evaluation of the model and its relative success should take place at the end of the first year. This study represents that evaluation. It was carried out at the conclusion of the 1979-80 school year, at which time the author was serving in the capacity of an administrative intern at the Cedar Falls High School.

The study was based on a survey (through a questionnaire) of the various populations within the school district that were involved in secondary curriculum articulation efforts. Those populations consisted of the secondary instructional staff, members of that staff who had been appointed to curriculum chairperson positions, and the

line administrators who had been charged with coordination responsibilities. The latter group was inclusive of all secondary principals and assistant principals, the Director of Pupil Personnel Services, and the Director of Secondary Education.

Questionnaires were designed to measure the degree of satisfaction felt by the identified populations, regarding the various aspects of the curriculum articulation model utilized in preceding years, which had been addressed by the modification of the structure. These aspects had been identified as areas of concern by the participants: a clear definition of the role and responsibilities of the curriculum chairperson, the adequacy of the time and the remuneration provided to the chairpersons by the district to fulfill these responsibilities, the significance of the efforts of the chairperson to the classroom teacher, the availability of the chairperson to the teacher he or she served, the frequency of department level meetings, and the services provided by the model through the articulation process. Information was also sought regarding the role and function of the coordinating administrator in the modified structure.

These concerns were also found to be significant to the discussion in the related literature which addressed problems in curriculum articulation. Three of the four general aspects of school organization that presented such problems mentioned by Campbell (18) were addressed directly by these questionnaires. Those three areas were philosophical understandings, the thrust of instructional and guidance programs, and organization and administrative

structures. From other sources the importance of clarification of administrative roles and responsibilities was stressed as a crucial factor (19), as was the development of sensitivity on the part of teachers to teaching-learning problems of situations other than their own (20).

Three forms of the survey were distributed so the responses could be categorized separately for each sub-group. The data collected were compiled and put into tables so that a clear comparison of all three groups would be possible. It was then possible to draw some general conclusions about the results of the survey.

Generalizations Extrapolated
From the Staff Survey A-1

Nearly two-thirds of the responding staff members had eleven or more years of teaching experience and slightly more than half of the responding staff had eleven or more years experience within the Cedar Falls Community Schools.

When questioned about their understanding of the present curriculum structure, an arrangement which included placing building chairpersons in each building and assigning a coordinating administrator to each curriculum area, seventy-two percent of those responding indicated that they did understand the structure. In the comments regarding the structure there was some evidence of a lack of real understanding of the role of the coordinating administrator.

The accessibility of the chairperson to the staff members in their building was judged to be good by those responding. The selections "often available" and "always available" were chosen by eighty-two percent of the responding staff.

The general response in regard to frequency of department meetings at the building level was that they were occurring at a satisfactory interval. Each building chairperson determined the frequency of meetings for his or her department. Seventy-five percent of the responding staff felt that they met often enough.

While few negative feelings were expressed about the quality of service in matters of curriculum, few respondents felt that there had been a substantial change in the quality of service through the modification. Fourteen and one-half percent of the respondents felt they had no basis to compare the two year's service and six percent did not reply to the item. Some of the comments addressed this question and the general indication was that the service had been good, particularly at the high school, and continued to be so under the changed structure.

Released time for the performance of curriculum chairperson duties was judged to be "adequate" to "very adequate" by sixty-four percent of those responding, "inadequate" to "barely adequate" by twenty-two percent; and the item was not responded to by fourteen percent of the staff respondents. The parallel item dealing with compensation to curriculum chairpersons was responded to from "adequate" to "very adequate" by sixty-two percent of the staff, with twenty-two percent selecting "inadequate" to "barely adequate", and sixteen percent failing to respond.

Generalizations Extrapolated
From the Curriculum Chair-
persons and the Coordinating
Administrators Surveys A-2
and 3

Reflecting the experience level of the staff, the curriculum chairpersons' responses showed that eighty-eight percent had eleven or more years of teaching experience. Fewer indicated that many years of experience in curriculum leadership roles, probably due to the relatively new appointments of junior high personnel to such positions. The breakdown indicated thirty-five percent had one to three years of experience, twelve percent had four to six years of experience, and fifty-four percent had seven or more years of experience in curriculum leadership roles.

The majority of the respondents on both the curriculum chairpersons' survey and the coordinating administrators' survey felt that they did understand the curriculum structure in present use. Eighty-eight percent of the curriculum chairs and eighty-six percent of the administrators selected the affirmative response.

When questioned about the format for the monthly curriculum chairpersons meetings, the majority of those responding favored an arrangement that included a combination of large group and area level meetings. Nineteen percent of the curriculum chairpersons indicated a preference for area level meetings exclusively, but seventy percent of the chairpersons and one hundred percent of the coordinating administrators favored the combination meeting approach.

When asked to ascertain the effect of the coordinating administrator working within the committees on a 7-12 basis, the

curriculum chairpersons evidenced a fifty percent response to "some beneficial effect" and "significant beneficial effect". Forty-two percent felt no effect from the presence of an administrator, and eight percent felt some negative effect from this arrangement.

Coordinating administrators felt positive about the services received by the school system from this articulation model. Slightly more than seventy-one percent of those responding felt that improved service had resulted from this change, while twenty-four percent felt no change in service. Another twenty-four percent felt they had no basis to make the comparison between previous years and the year under study. One hundred percent of the responding administrators felt that improved coordination had come about because of the curriculum articulation model utilized during the trial period.

All of the coordinating administrators rated the released time allotted to curriculum chairpersons from "adequate" to "very adequate", and forty-four percent of the chairpersons responded in the same range. Similar results were apparent regarding compensation for chairpersons in that all of the administrators felt that it was "adequate" to "very adequate", and sixty-two percent of the chairpersons placed it in the same range.

Generalizations Regarding the
Rank Order Question Common
to all Forms of Survey A

There was a great deal of agreement across the populations surveyed about the importance of the duties of a curriculum chairperson. Generally it was agreed that the most significant duties of

the position involved these items: development of new programs, coordination of existing programs at the building level, and reporting budgetary needs to the administration. Comments about these three areas reflected some degree of frustration in terms of having enough time to really get into curriculum development and frustration at dealing with the budget and understanding the various forms and procedures inherent in that area.

Other areas of agreement were the areas deemed to be least important in the tasks of a curriculum chairperson. These areas were classroom visitation, securing substitutes, and evaluation of teachers by curriculum chairpersons. Comments from staff and chairpersons alike reflected the undesirable aspect of being visited and/or evaluated by a chairperson. Administrators felt that these tasks were significant to the position, but not as important as the duties discussed in the first group.

Generalizations Extrapolated From Survey B

When a comparison was made of the relative importance assigned the various responsibilities of the curriculum chairpersons in Survey A with the amounts of time chairpersons felt they actually spent on each of them as indicated in Survey B, it became apparent that the second item, coordination of existing programs at the building level, consumed the most time. It was designated as the most significant responsibility by all populations surveyed. Other duties seemed to demand less than one hour per week for the majority of the chairpersons responding. The total response for this comparison is indicated in Table 4.1.

The first column indicates an average rank given each identified task by all chairpersons responding. The second column shows the average of the indications of approximate time spent on each of the identified tasks on a weekly basis, as found in the chairpersons' responses to Survey B.

Table 4.1

Comparison of Ranked Responses by Curriculum
Chairpersons from Survey A with
Indications of Time Consumed
from Survey B

Response Item	Rank	Time Spent Per Week
Dev. of New Programs	3	2 hours or less
Coord. of Existing Programs	1	3 hours or less
Report Budget Needs to Administration	4	1 hour or less
Calling/Chairing Dept. Meetings	5	2 hours or less
Classroom Visitation	6	1 hour or less
Assistance with Program Objectives	2	2 hours or less
Securing Substitutes	8	1 hour or less
Evaluation of Teachers	7	1 hour or less

The curriculum chairpersons clearly felt that their highest priority of the items ranked was the coordination of existing programs at the building level. Their indication of time spent on this task was consistent with that determination. Twenty-eight percent of them indicated that they spent up to three hours per week engaged in

this process, twenty-four percent spent up to two hours per week, and twenty percent spent less than one hour per week.

In other items included in Survey B, curriculum chairpersons expressed little anxiety with regard to the presence of coordinating administrators in the articulation model. Seventy-two percent felt that the authority and responsibility to initiate curricular change was their own, and the same percentage felt that they had indeed utilized that authority and responsibility.

Slightly more than half of the curriculum chairpersons met on a regular basis with the building administrator for purposes of discussing curriculum. Coordinating administrators agreed that the responsibility for calling department meetings within curricular areas for the purposes of coordination belonged to the curriculum chairpersons, as was determined in the job description. Most of the chairpersons felt that coordinating administrators should fulfill that function occasionally. There were no guidelines for such functions regarding administrators in the articulation model. Approximately one-third of the chairpersons provided departmental meeting agendas to their coordinating administrator regularly, one-third did not provide such agendas, and one-third did provide them sometimes.

Generalizations Extrapolated From Survey C

Responses to Survey C indicated a great deal of satisfaction among administrators with the articulation model and their own participation within its structure. Comments from this group served mainly to reinforce the beneficial results perceived by them of participating in the modified form of the articulation process.

The administrators' response to the receipt of agendas from curriculum chairpersons paralleled the conclusion drawn from Survey B. Approximately one-third received an agenda regularly and two-thirds did not. All of those who did not receive such agendas indicated that they felt one should have been provided.

The last two items on Survey C provided a strong endorsement for the articulation model from the administrative participants, in that seventy-five percent indicated they had a greater understanding of curricular areas other than their own as a result of this experience, and eighty-eight percent were satisfied with the functioning of the department meetings under this structure.

Conclusions

The general responses received from these surveys indicated a positive feeling toward the curriculum articulation efforts in the Cedar Falls Community School District, at the secondary level. While the system was not absolutely free of controversy or frustration, it was apparent that good things were believed to be happening in the areas of articulation and coordination as a result of this effort.

Some of the problems discussed were those of a new program becoming operative. There was some confusion about the hierarchial authority of the administrative coordinator in relation to the curriculum chairperson, as well as some discrepancy in the way each viewed his or her obligation to the other. The teaching staff expressed a desire to be made cognizant of the role of the coordinating administrator through documentation in the form of a position

description and an organizational flow chart. It appeared that since administrators were more directly involved in this project, adjustments would have to be made on the part of all of the populations surveyed.

Most respondents indicated that the amount of released time was adequate to perform departmental duties, but many expressed concern for the necessity to place a substitute teacher in a classroom to facilitate such release. This issue, and its companion question, the matter of adequacy of compensation, provided the highest level of conflict among responses. No conclusion can be drawn from these data without acknowledging the highly emotional nature of such issues, as well as the impact collective bargaining has had upon any discussion of salary items in the educational setting.

The Cedar Falls Community School District appeared to be a stable setting in terms of tenure among the teaching staff. This consistency has assisted the district in maintaining continuity in its efforts to provide curriculum articulation. Administrative positions also reflected the security of low turn-over from year to year.

There was significant consensus among all populations with regard to the relative importance of the services provided by the curriculum chairpersons. This consensus contributed strength to the articulation model, and was further amplified by the evidence that time spent by the chairpersons was in proportion to the perceived relative importance of the responsibility.

Some concerns were expressed that no structure existed to provide for regular communication between curriculum chairpersons in the same department, but in different buildings, and the coordinating administrator assigned to that curricular area. The disagreements about which individual should have the responsibility for calling building meetings and whether the coordinating administrator should always be provided with an agenda of building meetings were indicative of confusions that existed about issues that had been addressed in the articulation proposal and in the curriculum chairperson position description. This type of misunderstanding indicated a degree of ambiguity about roles that could have been avoided through careful and systematic in-service.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made to the Cedar Falls Community School District for consideration in their continuing efforts to effect improvements in this articulation model:

1. More emphasis is needed on regularly scheduled meetings between building principals and curriculum chairpersons for purposes of coordination.

2. A position description for the administrative role in the articulation model would be desirable, not from the standpoint of increasing the responsibility of the coordinating administrator, but with the goal of clearly defining the role for the benefit of the other populations involved.

3. A more systematic and consistent structure for coordinating administrators to work within, to accomplish cross-level coordination in the curricular areas of their responsibility, would be desirable. While there is little concern that cross-level communication is taking place, there is at present no guarantee that it will continue to happen in the future.

4. Agendas of building curriculum meetings should be provided to coordinating administrators in order to keep them informed of the on-going process in each building curricular area for which they have assigned responsibility.

5. The district should provide a comprehensive in-service experience for all new curriculum chairpersons at the outset of their service, informing them of budgetary procedures, forms, and priorities.

6. The district is encouraged to follow through with its plans for continued evaluation of the articulation model. The setting is in a constant state of change and the model must be flexible enough to change with it in order to remain effective.

7. Highly emotional aspects of the articulation model, specifically those dealing with salary and released time, present obstacles to objective evaluation by staff. Care should be taken to minimize these obstacles in further evaluations of the articulation model.

8. Future evaluations of curriculum articulation in the Cedar Falls Community School District should extend to the coordination between the elementary schools and the juniorhigh schools as well as through subject matter curricula in the secondary schools.

The concerns mentioned are those that deal with making a good system better. It is obvious that continued work is needed and that systematic evaluation is desirable in the coming years. This project indicates that those ends are being sought under the present curriculum leadership structure and that there is significant improvement from the previous structure.

The Cedar Falls Community School District is to be congratulated on its educational dedication and its efforts to provide a continuous learning environment for its students. The purposeful manner in which the district has pursued curriculum articulation is evidence of the integrity of its intent.

FOOTNOTES

FOOTNOTES

1. Carter V. Good, editor. Dictionary of Education, 3rd Edition. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. 42.
2. Ernest L. Hunter, "Articulation for Continuity in the School Program." The National Elementary Principal. 49:3 (January 1967) p. 58.
3. R. Paul Brimm, Fostering Articulation Within and Between Schools, (Chicago: North Central Association, 1975), p. 2.
4. Robert L. Ebel, Editor. Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th Edition. (London: MacMillan, 1969), p. 86-7.
5. Ibid., p. 87.
6. Roald F. Campbell. "Articulating Elementary and Secondary Schools." Elementary School Journal. 58:5 (February 1958), p. 257.
7. G. R. Snider, "School Program: Organization and Staff." Review of Educational Research. 30 (February 1960) p. 70.
8. Sherman H. Frey, "Articulation Between the Junior and Senior High School." National Association of Secondary Schools Bulletin. 47:285 (October 1963), p. 42.
9. Campbell, loc. cit.
10. Stephen A. Romine, "Articulation: A Look at the Twelve Year Program." The North Central Association Quarterly. 35 (April 1961), p. 275.
11. Phillip S. Jones, "The Importance of Articulation." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. Vol. 43 (May 1959), pp. 107-8.
12. Campbell, op. cit., p. 258.
13. Bob Woods, "Upgrading Curriculum Content." School and Community. 53:2 (October 1966), p. 27.
14. Hunter, loc. cit.
15. Brimm, op. cit., p. 4.
16. Campbell, op. cit., p. 259.

17. Brimm, op. cit., pp. 15-16.
18. Campbell, op. cit., pp. 257.
19. Woods, loc. cit.
20. Hunter, loc. cit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Periodicals

- Barbour, James, and Others. "Declining Enrollment - Effect on Articulation." College and University. 53:4, Summer 1978.
- Belanger, Laurence L. "Lessinger's Typology Revisited." Journal of Secondary Education. 40:6, October 1965.
- Brimm, R. Paul. "Developing A Program For Improving Articulation Practices." American Secondary Education. Vol. 7, Summer 1977.
- Bushness, David S. "Closing the Gap and Eliminating the Overlap." American Vocational Journal. 53:4, April 1978.
- Campbell, Roald F. "Articulating Elementary and Secondary Schools." Elementary School Journal. 58:5, February 1958.
- Charles, A. D. "Achieving Articulation of Subject Matter." School and Community. 54:6, February, 1968.
- Cooper, R. M. "Educational Program: Articulation of Educational Programs." Review of Educational Research. Vol. 30, October 1960.
- Eible, Charles, and Zavarella, Charles. "Curriculum Development: A Model for Action." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. 63:425, March 1979.
- Fiedler, W. G. "Bridging the Gap Between Elementary and High School." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. 44:257, September 1970.
- Fisher, L. B. "Analysis of Problems of Articulation and Suggestions for Action." North Central Association Quarterly. 35:1, July 1960.
- Frey, Sherman H. "Articulation Between the Junior and Senior High School." National Association of Secondary Schools Bulletin. 47:285, October 1963.
- Hearn, Arthur C. "Improving the School's Holding Power Through Improved Articulation." Educational Administration and Supervision. 42:4, April 1956.

- Hunter, Ernest L. "Articulation for Continuity in the School Program." The National Elementary Principals Bulletin. 49:3, January 1967.
- Isacksen, Roy O. "Assessing New Issues in Junior High School Organization." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. 45:264, April 1961.
- Jones, Phillip S. "The Importance of Articulation." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. Vol. 43, May 1959.
- Keller, Charles R. "Needed: Revolution in the Social Studies." Saturday Review. 64:37, September 16, 1961.
- Kirksey, Howard G. "Articulation in the Junior-Senior High School." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. 43:246, April 1959.
- Krockover, Gerald H., and Others. "Getting Together: A K-12 In-service Program." Science Teacher. 44:5, May 1977.
- Lee, D. E. "After Middle School, What?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. 62:421, November 1978.
- Lessinger, Leon M. "Toward A More Adequate High School Student Typology." Journal of Secondary Education. 40:6, October 1965.
- McKeehan, Rollin. "Assessing New Issues in Junior High School Organization." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. 45:264, April 1961.
- Meder, Albert E. Jr. "Articulation of General Education Programs." Journal of Educational Sociology. 29:5, January 1956.
- Meyer, Robert E. "Needed: Vertical Articulation." Illinois Education. 53:7. March 1965.
- Michael, Lloyd S. "Articulation Problems with Lower Schools and Higher Education." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. 43:244, February 1959.
- Myers, Alonzo F. "A Time for Action." Journal of Educational Sociology. 29:5, January 1956.
- Pratzner, Frank C. "Job Analysis: Key to Program Articulation." Educational Technology. 19:3, March 1979.
- Romine, Stephen A. "Articulation: A Look at the Twelve Year Program." The North Central Association Quarterly. Vol. 35, April 1961.

- Shane, Harold G. "A Curriculum Continuum: Possible Trends in the Seventies." Phi Delta Kappan. Vol. 51, March 1970.
- Smith, Rolland R. "The Supervisor, the Teacher, and Articulation Between Elementary and Junior High Schools." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Vol. 43, May 1959.
- Snider, G. R. "School Program: Organization and Staff." Review of Educational Research. Vol. 30, February 1960.
- Spain, Clarence H. "Continuity in the Whole School Program." Clearing House. 31:4, December 1956.
- St. Mary, M. E. "Bridging the Gap." Education. 81:8, April 1961.
- Strickland, Joann H., and William Alexander. "Seeking Continuity in Early and Middle School Education." Phi Delta Kappan. 50:7, March 1969.
- Swenson, Esther J. "Issues Concerning Articulation Between Elementary and Secondary Schools." High School Journal. Vol. 38, May 1955.
- Varner, Glenn F. "How May We Achieve Better Articulation with the Elementary School and the Senior High School?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. 46:276, October 1962.
- Woods, Bob. "Upgrading Curriculum Content." School and Community. 53:2, October 1966.

Books

- Berdie, Douglas R., and John F. Anderson. Questionnaires: Design and Use. New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1974.
- Brimm, R. Paul. Fostering Articulation Within and Between Schools. An NCA Commission of Schools Occasional Paper. Chicago: North Central Association, 1975.
- Conant, James Bryant. Recommendations For Education in the Junior High Years. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1960.
- Ebel, Robert L., Editor. Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th Edition. London: MacMillan, 1969.
- Good, Carter V., Editor. Dictionary of Education, 3rd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Learned, W. S., and B. D. Wood. The Student and His Knowledge. New York: Carnegie, 1938.

Russell, John Dale, and Charles H. Judd. The American Educational System. New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1940.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Staff Survey, May 1978

The administrative task force has been extensively studying the area of curriculum improvement and articulation for classes 7-12, with emphasis on the existing building chairperson and department head structure. The task force would like staff in-put in order to have a broad representation of ideas before final recommendations are made in November of 1978. I am stressing the fact that this survey is in no way intended to be an evaluation of individual department heads or building chairpersons, but rather a structure for delivering instructional services.

1. What kinds of services do you feel are most helpful to you in this area?
2. Do you, as an individual staff member, feel that you understand the role, duties, and responsibilities of our existing structure of building chairpersons and department heads?
3. If you answered negatively on Question 2, what are some suggestions or ideas that you might have so that you could better understand the structure?
4. If possible, list some recommendations that you might feel would be helpful to this entire study.

APPENDIX B

SECONDARY CURRICULUM AREA STRUCTURE PROPOSAL

The Statement of Philosophy for the Cedar Falls Community School District, as listed in the School Board Policy Handbook, includes the following statement:

"The Cedar Falls Community Schools are dedicated to providing an educational program which aims to promote the maximum development of the individual within the context of society, country, and the entire world community."

As a means to this end, the following proposal for curriculum structure is submitted to the Board of Education for its consideration and is recommended for approval. This proposal will parallel efforts at the elementary level and will provide for a more effective K-12 curriculum articulation process for the Cedar Falls Community Schools.

Purpose

The purpose is to provide a broad based curriculum development structure that will promote a smoothly flowing and efficiently operating instructional program.

Rationale

1. Curriculum development will occur when there is opportunity for involvement of the professional staff at the building level and when there is effective leadership in each area.
 - A. It has been the policy of the Cedar Falls Community Schools to have the professional staff involved in goal setting and instructional objective writing for a number of years.
 - B. Staff members in each curriculum area have been involved in curriculum development and revision through the existing structure.
2. Participation and involvement by the professional staff will stimulate interest in and create a positive atmosphere for instructional improvement in each curriculum level. The designation of staff members as building curriculum chairpersons will help in achieving this goal.

Structure - Description

1. Building curriculum chairpersons will be designated in the following curricular departments: Language Arts, Social Studies, Mathematics, Science, Applied Arts (Industrial Arts, Business 9-12, Home Economics, Driver Education), Fine Arts (Music K-12, Speech-Dramatics 9-12, Art 7-12, Foreign Language 9-12), Physical Education-Health, Special Areas (Ed. Media K-12, Guidance, Special Needs, Health Services).
2. Due to the limited number of teachers within several of the curricular departments and the uniqueness of their assignments (i.e., multi-building), one staff member in several of the above areas is designated as curriculum chairperson. Those are noted by grade level assignments as stated in Number 1.
3. All staff members will serve as committee members in their curriculum development.
4. The building curriculum chairperson will meet on a regular basis with the members of the curriculum department within the building. The committee members, through the curriculum chairperson, will provide suggestions for curriculum improvement for district-wide study.
5. The building curriculum chairperson will meet on a regular basis with the building principal. The building curriculum chairperson will provide the building principal with suggestions for curriculum improvement on a building level basis.
6. An administrative coordinator will be assigned to a curriculum department(s). The administrative coordinators will be seven secondary school principals along with the Director of Pupil Personnel. They will serve those assignments on a rotating basis. They will meet with the building chairpersons of the assigned department as deemed necessary. Meeting agendas will be developed from items submitted to the administrative coordinator. The building chairpersons will select a meeting leader from their group.
7. The building curriculum chairpersons will meet on a regular basis with the Director of Secondary Education. These meetings may be single or multidisciplinary in nature.
8. The building curriculum chairpersons will have released time to perform the assigned responsibilities.

Procedures for Implementation

1. Job descriptions and application forms are available in each building principals' office. Application forms for the 1979-80

school year must be returned to the building principal by Friday, January 12, 1979.

2. Building chairpersons will serve for a three-year period. Each chairperson may reapply along with all other eligible staff members.
3. The selection committee will consist of the building principals and Director of Secondary Education. The building principals will be involved only in the selection process of his/her building. (Example: The high school principals and Director of Secondary Education will select the high school building chairpersons.)
4. The administrative coordinators will be assigned to a three-year period to the respective curricular areas.
5. The entire structure will be reviewed at the conclusion of each academic year.

APPENDIX C

JOB DESCRIPTION: BUILDING CURRICULUM CHAIRPERSON

- Qualifications:
1. Exhibits a continuing interest and desire to improve the instructional program.
 2. Demonstrates the ability to work cooperatively and productively with others.
 3. Capable of motivating and providing leadership for the curriculum committee at the building level.

- Reports to:
1. Building Principal
 2. Director of Secondary Education

Goal: To assist the Principal and Administrative Curriculum Coordinator in development and articulation of the curriculum and instructional program at the building and district levels.

- Responsibilities:
1. Assist at the building level in developing new programs and revising existing programs.
 2. Assist in the development and maintenance of coordinated instructional programs at the building level.
 3. Recommend to the Principal budgetary needs for their specific curricular area.
 4. Plan and conduct building level curricular meetings.
 5. Meet with the Administrative Curriculum Coordinator as requested to provide input and direction to the instructional program.
 6. Will be knowledgeable as to the degree of implementation of the course goals and instructional objectives in their curricular area through classroom visitation.
 7. Will be involved in securing substitutes for their curricular area.

8. May be involved with Professional Growth Responsibilities as related to the improvement of instruction.
9. *Will be responsible for requisitioning and processing in property accounting.*
10. Will assist in the scheduling process.
11. May be involved with new staff selection in their curricular area.

APPENDIX D

SURVEY A: FORM 1

Staff Survey
March 1980

In accordance with our commitment to re-evaluate the existing building chairperson structure, we would like staff in-put in order to have a broad representation of ideas to work with. I am stressing the fact that this survey is in no way intended to be an evaluation of individual building chairpersons, but rather of a structure for delivering instructional services.

1. How many years of experience in teaching have you had?
 1 - 5 6 - 10 11+
2. How many years of experience in teaching have you had in the Cedar Falls Schools System?
 1 - 5 6 - 10 11+
3. Rank order the following responsibilities of the building curriculum chairperson in the order of their importance to you as a classroom teacher. (1 is highest)
 Development of new programs
 Coordination of existing programs at building level
 Reporting budgetary needs to administration
 Calling and chairing building level department meetings
 Classroom visitation
 Assistance with program objectives
 Securing substitutes
 Evaluation of teachers within the department
4. Do you, as a staff member, feel that you adequately understand the role, duties and responsibilities of the building chairpersons as a part of the current curriculum services structure?
 Yes No
5. How accessible for consultation is your building chairperson under the present structure?
 Always available Seldom available
 Often available Never available
6. What is your reaction to the frequency of building department meetings that your department has?
 Should meet more often Meet often enough Should meet less often
7. Compare the services of the current curriculum structure with those provided to you under the past structure.
 Improved service Less service
 No change in service No basis for comparison
8. How would you describe the released time allotted to building chairpersons for the performance of their curricular responsibilities?
 Very adequate Barely adequate
 Adequate Inadequate
9. How would you describe the compensation allowed building chairpersons for the performance of their curricular responsibilities?
 Very adequate Barely adequate
 Adequate Inadequate
10. Additional comments:

APPENDIX E

SURVEY A: FORM 2

Curriculum Chairperson's Survey
March 1980

In accordance with our commitment to re-evaluate the existing building chairperson structure, we would like your in-put in order to have a broad representation of ideas to work with. I am stressing the fact that this survey is in no way intended to be an evaluation of individual building chairpersons, but rather of a structure for delivering instructional services.

1. Junior High High School
2. How many years teaching experience do you have?
 1 - 5 6 - 10 11+
3. How many years experience in a department leadership role do you have?
 1 - 3 4 - 6 7+
4. Rank order the following responsibilities of the building curriculum chairperson in the order of their importance to you. (1 is the highest)
 - Development of new programs
 - Coordination of existing programs at building level
 - Reporting budgetary needs to administration
 - Calling and chairing building level department meetings
 - Classroom visitation
 - Assistance with program objectives
 - Securing substitutes
 - Evaluation of teachers within the department
5. Do you, as a building chairperson, feel that you adequately understand the role, duties, and responsibilities of the current structure of building chairpersons and administrative coordinators?
 Yes No
6. What type of structure do you prefer for the meetings of all building curriculum chairpersons?
 Large group meetings
 Area level meetings (all S.S., all Lang. Arts, etc.)
 Combination of large group and area level meetings
7. In your opinion, what is the effect of having a coordinating administrator working with each department on a 7-12 basis?
 Significant beneficial effect
 Some beneficial effect
 No effect
 Some negative effect
 Significant negative effect
8. How would you describe the released time allotted you for the performance of your responsibilities as building chairperson?
 Very adequate Barely adequate
 Adequate Inadequate
9. How would you describe the compensation allowed you for the performance of your responsibilities as building chairperson?
 Very adequate Barely adequate
 Adequate Inadequate
10. Additional Comments:

APPENDIX F

SURVEY A: FORM 3

Administrator's Survey
March 1980

In accordance with our commitment to re-evaluate the existing building chairperson structure, we would like your input in order to have a broad representation of ideas to work with. I am stressing the fact that this survey is in no way intended to be an evaluation of individual building chairpersons, but rather of a structure for delivering instructional services.

1. Rank order the following responsibilities of the building curriculum chairperson in the order of their importance to you as a building administrator. (1 is high)
 - Development of new programs
 - Coordination of existing programs at building level
 - Reporting budgetary needs to administration
 - Calling and chairing building level department meetings
 - Classroom visitation
 - Assistance with program objectives
 - Securing substitutes
 - Evaluation of teachers within the department

2. Do you, as an administrative coordinator, feel that you adequately understand your role and involvement in the curriculum structure?
 - Yes No

3. How would you describe the released time allotted the curriculum chairpersons in your building for the performance of their responsibilities as curriculum chairperson?
 - Very adequate Barely adequate
 - Adequate Inadequate

4. How would you describe the compensation allowed the curriculum chairpersons in your building for the performance of their responsibilities as curriculum chairpersons?
 - Very adequate Barely adequate
 - Adequate Inadequate

5. What type of structure do you prefer for the meetings of all building curriculum chairpersons?
 - Large group meetings
 - Area level meetings (all S.S., all Lang. Arts, etc.)
 - Combination of large group and area level meetings

6. Compare the services of the current curriculum structure with those provided under the past structure.
 - Improved service Less service
 - No change in service No basis for comparison

7. Compare the over-all coordination of effort under the current curriculum structure
 - Improved coordination Less coordination
 - No change in coordination No basis for comparison

8. Additional comments:

APPENDIX G

SURVEY B

Curriculum Chairperson Follow-up Survey

1. Do you feel that you have the authority and responsibility to initiate curriculum changes in your department?
 Yes No Not sure
2. Do you feel that you have been personally instrumental in moving your department toward a curricular change?
 initiated by yourself? Yes No No opportunity
 initiated by the district? Yes No No opportunity
3. Do you meet on a regular basis with your building principal for purposes of discussing curriculum improvement/development on a building level?
 Yes No
4. How often should the administrative coordinator be responsible for calling department chairperson meetings at the 7-12 level for purposes of coordination?
 Always Occasionally
 Frequently Never
5. Is the coordinating administrator of your department provided with an agenda of each departmental meeting?
 Yes No Sometimes
6. Indicate the relative amount of time spent on the following aspects of curriculum chairperson responsibilities by placing an x on the continuum that indicates approximately how much time each week you spend on each item.
 1. Development of new programs

 0 hours More than three hours per week
 2. Coordination of existing programs at building level

 0 hours More than three hours per week
 3. Reporting budgetary needs to administration

 0 hours More than three hours per week
 4. Calling and chairing building level department meetings

 0 hours More than three hours per week
 5. Classroom visitation

 0 hours More than three hours per week
 6. Assistance with program objectives

 0 hours More than three hours per week
 7. Securing substitutes

 0 hours More than three hours per week
 8. Evaluation of teachers within the department

 0 hours More than three hours per week

APPENDIX H: SURVEY C

COORDINATING ADMINISTRATORS FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

1. Who should have the primary responsibility for calling building level department meetings?
 Coordinating administrators
 Department chairpersons
 Equal responsibility
2. Who should have the primary responsibility for initiating curriculum improvements/developments at the building level?
 Coordinating administrators
 Department chairpersons
 Building principals
 Equal responsibility
3. Are you provided with meeting agendas from each of the department meetings that fall within your area of coordination (all schools)?
 Yes
 No
4. Do you feel that you have a greater understanding of curriculum areas other than those of your coordinative responsibilities as a result of the present structure?
 Yes
 No
5. Have department meetings functioned the way you think they should under the present structure?
 Yes
 No
6. Please indicate any other areas of concern that you may have in regard to a job description for the position of administrative coordinator:

APPENDIX I

CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY: ITEM 1

ITEM: Development of New Programs

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NR
STAFF									
High School	12	14	6	9	9	1	2	2	3
Holmes	2	4	5	1	4	1	4	5	4
Peet	3	3	4	0	5	1	3	3	7
Sub-Total	17	21	15	10	18	3	9	10	14
CURRICULUM CHAIRPERSONS									
High School	0	3	2	2	2	0	2	1	0
Junior Highs	1	3	6	0	2	1	1	0	0
Sub-Total	1	6	8	2	4	1	3	1	0
COORDINATING ADMINISTRATORS									
	0	0	2	0	3	1	0	1	0
GRAND TOTAL	18	27	25	12	25	5	12	12	14
PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONSE	12%	18%	17%	8%	17%	3%	8%	8%	9%

APPENDIX J

CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY: ITEM 2

ITEM: Coordination of Existing Programs at Building Level

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NR
STAFF									
High School	24	14	7	4	2	1	0	1	5
Holmes	11	7	5	5	0	0	1	0	1
Peet	10	5	3	1	1	1	1	0	7
Sub-Total	55	26	15	10	3	2	2	1	13
CURRICULUM CHAIRPERSONS									
High School	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Junior Highs	10	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total	20	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
COORDINATING ADMINISTRATORS	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
GRAND TOTAL	80	28	17	12	5	2	2	1	13
PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONSE	53%	19%	11%	8%	3%	1%	1%	.6%	9%

APPENDIX K

CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY RANKING: ITEM 3

ITEM: Reporting Budgetary Needs to Administration

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NR
STAFF									
High School	6	14	17	7	5	5	1	3	0
Holmes	8	8	2	3	4	1	0	1	3
Peet	9	2	6	3	1	3	0	0	5
Sub-Total	23	24	25	13	10	9	1	4	8
CURRICULUM CHAIRPERSONS									
High School	2	2	5	0	3	0	0	0	0
Junior Highs	1	2	2	2	1	2	3	1	0
Sub-Total	3	4	7	2	4	2	3	1	0
COORDINATING ADMINISTRATORS									
	0	1	1	0	1	0	4	0	0
GRAND TOTAL	26	29	33	15	15	11	8	5	8
PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONSE	17%	19%	22%	10%	10%	7%	5%	3%	5%

APPENDIX L

CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY RANKING: ITEM 4

ITEM: Calling and Chairing Building Level Department Meetings

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NR
STAFF									
High School	5	5	10	10	5	8	6	3	6
Holmes	5	1	6	5	4	2	2	1	4
Peet	2	5	4	1	3	5	2	0	7
Sub-Total	12	11	20	16	12	15	10	4	17
CURRICULUM CHAIRPERSONS									
High School	0	3	1	2	2	3	1	0	0
Junior Highs	1	1	0	5	3	1	0	3	0
Sub-Total	1	4	1	7	5	4	1	3	0
COORDINATING ADMINISTRATORS									
	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
GRAND TOTAL	13	17	22	24	17	20	4	8	18
PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONSE	9%	11%	15%	16%	11%	13%	3%	5%	12%

APPENDIX M

CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY RANKING: ITEM 5

ITEM: Classroom Visitation

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NR
STAFF									
High School	0	3	0	4	9	10	16	6	10
Holmes	0	1	3	1	4	8	7	1	5
Peet	0	0	2	1	3	4	9	1	9
Sub-Total	0	4	5	6	16	22	32	8	24
CURRICULUM CHAIRPERSONS									
High School	0	0	1	4	2	3	2	0	0
Junior Highs	1	1	1	2	1	5	2	0	1
Sub-Total	1	1	2	6	3	8	4	0	1
COORDINATING ADMINISTRATORS									
	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	0	0
GRAND TOTAL	2	7	7	12	20	31	38	8	25
PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONSE	1%	5%	5%	8%	13%	21%	25%	5%	17%

APPENDIX N

CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY RANKING: ITEM 6

ITEM: Assistance with Program Objectives

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NR
STAFF									
High School	7	4	7	10	6	6	5	9	4
Holmes	1	1	3	7	2	5	4	3	4
Peet	2	3	3	7	2	2	1	2	7
Sub-Total	10	8	13	24	10	13	10	14	15
CURRICULUM CHAIRPERSONS									
High School	2	1	1	2	2	3	0	1	0
Junior Highs	1	5	5	0	1	1	1	0	0
Sub-Total	3	6	6	2	3	4	1	1	0
COORDINATING ADMINISTRATORS									
	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	0
GRAND TOTAL	13	15	20	27	14	19	11	16	15
PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONSE	9%	10%	13%	18%	9%	13%	7%	11%	10%

APPENDIX O

CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY RANKING: ITEM 7

ITEM: Securing Substitutes

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NR
STAFF									
High School	7	2	10	6	8	5	6	12	2
Holmes	5	3	2	2	4	1	2	7	4
Peet	1	5	0	5	3	4	0	2	9
Sub-Total	13	10	12	13	15	10	8	21	15
CURRICULUM CHAIRPERSONS									
High School	0	2	1	1	0	1	3	4	0
Junior Highs	0	2	0	3	2	0	1	4	2
Sub-Total	0	4	1	4	2	1	4	8	2
COORDINATING ADMINISTRATORS									
	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	2	0
GRAND TOTAL	14	14	14	19	17	12	12	31	17
PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONSE	9%	9%	9%	13%	11%	8%	8%	21%	11%

APPENDIX P

CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITY RANKING: ITEM 8

ITEM: Evaluation of Teachers Within the Department

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NR
STAFF									
High School	2	2	2	3	5	14	7	13	10
Holmes	0	2	5	1	3	6	4	4	5
Peet	0	1	0	3	3	1	3	9	9
Sub-Total	2	5	7	7	11	21	14	26	24
CURRICULUM CHAIRPERSONS									
High School	0	0	0	2	1	2	3	4	0
Junior Highs	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	2	0
Sub-Total	0	0	0	4	4	5	7	6	0
COORDINATING ADMINISTRATORS									
	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	2	0
GRAND TOTAL	2	6	8	13	15	27	21	34	24
PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONSE	1%	4%	5%	9%	10%	18%	14%	23%	16%