

1981

# Curriculum Problems and Recommendations: Cowden-Herrick Community Consolidated School District 11

Jamie R. Driskill  
*Eastern Illinois University*

---

## Recommended Citation

Driskill, Jamie R., "Curriculum Problems and Recommendations: Cowden-Herrick Community Consolidated School District 11" (1981). *Masters Theses*. 2977.  
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/2977>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

September 25, 1981

Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Author

CURRICULUM PROBLEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

COWDEN-HERRICK COMMUNITY CONSOLIDATED

SCHOOL DISTRICT 11  
(TITLE)

BY

JAMIE R. DRISKILL

**THESIS**

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Specialist in Education  
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1981  
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING  
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

*Sept. 28, 1981*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

CURRICULUM PROBLEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:  
COWDEN-HERRICK COMMUNITY CONSOLIDATED  
SCHOOL DISTRICT 11

BY

JAMIE R. DRISKILL

B. S. in Agronomy, Northeast Louisiana University, 1966  
M. Ed. in School Administration, Mississippi State  
University, 1973

ABSTRACT OF A FIELD STUDY

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Specialist in Education at the Graduate  
School of Eastern Illinois University.

CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1981

This field study examines curriculum. Historical developments and trends are enumerated and discussed. A recent development in the field of education, minimal competency testing, and its possible effects on curriculum are reviewed.

Specifically, this paper examines curriculum problem areas in the Cowden-Herrick Community Consolidated School District #11, Cowden, Illinois. The Cowden-Herrick Community Consolidated School District #11 is an elementary (K-8) district with an enrollment of four hundred and twenty students. A survey of administrators and teachers was conducted in the following basic curriculum areas: reading, mathematics, language arts/communication skills, science, and social studies. These five areas were selected as a beginning point for curriculum evaluation in the Cowden-Herrick Elementary Schools.

Survey results were itemized and an analysis was conducted to determine trends or consensus of opinion. All of the five areas surveyed were perceived as having some problems. Even though teacher response was limited in science and social studies areas, teachers were in agreement that the science curriculum area had more problems than any other subject area surveyed.

Administrators and teachers were, in general, in agreement as to what specific problems existed within each curriculum area surveyed. Additionally, administrators were in agreement on the survey instrument approximately sixty-three percent of the time.

As a result of the School District Curriculum Problems Survey several recommendations/suggestions were made in relationship to the Cowden-Herrick Community Consolidated School District #11. Among recommendations were: consideration be given to utilization of the Illinois Problem Index Survey; early involvement of teachers in curriculum problem solving efforts; a schedule of inservice workshops for teachers of the district in the science and social studies areas; and Curriculum Committees, which are adequately funded, need to be established in the school district.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. . . . . iv

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION . . . . . 1

CHAPTER II - CURRICULUM PROBLEMS SURVEY AND  
RESULTS . . . . . 10

CHAPTER III - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. 27

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 30

APPENDIX A - CURRICULUM PROBLEMS SURVEY  
INSTRUMENT. . . . . 33

APPENDIX B - ILLINOIS PROBLEMS INDEX  
INSTRUMENT. . . . . 43

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1	TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR READING. . . .	14
TABLE 2	TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR MATHEMATICS . . . . .	15
TABLE 3	TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR COMMUNICATION SKILLS/LANGUAGE ARTS. . . . .	17
TABLE 4	TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR SCIENCE. . . .	18
TABLE 5	TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR SOCIAL STUDIES . . . . .	19
TABLE 6	ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY RESULTS FOR READING . . . . .	21
TABLE 7	ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY RESULTS FOR MATHEMATICS . . . . .	22
TABLE 8	ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY RESULTS FOR COMMUNICATION SKILLS/LANGUAGE ARTS. . . .	23
TABLE 9	ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY RESULTS FOR SCIENCE . . . . .	24
TABLE 10	ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY RESULTS FOR SOCIAL STUDIES. . . . .	24



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author of this field study wishes to express his appreciation to the teachers of Cowden-Herrick Community Consolidated School District #11 who participated in the curriculum survey. Special appreciation is also given to the author's wife, Carolyn Driskill, and Tim Long, a friend, for their help and encouragement while working on this field study.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The objectives of this field study are to examine curriculum problem areas in the Cowden-Herrick Elementary Schools and to develop recommendations related to possible solution of those problem areas. An additional objective is to provide teachers and administrators with a starting point for curriculum development and improvement. If the aforementioned objectives are accomplished, then this field study will have served its purpose.

### HISTORICAL MOVEMENTS/TRENDS AFFECTING CURRICULUM

Many significant developments have occurred in the United States that have affected the curriculum of elementary schools. Some of these movements and events of the past century as identified by Doll were as follows:

<u>PERIOD OR DATE</u>	<u>EVENT</u>
1860 to 1890	A continuing struggle for establishment of free public schools was in process.
1860 to 1890	Arrival of immigrants and doubling of population created demands for new and broadened types of schooling.

<u>PERIOD OF DATE</u>	<u>EVENT</u>
1860 to 1890	Manual training was introduced widely in elementary schools.
The 1860's	Newly established normal schools assumed responsibilities for preparing teachers, and continued to transform school keeping into school teaching.
1873	The first public school kindergarten was opened in Saint Louis.
1890 to 1920	Herbart's view of "apperception", formulated into his famous five steps (preparation, presentation, comparison and abstraction, generalization, and application), encouraged correlation of subject matter, especially in the elementary schools.
1890 to 1920	Edward L. Thorndike and Charles Judd began studying the curriculum quantitatively and scientifically as they opened an era of mental measurement.
1895	The Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education urged concentration and correlation of subjects taught in the elementary schools.
1896	John Dewey founded his Laboratory School at the University of Chicago, a school which had special concerns for the interests and purposes of learners.
1900 to 1920	The junior high school movement started.

PERIOD OR DATEEVENT

The 1920's  
and 1930's

The 1920's constituted a decade during which particular attention was given to the curriculum of the elementary school. The 1920's heralded a long era of scientific studies in education, including immediate emphasis on testing and measurement. Curriculum specialists began asking that the curriculum be made more relevant to the problems and activities of contemporary life.

The 1940's  
and 1950's

Little money was being spent for curriculum study as opposed to the funds being expended for school building construction, pupil transportation, bonding and insurance costs, attorneys' fees, and the public was becoming disenchanted with education as it existed and was pushing the schools to do better. The 1950's became a time of ferment for school systems in the United States. McCarthyism, changes in the family as an institution, and criticism about scientific and mathematical illiteracy in the general population was growing. The launching of Sputnik in 1957 caused much criticism to be directed at American schools. Part of that which came to be called "curriculum reform" was a variant of classic efforts at reform, emphasizing indirect ways of changing programs through adding facilities and materials and altering organizational plans.

<u>PERIOD OR DATE</u>	<u>EVENT</u>
The 1960's	Updating of subject matter under the guidance of scholars in subject fields dictated the selection of experiences for students. Money began to pour into curriculum study by way of the National Defense Education Act, the National Science Foundation, and private, tax-exempt foundations. Other movements affecting schools during the decade of the sixties were individualized instruction, non-grading, open classrooms, urban education, and increasing teacher militancy. Desegregation, as mandated by law and the courts, also had an affect on schools and curriculum of the sixties.
The 1970's	The decade of the seventies saw decreasing enrollments, reduction of school funding, use of behavioral objectives, performance criteria, and early childhood education, as some of the events affecting schools and curriculum. <sup>1</sup>

Thus far in the decade of the eighties, demands by the public for increased accountability, minimal competency testing of students, increased financial problems and further reduction in staff, have all had a part in affecting curriculum.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ronald C. Doll, Curriculum Improvement, 3rd ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974), pp.8-12.

To some extent each of the previously mentioned events has played a part in curriculum development and improvement at the local school district level. These developments and others not mentioned have helped to make the school curriculum what it is today.

Major trends that have influenced the evolution of curriculum in the United States are:

1. Schools and school systems everywhere have frankly copied plans, procedures, and curriculum content from other schools and school systems.
2. Educational principles, such as that of schooling for everyone, have been adopted in substance and modified in detail whenever they have struck a popular chord.
3. Experimentation has occurred, but it has usually been informal and its results have remained largely untested.
4. National committees have determined general objectives, policies, and programs.
5. Even those educational ideas which have been based on the soundest evidence have been adopted very slowly by practitioners.
6. The schools, as an instrument of American Society, have been subjected to numerous public pressures, the nature of which tends to change from generation to generation.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 12-13.

The processes and trends thus far enumerated should serve to make teachers, administrators, and all others interested in curriculum aware of possible problems and real challenges in the area of curriculum change and improvement.

#### MINIMAL COMPETENCY AND ITS EFFECT ON CURRICULUM

A recent phenomena on the educational scene that will play an important part in curriculum development is the issue of minimal competency testing of students. Presently, some thirty-eight plus states require minimal competency testing of students in some form or another. In the state of Illinois, on August 31, 1978, a law was passed directly relating to minimal competency testing of students in the public schools of the state.<sup>3</sup> This law requires the State Board of Education to encourage local school districts to establish minimum competency testing programs, and provide them with procedures and materials to assist in the establishment of such programs by December 15, 1978.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Larry Huber, "MCT-A Competency Test for Westville, Illinois Eighth and Twelfth Graders" (Ed. S. thesis, Eastern Illinois University, 1980), p. 5.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

The Cowden-Herrick Elementary Schools are presently in the process of complying with state law on minimum competency testing of students. A survey was completed in the spring of 1981, in regards to those areas that district residents thought should be considered in developing minimal competency testing for students of the Cowden-Herrick Schools. During this past school year 1980-1981 teachers and administrators have been involved in writing objectives and test items for minimum competency testing to be done at Cowden-Herrick School during the 1981-1982 school year.

Areas of expressed concern by district residents included consumer education, language arts/communication skills, and mathematics. Each of these areas, of necessity, must be considered by those working with curriculum as possible subject areas for curriculum change and improvement. Those working on curriculum problem areas should not, however, neglect the other subjects that were not listed as concerns by school district residents.



PREVIOUS CURRICULUM EFFORTS IN THE COWDEN-HERRICK SCHOOLS

The Cowden-Herrick Elementary School district was not organized until the school year 1971. Prior to this organization, there were separate elementary and high school districts at both Cowden and Herrick. These districts were extremely small in enrollment, in geographical area, and were not cost efficient.

There were, undoubtedly, some efforts at solving curriculum problems in the Cowden and Herrick school districts prior to consolidation, but such efforts were infrequent, poorly planned, and for the most part ineffective. The first real concerted effort at dealing with curriculum and curriculum problem areas was given impetus by the Illinois Office of Education under Michael Bakalis as State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The early 1970's witnessed the implementation of state education guidelines at the local district level through the A-160 Program Plan. Schools districts throughout Illinois, many for the first time in years, were forced to take a look at school curriculum and curriculum problem areas. Many school districts attempted to develop comprehensive curriculum guides in all subject areas K-12. Also along with this effort, course outlines were developed in local school districts.

The Cowden-Herrick Elementary School district developed curriculum guides and course outlines during the school years 1973-1974. As was true with many other school districts during this time, both curriculum guides and course outlines left a lot to be desired from the educational point of view. These shortcomings must be shared with requirements by the then Illinois Office of Education and its superintendent, Michael Bakalis. The Illinois Office of Education required too much of local school districts in a short span of time. As a result, curriculum guides that were developed were in many cases less than adequate.

At the present time, the Cowden-Herrick Elementary School district has a textbook adoption plan that is being utilized to the extent that financial resources allow. The textbook adoption plan allows replacement of textbooks every nine years.

## CHAPTER II

### CURRICULUM PROBLEMS SURVEY AND RESULTS

The author's interest in curriculum problems is a result of his previous experiences in education. He has served on several curriculum development committees. Additionally, he has been involved in revision of curriculum guides and development of course outlines. Most of his curriculum experiences have been in the science area. As principal for the Cowden-Herrick Community Consolidated School District #11, the author had as one responsibility curriculum planning and development for the kindergarten through eighth grade level.

#### SELECTING AN INSTRUMENT

The instrument used for this curriculum problem survey is a modification of the Illinois Problems Index Survey Instrument (Appendix B). Each statement on the survey instrument was revised so that the statement was neither positive nor negative. The survey instrument used is found in Appendix A of this field study.

The Illinois Problems Index was developed by the staff of the Illinois State Board of Education. The first Illinois

Problems Index was developed and field tested in approximately sixty school districts during the 1977-78 and 1978-79 school years. The Illinois Problems Index approach to school district needs assessment is an approach that is uncomplicated and characterized by ease and rapidity of administration while being sound in theory and practice.<sup>5</sup>

The Illinois Problems Index used by the author is a 1979-80 revision of the original Illinois Problems Index. The Illinois Problems Index was developed with assistance and co-operation from the Illinois Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, the Illinois Association of School Administrators, the Illinois Association of School Business Officials, and a parent from a participating school district.

#### CURRICULUM AREAS SURVEYED

The survey instruments selected were those that dealt with reading, language arts/communication skills, mathematics, science, and social studies. These five areas were selected to be surveyed for the following reasons: previous concern expressed by school district residents in the areas of language arts/communication skills and

---

<sup>5</sup> Illinois State Board of Education, Establishing Educational Priorities Through the Illinois Problems Index (Springfield, Illinois: Illinois State Board of Education, 1980), p. 3.

mathematics on a Basic Skills Survey completed in the spring of 1980, and general agreement among educators that the five areas selected represent basic subject content areas in grades kindergarten through eight.

#### CONDUCTING THE SURVEY

The Curriculum Problems Survey was mailed to teachers and administrators of the Cowden-Herrick Community Consolidated School District #11 on Wednesday, July 1, 1981. Since the survey dealt with reading, language arts/ communication skills, mathematics, science, and social studies, only teachers who taught in those subject areas were surveyed. Eighteen of twenty-one teachers returned their completed survey instruments. This is a response rate of eighty-five and seven tenths percent.

#### INSTRUMENT DATA ARRANGEMENT

At the completion of data collection, both teacher and administrator responses were arranged in tabular form. Individual items on the five areas surveyed were arranged in rank order based on the percentage of negative response for each item. The item numbers in tables one through ten are the same as the item numbers found in Appendix A of this field study.

TABLE 1 TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR READING

Teachers completing this survey instrument indicated that all items on the reading survey represented problem areas. A negative response rate of greater than fifty percent was given for item numbers 3, 17, 14, 18, 7, 8, 15, and 4. Most teachers surveyed, eighty-seven and five tenths percent, indicated that students can read. Also a large majority of teachers indicated that students can use indexes, tables of content, and glossaries. The response rate on the reading survey was among the highest of the five instruments used.

TABLE 2 TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR MATHEMATICS

One hundred percent of the teachers responding indicated that item numbers 14, 15, 16, 17, and 9 represented problem areas. It should be noted however, that total responses for the previously mentioned items were very low. Item numbers 2 and 5 were indicated by one hundred percent of teachers responding as not being problem areas. The teacher response rate for items 2 and 5 was much higher than the rate for items 14, 15, 16, 17, and 9.

TABLE 1

## TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR READING

Negative Response		Positive Response		
%	Number	%	Number	Item Number
80.0	12	20.0	3	3
73.3	11	26.7	4	17
71.4	10	28.6	4	14
71.4	10	28.6	4	18
64.3	9	35.7	5	7
58.3	7	41.7	5	8
57.1	8	42.9	6	15
53.3	8	46.7	7	4
46.2	6	53.8	7	12
42.9	6	57.1	8	9
37.5	6	62.5	10	13
35.7	5	64.3	9	10
33.3	5	66.7	10	5
31.3	5	68.7	11	16
25.0	4	75.0	12	2
18.8	3	81.2	13	6
14.2	2	85.8	12	11
12.5	2	87.5	14	1

TABLE 2

## TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR MATHEMATICS

Negative Response		Positive Response		
%	Number	%	Number	Item Number
100.0	1	0	0	14
100.0	4	0	0	15
100.0	4	0	0	16
100.0	4	0	0	17
100.0	4	0	0	9
77.8	7	22.2	2	20
75.0	3	25.0	1	18
71.4	5	28.6	2	10
66.7	2	33.3	1	19
58.3	7	41.7	5	6
38.5	5	61.5	8	11
37.5	3	62.5	5	8
33.0	3	66.7	6	7
30.0	3	70.0	7	13
18.2	2	81.8	9	4
16.7	2	82.3	10	3
9.1	1	90.9	10	12
8.3	1	91.7	11	1
0	0	100.0	11	2
0	0	100.0	12	5



TABLE 3 TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR COMMUNICATION  
SKILLS/LANGUAGE ARTS

At least fifty percent of those teachers responding to this survey instrument indicated that item numbers 10, 17, 12, 15, 9, 5, 1, 13, and 16 represent problem areas in the communication skills/language arts area. Teachers agreed that approximately fifty-three percent of the items on this particular survey were indicative of problem areas.

TABLE 4 TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR SCIENCE

TABLE 5 TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR SOCIAL STUDIES

Fewer teachers responded to tables 4 and 5 than any of the preceding tables. One hundred percent of those teachers responding to item numbers 1, 3, 16, 9, 10, 11, and 15 (TABLE 4) agreed that the statements represented problem areas in the science curriculum. Likewise, one hundred percent of those teachers responding to item numbers 8, 12, 13, and 14 (TABLE 5) agreed that the statements represented problem areas in the social studies curriculum.

TABLE 3

TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR  
COMMUNICATION SKILLS/LANGUAGE ARTS

Negative Response		Positive Response		
%	Number	%	Number	Item Number
92.9	13	7.1	1	10
75.0	9	25.0	3	17
66.7	10	33.3	5	12
66.7	6	33.3	3	15
64.3	9	35.7	5	9
53.3	8	46.7	7	5
50.0	8	50.0	8	1
50.0	7	50.0	7	13
50.0	5	50.0	5	16
46.2	6	53.8	7	4
40.0	6	60.0	9	6
35.7	5	64.3	9	8
35.7	5	64.3	9	11
28.6	4	71.4	10	7
26.7	4	73.3	11	3
26.7	4	73.3	11	14
25.0	4	75.0	12	2

TABLE 4

## TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR SCIENCE

Negative Response		Positive Response		
%	Number	%	Number	Item Number
100.0	7	0	0	1
100.0	6	0	0	3
100.0	5	0	0	16
100.0	4	0	0	9
100.0	3	0	0	10
100.0	3	0	0	11
100.0	1	0	0	15
85.7	6	14.3	1	6
85.7	6	14.3	1	7
83.3	5	16.7	1	2
80.0	4	20.0	1	5
80.0	4	20.0	1	8
66.7	2	33.3	1	12
66.7	2	33.3	1	13
66.7	2	33.3	1	14
60.0	3	40.0	2	4
33.3	1	66.7	2	17

TABLE 5

## TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR SOCIAL STUDIES

Negative Response		Positive Response		
%	Number	%	Number	Item Number
100.0	3	0	0	8
100.0	3	0	0	12
100.0	3	0	0	13
100.0	2	0	0	14
50.0	3	50.0	3	1
50.0	3	50.0	3	7
50.0	2	50.0	2	10
50.0	2	50.0	2	11
42.9	3	57.1	4	3
42.9	3	57.1	4	5
33.3	3	66.7	6	6
33.3	2	66.7	4	4
25.0	1	75.0	3	16
25.0	1	75.0	3	17
22.2	2	77.8	7	2
14.3	1	85.7	6	9
0	0	100.0	2	15

TABLE 6 ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY RESULTS FOR READING

The two administrators who were surveyed for this curriculum problems study agreed that item numbers 2, 3, 7, 8, 12, 14, and 18 represent problem areas in the reading curriculum. Administrators were in agreement on the reading survey for approximately sixty-seven percent of the survey items.

TABLE 7 ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY RESULTS FOR MATHEMATICS

Administrators agreed that item numbers 4, 6, 9, 13, 16, 17, and 20 represented problem areas in the mathematics curriculum. Administrators were in agreement on the mathematics survey for fifty-five percent of the survey items.

TABLE 8 ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY RESULTS FOR COMMUNICATION SKILLS/LANGUAGE ARTS

Administrators agreed that item numbers 3, 5, 12, 15, 16, and 17 represented problem areas in the communication skills/language arts curriculum. Administrators were in agreement on this particular survey instrument for forty-seven percent of the survey items.

TABLE 6

## ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY RESULTS FOR READING

Negative Response		Positive Response		
%	Number	%	Number	Item Number
100.0	2	0	0	2
100.0	2	0	0	3
100.0	2	0	0	7
100.0	2	0	0	8
100.0	2	0	0	12
100.0	2	0	0	14
100.0	2	0	0	18
50.0	1	50.0	1	1
50.0	1	50.0	1	4
50.0	1	50.0	1	9
50.0	1	50.0	1	13
50.0	1	50.0	1	15
50.0	1	50.0	1	17
0	0	100.0	2	5
0	0	100.0	2	6
0	0	100.0	2	10
0	0	100.0	2	11
0	0	100.0	2	16

TABLE 7

ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY RESULTS FOR MATHEMATICS				
Negative Response		Positive Response		
%	Number	%	Number	Item Number
100.0	2	0	0	4
100.0	2	0	0	6
100.0	2	0	0	9
100.0	2	0	0	13
100.0	2	0	0	16
100.0	2	0	0	17
100.0	2	0	0	20
50.0	1	50.0	1	7
50.0	1	50.0	1	8
50.0	1	50.0	1	10
50.0	1	50.0	1	11
50.0	1	50.0	1	12
50.0	1	50.0	1	14
50.0	1	50.0	1	15
50.0	1	50.0	1	18
50.0	1	50.0	1	19
0	0	100.0	2	1
0	0	100.0	2	2
0	0	100.0	2	3
0	0	100.0	2	5

TABLE 8

ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY RESULTS FOR  
COMMUNICATION SKILLS/LANGUAGE ARTS

Negative Response		Positive Response		
%	Number	%	Number	Item Number
100.0	2	0	0	3
100.0	2	0	0	5
100.0	2	0	0	12
100.0	2	0	0	15
100.0	2	0	0	16
100.0	2	0	0	17
50.0	1	50.0	1	1
50.0	1	50.0	1	2
50.0	1	50.0	1	4
50.0	1	50.0	1	6
50.0	1	50.0	1	8
50.0	1	50.0	1	9
50.0	1	50.0	1	10
50.0	1	50.0	1	11
50.0	1	50.0	1	13
0	0	100.0	2	7
0	0	100.0	2	14



TABLE 9 ADMINISTRATOR RESULTS FOR SCIENCE

An analysis of items on the administrator survey for science show that both administrators agreed item numbers 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 14, and 16 were indicative of problem areas. Additionally on the science survey, administrators agreed on seventy-six percent of the items. One of the administrators involved in the survey has strong academic preparation in science.

TABLE 10 ADMINISTRATOR RESULTS FOR SOCIAL STUDIES

An analysis of items on the social studies survey shows that administrators were in agreement that item numbers 1, 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, and 14 represented problem areas. Administrators were in agreement on the social studies survey instrument for seventy-one percent of the items. One of the two administrators involved in this survey has strong academic preparation in social studies.

TABLE 9

## ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY RESULTS FOR SCIENCE

Negative Response		Positive Response		
%	Number	%	Number	Item Number
100.0	2	0	0	4
100.0	2	0	0	5
100.0	2	0	0	8
100.0	2	0	0	9
100.0	2	0	0	11
100.0	2	0	0	14
100.0	2	0	0	16
50.0	1	50.0	1	2
50.0	1	50.0	1	3
50.0	1	50.0	1	10
50.0	1	50.0	1	12
0	0	100.0	2	1
0	0	100.0	2	6
0	0	100.0	2	7
0	0	100.0	2	13
0	0	100.0	2	15
0	0	100.0	2	17

TABLE 10

---

 ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY RESULTS FOR SOCIAL STUDIES
 

---

Negative Response		Positive Response		
%	Number	%	Number	Item Number
100.0	2	0	0	1
100.0	2	0	0	3
100.0	2	0	0	4
100.0	2	0	0	8
100.0	2	0	0	11
100.0	2	0	0	12
100.0	2	0	0	14
50.0	1	50.0	1	2
50.0	1	50.0	1	5
50.0	1	50.0	1	7
50.0	1	50.0	1	13
50.0	1	50.0	1	15
0	0	100.0	2	6
0	0	100.0	2	9
0	0	100.0	2	10
0	0	100.0	2	16
0	0	100.0	2	17

---

## CHAPTER III

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the results of the School District Curriculum Problems Survey the following conclusions are offered: (1) Kindergarten through eighth grade teachers agree that specific problems exist in each of the five curriculum areas surveyed. (2) More teachers were confident of their perception of problem areas in reading, language arts/communication skills, and mathematics.

The science and social studies areas received the fewest responses from teachers surveyed. One reason for the low rate of response, in the science and social studies areas, might be teachers lack of academic preparation in the science and social studies fields. Another reason for low rate of response, in these areas, may be that most lower elementary (K-3) teachers spend little, if any time, teaching science or social studies.

Teachers who responded to the science survey believe that most of the statements (16 of 17) are indicative of problem areas in the science curriculum.

The two administrators (district superintendent and building principal) were in agreement on items in the survey approximately sixty-three percent of the time. Administrators agreed more on items in the science and social studies areas than any other section of the curriculum survey. One administrator has a strong social studies background and the other a strong science background.

Administrators agreed least in the area of language arts/communication skills. The lack of agreement is perhaps due to weak undergraduate academic preparation in the language arts area by both administrators. Another factor affecting language arts area agreement may be the differences in teaching and administrative experience of the administrators surveyed.

Considering the results of the Curriculum Problems Survey and conclusions that have been made, the following items are recommended for discussion, consideration, and possible implementation by Cowden-Herrick Community Consolidated School District #11:

1. In order to gain a better indication of problem areas in the school district the Illinois Problem Index should be utilized. Used properly the Illinois Problem Index will give all persons involved a better conception of curriculum problem areas as well as other problem areas not considered in this field study.

2. If the Illinois Problems Index is not utilized by the district, then possible use of the school district Curriculum Problems Survey should be considered by both high school and elementary districts at Cowden-Herrick. All teachers and administrators should be included in the survey. As a result, greater articulation should occur.

3. Based on the results of this field study in-service workshops should be scheduled for teachers in the science and social studies areas. Administrators might serve as resource people for the workshops.

4. At an early stage in dealing with curriculum problems, teachers should be actively involved. This field study would have been more meaningful if the total teaching staff were involved in the curriculum problem study at its inception.

5. Curriculum Committees need to be established at the Cowden-Herrick Community Consolidated School District #11. The committees need to agree on objectives and goals and should be adequately funded by the board of education. Various areas of the curriculum need to be worked with on a rotating basis.

6. Administrators, as well as teaching staff, would profit from attendance at Curriculum Workshops and conferences. Attendance at Curriculum Workshops should be encouraged by administrators and school board members.

If any of the recommendations enumerated above are discussed, considered, or implemented in the Cowden-Herrick Community Consolidated School District #11, then students, teachers, administrators, and other district residents interested in education will be greatly benefited.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Collins, William J. "Basics-In Perspective." Arithmetic Teacher 28 (March 1981): 51-52.
- Combs, Arthur W. "What the Future Demands of Education." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (January 1981): 369-372.
- Doll, Ronald C. Curriculum Improvement. 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974.
- Frazier, Alexander. "Making a Curriculum for Children." Childhood Education 56 (April/May 1980):
- Frymier, Jack R., and Hawn, Horace C. Curriculum Improvement for Better Schools. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1970.
- Griffiths, Daniel E. "Beyond the Basics." N.Y.U. Education Quarterly 12 (Fall 1980): 2-6.
- Huber, Larry. "MCT-A Competency Test for Westville, Illinois Eighth and Twelfth Graders." Ed. S. thesis, Eastern Illinois University, 1980.
- Illinois State Board of Education. Establishing Educational Priorities Through the Illinois Problems Index. Springfield, Illinois: 1980.
- Jenkins, Ronald K.; Haider, Ronald W.; and BeBloois, Michael. "A Model Process for Curriculum Improvement in Small School Districts." International Journal of Instructional Media 8 (1980-81): 109-114.
- Johnston, A. Montgomery, and Burns, Paul C. Research in Elementary School Curriculum. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970.
- Kowalski, Theodore J. "The Principal's Role in Curriculum Development: What Are the Barriers?" Contemporary Education 50 (Spring 1979): 159-161.

Lawler, Marcella R., ed. Strategies for Planned Curricular Innovation. New York: Teachers College Press, 1970.

Littrell, J. Harvey. "Here's How to Evaluate Proposals for Curriculum Changes." The American School Board Journal 167 (January 1980): 30, 46.

Martorelli, Debra; Andersen, Dennis; Siev, Daphne. "What's in Store for Curriculum?" Instructor 90 (September 1980): 86, 88, 149.

Morley, Franklin P. A Modern Guide to Effective K-12 Curriculum Planning. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1973.

"National Groups Tell Why Curriculum Reform Didn't Work." Education USA, 13 October 1980, p. 49.

Rodgers, Frederick A. Curriculum and Instruction in the Elementary School. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1975.

Seifert, Edward H., and Beck, John J. "Elementary Principals: Instructional Leaders or School Managers?" Phi Delta Kappan 62 (March 1981): 528.

Skeel, Dorothy J., and Hagen, Owen A. The Process of Curriculum Change. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Co., 1971.

Spencer, Carol. "The Illinois Problems Index: A Look at the South Ridge Public Schools." Ed. S. thesis, Eastern Illinois University, 1980.

Spillane, Robert R., and Regnier, Paul. "Revitalizing the Academic Curriculum: The Case of the Social Studies." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (June 1981): 731-732.

Tye, Kenneth A. "The School Principal: Key Man in Educational Change." NASSP Bulletin 56 (May 1972): 77-84.



VanTil, William, ed. Curriculum: Quest for Relevance.  
2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1974.

Vedros, Ralph G., and Foster, Ray E. "Trouble-  
Shooting Instructional Programs." Educational Technology  
21 (April 1981): 9-17.

Wood, Merle W. "A Curriculum Development Check-  
list." Business Education Forum 32 (May 1978): 40-43.

Young, Jean Helen. "Curriculum Decision Making:  
An Organization Dilemma." Curriculum Inquiry 9  
(1979): 113-126.

APPENDIX A

CURRICULUM PROBLEMS SURVEY INSTRUMENT

SCHOOL DISTRICT CURRICULUM PROBLEMS  
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

34

Reading

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING DIRECTIONS CAREFULLY. Draw a line through the word or words in parenthesis with which you do not agree.

1. Students (can, cannot) read.
2. Students (do, do not) comprehend what is read.
3. Students (do, do not) analyze what is read.
4. Students (do, do not) reason logically from what is read.
5. Students (do, do not) make judgments about what is read.
6. Students (do, do not) have skills for learning new words.
7. Students (do, do not) analyze word root, prefixes and suffixes to determine the meaning of words.
8. Students (do, do not) discriminate between fact and opinion.
9. Students (do, do not) draw conclusions, generalizations, and inferences from what is read.
10. Students (can, cannot) use reference materials efficiently (e.g., dictionaries, encyclopedias).
11. Students (can, cannot) use indexes, table of contents, and glossaries.
12. Students (can, cannot) read graphic materials (e.g., maps, tables, graphs).
13. Students (do, do not) read aloud in an effective manner.
14. Students (do, do not) adapt the style and speed of their reading to particular purposes.
15. Students (do, do not) vary their reading materials.

16. Students (do, do not) choose to read on their own.
17. Students (do, do not) follow written directions.
18. Students, ranging from remedial to gifted, (are, are not) provided with appropriate curriculum alternatives.

SCHOOL DISTRICT CURRICULUM PROBLEMS  
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Mathematics

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING DIRECTIONS CAREFULLY. Draw a line through the word or words in parenthesis with which you do not agree.

1. Students (do, do not) know common mathematical definitions, facts and symbols.
2. Students (do, do not) add and subtract with whole numbers.
3. Students (do, do not) multiply and divide with whole numbers.
4. Students (do, do not) know relationships among different units in a given measurement system.
5. Students (do, do not) make transactions involving money.
6. Students (do, do not) understand the metric system of measurement.
7. Students (do, do not) compute with fractions.
8. Students (do, do not) compute with decimals.
9. Students (do, do not) apply ratios and proportions.
10. Students (do, do not) use percents.
11. Students (do, do not) solve word problems.
12. Students (do, do not) use charts, graphs, tables.
13. Students (do, do not) use maps, scale-drawings, and diagrams.
14. Students (do, do not) know algebra concepts.
15. Students (do, do not) solve algebra problems.
16. Students (do, do not) construct geometric proofs.
17. Students (do, do not) solve geometry problems.
18. Students (are, are not) offered higher level mathematics.

19. Students (do, do not) receive instruction in calculators and computers.
20. Students, ranging from remedial to gifted, (are, are not) provided with appropriate curriculum alternatives.

SCHOOL DISTRICT CURRICULUM PROBLEMS  
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Communication Skills/Language Arts

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING DIRECTIONS CAREFULLY. Draw a line through the word or words in parenthesis with which you do not agree.

1. Students (do, do not) have listening skills.
2. Students (are, are not) required to practice listening skills.
3. Students (do, do not) have an adequate vocabulary.
4. Students (do, do not) have creative oral expression.
5. Students (do, do not) enunciate clearly.
6. Students (are, are not) required to practice speaking skills.
7. Students (do, do not) express their thoughts orally so others can understand.
8. Students (do, do not) write legibly.
9. Students (do, do not) use correct punctuation.
10. Students (do, do not) use correct grammar.
11. Students (do, do not) spell correctly.
12. Students (do, do not) express their thoughts in writing so others can understand.
13. Students (do, do not) have creative written expression.
14. Students (are, are not) required to practice writing skills.
15. Students (are, are not) aware of nonverbal communication techniques.
16. Students (are, are not) aware of techniques used in mass media and advertising.
17. Students (do, do not) communicate through the performing arts, (e.g., theatre, music, dance).

SCHOOL DISTRICT CURRICULUM PROBLEMS  
SURVEY INSTRUMENTScience

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING DIRECTIONS CAREFULLY. Draw a line through the word or words in parenthesis with which you do not agree.

1. Students (do, do not) know the scientific terminology and symbols.
2. Students (do, do not) know historical aspects of science and technology.
3. Students (do, do not) know the difference between pure and applied science.
4. Students (do, do not) know how to use the scientific method in problem solving.
5. Students (do, do not) know how to reason inductively and deductively.
6. Students (do, do not) know fundamental techniques associated with scientific inquiry (e.g., observing, classifying, inferring).
7. Students (do, do not) have opportunity to use scientific laboratory equipment and procedures.
8. Students (do, do not) understand the purpose of theories or scientific hypotheses.
9. Students (do, do not) know how to interpret and report data.
10. Students (do, do not) know the fundamental principles of biology (e.g., classical mechanics, electricity).
11. Students (do, do not) know the fundamental principles of physics (e.g., classical mechanics, electricity).
12. Students (do, do not) know the fundamental principles of chemistry (e.g., atomic and molecular nature of matter).
13. Students (do, do not) know the fundamental principles of earth science (e.g., geological formations).
14. Students (do, do not) evaluate scientific information as presented by the mass media.



15. Students (do, do not) choose to take elective courses in science.
16. Students, ranging from remedial to gifted, (are, are not) provided with curriculum alternatives.
17. Students (are, are not) made aware of career opportunities in science areas.

SCHOOL DISTRICT CURRICULUM PROBLEMS  
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Social Studies

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING DIRECTIONS CAREFULLY. Draw a line through the word or words in parenthesis with which you do not agree.

1. Students (do, do not) know how social organizations begin, develop, and function.
2. Students (do, do not) know how peer groups affect human relationships.
3. Students (do, do not) know how the physical environment affects the development of social organization.
4. Students (do, do not) know basic concepts in the social studies.
5. Students (do, do not) know the history, geography, and culture of the local area.
6. Students (can, cannot) read maps and globes.
7. Students (do, do not) understand contributions made by past and present civilizations.
8. Students (do, do not) understand the historical background of modern political thought and theory.
9. Students (can, cannot) cope with change.
10. Students (do, do not) know about the management of world resources.
11. Students (do, do not) understand important economics, social and/or political problems.
12. Students (do, do not) understand the socialization process.
13. Students (can, cannot) recognize opposing value systems and their influences on social issues.
14. Students (do, do not) understand interrelationships between beliefs, values, and behavior.
15. Ethnic and cultural content (is, is not) integrated throughout the curriculum.

16. Courses (are, are not) logically sequenced.

17. Course objectives (do, do not) exist.

APPENDIX B

ILLINOIS PROBLEMS INDEX INSTRUMENT

District Name \_\_\_\_\_

County	District
--------	----------

- Board Member     Parent  
 Administrator     Community Member (non Parent)  
 Teacher  
 Student     Other

### ILLINOIS PROBLEMS INDEX INSTRUMENT II: READING

Circle "Y" for "Yes" if the statement represents a current or emerging problem in your school district. Circle "N" for "No" if the statement does not represent a problem. Circle "U" if you are undecided. Add additional problem statements at the end of the list if necessary.

If you circled "Y", indicate the grade level(s) at which the problem occurs:

- |                |                 |
|----------------|-----------------|
| 1 = Grades K-3 | 4 = Grades 9-12 |
| 2 = Grades 4-6 | 5 = All Grades  |
| 3 = Grades 7-8 | 6 = Other       |

If you circled "Y", circle the numbers below that describe the best evidence you are using to document that a problem exists.

CODE	PROBLEM STATEMENT	IS A PROBLEM	IS NOT A PROBLEM	UNDECIDED	GRADE LEVEL(S)	CLASSROOM/SCHOOL CONDITIONS	STUDENT(S) I KNOW	RESEARCH STUDIES/ EXPERT OPINION	TEST SCORES	BUDGET	CURRICULUM MATERIALS	OTHER
0101	Students cannot read.	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						
0102	Students do not comprehend what is read.	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						
0103	Students do not analyze what is read.	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						
0104	Students do not reason logically from what is read.	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						
0105	Students do not make judgments about what is read.	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						
0106	Students do not have skills for learning new words.	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						
0107	Students do not analyze word root, prefixes and suffixes to determine the meaning of words.	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						
0108	Students do not discriminate between fact and opinion.	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						
0109	Students do not draw conclusions, generalizations, and inferences from what is read.	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						
0110	Students cannot use reference materials efficiently (e.g. dictionaries, encyclopedias).	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						
0111	Students cannot use indexes, table of contents, and glossaries.	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						
0112	Students cannot read graphic materials (e.g., maps, tables, graphs).	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						
0113	Students do not read aloud in an effective manner.	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						
0114	Students do not adapt the style and speed of their reading to particular purposes.	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						
0115	Students do not vary their reading materials.	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						
0116	Students do not choose to read on their own.	Y	N	U		1 2 3 4 5 6 7						

District Name \_\_\_\_\_

County			District		

- Board Member     Parent  
 Administrator     Community Member (non parent)  
 Teacher  
 Student     Other

**ILLINOIS PROBLEMS INDEX INSTRUMENT II:  
READING**

Circle "Y" for "Yes" if the statement represents a current or emerging problem in your school district. Circle "N" for "No" if the statement does not represent a problem. Circle "U" if you are undecided. Add additional problem statements at the end of the list if necessary.

If you circled "Y", indicate the grade level(s) at which the problem occurs:

- |                |                 |
|----------------|-----------------|
| 1 = Grades K-3 | 4 = Grades 9-12 |
| 2 = Grades 4-6 | 5 = All Grades  |
| 3 = Grades 7-8 | 6 = Other       |

If you circled "Y", circle the numbers below that describe the best evidence you are using to document that a problem exists.

CODE	PROBLEM STATEMENT	IS A PROBLEM	IS NOT A PROBLEM	UNDECIDED	GRADE LEVEL(S)	CLASSROOM/SCHOOL CONDITIONS	STUDENT(S) I KNOW	RESEARCH STUDIES/ EXPERT OPINION	TEST SCORES	BUDGET	CURRICULUM MATERIALS	OTHER
0117	Students do not follow written directions.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0118	Students, ranging from remedial to gifted, are not provided with appropriate curriculum alternatives.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

District Name \_\_\_\_\_

County				District			

- Board Member     Parent  
 Administrator     Community Member (non parent)  
 Teacher  
 Student     Other

### ILLINOIS PROBLEMS INDEX INSTRUMENT II: MATHEMATICS

Circle "Y" for "Yes" if the statement represents a current or emerging problem in your school district. Circle "N" for "No" if the statement does not represent a problem. Circle "U" if you are undecided. Add additional problem statements at the end of the list if necessary.

If you circled "Y", indicate the grade level(s) at which the problem occurs:

- |                |                 |
|----------------|-----------------|
| 1 = Grades K-3 | 4 = Grades 9-12 |
| 2 = Grades 4-6 | 5 = All Grades  |
| 3 = Grades 7-8 | 6 = Other       |

If you circled "Y", circle the numbers below that describe the best evidence you are using to document that a problem exists.

CODE	PROBLEM STATEMENT	IS A PROBLEM			GRADE LEVEL(S)	CLASSROOM/SCHOOL CONDITIONS	STUDENT(S) I KNOW	RESEARCH STUDIES/ EXPERT OPINION	TEST SCORES	BUDGET	CURRICULUM MATERIALS	OTHER
		IS NOT A PROBLEM	UNDECIDED									
0201	Students do not know common mathematical definitions, facts and symbols.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0202	Students do not add and subtract with whole numbers.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0203	Students do not multiply and divide with whole numbers.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0204	Students do not know relationships among different units in a given measurement system.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0205	Students do not make transactions involving money.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0206	Students do not understand the metric system of measurement.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0207	Students do not compute with fractions.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0208	Students do not compute with decimals.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0209	Students do not apply ratios and proportions.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0210	Students do not use percents.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0211	Students do not solve word problems.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0212	Students do not use charts, graphs, tables.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0213	Students do not use maps, scale-drawings, and diagrams.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0214	Students do not know algebra concepts.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0215	Students do not solve algebra problems.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0216	Students do not construct geometric proofs.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0217	Students do not solve geometry problems.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

District Name \_\_\_\_\_

County				District			

- Board Member     Parent  
 Administrator     Community Member (non parent)  
 Teacher  
 Student     Other

### ILLINOIS PROBLEMS INDEX INSTRUMENT II: MATHEMATICS

Circle "Y" for "Yes" if the statement represents a current or emerging problem in your school district. Circle "N" for "No" if the statement does not represent a problem. Circle "U" if you are undecided. Add additional problem statements at the end of the list if necessary.

If you circled "Y", indicate the grade level(s) at which the problem occurs:

- |                |                 |
|----------------|-----------------|
| 1 = Grades K-3 | 4 = Grades 9-12 |
| 2 = Grades 4-6 | 5 = All Grades  |
| 3 = Grades 7-8 | 6 = Other       |

If you circled "Y", circle the numbers below that describe the best evidence you are using to document that a problem exists.

CODE	PROBLEM STATEMENT	IS A PROBLEM	IS NOT A PROBLEM	UNDECIDED	GRADE LEVEL(S)	CLASSROOM/SCHOOL CONDITIONS	STUDENT(S) I KNOW	RESEARCH STUDIES/ EXPERT OPINION	TEST SCORES	BUDGET	CURRICULUM MATERIALS	OTHER
0218	Students are not offered higher level mathematics.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0219	Students do not receive instruction in calculators and computers.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0220	Students, ranging from remedial to gifted, are not provided with appropriate curriculum alternatives.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7



District Name \_\_\_\_\_

County       District

County 48

District \_\_\_\_\_

- Board Member  Parent  
 Administrator  Community Member (non parent)  
 Teacher  
 Student  Other

**ILLINOIS PROBLEMS INDEX INSTRUMENT II:  
COMMUNICATION SKILLS/LANGUAGE ARTS**

Circle "Y" for "Yes" if the statement represents a current or emerging problem in your school district. Circle "N" for "No" if the statement does not represent a problem. Circle "U" if you are undecided. Add additional problem statements at the end of the list if necessary.

If you circled "Y", indicate the grade level(s) at which the problem occurs:

- 1 = Grades K-3      4 = Grades 9-12  
 2 = Grades 4-6      5 = All Grades  
 3 = Grades 7-8      6 = Other

If you circled "Y", circle the numbers below that describe the best evidence you are using to document that a problem exists.

CODE	PROBLEM STATEMENT	IS A PROBLEM	IS NOT A PROBLEM	UNDECIDED	GRADE LEVEL(S)	CLASSROOM/SCHOOL CONDITIONS	STUDENT(S) I KNOW	RESEARCH STUDIES/ EXPERT OPINION	TEST SCORES	BUDGET	CURRICULUM MATERIALS	OTHER
0301	Students do not have listening skills.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0302	Students are not required to practice listening skills.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0303	Students do not have an adequate vocabulary.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0304	Students do not have creative oral expression.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0305	Students do not enunciate clearly.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0306	Students are not required to practice speaking skills.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0307	Students do not express their thoughts orally so others can understand.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0308	Students do not write legibly.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0309	Students do not use correct punctuation.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0310	Students do not use correct grammar.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0311	Students do not spell correctly.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0312	Students do not express their thoughts in writing so others can understand.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0313	Students do not have creative written expression.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0314	Students are not required to practice writing skills.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0315	Students are not aware of nonverbal communication techniques.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0316	Students are not aware of techniques used in mass media and advertising.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0317	Students do not communicate through the performing arts, e.g., theatre, music, dance.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

District Name \_\_\_\_\_

County            
District

- Board Member  Parent
- Administrator  Community Member (non parent)
- Teacher
- Student  Other

### ILLINOIS PROBLEMS INDEX INSTRUMENT II: SCIENCE

Circle "Y" for "Yes" if the statement represents a current or emerging problem in your school district. Circle "N" for "No" if the statement does not represent a problem. Circle "U" if you are undecided. Add additional problem statements at the end of the list if necessary.

If you circled "Y", indicate the grade level(s) at which the problem occurs:

- 1 = Grades K-3      4 = Grades 9-12  
 2 = Grades 4-6      5 = All Grades  
 3 = Grades 7-8      6 = Other

If you circled "Y", circle the numbers below that describe the best evidence you are using to document that a problem exists

CODE	PROBLEM STATEMENT	IS A PROBLEM	IS NOT A PROBLEM	UNDECIDED	GRADE LEVEL(S)	CLASSROOM/SCHOOL CONDITIONS	STUDENT(S) I KNOW	RESEARCH STUDIES/ EXPERT OPINION	TEST SCORES	BUDGET	CURRICULUM MATERIALS	OTHER
0501	Students do not know the scientific terminology and symbols.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0502	Students do not know historical aspects of science and technology.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0503	Students do not know the difference between pure and applied science.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0504	Students do not know how to use the scientific method in problem solving.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0505	Students do not know how to reason inductively and deductively.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0506	Students do not know fundamental techniques associated with scientific inquiry (e.g., observing, classifying, inferring).	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0507	Students do not have opportunity to use scientific laboratory equipment and procedures.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0508	Students do not understand the purpose of theories or scientific hypotheses.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0509	Students do not know how to interpret and report data.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0510	Students do not know the fundamental principles of biology (e.g., characteristics of living things).	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0511	Students do not know the fundamental principles of physics (e.g., classical mechanics, electricity).	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0512	Students do not know the fundamental principles of chemistry (e.g., atomic and molecular nature of matter).	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

District Name \_\_\_\_\_

County	50	District				
--------	----	----------	--	--	--	--

- Board Member
- Administrator
- Teacher
- Student
- Parent
- Community Member (non parent)
- Other

### ILLINOIS PROBLEMS INDEX INSTRUMENT II: SCIENCE

Circle "Y" for "Yes" if the statement represents a current or emerging problem in your school district. Circle "N" for "No" if the statement does not represent a problem. Circle "U" if you are undecided. Add additional problem statements at the end of the list if necessary.

If you circled "Y", indicate the grade level(s) at which the problem occurs:

- 1 = Grades K-3
- 2 = Grades 4-6
- 3 = Grades 7-8
- 4 = Grades 9-12
- 5 = All Grades
- 6 = Other

If you circled "Y", circle the numbers below that describe the best evidence you are using to document that a problem exists.

CODE	PROBLEM STATEMENT	IS A PROBLEM			GRADE LEVEL(S)	CLASSROOM/SCHOOL CONDITIONS	STUDENT(S) I KNOW	RESEARCH STUDIES/ EXPERT OPINION	TEST SCORES	BUDGET	CURRICULUM MATERIALS	OTHER
		IS NOT A PROBLEM	UNDECIDED									
0513	Students do not know the fundamental principles of earth science (e.g., geological formations).	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0514	Students do not evaluate scientific information as presented by the mass media.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0515	Students do not choose to take elective courses in science.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0516	Students, ranging from remedial to gifted, are not provided with curriculum alternatives.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0517	Students are not made aware of career opportunities in science areas.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

District Name \_\_\_\_\_

County						District					

52

- Board Member     Parent
- Administrator     Community Member (non parent)
- Teacher
- Student     Other

**ILLINOIS PROBLEMS INDEX INSTRUMENT II:  
SOCIAL STUDIES**

Circle "Y" for "Yes" if the statement represents a current or emerging problem in your school district. Circle "N" for "No" if the statement does not represent a problem. Circle "U" if you are undecided. Add additional problem statements at the end of the list if necessary.

If you circled "Y", indicate the grade level(s) at which the problem occurs:

- 1 = Grades K-3      4 = Grades 9-12
- 2 = Grades 4-6      5 = All Grades
- 3 = Grades 7-8      6 = Other

If you circled "Y", circle the numbers below that describe the best evidence you are using to document that a problem exists.

CODE	PROBLEM STATEMENT	IS A PROBLEM			GRADE LEVEL(S)	CLASSROOM/SCHOOL CONDITIONS	STUDENT(S) I KNOW	RESEARCH STUDIES/ EXPERT OPINION	TEST SCORES	BUDGET	CURRICULUM MATERIALS	OTHER
		IS NOT A PROBLEM	UNDECIDED									
1114	Students do not understand interrelationships between beliefs, values, and behavior.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1115	Ethnic and cultural content is not integrated throughout the curriculum.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1116	Courses are not logically sequenced.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1117	Course objectives do not exist.	Y	N	U		1	2	3	4	5	6	7