

1975

A Basis for Articulation in Community Unit No. 2 Schools, Crawford County, Illinois

Carl E. House

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Educational Administration](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

House, Carl E., "A Basis for Articulation in Community Unit No. 2 Schools, Crawford County, Illinois" (1975). *Masters Theses*. 3520.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/3520>

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.

PAPER CERTIFICATE #2

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.

December 12, 1975

Date

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

Date

Author

pdm

A BASIS FOR ARTICULATION IN COMMUNITY UNIT

NO. 2 SCHOOLS, CRAWFORD COUNTY, ILLINOIS
(TITLE)

BY

Carl E. House
=

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Specialist in Education

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1975

YEAR

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

December 12, 1975
DATE

ADVISER

December 12, 1975
DATE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
PREFACE	x
CHAPTER	
I. NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Historical Perspective	1
Local Perspective	3
II. METHODOLOGY	9
Purpose	9
Procedure	9
Definition of terms	10
Limitations	11
III. ATTITUDES, VALUES, AND OPINIONS OF KEY PERSONNEL.	13
IV. POPULATION OF STUDY	18
V. RESULTS OF STUDY	23
Questionnaire Item 1--Faculties serving the various levels should cooperatively and contin- uously construct curriculum sequences	24
Summary of Item 1	24
Questionnaire Item 2--Plans for coordination among primary, intermediate, middle and high school levels include ways of jointly and effi- ciently using special services and facilities such as health, guidance, media centers, labor- atories, gymnasiums, and auditoriums	26
Summary of Item 2	26
Questionnaire Item 3--De-emphasize the "grades and segmented" concept of organization by in- terest groups developing alternative modes of schooling	28
Summary of Item 3	30
Questionnaire Item 4--Staffing practices em- bodying the principles of sharing teachers, multi-grade level assignments, team teaching .	30

Summary of Item 4	32
Questionnaire Item 5--The "Administrative Team" concept implemented through periodic meetings of administrative staff	32
Summary of Item 5	34
Questionnaire Item 6--Curriculum specialist assigned to the central staff	34
Summary of Item 6	36
Questionnaire Item 7--Planned programs of orientation for students and parents at the "break points" to the next level	36
Summary of Item 7	37
Questionnaire Item 8--District wide curriculum planning groups	39
Summary of Item 8	39
Questionnaire Item 9--District wide program of communications through media devices from central office	39
Summary of Item 9	41
Questionnaire Item 10--Exchange teacher day or days between elementary and secondary levels	41
Summary of Item 10	45
Questionnaire Item 11--Non-teaching certified personnel in district be expected to substitute specified number of days per year	45
Summary of Item 11	47
Questionnaire Item 12--Board agenda provide portion of time to instructional orientation and related problems	47
Summary of Item 12	49
Questionnaire Item 13--Some type of machinery established to permit direct and systematic communications between department heads and head teachers at middle and elementary schools	49
Summary of Item 13	51
Questionnaire Item 14--Textbook selection on a unit wide basis for basic study areas	53
Summary of Item 14	53
Questionnaire Item 15--Inservice training programs aimed at better understanding of the total educational program both vertical and horizontal	53
Summary of Item 15	55
Questionnaire Item 16--Curriculum models defining basic expectations at each level	55
Summary of Item 16	55
Questionnaire Item 17--Uniform system of record keeping on each student	57
Summary of Item 17	57
Questionnaire Item 18--Student "visitation day" to middle school and high school	59
Summary of Item 18	59

Questionnaire Item 19--Systematic procedure of planning and purchasing allowing for coordinated use and control of supplies and equipment	61
Summary of Item 19	61
Questionnaire Item 20--Person assigned to coordinate and schedule all after school events and facilities.	63
Summary of Item 20	63
Questionnaire Item 21--Department heads at high school level and head teachers at elementary levels provided released time for coordinated efforts in the unit	65
Summary of Item 21	65
Questionnaire Item 22--Formal program of evaluation in the unit	67
Summary of Item 22	67
Questionnaire Item 23--To achieve maximization of communication, attention should be given to development of communication model for unit	69
Summary of Item 23	69
Questionnaire Item 24--A basic approach toward elimination of articulation problems within the unit is a philosophy of learning away from the "graded" approach to the "non-graded" approach.	71
Summary of Item 24	71
Questionnaire Item 25--Use of grades or marks in evaluation of students aids the continuity of learning	73
Summary of Item 25	73
 VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	 75
Conclusions	75
Recommendations	76
 APPENDIX A: SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE	 86
Total Summary for All Items Ranked by Combined Total Percentages of Columns One and Two	87
 APPENDIX B: REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE ON TOPIC	 89
 APPENDIX C: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	 99
Cover Letter	100
Questionnaire	101
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 106

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Opinionnaires distributed and percent returned by instructional levels	19
2. Respondents' teaching experience in the system and percent of total response by category	21
3. Respondents' years of experience in system by grade level groups.	22
4. Respondents' level of education and percentage at each level	22
5. Questionnaire Item 1: Faculties serving the various levels should cooperatively and continuously construct curriculum sequences	25
6. Questionnaire Item 2: Plans for coordination among primary, intermediate, middle, and high school should include ways of jointly using special services and facilities	27
7. Questionnaire Item 3: De-emphasize the "graded and segmented" concept by interest groups developing alternative modes of schooling	29
8. Questionnaire Item 4: Staffing practices embodying the principles of sharing teachers, multi-level assignments, team teaching, etc.	31
9. Questionnaire Item 5: The "administrative team" concept implemented through periodic meetings of the administrators, department heads, and others in supervisory and administrative capacities	33
10. Questionnaire Item 6: A curriculum specialist assigned to the central office staff	35
11. Questionnaire Item 7: Planned programs of orientation to the next organizational level for students and parents at the "break points"	38
12. Questionnaire Item 8: Establish district wide continuing curriculum planning group	40

13.	Questionnaire Item 9: A district wide continuing program of communications be established by various media devices originating from the central office	42
14.	Questionnaire Item 10: Establish exchange teacher program whereby teachers at different grade levels would exchange assignments temporarily	44
15.	Questionnaire Item 11: Non-teaching certificated personnel (principles, superintendent, etc.) be expected to teach a specific number of days each year as an avenue of contact	46
16.	Questionnaire Item 12: Board of education agenda each month allow a portion of time to instructional orientation and related problems	48
17.	Questionnaire Item 13: Avoid fragmentation of curriculum at the various levels in the unit with some type of machinery which would permit direct and systematic communication linkage among department heads at the secondary levels and "head teachers" at the middle and elementary levels	50
18.	Questionnaire Item 14: In-service training programs for all teachers aimed at better understanding of the total educational program of the district--vertically and horizontally	52
19.	Questionnaire Item 15: Textbook selection should be made on a Unit wide basis for the basic study areas	54
20.	Questionnaire Item 16: Establish curriculum models defining basic expectations at each level for basic study areas taught	56
21.	Questionnaire Item 17: Establish a uniform system of record keeping on each student providing a cumulative record of student ability, limitations, level of performance and other such pertinent data	58
22.	Questionnaire Item 18: Conduct "student visiting days" to the middle school and secondary levels for the purpose of orientation	60
23.	Questionnaire Item 19: Establish a more systematic and efficient procedure of planning and purchasing	62
24.	Questionnaire Item 20: Assign the responsibility and authority to coordinate and schedule all after school hours activities and facilities throughout the Unit with one person	64

25.	Questionnaire Item 21: Provide department chairpersons at high school level and head teachers at the middle school and elementary levels adequate release time for coordination of instructional efforts	66
26.	Questionnaire Item 22: Establish a formal program of evaluation for total Unit to analyze effectiveness in relation to established goals. . .	68
27.	Questionnaire Item 23: Develop a communication model for the Unit emphasizing wide participation and involvement of all parties associated with the educational process	70
28.	Questionnaire Item 24: Promote a philosophy away from the stratified "graded" or "levels" learning approach to the "nongraded" or "continuous progress" approach throughout the school system	72
29.	Questionnaire Item 25: The use of grade or marks in evaluating student progress aids the continuity of learning as students progress through the educational system	74

PREFACE

One of the most important and meaningful phases, if not the most important phase, of the program for the Specialist in Education Degree is the field study. This project gives the intern an opportunity to make a detailed study in an area of concentration that has a practical and helpful value not only to the intern but to the cooperating school district.

During the Winter Quarter of 1972, with the cooperation of Dr. Robert Shuff of Eastern Illinois University, a working agreement was established between Mr. Clyde Corn, then Superintendent of Community Unit No. 2 Schools, Crawford County, Dr. Shuff, my adviser, and myself. This was a verbal agreement that expressed a willingness of all parties concerned that Carl E. House, then Principal of Robinson High School, Community Unit No. 2 Schools, would be given the opportunity to carry out a field study in school administration in Community Unit No. 2.

After several conferences with the cooperating administrator and the professional adviser, it was decided that a study on articulation in Unit No. 2, Crawford County would be done. A letter of intent regarding the project was submitted and subsequently approved by both Mr. Corn and Dr. Shuff on February 2, 1972. A prospectus, A Basis for Articulation in Community Unit No. 2 Schools, Crawford

County, was submitted and approved in the Spring of 1973 by Dr. Shuff and the then Superintendent of Schools, Mr. M. L. Livingston.

The writer wishes to thank Dr. Robert Shuff for his assistance in the development of the topic and Dr. Gerhard Matzner for his criticism during the writing of this Field Study findings. The writer also wishes to thank Mr. Clyde Corn, Mr. M. L. Livingston and Mr. Robert Stitt for their permission, cooperation and support in the project. A very special thanks goes to the many individuals who gave time and information in the form of interviews and to the teachers and administrators of Community Unit No. 2 Schools who returned the completed questionnaire. Without the excellent cooperation and support received, this study would not have been possible.

CHAPTER I

NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

If education is to be a continuous process, there must be a smooth transition for the child as he progresses from one educational unit or level to another. In new surroundings, the child should find curriculum content that is harmonious with that of the previous level, a social atmosphere--particularly the child-adult relationship--that is similar, although possibly progressively more formal. The child should be able to expect that the demands upon him/her and the expectations for him/her will continue to be geared to his abilities. In general, the child has a right to expect, despite his increased maturity and the differences in the administrative organization, there will be an obvious and comfortable continuity between his preceding educational experiences and those which he/she is now to encounter.

A perusal of the literature reveals, unfortunately, that faulty articulation is a major weakness in the American educational system. More often than we care to admit, there is often little relation in curriculum areas between what is presented in the elementary school and what is presented in the junior high or middle school and the senior high schools. Indeed, one critic identified the lack of articu-

lation as one of the most serious educational problems in many school systems.¹ Another scholar reflects upon it, "...as a principal focus of failure in American Education."²

Historically, the problem of coordination or articulation has long been with school officials. In fact the inception of the problem dates back to the beginnings of our present educational establishment. Formal education as we know it today was not planned or conceived as one continuous process or to be a unified whole. Instead, the American educational system is made up of uncoordinated units drawn from several different nations and educational philosophies. The kindergarten concept derived from a German background, the elementary school followed a Prussian model, the junior high, middle school, and senior high are indigenous American institutions. The college concept is English in origin, but the graduate school and university have their foundations in Germany.³ Such an amalgamation of units understandably will have inherent faulty articulation, but the American people have further compounded the problem through its ingenious numbers game by expediently organizing

¹Ernest L. Hunter, "Articulation: For Continuity in the School Program." National Elementary Principal, 45:58-66, January, 1967.

²Stephen A. Romine, "Articulation: A Look at the Twelve Year Program," North Central Association Quarterly, 35:274-7, April, 1961.

³Paul R. Brimm, "Fostering Articulation Within and Between Schools" Occasional Paper Number One, Commission on Schools, North Central Association, p. 4.

6-6, 6-2-4, 6-3-3, 8-4, and other similar combinations thinking more in terms of organizational tagging and convenience in place of education. As a result many effective arithmetic, reading, or language program (or student) has failed to hurdle the hyphen.

Casual observations of this writer also tend to support the premise that a problem does exist in the public school system for providing a smooth transition of students in their educational process. The large number of under achievers, the high percentage of students who are not reading at expected grade level, the wide-spread, persistent number of "dropouts," and the unexcusable waste of talent and potential of the exceptional student are evidence. One frequently hears the comment of an elementary school teacher who says, "Why don't the high school people follow the practices and programs we start in the elementary schools?," or the comment of the secondary school teacher who says, "If those elementary teachers would just teach students how to read and a few other skills, we could do our job in the high school!" Also, it is not uncommon for the colleges and universities to become involved in the "pecking order" by directing charges at the high school for inadequate preparation of it's students.

LOCAL PERSPECTIVE

Community Unit No. 2 Schools are in a district of 116.5 square miles located in East-Central Illinois and organized on a K-5-3-4 plan. The school district's student population

is centered in Robinson where a high school comprised of grades 9-12 (747 students) is housed in one building. There are two elementary schools within the City of Robinson (Lincoln--314 students; Washington--581 students) housing grades K-5 in each. One school at Flat Rock eight miles south of Robinson is composed of grades K-8 (217 students). The instructional program in each of these schools is primarily traditional in approach.

The Nuttall Middle School, which opened the fall of 1973, is located in the City of Robinson and houses all students of the Unit in grades 6-8 except Flat Rock students. It has a student capacity of 625 but currently has enrolled 493 students. The instructional program of the middle school is developed around the newly emerging "open school" concept with the building designed specifically to accommodate this type program approach.

The idea for this study grew from what the writer considers a top priority need currently existing in Community Unit No. 2 Schools, Crawford County, Illinois. Since the incorporation of the Unit back in 1948, it has experienced like most school districts all of the various aspects of growth and development. The district's size has increased, enrollments have risen, programs have grown both in number and size, and additional school plants and expanded facilities have been added to meet the growing needs. However, since the formation of the Unit very little formal time and effort have been given to the need and importance of providing the

desired continuity in the total program.

Various mandates, recommendations and advisories suggesting the need for such attention and work in the district have been made. Reports have come from the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges Visitation Teams, and Division of Vocational and Technical Education Evaluation Committees. The most recent statement of this nature comes out of the Illinois Office of Education (formerly O.S.P.I.) Circular A-160 which states:

Every school should make provisions for continuity and horizontal and vertical articulation of its program from level to level and course to course. The central goal of such articulation should be the provision of programs adapted to the individual student's needs and abilities.⁴

A Visitation Report from the Department of Recognition dated April 21, 1971, emphasized the need for action in the area of articulation in Community Unit No. 2 Schools. In part the report states:

...with the addition of this building (middle school) in the fall of 1973, it is suggested that the board of education take a look at the overall administrative and supervisory structure of the school district.

There is a great need for more articulation between the elementary program and the overlying high school program.

⁴ Illinois Office of Education, The Illinois Program for Evaluation, Supervision, and Recognition of Schools, Circular Series A, Number 160, 1973

This should involve the administration, community and faculty representatives. This would encourage and should improve the sequential learning experiences for all students in the district.

For the improvement of the total program, a curriculum coordinating council should be developed to undertake a planned course of action relative to self-evaluation of the total curriculum... The cooperative planning insured through the council would more nearly assure a well-articulated curriculum to all grade levels in the district.

The North Central Association Report of the Visiting Committee, April 20, 1971, makes the following recommendations:

Stronger efforts in articulation between the work of the high school and the elementary level need to be instituted and put on a continuous basis.

While the fine articulation in curriculum building has been mentioned (in some areas), it is further recommended that this program be extended to all areas.

Curriculum guides, course content, objectives, etc. should be prepared for all courses offered and revised every two years. In those departments where this has been done, these would be updated to reflect current course content, and philosophical and psychological developments.

Encourage cooperation with middle and elementary schools in the development of a K-12 science program.

Music instructors from elementary, junior high and high school should work together and develop the total music program.

With the coming of the new middle school, it will be necessary to coordinate the

(home economics) curriculum between the two schools."

The Evaluation Report of the Occupational Program submitted by the evaluation committee of Department of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation after its study in November, 1971, calls for a coordinating committee on career education K-12.

An Administrative Review report filed by Charles R. Heinz, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, September 22, 1972, states as one of the recommendations, "... provide special supervisory services to assist program coordination."

An additional need for articulation exists in Unit No. 2 Schools with the opening of the middle school. This new program approach for the middle rungs of the educational ladder necessitates a realistic assessment and for the most part considerable adjustment in philosophy and beliefs about children, learning, and teaching both below and above the six-seven-eight grade levels if the middle school program is to be properly integrated into the total program. The official brochure describes the philosophy and underlying concepts of the program as follows:

Our philosophy is developing the whole individual through a curriculum that is truly student-centered based upon each individual's needs, interest, and abilities in an atmosphere of mutual trust and responsibility.

There are several key concepts...a continuous progress approach to learning, a de-emphasis on departmentalized curriculum, competitive aspects are kept

to a minimum and increased pupil-teacher contact not only in class situations but also in external surroundings.

It can be safely assumed that the introduction of this new "open concept" approach to the educational program of the district will disturb the more traditional programs existing in the system particularly at the secondary level. Accommodations throughout the system will be necessary thus necessitating an even greater need for close articulation.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

PURPOSE

This study was designed to ascertain the opinions and attitudes of teachers and administrators of Community Unit No. 2 Schools on importance and need for improved articulation within the school district. It is the purpose of the study to determine what can be done in the district to provide an effective basis of articulation and to make recommendations for same based upon the values and attitudes of teachers and a study of the literature.

PROCEDURE

This study was divided into three major steps. In Step I a review of the literature was made to determine the historical background of the articulation problem as it relates to the philosophies, the practices and organizations of the public schools in the United States. The findings are found in Appendix B.

Step II attempted to ascertain current recommended articulation practices in the Unit and to determine the attitudes, values and opinions of certain key personnel in the district on the topic. This was done through the interview technique with the supervisory personnel of the district

including the superintendent, elementary coordinator, the building principals, the music and athletic directors, and the department heads at the then junior and senior high schools which at the time of the interviews were housed in the current high school building.

Step III was designed to ascertain the desirable articulation principles and practices for Community Unit #2 Schools. A rather highly structured combination opinionnaire and check-list consisting of twenty-five items was used (Appendix C). The instrument used was self-developed without any previous field testing, however, it is assumed to be a valid instrument. It was designed to give specific kinds of things one might do to improve articulation, to determine the degree of support to be expected, and to determine the respondent's awareness of its use in the district. The instrument was given to all classroom teachers and administrators of the unit.

Step IV is an attempt to draw conclusions from the study and to set down some recommendations that will assist in developing a program of articulation in Community Unit No. 2 Schools.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Articulation: The degree to which the interlocking and interrelation of the successive levels of the educational system facilitate continuous and efficient educational progress of pupils.⁵

⁵Dictionary of Education, rev. ed. (1959), s.v. "Articulation."

Middle School: Schools for a range of children--preadolescent to early adolescent--that seek to eliminate repressive practices and archaic structural barriers to the educational process by offering programs of total development that have as their objective to return the emphasis of the educational program to the learner and to build flexibility for dealing with changes in the nature of⁶ knowledge and in the students they serve.

Population of Study: All classroom teachers at all grade levels or unit and all administrative and supervisory personnel of the school district.

LIMITATIONS

One final note on the methodology employed. We realize that the solicitation of teachers' and other school personnel's opinions sometimes do not reflect the true feelings of an individual at the time of the solicitation. Environmental factors can enter and affect the reliability of the data or the fact that some people are prone to make rather arbitrary decisions or snap judgements can be limiting factors.

Two assumptions, however, over-ruled the use of some other technique as opposed to the opinionnaire or a different population in this particular study. One assumption was that teachers and administrators in this particular situation held rather informative opinions and ideas on the topic. It had been a subject and topic of discussion and concern the year before the study. A series of workshops and faculty meetings had been the setting of these discussions.

⁶John Wiles, "The Middle School; Alternative within the System," The National Elementary Principal, November, 1971 p. 46.

A second major assumption is that the classroom teachers hold the key of success to any practices or techniques of articulation that may be implemented. As in most aspects of the instructional program in a school, to be effective, the teachers must be supportive both philosophically as well as in practice. From this premise, a strong degree of dependence and faith in the opinions and attitudes of the teachers was placed.

CHAPTER III

ATTITUDES, VALUES, AND OPINIONS OF KEY PERSONNEL

In an effort to get at some of the attitudes, values and opinions of certain key personnel in the district on the topic of articulation, an interview question was asked of all persons in coordinating positions or roles including all administrators, music and athletic directors, reading coordinator, and department heads. Each interviewee was asked to react to the question, "What can be done to help make the learning experiences of students a smooth, continuous and cumulative process K-12 in Community Unit No. 2 Schools?"

It is interesting to note that there was a commonalty of need expressed by all respondents for better and more effective continuity and sequential programing between all levels. That the total program in the district is more or less fragmented as far as curriculum is concerned was expressed by most respondents. Department heads in general at the upper six grade levels expressed the need for more effective communication with the elementary program. Since the junior-senior high school programs at the time of interview were under one administrative head, a principal, and, since the two programs came under the responsibilities of department chairmen, there were some elements of continuity and

coordination among grades seven through twelve in the district.

Articulation downward was felt to be very limited and informal in nature. Personnel at the upper grade levels expressed very little knowledge of the program at the elementary levels. One department head expressed the feeling that elementary teachers do not seem to appreciate such inquiry, and with no formal machinery or means of making this contact, upper grade teachers seem reluctant to approach the topic.

Administrative staff personnel saw time and lack of assigned responsibility as a major weakness in program coordination. The central office staff is limited to a chief administrative officer, a business manager, a bookkeeper-treasurer, and two secretaries. Some limited coordinating responsibilities are assigned to a reading coordinator, who is housed in one of the attendance centers, but basically the superintendent of schools is the only officer in the organization assigned responsibilities for rendering administrative and supervisory services to all schools in the district. It was frequently expressed that additional personnel at the central office level are needed to adequately supervise and coordinate the instructional program. There are titles of Athletic Director and Music Director in the district but they are perfunctory with little authority.

Considerable apprehension was expressed, particularly by department heads and other personnel at the junior and senior high levels, as to how the new "open concept" of

programing and learning could articulate with levels K-5 and 9-12. One respondent expressed deep reservations and felt proper education of the community as well as school personnel on the type of program being introduced at the new middle school had not been adequate. This feeling was somewhat substantiated at the time interviewed when nine out of the sixteen key personnel visited expressed little understanding or knowledge as to how the middle school program was to be organized and operated.

A coordinated, joint-planning approach to program development representative of all teachers within each discipline spanning all levels was advocated by most respondents. There were differences of opinion as to what approach program development should take but all agreed that program development should be "student centered." Whether this can be interpreted to mean the respondents were answering from the more acceptable viewpoint held by most people in education that schools exist for students or whether they were thinking in the true sense of the meaning that programs should be based upon individual student's needs, interest and abilities is not clear.

Several respondents emphasized the point that learning is a cumulative process and that the approach to learning should be consistent if there is to be a smooth transition for the student from one level to another. Again there were differences of opinions as to what that approach should be. There was a feeling of concern as to how a student coming

out of the middle school "open concept" setting will be able to adapt to the secondary program which is fairly traditional in approach. It was suggested that other schools with similar organization be visited to discover problems and solutions they have faced.

One respondent in the interview very vociferously stated that the learning experiences of students in Unit No. 2 schools will not be a smooth continuous, and cumulative process K-12 until there is a commitment to make it that way. "...only persons whose ideals and deed indicate a consistent, constructive attitude toward students should be members of the staff," was his statement. It was suggested that Unit No. 2 needs to be more critical of both its probationary and tenure teachers because, "...teachers who are concerned more about salaries, job protection, and work hours rarely inspire students."

Another respondent's answer to the question was individualization, flexibility, assessment of teachers' roles and a total staff commitment. These must be grounded in a district philosophy and a set of goals that are strictly child centered. He continued that students should not be tagged as gifted, honors, slow, special or exceptional; however, provisions should be made at all levels to accommodate these students. It was further stated, "...the ultimate answer would be a continuous progress program K-12." The question then becomes irrelevant, according to the respondent.

Another portion of the interview had to do with the respondents suggesting devices, procedures, and techniques that would aid in implementing a program of articulation. The purpose of this question was to get generalizations that could be incorporated into a check-list type questionnaire administered to all certificated personnel in an effort to get at their degree of support of various devices, techniques and practices. The results of this effort are incorporated in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER IV

POPULATION OF STUDY

The survey instrument was distributed in the spring of 1973 to all certificated personnel of the district who numbered 138. A total of 109 opinionnaires were returned or 78.98 percent of the number distributed. The returns reflected a general distribution of opinions from the various level categories throughout the system. The categories are:

Primary--grades K-3
Intermediate--grades 4-6
Junior high--grades 7-8
Senior high--grades 9-12
Special education
Administrators

Table 1 indicates the number of opinionnaires distributed and the number and percent returned by each reporting category. In each of the categories, over one-half of the survey instruments were returned. The number of returns for one category, junior high 7-8, was 100 percent. The high response for that particular category possibly reflected high interest and motivation on the topic as it relates to the new middle school program since in almost every case each member of that category anticipated being assigned teaching responsibilities in the middle school.

The next highest percent response came from the intermediate group, the level upon which the new program must

TABLE 1

OPINIONNAIRES DISTRIBUTED AND PERCENT RETURNED
BY INSTRUCTIONAL LEVELS

Instructional Level	Number of Opinionnaires Distributed	Number of Opinionnaires Returned	Percent Returned
Primary K-3	28	20	71.42
Intermediate 4-6	28	23	82.14
Junior High 7-8	18	18	100.00
Senior High 9-12	47	37	78.72
Special Education	10	6	60.00
Administrators	7	5	71.42
TOTAL	138	109	78.98

build. This, too, probably has significance and reflects those teachers' concern for adjustment of program at the level to meet the demands of the new program. The high interest in the subject on the part of this category of teachers may also be a reflection of the fact that over 55 percent of that category have six or more years of teaching experience in the system in a rather traditional program of instruction. (See Table 3)

The third highest response came from the senior high level, grades 9-12. Forty-seven opinionnaires were distributed and thirty-seven or 78.72 percent returned. These teachers who are highly departmentalized and who place much emphasis upon content, skills, and knowledge have expressed repeated concern about what will happen when students coming

out of the open environment of the middle school move into the high school. They realize, too, that there have been some elements of continuity and coordination among grades seven through twelve under one administrative head and through department heads. They are apprehensive about what can be expected with the loss of this organizational structure.

Table 2 shows the respondent's experience in Community Unit No. 2 Schools and the percent of the total response coming from each category. It is interesting to note that over 50 percent of the respondents have six or more years of working experience in the system, and almost 35 percent of the respondents have two to five years experience in the system. This background and experience in the school system give added credence to the respondents' opinions on the problems currently existing in the area of articulation.

Table 3 gives respondent's years of experience in system and from the various grade levels. The number of respondents reporting from the primary level with six or more years of experience in the system is 11; intermediate level is 13; junior high level is 8; from the senior high level is 23; from the special education group is 1; and from the administrators is 3. Those responding from the primary level with two to five years of teaching experience in the system is 5; from the intermediate level is 8; from the junior high level is 9; from the senior high level is 13; from the special education group is 3; and none from the administrators.

TABLE 2

RESPONDENTS' TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN THE SYSTEM
AND PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONSE BY CATEGORY

Years in System	Number of Opinionnaires Returned	* Percent of Total Opinionnaires Returned
1 year	12	11.00
2-5 years	38	34.86
6-10 years	30	27.52
11-15 years	12	11.00
16-20 years	9	8.25
21-25 years	6	5.50
26-up	2	1.83
TOTAL	109	100.00

* Approximated percentages.

Those with only one year experience in the system are distributed evenly except for the primary level where one-third of those reporting with one year experience in the system are found.

The respondents' levels of professional education are shown in Table 4. Over half of the respondents have a master's degree or above.

TABLE 3

RESPONDENTS' YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SYSTEM
BY GRADE LEVEL GROUPS

Years in System	K-3 Grades	4-6 Grades	7-8 Grades	9-12 Grades	Spec. Educ.	Admin.
1 year	4	2	1	1	2	2
2-5 years	5	8	9	13	3	0
6-10 years	4	5	7	12	1	1
11-15 years	1	6	1	3	0	1
16-20 years	4	0	0	4	0	1
21-25 years	1	2	0	3	0	0
26-up	1	0	0	1	0	0
Total	20	23	18	37	6	5

TABLE 4

RESPONDENTS' LEVEL OF EDUCATION
AND PERCENTAGE AT EACH LEVEL

Level of Education	RESPONDENTS Reporting	* Percentage of Respondents
Less than Bachelor	0	0
Bachelor	50	45.87
B.S. + 16	3	2.75
Master	48	44.03
M.S. + 16	3	2.75
M.S. + 30	5	4.59
Total	109	100.00

* Approximated

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS OF SURVEY

The items used in the survey administered to all certificated staff members of the district contained those generalized opinions suggested at the time of the interviews with key coordinating personnel and those suggested by the writer based upon readings from the literature on the topic and experience. They represent those measures that either currently do or possibly could aid the articulation process in the district.

Twenty-five position statements make up the questionnaire. The respondents were asked to check their degree of support or value for each item in terms of own experience and belief. Each item was given five values in relation to the basic point of view. All statements were quantified as:

- 1 Most Important
- 2 Very Important
- 3 Important
- 4 Fairly Important
- 5 Least Important

In addition, each respondent was asked to check either "yes" or "no" for each item based upon knowledge of technique or concept being applied on a regular basis in the district.

To provide the most straightforward analysis possible, correlative statistical techniques will not be used in

reporting data. Rather actual scores and percentages will be presented for each item on the survey instrument.

ITEM 1--FACULTIES SERVING THE VARIOUS LEVELS SHOULD COOPERATIVELY AND CONTINUOUSLY CONSTRUCT CURRICULUM SEQUENCES K-12. Item 1 attempted to get a philosophical basis for curriculum development in the district. In general, respondents favored some type of logical ordering of curriculum content and skills to achieve predetermined outcomes. Of those responding, 45 percent felt this approach "most important" and 31 percent felt it to be "very important."

It is interesting to note that the relative importance placed upon this item was fairly equally distributed throughout the instructional levels as indicated in Table 5. Two respondents at the junior high level felt this item to be "least important."

Of the respondents reporting, 40 percent answered with "no" or gave no response to the question of current use on a regular basis in the district while 60 percent responded with a "yes." A majority of those responding "no" have assignments either at the primary or intermediate grade levels.

Summary of Item 1: Sequential curriculum development K-12 was supported by those responding to the survey. Approximately three-fourths of the respondents felt it significantly important by checking value choices 1 or 2.

The grade level taught variable is apparently not a determinant of the degree of support for this approach since the distribution of respondents expressing "most important"

TABLE 5.--Questionnaire Item 1: Faculties serving the various levels should cooperatively and continuously construct curriculum sequence K-12

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(10) 50	(6) 30	(2) 10	(1) 5	. . .	(1) 5	(8) 40	(11) 55	(1) 5
Intermediate 4-6	(10) 43	(4) 17	(8) 35	(1) 4	(12) 52	(11) 48	. . .
Junior High 7-8	(8) 44	(5) 28	(3) 17	. . .	(2) 11	. . .	(13) 72	(4) 22	(1) 5
High School 9-12	(16) 43	(15) 41	(4) 11	(1) 3	. . .	(1) 3	(25) 68	(9) 24	(3) 8
Special Educ. K-12	(2) 33	(3) 50	(1) 17	(4) 67	(2) 33	. . .
Administrators	(3) 60	(1) 20	. . .	(1) 20	(3) 60	(2) 40	. . .
Total	(49) 45	(34) 31	(18) 17	(4) 4	(2) 2	(2) 2	(65) 60	(39) 36	(5) 4

^aApproximate percent

were fairly equally distributed. Lack of knowledge of application in the district seemed to run higher at the primary and intermediate grade levels since over one-half of those responding "no" teach at those levels. One might explain this by the fact that of those responding with only one year experience in the system, one-half of those are found at the primary and intermediate levels as shown in Table 3.

ITEM 2--PLANS FOR COORDINATION AMONG PRIMARY, INTERMEDIATE, MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL LEVELS INCLUDE WAYS OF JOINTLY AND EFFICIENTLY USING SPECIAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES SUCH AS HEALTH, GUIDANCE AND TESTING SERVICES, MEDIA CENTERS AND LIBRARIES, LABORATORIES, GYMNASIUMS, AND AUDITORIUMS. Approximately one-third of the respondents valued this item as "most important" means of articulation; 28 percent gave it a "very important" rating; and 23 percent considered it important. Another 15 percent considered it of little or no importance. The junior and senior high school teachers who have been experiencing such sharing arrangements for the past several years more than any other group seem to least favor the basic point of view. The disadvantages usually associated with this type of cooperative effort, such as scheduling, were possibly strong deterrent factors. At present, this practice is not common policy in the district.

Summary of Item 2: Respondents indicate teacher support for general policy of cooperative sharing at different instructional levels. Indications are this type of cooperative activity not to be generally practiced in the district, but

TABLE 6.--Questionnaire Item 2: Plans for coordination among primary, intermediate, middle and high school should include ways of jointly and efficiently using special services and facilities such as health, guidance, media centers, laboratories, gymnasiums, auditoriums, etc.

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(8) 40	(5) 25	(5) 25	(1) 5	. . .	(1) 5	(7) 35	(12) 60	(1) 5
Intermediate 4-6	(9) 39	(6) 26	(4) 17	(3) 13	(1) 4	. . .	(10) 43	(12) 52	(1) 4
Junior High 7-8	(5) 27	(6) 33	(5) 27	(2) 11	(7) 39	(11) 61	. . .
High School 9-12	(10) 27	(13) 35	(7) 19	(5) 13	(1) 3	(1) 3	(12) 32	(22) 59	(3) 8
Special Educ. K-12	(3) 50	(1) 17	(2) 33	(2) 40	(4) 60	. . .
Administrators	(2) 40	. . .	(2) 40	(1) 20	(2) 40	(3) 60	. . .
Total	(37) 34	(31) 28	(25) 23	(12) 11	(2) 2	(2) 2	(40) 37	(64) 59	(5) 4

^aApproximate percent

one that could be given support provided a feasible plan were set in motion.

ITEM 3--DE-EMPHASIZE THE "GRADED AND SEGMENTED" CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATION BY INTEREST GROUPS DEVELOPING ALTERNATIVE MODES OF SCHOOLING UTILIZING CLOSELY COORDINATED PROGRAM AND STAFFING PATTERNS FOCUSED UPON THE LEARNER, NOT LEVELS. Item 3 is an attempt to get at teachers' values and beliefs relative to the traditional lock-step, graded program concept and the non-graded configuration as an alternate delivery system. Results indicate that a majority of the respondents recognize the value of experimenting with alternative designs as a means for eliminating some of the problems associated with articulation. Of the total respondents, 63 percent rated such an approach significantly important by checking value choices 1 or 2. An additional 23 percent classified it as "important" (see Table 7)

The results also show a greater degree of support at the primary and intermediate levels when compared to the junior and senior high levels. This reluctance on the part of secondary level teachers to experiment with alternative modes of instruction is reflected in their response to the knowledge of current application in the district. Responding "no" to the question were 89 percent of the junior high teachers and 78 percent of the senior high teachers. At the elementary levels the experimentation with the continuous progress reading program in the Washington School is reflected in the responses where 65 percent and 61 percent respectively checked

TABLE 7.--Questionnaire Item 3: De-emphasize the "graded and segmented" concept of organization by interest groups developing alternative modes of schooling utilizing closely coordinated program and staffing patterns focused upon the learner not levels

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(6) 30	(8) 40	(6) 30	(6) 30	(13) 65	(1) 5
Intermediate 4-6	(11) 48	(6) 26	(2) 9	(3) 13	(1) 4	. . .	(9) 39	(14) 61	. . .
Junior High 7-8	(4) 22	(5) 28	(5) 28	(3) 17	(1) 5	. . .	(1) 5	(16) 89	(1) 5
High School 9-12	(8) 22	(11) 30	(9) 24	(2) 5	(5) 14	(2) 5	(6) 16	(29) 78	(2) 5
Special Educ. K-12	(2) 33	(4) 67	(1) 17	(5) 83	. . .
Administrators	(2) 40	(2) 40	(1) 20	(2) 40	(3) 60	. . .
Total	(33) 30	(36) 33	(23) 21	(8) 7	(7) 6	(2) 2	(25) 23	(80) 73	(4) 4

^aApproximate percent

"no" from the primary and intermediate groups.

Summary of Item 3: The degree of support given this item gives evidence of a broad base on which to expand the continuous progress reading program currently under way as well as encourage some other innovation practices such as multi-grade groupings in the district. Encouraging interested teachers at the high school level to experiment with individualized or continuous progress learning on a subject-by-subject basis is suggested by the response to this item.

ITEM 4--STAFFING PRACTICES EMBODYING THE PRINCIPLES OF SHARING TEACHERS, MULTI-GRADE LEVEL ASSIGNMENTS, TEAM TEACHING. This item tends to suggest some more common practices of cooperative efforts that could help to expose teachers to various programs and practices at more than one grade level. The results shown in Table 8 indicate the faculty of Unit 2 responded with only moderate enthusiasm toward the practice.

Approximately half of the respondents accepted the suggestion with a high degree of support by checking columns 1 or 2. Another 28 percent supported it as being "important." It is again interesting to note that the 7-12 grade teachers when compared with the other groupings accepted the statement with less enthusiasm. This no doubt reflects those teachers' past experiences with sharing and multi-grade level staffing practices used on a limited basis in those two schools in some of the speciality areas such as art, music, and foreign language. It is also interesting to note the level

TABLE 8.--Questionnaire Item 4: Staffing practices embodying the principles of sharing teachers, multi-grade level assignments, team teaching

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(4) 20	(7) 35	(6) 30	(1) 5	(1) 5	(1) 5	(4) 20	(15) 75	(1) 5
Intermediate 4-6	(5) 22	(6) 26	(6) 26	(3) 13	(3) 13	. . .	(4) 17	(19) 83	. . .
Junior High 7-8	(3) 17	(6) 33	(5) 28	(1) 06	(3) 17	. . .	(3) 17	(15) 83	. . .
High School 9-12	(4) 11	(14) 38	(10) 27	(6) 16	(1) 3	(2) 5	(10) 27	(26) 70	(1) 3
Special Educ. K-12	(2) 33	(3) 50	(1) 17	(1) 17	(5) 83	. . .
Administrators	(1) 20	(2) 40	(2) 40	(1) 20	(4) 80	. . .
Total	(19) 17	(38) 35	(30) 28	(11) 10	(8) 7	(3) 3	(23) 21	(84) 77	(2) 2

^aApproximate percent

of administrative support is not as high for this item. This possibly could be more a reflection of their concern with administrative problems of scheduling than a lack of support as a sound articulation practice.

The response to current use of practices is decidedly "no". Again the use of such practices at the second level in comparison to the remainder of the district is reflected in the high school teachers' response of 27 percent "yes" which is noticeably higher than any other group.

Summary of Item 4: The natural uncomfortableness that tends to come with new and different assignments and responsibility caused many of the respondents to be less supportive of this item. However, respondents in general seem to recognize in this type of staffing practices important advantages and benefits in aiding teachers to learn what, how, and why it is taught by those on the "upper" and "lower" levels.

ITEM 5--THE "ADMINISTRATIVE TEAM" CONCEPT IMPLEMENTED THROUGH PERIODIC MEETINGS OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR, PRINCIPALS, COORDINATORS, DEPARTMENT HEADS AND OTHERS IN SUPERVISORY AND ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITIES FUNCTIONING AS A DECISION MAKING AND POLICY RECOMMENDING BODY ON ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS. Item 5 is an attempt to assess the respondents' views placed on the "administrative team" concept as a tool of articulation in the district. Table 9 shows 28 percent of the respondents considered this item to be "most important" with 60 percent of the administrators reporting this choice. Of the total respondents, 28 percent indicated it to be

TABLE 9.--Questionnaire Item 5: The "administrative team" concept implemented through periodic meetings of the chief administrator, principals, coordinators, department heads and others in supervisory and administrative capacities

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(5) 25	(8) 40	(4) 20	(1) 5	. . .	(2) 10	(10) 50	(5) 25	(5) 25
Intermediate 4-6	(7) 30	(6) 26	(6) 26	(1) 4	(1) 4	(2) 9	(11) 48	(10) 43	(2) 9
Junior High 7-8	(2) 11	(3) 17	(10) 56	(1) 6	(2) 11	. . .	(13) 72	(5) 28	. . .
High School 9-12	(12) 32	(10) 27	(8) 22	(5) 14	(2) 5	. . .	(11) 30	(24) 65	(2) 5
Special Educ. K-12	(2) 33	(2) 33	(2) 33	(5) 83	. . .	(1) 17
Administrators	(3) 60	(1) 20	. . .	(1) 20	(2) 40	(3) 60	. . .
Total	(31) 28	(30) 28	(30) 28	(9) 8	(5) 5	(4) 4	(52) 48	(47) 43	(10) 9

^aApproximate percent

"very important" and another 28 percent said it was "important." Considering it to be of little relative importance was indicated by 17 percent of the respondents including one administrator.

In the area of current utilization of the concept, the respondents were somewhat equally divided as to its current use. It is particularly interesting to note that the administrators were not in accord on the question.

Summary of Item 5: With 84 percent of the respondents indicating a preference of "most important" or "important" for this item, it is obvious the administrator's role and responsibility in a program of articulation has high priority in the minds of the respondents. It is also obvious that a wholesome working relationship on the part of the administrative staff is essential in the opinions of respondents.

ITEM 6: A CURRICULUM SPECIALIST ASSIGNED TO THE CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF DESIGNATED AS "CURRICULUM COORDINATOR" OR SOME SIMILAR TITLE WHOSE CHIEF FUNCTION WOULD BE IN THE AREA OF CURRICULUM COORDINATION AND SUPERVISION K-12. As evident in Table 10, respondents were pretty evenly divided as to the importance of such a position in the district except for the administrator group who felt this position to be highly desirable. However, one of the administrator respondents felt it to be of little value. Of the total respondents, 27 percent checked "most important", 21 percent indicated the value as "very important", and 24 percent expressed "important". Approximately 29 percent of the respondents felt such a

TABLE 10.--Questionnaire Item 6: A curriculum specialist assigned to the central office staff

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(4) 20	(4) 20	(7) 35	(2) 10	(3) 15	. . .	(5) 25	(15) 75	. . .
Intermediate 4-6	(8) 35	(7) 30	(2) 9	(4) 17	(2) 9	. . .	(6) 26	(17) 74	. . .
Junior High 7-8	(5) 28	(3) 17	(6) 33	(3) 17	(1) 6	. . .	(1) 6	(17) 94	. . .
High School 9-12	(9) 24	(8) 22	(7) 19	(6) 16	(6) 16	(1) 3	(1) 3	(35) 95	(1) 3
Special Educ. K-12	(4) 67	(2) 33	(1) 17	(5) 83	. . .
Administrators	(3) 60	(1) 20	(1) 20	(5) 100	. . .
Total	(29) 27	(23) 21	(26) 24	(17) 16	(13) 12	(1) 1	(14) 13	(94) 86	(1) 1

^aApproximate percent

position is of little or no importance or did not commit themselves. Again grade level did not seem to be a determinate of expression, however, it should be noted that those teachers who make up the special education group placed less value on the position statement than any other group.

Approximately 13 percent expressed a feeling this type of function was currently being carried out in the district. This opinion is difficult to explain since no defined position of this nature currently exists in the district. Possibly they interpreted some special area coordinators such as the Reading Coordinator performing this role.

Summary of Item 6: Respondents were divided in their value of importance. Considering it to be significantly important that such a defined role and function be designated were 48 percent of the total respondents. Another 24 percent valued such a position to be important. It is obvious the administrators as a group consider the position essential to effective curriculum coordination which verified interview opinions of the group. Special education teachers who operate basically in independent, self-contained classrooms were the least enthusiastic. The general support of this item indicates a need for the establishment in the district a position primarily responsible for coordination of instructional program.

ITEM 7--SPECIALLY PLANNED AND CONDUCTED PROGRAMS OF COMPLETE ORIENTATION TO THE NEXT ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL FOR STUDENTS AND PARENTS AT THE "BREAK POINTS" (8TH GRADE, 5TH

GRADE, AND POSSIBLY 3RD GRADE) SHOULD BE HELD. A total of 17 percent of the respondents indicated this item to be "most important"; 27 percent felt it to be "very important"; and a total of approximately 22 percent considered it to be of little or no importance. It is interesting to note that the junior high teachers were the least supportive of the position with approximately one-fourth considering this type of activity to be significant. Primary teachers were the most supportive with approximately 65 percent of them feeling it to be significant by checking values 1 and 2.

The only current "break points" in the district where a similar type of activity is conducted are between the intermediate and junior high levels and at the point of entry into high school. This fact is reflected in the respondents' reactions to current use question with 61 percent of the junior high teachers and 51 percent of the senior high teachers responding positively.

Summary of Item 7: Since only 44 percent of the respondents (those checking values 1 and 2) considered this activity to be significant, one might deduce less than majority support for this item. However, in discussing this particular item with some of the respondents, it was evident the wording of the statement which included possibility of 3rd grade level being included caused less support. It is, as the results in Table 11 indicate, true that the respondents consider this position statement to be of lesser importance particularly if many of the other items were implemented.

TABLE 11.--Questionnaire Item 7: Planned programs of orientation to the next organizational level for students and parents at the "break points"

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(5) 25	(8) 40	(3) 15	(2) 10	(2) 10	. . .	(5) 25	(15) 75	. . .
Intermediate 4-6	(4) 17	(6) 26	(9) 39	(2) 9	(2) 9	. . .	(2) 9	(21) 91	. . .
Junior High 7-8	(1) 6	(3) 17	(8) 44	(3) 17	(3) 17	. . .	(11) 61	(7) 39	. . .
High School 9-12	(7) 19	(8) 22	(16) 43	(4) 11	(1) 3	(1) 3	(19) 51	(16) 43	(2) 5
Special Educ. K-12	. . .	(2) 33	(2) 33	(1) 17	(1) 17	. . .	(1) 17	(5) 83	. . .
Administrators	(1) 20	(2) 40	. . .	(2) 40	(1) 20	(4) 80	. . .
Total	(18) 17	(29) 27	(38) 35	(14) 13	(9) 8	(1) 1	(39) 36	(68) 62	(2) 2

^aApproximate percent

ITEM 8--DISTRICT WIDE CONTINUING CURRICULUM PLANNING GROUP COMPOSED OF TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS AND STUDENTS (AND PERHAPS PARENTS) WHOSE CHIEF FUNCTION IS TO SERVE AS A RECOMMENDING BODY ON ALL CURRICULUM MATTERS. Mixed degrees of support were expressed relative to a district wide curriculum coordinating committee of this nature. The most supportive group was the administrator group with 80 percent considering it significant by selecting choice 2. The next most supportive groups were the primary and junior high with 50 percent of each group checking either choice 1 or 2. In the intermediate group, 40 percent chose either choices 1 or 2 followed by the senior high group with 31 percent. The least supportive of the position statement were the special education teachers with only 17 percent checking either 1 or 2. The percent of the respondents who felt such a group as only marginal or less value was 57. Those who felt such a function currently existed in the district were 23 percent while approximately three-fourths did not.

Summary of Item 8: With 44 percent of the respondents expressing enthusiasm for a study group on matters of curriculum study and development at the unit level and with another 28 percent expressing marginal support, one can conclude teachers and administrators would support such an organization provided properly organized. Possibly the lack of greater support comes more from the suggested composition of the group than from the functional need.

ITEM 9--A DISTRICT WIDE PROGRAM OF COMMUNICATIONS BE ESTABLISHED THROUGH VARIOUS MEDIA DEVICES ORIGINATING FROM

TABLE 12.--Questionnaire Item 8: Establish district wide continuing curriculum planning group

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(7) 35	(3) 15	(6) 30	. . .	(4) 20	. . .	(3) 15	(17) 85	. . .
Intermediate 4-6	(3) 13	(6) 26	(7) 30	(3) 13	(4) 17	. . .	(2) 9	(21) 91	. . .
Junior High 7-8	(3) 17	(6) 33	(3) 17	(3) 17	(3) 17	. . .	(6) 33	(12) 67	. . .
High School 9-12	(8) 22	(7) 19	(10) 27	(5) 14	(5) 14	(2) 5	(10) 27	(25) 68	(2) 5
Special Educ. K-12	(1) 17	. . .	(3) 50	(2) 33	(3) 50	(3) 50	. . .
Administrators	. . .	(4) 80	(1) 20	(1) 20	(4) 80	. . .
Total	(22) 20	(26) 24	(30) 28	(13) 12	(16) 15	(2) 2	(25) 23	(82) 75	(2) 2

^aApproximate percent

THE CENTRAL OFFICE PRESENTING POLICIES, PHILOSOPHY, REPORTS, RECOMMENDATIONS, NEW PROGRAMS AND DIRECTIONS, BUDGETARY CONSIDERATIONS, ETC. The value choice receiving the heaviest response for this item was 2 with 32 percent; the next highest was 1 with 22 percent. Less than half of the junior and senior high teachers supported this item with checks in value categories 1 or 2. The strongest support within in any one group was the special education teachers with 83 percent followed by the intermediate teachers with 65 percent. The administrator group supported statement with 60 percent of the group checking either 1 or 2. Respondents having no knowledge of such practices being made in the district was 83 percent while 16 percent felt there was some effort and use of unit wide media devices.

Summary of Item 9: Over half of the respondents value some type of district wide information gathering and disseminating system on a regular and systematic basis helpful to the articulation process in the district. Another one-fourth sanctioned such an activity as important while only 16 percent of the respondents considered it at the lowest value on the scale. Currently such communicative devices are not regularly used in the district.

ITEM 10--AN ON-GOING EXCHANGE TEACHER DAY OR DAYS WHEREBY A SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHER WOULD SERVE AS AN ELEMENTARY OR MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHER AND THE FELLOW TEACHER WOULD TAKE OVER HIS COLLEAGUE'S CLASSES AT THE HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL, ETC. This item attempted to gauge teacher support

TABLE 13.--Questionnaire Item 9: A district wide program of communications be established by various media devices originating from the central office

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(8) 40	(3) 15	(6) 30	. . .	(3) 15	. . .	(3) 15	(17) 85	. . .
Intermediate 4-6	(5) 22	(10) 43	(6) 26	(1) 4	(1) 4	. . .	(2) 9	(21) 91	. . .
Junior High 7-8	(1) 1	(7) 39	(8) 44	(2) 11	(6) 33	(12) 67	. . .
High School 9-12	(6) 16	(11) 30	(10) 27	(7) 19	(2) 5	(1) 3	(6) 16	(30) 81	(1) 3
Special Educ. K-12	(2) 33	(3) 50	(1) 17	(6) 1	. . .
Administrators	(2) 40	(1) 20	(2) 40	(5) 1	. . .
Total	(24) 22	(35) 32	(31) 28	(10) 9	(8) 7	(1) 1	(17) 16	(91) 83	(1) 1

^aApproximate percent

for some type of periodic teacher exchange program permitting teachers at the various levels of background training and experience to gain a better understanding of and sympathy with the instruction and problems encountered by colleagues at different age levels of instruction. A look at Table 14 will indicate this type of activity to receive only limited support of the respondents. Only 29 percent of the respondents considered this activity to make a significant contribution to the articulation process by checking value categories 1 and 2. Another 26 percent considered it to be of some relative importance, and 46 percent of the respondents considered it to be of little relative value by checking either categories 4, 5, or refused to commit themselves by giving no response.

It is interesting to note that within most grade levels groupings there were wide variances of feelings to this type of activity making it rather controversial. At the primary level, 30 percent of the teachers considered it to be "most important" while 45 percent considered it to be of the "least importance". At the intermediate level and in the special education group, teachers were equally divided. Junior high teachers responded negatively with only 6 percent giving strong support and 33 percent opposed. Senior high group expressed strong support by 11 percent while 35 percent considered it of least importance. The administrative group gave limited support with only 40 percent expressing any degree of enthusiasm. The practice is currently not followed in the district.

TABLE 14.--Questionnaire Item 10: Establish exchange teacher program whereby teachers at different grade levels would exchange temporarily assignments

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(6) 30	. . .	(2) 10	(2) 10	(9) 45	(1) 5	. . .	(18) 90	(2) 10
Intermediate 4-6	(6) 26	(2) 9	(7) 30	(2) 9	(6) 26	. . .	(2) 9	(21) 91	. . .
Junior High 7-8	(1) 6	(4) 22	(5) 28	(2) 11	(6) 33	(18) 1	. . .
High School 9-12	(4) 11	(3) 8	(10) 27	(6) 16	(13) 35	(1) 3	. . .	(36) 97	(1) 3
Special Educ. K-12	(1) 17	(2) 33	(2) 33	. . .	(1) 17	(6) 1	. . .
Administrators	. . .	(2) 40	(2) 40	. . .	(1) 20	(5) 1	. . .
Total	(18) 17	(13) 12	(28) 26	(12) 11	(36) 33	(2) 2	(2) 2	(104) 95	(3) 3

^aApproximate percent

Summary of Item 10: Even though such a plan would seem to give real implementation to gradual curriculum transition and should help to bring about a better understanding of all segments of the school district, the survey indicates this activity to be non-supportive by a majority of the staff.

ITEM 11--ALL NON-TEACHING CERTIFIED PERSONNEL IN THE DISTRICT (PRINCIPALS, ASSISTANTS, COORDINATORS, SUPERINTENDENT, ETC.) BE EXPECTED TO ACTUALLY SUBSTITUTE TEACH A SPECIFIED NUMBER OF DAYS EACH YEAR AS AN AVENUE OF CONTACT. Again it was found that respondents were divided as to value of the administrative contact through periodic classroom instruction as a means of communication and understanding. Of the total respondents, 42 percent felt this would be effective and strongly supported. Another 44 percent considered it to be of little or no value. A majority of the responding administrators accepted the suggestion with 40 percent considering it a "most important" means of relating and another 40 percent gave favorable support by checking categories 2 or 3.

Special education teacher saw considerable value in such an activity with 66 percent expressing support of value columns 1 or 2. In the high school group, 49 percent favored the suggestion followed by the intermediate teachers with 39 percent. With lesser support were the junior high teachers with 33 percent, and this group was followed by the primary personnel with only 30 percent favoring the

TABLE 15.--Questionnaire Item 11: Non-teaching certified personnel (principals, superintendent, etc.) be expected to teach a specified number of days each year as an avenue of contact

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Response	Yes	No	No Response
Primary K-3	(3) 15	(3) 15	(1) 5	(8) 40	(5) 25	. . .	(1) 5	(19) 95	. . .
Intermediate 4-6	(6) 26	(3) 13	(5) 22	(4) 17	(5) 22	. . .	(1) 4	(22) 96	. . .
Junior High 7-8	(4) 22	(2) 11	(3) 17	(3) 17	(6) 33	(18) 1	. . .
High School 9-12	(10) 27	(8) 22	(4) 11	(5) 14	(9) 24	(1) 3	(2) 5	(34) 91	(1) 3
Special Educ. K-12	(2) 33	(2) 33	(1) 17	. . .	(1) 17	(6) 1	. . .
Administrators	(2) 40	(1) 20	(1) 20	(1) 20	(5) 1	. . .
Total	(27) 25	(19) 17	(15) 14	(21) 19	(26) 24	(1) 1	(4) 4	(104) 95	(1) 1

^aApproximate percent

practice. Current use of the practice is negligible in the district

Summary of Item 11: Teacher response to this type of practice as a means giving administrative and supervisory personnel on site opportunity to experience what is happening in the instructional program indicates cautious acceptance. Probably to be the most effective, if implemented, such a practice would need to be done on an interschool basis providing greater opportunity for the supervising personnel to gain better insight on programs at levels of instruction other than his or her own building.

ITEM 12--BOARD OF EDUCATION AGENDA EACH MONTH ALLOWING A PORTION OF TIME TO INSTRUCTIONAL ORIENTATION AND RELATED PROBLEMS. STAFF PRESENT AN OVERVIEW OF THE STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, AND FUTURE NEEDS OF A PROGRAM AREA. An important aspect of any program of articulation is keeping lines of communication open among all interested and affected parties. In an effort to find staff reaction and degree of support to such an effort with the board of education, item twelve was included. Table 16 indicates the respondents in general consider this to be important. Only 10 percent reporting considered this approach to be a low priority item. Relative high importance was attached to this type of activity by 48 percent of the respondents, and another 26 percent indicated it to be "important." It is interesting to note that none of the junior high teachers gave it the highest value while all other groups gave it some degree of emphasis

TABLE 16.--Questionnaire Item 12: Board of education agenda each month allow a portion of time to instructional orientation and related problems

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(4) 20	(7) 35	(5) 25	(2) 10	(1) 5	(1) 5	(9) 45	(10) 50	(1) 5
Intermediate 4-6	(3) 13	(8) 35	(5) 22	(4) 17	(3) 13	. . .	(5) 22	(18) 78	. . .
Junior High 7-8	. . .	(6) 33	(4) 22	(4) 22	(4) 22	. . .	(9) 50	(8) 44	(1) 6
High School 9-12	(8) 22	(11) 30	(10) 27	(5) 14	(3) 8	. . .	(13) 35	(23) 62	(1) 3
Special Educ. K-12	(1) 17	(2) 33	(3) 50	(1) 17	(5) 83	. . .
Administrators	(2) 40	. . .	(1) 20	(2) 40	(5) 100	. . .
Total	(18) 17	(34) 31	(28) 26	(17) 16	(11) 10	(1) 1	(37) 34	(69) 63	(3) 3

^aApproximate percent

as being "most important."

As indicated by the response to the current usage question, some limited effort along this line is being done. Usually this occurs only when an area of the instructional program requires some special consideration by the board and not necessarily as means of ongoing procedure.

Summary of Item 12: The survey response to this position statement indicates a need and support of some formal method to keep the board of education regularly informed on curriculum. Approximately half of the respondents considered such contact to be significantly important. Negative response to this item would probably stem from some past unsuccessful personal experience or reluctance to participate in this type activity rather than the unsoundness of such a program.

ITEM 13--TO PREVENT FRAGMENTATION OF CURRICULUM AT VARIOUS LEVELS IN THE UNIT, SOME TYPE OF MACHINERY ESTABLISHED WHICH WOULD PERMIT DIRECT AND SYSTEMATIC COMMUNICATION LINKAGE AMONG DEPARTMENT HEADS AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL AND "HEAD TEACHERS" AT THE MIDDLE SCHOOL AND ELEMENTARY LEVELS. Table 17 indicates teachers and others are concerned about gaps in the curriculum and the need for communication and cooperation to avoid unnecessary fragmentation. Well over a majority of the respondents consider this type of effort to be significantly important. Valuing it most important were 28 percent of the respondents; 33 percent said it was "very important", and another 26 percent

TABLE 17.--Questionnaire Item 13: Avoid fragmentation of curriculum at the various levels in the Unit with some type of machinery which would permit direct and systematic communication linkage among department heads at the secondary levels and "head teachers" at the middle and elementary levels

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(6) 30	(4) 20	(7) 35	(2) 10	(1) 5	. . .	(2) 10	(15) 75	(3) 15
Intermediate 4-6	(6) 26	(10) 43	(7) 30	(3) 13	(19) 83	(1) 4
Junior High 7-8	(3) 17	(2) 11	(8) 44	(3) 17	(2) 11	. . .	(1) 6	(17) 94	. . .
High School 9-12	(12) 32	(16) 43	(3) 8	(2) 5	(2) 5	(2) 5	(5) 14	(31) 84	(1) 3
Special Educ. K-12	(1) 17	(4) 67	(1) 17	(1) 17	(5) 83	. . .
Administrators	(3) 60	. . .	(2) 40	(5) 100	. . .
Total	(31) 28	(36) 33	(28) 26	(7) 6	(5) 5	(2) 2	(12) 11	(92) 84	(5) 5

^aApproximate percent

50

attached "importance" to it. Only 13 percent of the total reporting considered it to be of low importance. Strong support came from grade levels both below and above the middle school levels indicating concern at both ends of the spectrum.

To the current practice question, 84 percent of the respondents felt there was no effort along this line being made and 11 percent indicated knowledge of some effort being made.

Summary of Item 13: One could conclude from the results on this item that most of the staff are concerned about curriculum fragmentation and the need for some type of organizational structure to prevent such from happening. Since little or no effort in this direction is being done, it would seem advisable to give to a plan of implementation.

ITEM 14--IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR ALL TEACHERS AIMED AT BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE TOTAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM OF THE DISTRICT--VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL. Well over a majority of the respondents expressed a need and support of inservice activities that would help them to gain a better understanding of the total educational program of the district. A majority, 57 percent, considered this type of activity to be highly important and another 26 percent attached "important" to it. Only 15 percent of the respondents rated it low in importance while just 2 percent failed to respond. As indicated in Table 18, only the junior high teachers and the senior high teachers attached less than

TABLE 18.--Questionnaire Item 14: In-service training programs for all teachers aimed at better understanding of the total educational program of the district--vertically and horizontally

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(9) 45	(6) 30	(4) 20	(1) 5	(12) 60	(7) 35	(1) 5
Intermediate 4-6	(7) 30	(9) 39	(4) 17	(3) 13	(17) 74	(6) 26	. . .
Junior High 7-8	(3) 17	(5) 28	(6) 33	(4) 22	(14) 78	(4) 22	. . .
High School 9-12	(10) 27	(7) 19	(12) 32	(3) 8	(4) 11	(1) 3	(20) 54	(16) 43	(1) 3
Special Educ. K-12	(2) 33	(1) 17	(2) 33	. . .	(1) 17	. . .	(4) 67	(2) 33	. . .
Administrators	(1) 20	(3) 60	(1) 20	. . .	(4) 80	(1) 20	. . .
Total	(32) 29	(31) 28	(28) 26	(10) 9	(6) 6	(2) 2	(71) 65	(36) 33	(2) 2

^aApproximate percent

majority support to value columns 1 or 2 for this item.

Recent efforts with the half-day district workshops are reflected in the current use response where 65 percent of the respondents indicated this to be a current effort.

Summary of Item 14: Respondents believe inservice training activities aimed at gaining knowledge and understanding of the total educational program should be planned and conducted to involve all personnel of the district. Preschool workshops as well as inservice days should be planned to give time and attention to need.

ITEM 15--TEXTBOOK SELECTIONS SHOULD BE MADE ON A UNIT WIDE BASIS FOR THE BASIC STUDY AREAS WITH THE AIM OF USING THE SAME SERIES K-12. Response to this item indicates respondents do not feel textbooks should be the major articulating device in the subject areas. This feeling is particularly evident at the junior and high school levels where the support was the least and shown in Table 19. Only 36 percent of the total respondents strongly supported this position item with 46 percent indicating little or no support of the idea. It is interesting to note that the junior high level teachers are more firmly opposed to this type of activity than any other group. This attitude will tend to lend itself more to the new middle school program which will be using the multi-media approach. It is also interesting to note the scattering of opinions reported by the administrator group which points up the controversial nature of building subject matter content around a

TABLE 19.--Questionnaire Item 15: Textbook selections should be made on a Unit wide basis for the basic study areas

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(5) 25	(4) 20	(5) 25	. . .	(5) 25	(1) 5	(5) 25	(14) 70	(1) 5
Intermediate 4-6	(5) 22	(6) 26	(4) 17	. . .	(8) 35	. . .	(7) 30	(16) 70	. . .
Junior High 7-8	(1) 6	(2) 11	(2) 11	(3) 17	(9) 50	(1) 6	(4) 22	(14) 78	. . .
High School 9-12	(4) 11	(8) 22	(8) 22	(10) 27	(5) 14	(2) 5	(8) 22	(27) 73	(2) 5
Special Educ. K-12	(1) 17	(1) 17	. . .	(1) 17	(3) 50	. . .	(2) 33	(4) 67	. . .
Administrators	(1) 20	(1) 20	(1) 20	(1) 20	(1) 20	(3) 60	(2) 40
Total	(17) 16	(22) 20	(20) 18	(15) 14	(31) 28	(4) 4	(26) 24	(78) 72	(5) 5

^aApproximate percent

single program or series of texts.

Summary of Item 15: The respondents in general were non-supportive of the single series textbook K-12. This reaction probably stems from two types of feelings on the question. One might possibly represent a reaction to this method in determining major content of the instructional program while another reaction could represent the feeling that the single adoption approach is not practical or advisable with most publisher's programs.

ITEM 16--CURRICULUM MODELS DEFINING BASIC EXPECTATIONS AT EACH LEVEL FOR BASIC STUDY AREAS TAUGHT K-12 SHOULD BE DEVELOPED AND FOLLOWED. Lending strong support to this type of program development were 52 percent of the respondents who checked categories 1 and 2. Considering it to be an important approach to curriculum programming were 28 percent of those surveyed. Only one-fifth of the respondents indicated it to be of little or no importance to the articulation process. All groups supported the suggestion with 50 percent or more in each checking categories 1 or 2 except the primary and intermediate groups. The use of this approach is not a common practice currently followed in the district as evidenced by 64 percent expressing negative to the question.

Summary of Item 16: Respondents' positive reaction to this statement is supportive of their response to Item 15. If curriculum models or guides for each discipline or multi-discipline areas were developed specifically defining in a

TABLE 20.--Questionnaire Item 16: Establish curriculum models defining basic expectations at each level for basic study areas taught K-12

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(5) 25	(4) 20	(7) 35	(2) 10	(1) 5	(1) 5	(5) 25	(14) 70	(1) 5
Intermediate 4-6	(5) 22	(5) 22	(7) 30	(3) 13	(2) 9	(1) 4	(6) 26	(16) 70	(1) 4
Junior High 7-8	(4) 22	(5) 28	(6) 33	(1) 6	(2) 11	. . .	(6) 33	(12) 67	. . .
High School 9-12	(12) 32	(9) 24	(10) 27	(4) 11	(1) 3	(1) 3	(16) 43	(20) 54	(1) 3
Special Educ. K-12	(2) 33	(1) 17	(1) 17	(1) 17	(1) 17	. . .	(2) 33	(3) 50	(1) 17
Administrators	(2) 40	(2) 40	. . .	(1) 20	(5) 100	. . .
Total	(30) 28	(26) 24	(31) 28	(12) 11	(7) 6	(3) 3	(35) 32	(70) 64	(4) 4

^aApproximate percent

sequential manner the student learner objectives for each level or division, the basic text adoption approach K-12 would not be necessary. Teacher response to Item 16 supports this type of program development.

ITEM 17--A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF RECORD KEEPING ON EACH STUDENT PROVIDING A CUMULATIVE RECORD OF STUDENT ABILITY, LIMITATIONS, LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE AND OTHER SUCH PERTINENT DATA. Teachers' and administrators' responses to this type of coordinated activity were highly supportive. Almost two-thirds considered it to be most helpful and essential to the smooth transition of student by selecting value items 1 and 2. Another 24 percent showed their preference by checking value category 3. Grade level was not a determinant factor since all groups highly supported the activity.

A cumulative record process is currently used in the school system as indicated by Table 21. Possibly a re-evaluation of the data included would be in order since a sizable group of the respondents, 34 percent, indicated "no" to current use question.

Summary of Item 17: Response to this item supports the position that it is essential to the successful educational development of the child that a systematic program of recording and reporting student's abilities, limitations, skills to be attained at the various levels and student proficiency in those skills along with other pertinent data be transmitted to the teachers at the next higher level of instruction.

TABLE 21.--Questionnaire Item 17: Establish a uniform system of record keeping on each student providing a cumulative record of student ability, limitations, level of performance and other such pertinent data

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(6) 30	(9) 45	(2) 10	. . .	(2) 10	(1) 5	(12) 60	(7) 35	(1) 5
Intermediate 4-6	(10) 43	(4) 17	(9) 39	(20) 87	(3) 13	. . .
Junior High 7-8	(7) 39	(4) 22	(5) 28	(1) 6	(1) 6	. . .	(13) 72	(5) 28	. . .
High School 9-12	(16) 43	(6) 16	(9) 24	(4) 11	(2) 5	. . .	(17) 46	(17) 46	(3) 8
Special Educ. K-12	(4) 67	(1) 17	(1) 17	. . .	(3) 50	(3) 50	. . .
Administrators	(3) 60	. . .	(1) 20	(1) 20	(3) 60	(2) 40	. . .
Total	(46) 42	(23) 21	(26) 24	(7) 6	(6) 6	(1) 1	(68) 62	(37) 34	(4) 4

^aApproximate percent

ITEM 18--STUDENT "VISITING DAYS" TO THE MIDDLE SCHOOL AND SECONDARY LEVELS FOR THE PURPOSE OF WELCOMING, ASSISTING AND ORIENTATION. Response to this type of activity by the respondents rates the suggestion as one of high priority. Strong support was given with 61 percent of those responding giving it a relative value of "very important" or "most important." Respondents at all levels consider the bringing of students at the lower level to visit classes and other planned activities in the receiving school as a valuable contribution to the adjustment and orientation of students. Only 12 percent of the respondents reacted negatively to the practice. Current practice in the district for this type of activity is reflected in the 78 percent checking "yes" and 18 percent reporting "no." Approximately 4 percent failed to respond.

Summary of Item 18: The current practice of the guidance counselors planning and providing orientation visits for prospective students has broad acceptance and support of the teaching and administrative staff. It should be expanded and extended, particularly for those students who are to enter the middle school and high school programs. The response to a related and similar question in Item 7 suggests the expansion of such activities to other "break points" in the program questionable (i.e., end of primary level).

ITEM 19--MORE SYSTEMATIC AND EFFICIENT PROCEDURE OF PLANNING AND PURCHASING OF SUPPLIES, MATERIALS, AND

TABLE 22.--Questionnaire Item 18: Conduct "student visiting days" to the middle school and secondary levels for the purpose of orientation

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(10)50	(8)40	(1) 5	. . .	(1) 5	. . .	(17) 85	(3) 15	. . .
Intermediate 4-6	(10)43	(6)26	(5) 22	. . .	(2) 9	. . .	(19) 83	(3) 13	(1) 4
Junior High 7-8	(5) 28	(6)33	(5) 28	(2) 11	(16) 89	(2) 11	. . .
High School 9-12	(8) 22	(8)22	(16) 43	(3) 8	(1) 3	(1) 3	(26) 70	(9) 24	(2) 5
Special Educ. K-12	(2) 33	(1)17	(2) 33	. . .	(1) 17	. . .	(4) 67	(2) 33	. . .
Administrators	. . .	(3)60	(1) 20	(1) 20	(3) 60	(1) 20	(1) 20
Total	(35) 32	(32)29	(30) 28	(5) 5	(5) 5	(2) 2	(85) 78	(20)18	(4) 4

^aApproximate percent

EQUIPMENT ALLOWING FOR COORDINATED USE AND CONTROL. A systematic procedure providing for coordinated and efficient plan of selecting and purchasing of supplies and materials as a means of providing additional assistance in program coordination was ranked by the respondents as having significant importance. A majority of the total staff, 62 percent, considered it a top priority item by selecting choices 1 and 2. Another 25 percent showed their support of this type of financial management in purchasing by selecting number choice 3, "important." Well over half of the respondents from each group indicated strong support to this item. Respondents were somewhat divided as to current practice reflecting different procedures now followed in budgeting and procurement in the various attendance centers of the district.

Summary of Item 19: Respondents soundly support the suggestion of this item as a means of helping to provide efficiently for students' smooth transition and continuity of educational experiences in the district. Educators today must be concerned and address themselves to the financial problems facing most school districts including Unit 2 which currently faces serious financial problems. The response to this item indicates a desire and need on the part of the respondents to adopt and follow practices which will help insure maximum use of all resources of the school district.

TABLE 23.--Questionnaire Item 19: Establish a more systematic and efficient procedure of planning and purchasing

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(8) 40	(5) 25	(6) 30	(1) 5	(9) 45	(11) 55	. . .
Intermediate 4-6	(9) 39	(6) 26	(5) 22	(2) 9	(1) 4	. . .	(8) 35	(15) 65	. . .
Junior High 7-8	(4) 22	(7) 39	(6) 33	. . .	(1) 6	. . .	(13) 72	(3) 17	(2) 11
High School 9-12	(11) 30	(10) 27	(9) 24	(5) 14	(1) 3	(1) 3	(10) 27	(23) 62	(4) 11
Special Educ. K-12	(1) 17	(3) 50	(1) 17	(1) 17	(1) 17	(4) 67	(1) 17
Administrators	(3) 60	(1) 20	(1) 20	. . .	(4) 80	(1) 20
Total	(36) 33	(32) 29	(27) 25	(9) 8	(3) 3	(2) 2	(41) 38	(60) 55	(8) 7

^aApproximate percent

Since the inception of this study, action has been taken by the district to help implement the philosophy expressed in this item. A position of Business Manager and Purchasing has been established for the Unit.

ITEM 20--A PERSON ASSIGNED THE RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY TO COORDINATE AND SCHEDULE ALL AFTER SCHOOL HOURS ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES THROUGHOUT THE UNIT. Teachers and administrators responded to this item as one not considered significantly important. Only 19 percent checked choice 1 and 2 ranking it significantly important. One-third gave it only warm support by selecting choice 3, and almost half of the respondents responded negatively to the suggestion. Only a limited amount of effort toward this type of activity is currently being applied in the district as shown by the response in Table 24.

Summary of Item 20: This item was an effort to pursue physical sharing of facilities concept set forth in Item 2. When comparing the results of Table 6 and Table 24, the writer gets the impression that respondents are agreeable to the concept of coordinating and sharing of common facilities such as gymnasiums, libraries, learning centers, auditoriums, etc., but oppose formalizing the plan to the point that one person or position would be responsible for all coordination of such activities and facilities. The writer concludes teachers and others prefer this function be done on a less formal, structured basis such as between building principals and other responsible personnel.

TABLE 24.--Questionnaire Item 20: Assign the responsibility and authority to coordinate and schedule all after school hours activities and facilities throughout the Unit with one person

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(2) 10	(2) 10	(6) 30	(6) 30	(4) 20	. . .	(1) 5	(18) 90	(1) 5
Intermediate 4-6	(1) 4	(2) 9	(7) 30	(3) 13	(9) 39	(1) 4	(4) 17	(18) 78	(1) 4
Junior High 7-8	(2) 11	(2) 11	(6) 33	(1) 6	(7) 39	. . .	(3) 17	(15) 83	. . .
High School 9-12	(3) 8	(4) 11	(15) 41	(4) 11	(9) 24	(2) 5	(7) 19	(30) 81	. . .
Special Educ. K-12	(1) 17	. . .	(1) 17	(1) 17	(3) 50	(6) 100	. . .
Administrators	(1) 20	(1) 20	. . .	(1) 20	(1) 20	(1) 20	(1) 20	(3) 60	(1) 20
Total	(10) 9	(11) 10	(35) 32	(16) 15	(33) 30	(4) 4	(16) 15	(90) 83	(3) 3

^aApproximate percent

ITEM 21--DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS AT HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL AND HEAD TEACHERS AT THE MIDDLE SCHOOL AND ELEMENTARY LEVELS PROVIDED ADEQUATE RELEASED TIME FOR COORDINATING INSTRUCTIONAL EFFORTS BOTH VERTICALLY AND HORIZONTALLY. This item received strong support in relation to the other items on the survey. A majority of all groups supported it as a basic and highly desirable approach in program articulation. The percent of respondents checking either choices 1 or 2 was 61; 19 percent rated it at choice 3 or "important." Only 16 percent gave it a fair or less rating of importance with another 3 percent uncommitted. As indicated in Table 25, little provision currently is being made for this type of activity.

Summary of Item 21: This item attempts to get at the key issue of effective coordination of program. To be effective, department heads and other essential coordinating personnel as well as teachers must have an opportunity to communicate and share ideas. Provisions must be made for regular department meetings not only within but among the various attendance centers within the system.

Articulation of one grade level with the next generally focuses on the subject area. If effective coordination is not achieved there, the more complex problems of articulation certainly cannot be resolved. Respondents recognize this fact as indicated by the support given this item.

This item and Item 13 are closely related in position. The difference between the two is that Item 21 is more

TABLE 25.--Questionnaire Item 21: Provide department chairpersons at high school level and head teachers at the middle school and elementary levels adequate release time for coordination of instructional efforts

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Response	Yes	No	No Response
Primary K-3	(5) 25	(7) 35	(5) 25	(2) 10	(1) 5	. . .	(4) 20	(14) 70	(2) 10
Intermediate 4-6	(7) 30	(7) 30	(3) 13	(1) 4	(4) 17	(1) 4	(2) 9	(20) 87	(1) 4
Junior High 7-8	(7) 39	(4) 22	(3) 17	(3) 17	(1) 6	. . .	(6) 33	(12) 67	. . .
High School 9-12	(11) 30	(13) 35	(7) 19	(3) 8	(2) 5	(1) 3	(8) 22	(28) 76	(1) 3
Special Educ. K-12	(2) 33	(1) 17	(3) 50	(6) 100	. . .
Administrators	(1) 20	(2) 40	. . .	(1) 20	. . .	(1) 20	(1) 20	(2) 40	(2) 40
Total	(33) 30	(34) 31	(21) 19	(10) 9	(8) 7	(3) 3	(21) 19	(82) 75	(6) 6

^aApproximate percent

specific as to the approach by specifying release time as means of accomplishing the task. It is interesting to note the similarity in response to the two items.

ITEM 22--A FORMAL PROGRAM OF EVALUATION FOR TOTAL UNIT TO ANALYZE EFFECTIVENESS IN RELATION TO ESTABLISHED GOALS. Only 20 percent of the respondents valued this item to be "most important"; 28 percent responded by checking choice 2, "very important"; and 29 percent of the total staff gave it moderate support by checking number 3. Another 29 percent considered it to be of little or no importance by checking either numbers 4 or 5, or by not committing themselves. Percentage wise, the administrative group was the most supportive followed by the primary group as shown in Table 26. Recent work in district wide goal setting involving many of the staff is probably reflected in the "current use" column with 30 percent reporting an awareness of current practice.

Summary of Item 22: When using combined total percentage of choices number 1 and 2 as indication of degree of support for this item, one can see that Item 22 ranks ninth in importance to the other items included in the survey (see Appendix A, Table 30). The writer suspects this response could be a reaction to the phrasing of the statement by including the phrase "formal evaluation" which seems to have a bad connotation.

Since specification of general goals and objectives for the total program is fundamental to coordination of the full program and since some plan of evaluation is essential to

TABLE 26.--Questionnaire Item 22: Establish a formal program of evaluation for total Unit to analyze effectiveness in relation to established goals

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(7) 35	(4) 20	(6) 30	(3) 15	(8) 40	(11) 55	(1) 5
Intermediate 4-6	(4) 17	(6) 26	(8) 35	(1) 4	(3) 13	(1) 4	(5) 22	(17) 74	(1) 4
Junior High 7-8	(2) 11	(7) 39	(3) 17	(3) 17	(3) 17	. . .	(5) 28	(13) 72	. . .
High School 9-12	(6) 16	(10) 27	(13) 35	(3) 8	(4) 11	(1) 3	(13) 35	(23) 62	(1) 3
Special Educ. K-12	(1) 17	(2) 33	(2) 33	. . .	(1) 17	. . .	(1) 17	(5) 83	. . .
Administrators	(2) 40	(2) 40	(1) 20	(1) 20	(3) 60	(1) 20
Total	(22) 20	(31) 28	(32) 29	(10) 9	(11) 10	(3) 3	(33) 30	(72) 66	(4) 4

^aApproximate percent

determine educational outcomes in relations to the goals, possibly the district should consider an inservice program that would expose staff to some type of device for implementing programs by objectives such as the Management by Objective (MBO) or some similar model.

ITEM 23--TO ACHIEVE A MAXIMAZATION OF COMMUNICATION AND UNDERSTANDING, ATTENTION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMUNICATION MODEL FOR THE UNIT EMPHASIZING WIDE PARTICIPATION AND INVOLVEMENT OF ALL PARTIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS IN THE DISTRICT. Slightly less than a majority of the respondents checked either value numbers 1 or 2 with another 31 percent supporting the suggestion by checking category 3 as their choice. Formalized plan of communication was considered of lesser importance by 14 percent of the respondents, and another 8 percent rated it "least important" or by not committing themselves. An established, structured procedure of communication providing maximum participation does not currently exist in the district according to response shown in Table 27.

Summary of Item 23: Respondents recognized the significance of an organized effort of communications. Over three-fourths of the respondents reflected this awareness by selecting either choices 1, 2, or 3 on this item. The lack of effort to establish the opportunities for a wide participation and exchange of ideas in the district is indicated with 84 percent of the respondents expressing "no" to current practice.

TABLE 27.--Questionnaire Item 23: Develop a communication model for the Unit emphasizing wide participation and involvement of all parties associated with the educational process

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(4) 20	(6) 30	(6) 30	(4) 20	(3) 15	(16) 80	(1) 5
Intermediate 4-6	(7) 30	(1) 4	(12) 52	. . .	(3) 13	. . .	(3) 13	(19) 83	(1) 4
Junior High 7-8	. . .	(8) 44	(5) 28	(2) 11	(3) 17	(18) 100	. . .
High School 9-12	(8) 22	(9) 24	(10) 27	(9) 24	(1) 3	. . .	(6) 16	(30) 81	(1) 3
Special Educ. K-12	(1) 17	(4) 67	(1) 17	. . .	(1) 17	(5) 83	. . .
Administrators	(2) 40	(1) 20	(1) 20	(1) 20	. . .	(4) 80	(1) 20
Total	(22) 20	(29) 27	(34) 31	(15) 14	(8) 7	(1) 01	(13) 12	(92) 84	(4) 4

^aApproximate percent

ITEM 24--A BASIC APPROACH TOWARD ELIMINATING THE PROBLEMS OF ARTICULATION WITHIN THE UNIT IS A PHILOSOPHY LEANING AWAY FROM THE STRATIFIED "GRADED" OR "LEVELS" OF LEARNING APPROACH TO THE "NONGRADED" OR "CONTINUOUS PROGRESS" APPROACH THROUGHOUT THE SCHOOL SYSTEM. In response to this item, every group with the exception of those teachers grouped at the high school level supported the concept of nongraded learning with a majority or more checking choice categories 1 or 2. Approximately 40 percent of the high school teachers expressed equally strong support. The most supportive group was the special education teachers whose programs are highly geared to the individualized, continuous progress approach to learning and instruction. Also lending strong support were the administrators and the primary teachers. Primary teachers are currently participating in a continuous progress reading program at one of the attendance centers. This practice is reflected in their response to the current practice question where 45 percent answered yes as opposed to an 18 percent response of yes from the total respondents.

Summary of Item 24: The general response to this item indicates teacher and administrator support of the concept that school programs should be designed, planned, and implemented around the learner and not be determined by administrative structure and configuration of the system. It is interesting to note the degree of similar support to Item 3 in the survey, a related item. (See Appendix A, Table 30.)

TABLE 28.--Questionnaire Item 24: Promote a philosophy away from the stratified "graded" or "levels" learning approach to the "nongraded" or "continuous progress" approach throughout the school system

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(10) 50	(5) 25	(3) 15	. . .	(1) 5	(1) 5	(9) 45	(10) 50	(1) 5
Intermediate 4-6	(6) 26	(6) 26	(6) 26	(1) 4	(1) 4	(3) 13	(6) 26	(13) 57	(4) 17
Junior High 7-8	(3) 17	(8) 44	(3) 17	(1) 6	(3) 17	. . .	(1) 6	(17) 94	. . .
High School 9-12	(4) 11	(11) 30	(8) 22	(7) 19	(6) 16	(1) 3	(3) 8	(33) 89	(1) 3
Special Educ. K-12	(3) 50	(2) 33	(1) 17	(5) 83	(1) 17
Administrators	(3) 60	(1) 20	. . .	(1) 20	(1) 20	(4) 80	. . .
Total	(29) 27	(33) 30	(21) 19	(10) 9	(11) 10	(5) 5	(20) 18	(82) 75	(7) 6

^aApproximate percent

This item shows strong respondents' support of the philosophical basis of an ungraded structure, and Item 3 indicates support for experimenting with alternate modes to implement such an approach.

ITEM 25--THE USE OF GRADES OR MARKS IN EVALUATING THE PROGRESS OF STUDENTS AIDS THE CONTINUITY OF LEARNING AS STUDENTS PROGRESS THROUGH THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM. In response to this item, 27 percent of the teachers and administrators voiced opinions by checking choices 1 and 2. Another 23 percent felt it to be important concept. Of the total respondents, 51 percent indicated lack of enthusiasm or support of this item by checking choices 4, 5, or by being noncommittal. The use of traditional grades or marks for evaluating and reporting pupil progress is the common practice in the district.

Summary of Item 25: The lack of significant support for this item reflects a lack of confidence on the part of teachers and administrators in the district in grade marks as a tool in aiding the consistency of learning for a student as he progresses through the educational program. The inconsistency of the traditional grading system coupled with its vagueness causes it to lend little help to the next teacher in revealing skills attained or knowledge gained.

TABLE 29.--Questionnaire Item 25" The use of grade or marks in evaluating student progress aids the continuity of learning as students

Instructional Group	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
	1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponse	Yes	No	No Re- sponse
Primary K-3	(1) 5	(2) 10	(6) 30	(2) 10	(8) 40	(1) 5	(13) 65	(6) 30	(1) 5
Intermediate 4-6	(4) 7	(1) 4	(4) 17	(4) 17	(9) 39	(1) 4	(19) 83	(3) 13	(1) 4
Junior High 7-8	(1) 6	(6) 33	(3) 17	(4) 22	(4) 22	. . .	(17) 94	(1) 6	. . .
High School 9-12	(6) 16	(7) 19	(11) 30	(9) 24	(4) 11	. . .	(33) 89	(2) 5	(1) 3
Special Educ. K-12	(4) 67	(2) 33	. . .	(6)100
Administrators	. . .	(1) 20	(1) 20	. . .	(3) 60	. . .	(5)100
Total	(12) 11	(17) 16	(25) 23	(23) 21	(30) 28	(2) 2	(93) 85	(12) 11	(3) 3

^aApproximate percent

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

As the author attempts to sift through and analyze the results of this study, four basic commonalties seem to exist in the attitudes and beliefs of the respondents.

(1) There are an awareness and concern about the lack of communication and understanding existing between all segments of the instructional program. The recognition of need for more contact and exchange in the total system was expressed in the interviews and by the degree of positive support given to such items as numbers 1, 2, 5, 13, and 21 in the questionnaire.

(2) Teachers and administrators are cognizant of the fact that school programs should be designed, planned, and implemented around the learner and should not be determined by administrative structure and configuration of the school. One respondent expressed it by saying, "No building, individual administrator, teacher or level of teachers should be able to easily determine or manipulate the program..." An administrator commented that the board cannot plead, no money; the administration cannot plead, no room; nor the professional staff plead, no time. Rather commitments must be made as to what is in the best interest of students and

then all put forth a positive attitude and effort. Again teachers' and administrators' responses to such items on the questionnaire as numbers 3, 5, 7, 17, and 24 tend to support this concept.

(3) In general, the teachers and administrators of Community Unit 2 Schools seem to be aware of the appropriateness in sequencing educational experiences from kindergarten through twelfth grade. Both teachers and administrators expressed concern about the lack of such continuity and particularly about the "gap" that could develop between the elementary and the secondary levels. Positive support for a curriculum continuum was generated both in interviews and the survey.

(4) A basic concept that can be deduced from the study is that the best intentions and most sophisticated plans will fail to materialize unless roles and functions are clearly defined and responsibilities explicitly assigned. There must be an organized effort to promote a smooth flow of educational experiences from one level to another. If not, discussions and studies about the problems of articulation become nothing more than just more philosophical pedagogism. With these basic concepts in mind, the recommendations contained herein and comments are made.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: Communication and cooperation are the very essence of any successful program of articulation. Communication must flow freely and openly within and between

all groups and segments making up the educational system. There must be portrayed a mutual feeling of trust and confidence exhibited through discussion, compromise, and agreement. The board of education sets the tone of such an atmosphere in a school system by its demonstration of a willingness to work together as a group toward the common good of the total program.

The board of education of the Robinson school system has not been the most exemplary in this regard during the last two or three years. Strife and disagreement displayed by the board on minor as well as important issues have created an atmosphere of distrust and lack of dedication and commitment that has to one degree or another permeated the whole system. The board should reassess its role as a prime mover in the communication model of the school system and become the catalyst through examples of cooperation among and between its own membership and by constructive action through joint board-superintendent-staff cooperation.

Recommendation 2: The role of the administrator as an educational leader could find no better challenge than in the problems resident in articulation. Where else could the administrator find a better framework for his role as master teacher and coordinator within the school system? Articulation difficulties frequently arise from a lack of coordination, and coordination stands as one of the chief functions of administration. Authentic leadership abilities are needed to lead a faculty to accept a plan for coordination and to

work toward its success.

The administrators, like the board of education, are catalyst in development of communications. It is of utmost importance that the administrative officers of the school district work as a team in an atmosphere of mutual trust and good will. The team composed of the superintendent and those staff members (line officers) who have administrative duties as their primary responsibility and function should function as an "administrative team" by adopting procedures to promote effective communication and cooperation in their joint efforts.

The superintendent must accept other administrative officers in the team effort as responsible administrative units and in return principals and other administrative officers in the team must recognize and accept the principle that the superintendent is by law and in practice the head of the school system. By virtue of his position, the superintendent is to be considered the only one directly responsible to the board of education for the administration of the total school district. This is not to imply that line officers should not have contact with the board of education or be called upon to make reports and recommendations to the board. It does mean that such recommendations and decisions should not be made until the "team" has had an opportunity to fully review and study together with the superintendent all the implications and ramifications and come to a consensus if other segments of the

system will be affected by the action. Such procedures and practices insures complete understanding and unity of effort along with full support from the chief administrative officer and other members of the team. This type of partnership effort is tantamount to a successful communication model.

The administrative council should meet weekly covering an agenda including items of mutual concern and district wide import. Since the instructional program is the main concern of the school, and since faulty articulation has been identified as a priority need of the district, it would seem appropriate that this council give substantial attention at its meetings to the discussion, planning, and development of activities promotive of good articulation practices. When the top administrative officials do not personally attend to these concerns, teachers often interpret this as meaning coordination of program is of limited importance.

Recommendation 3: The assignment of leadership responsibility for the coordination of the total district instructional program in a person who has adequate training, background, and experience in the area of curriculum development is essential if the problems of faculty articulation in the Robinson district are to be taken seriously. This person must be given the authority and responsibility to perform the role and function of curriculum director with the designation of Assistant Superintendent In-Charge of Instruction or some similar title appropriate to the

position. This officer would be a member of the administrative council providing leadership and receiving input at the council's deliberations on instructional program matters. Currently the only effort in this area on a district wide basis is being done by the superintendent which is a limited effort because of other demands.

An alternate but less effective means of getting program coordination would be to assign each district administrator a K-12 coordinating role. The superintendent may coordinate the mathematics program, the assistant superintendent in charge of business management the vocational program, the high school principal the English/language arts program, etc. An advantage to this type of arrangement would be it would force all to look at instruction on a unit wide basis regardless of particular administrative assignment. The big disadvantage is the lack of time and energy to adequately perform the responsibility because of other demands.

Recommendation 4: A need which became apparent in the study is the establishment of formal and feasible means of communication and contact whereby staff at various level and within disciplines can come together and give full attention to problems of articulation. The current lack of any systematic plan on a district wide basis to accomplish this purpose and strong support on the part of the staff were evident in many items of the survey.

It is recommended that a competent and experienced staff member in each of the major disciplines be appointed with commensurate release time and/or remuneration as a district wide coordinator for that discipline. A composite of this group would be the Articulation Council or the Instructional Council. The administrator assigned responsibility for instructional coordination on district wide basis would meet and be a part of this council. Such a group should meet approximately once every two weeks to set tasks, create study subcommittees, and act as a general steering committee for the district's instructional program. The committee's reports and recommendations would be carried directly to the Administrative Council.

So the total staff involvement may be accomplished in the all important task of program coordination, provisions should be made for teacher contact and communication on a vertical and horizontal basis. Monthly released time through early dismissal of approximately one hour should be authorized by the board of education. This time would be used on alternate basis providing opportunity for all teachers to meet by grade levels throughout the district for horizontal articulation purposes and by discipline or interdisciplinary structure K-12 for vertical program purposes. The discipline coordinators would serve as chairpersons at vertical group meetings and as liaison to the Articulation Council.

This type of organizational structure is working successfully in many school districts. However, its success will be

determined in each local situation by the degree of administrative support given and commitment on part of total staff.

Recommendation 5: The task of articulation involves the taking of a broader point of view than ordinarily is held by most educators. It requires flexibility, open-mindedness and a willingness to try new and possibly more effective ways as well as to discard time tried new practices that have proven to be ineffective. It requires educators to become understanding and knowledgeable about philosophical differences held by colleagues at the various levels.

Many of these differences stem from different training backgrounds and experiences and it behooves all to gain a greater breadth of vision as to what problems are encountered in the learning process kindergarten through twelfth grade. Secondary teachers, in general, need to know more about how individuals develop and learn at the early childhood years so they may more effectively help their students to take advantage of the strengths and weaknesses they have acquired while growing. Elementary teachers need to take a long, hard look at what lies ahead for the child and do things now with children that will help them face the future with well-founded confidence.

An official commitment should be made on the part of the board of education and the administration to encourage teachers to engage in retraining. Incentives and provisions should be made that would encourage teachers to either return

to campus or enroll in extension classes which help to broaden understanding and insight into the areas discussed. Special classes can be arranged with nearby universities designed to meet local need. To encourage participation, the school district can share cost of course with the participant as is done in some school systems or by allowing credit on the salary schedule.

Recommendation 6: The Nuttall Middle School will have been in operation three years by the end of the 1975-76 school year. District wide staff commitment to the "open concept" approach now being implemented in that school is something less than desirable for the program to succeed. It is providing an excellent on site opportunity for the school and community to try and evaluate an alternative mode of education. It no doubt will prove to have many desirable features and some not so desirable. Evaluative criteria should now be developed as to what is expected out of this program and a complete evaluation be made during 1975-76 school year. Adjustments must be made and directions determined as to how the current middle school "gap" is to be articulated into the total school program.

Recommendation 7: The Flat Rock attendance center, particularly the sixth, seventh and eighth grades, is an island to itself in relation to the total instructional program. It is not only a moral but a statutory obligation in the State of Illinois that all students within a school district must be provided equal opportunities in all

educational programs and services provided by the system. A feasibility study as to how best articulate the upper three grade levels at this school with that of the same grade levels at the Nuttall Middle School so as to provide the required and justifiable program and services is needed.

Recommendation 8: A systematic program should be developed that would identify the learning skills to be attained in each discipline at the various levels along with more specific learning objectives by subject area. Those guides should be developed by the instructional staff supported by the administration and implemented at the earliest opportunity to avoid the gaps and duplication in curriculum sequence. Expectations currently are not coordinated at the various exit levels creating serious transition problems for some students.

Recommendation 9: Additional services are needed to give personal attention and help to the developmental problems encountered by students as they move through the educational program at the elementary level. Continuity in learning for a student is an individual, internal affair, which, in the final analysis, only the student can manage. However, to assist the student in the management of his growth and development, to which he can respond on no level but his own, the student must have the personal attention necessary to insure that he be able to manage problems commensurate with his ability and readiness. This specialized guidance help and attention is of vital importance at the

primary and intermediate levels to avoid the student's being thrust into situations for which he is not maturationally, experientially and psychologically ready. This expanded downward program should be closely coordinated with the services at the middle school and the high school.

It is the writer's opinion that the guidance program of a school system should develop from the primary level upward contrary to the developmental pattern experienced in most public school systems. It should be a program of prevention. Students who are left to face frustrating school experiences which they are totally unable to handle during the early and late elementary years face serious problems later for themselves and others. By the time the student has reached the middle school or high school age, the problems are so complex and bewildering that the most competent guidance service at those levels cannot help.

APPENDIX A
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE

TABLE 30

TOTAL SUMMARY FOR ALL ITEMS RANKED BY COMBINED TOTAL PERCENTAGES
OF COLUMNS ONE AND TWO

Survey Item Number	Rank	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice						Current Use		
		1	2	3	4	5	No Re- sponce	Yes	No	No Re- sponce
Item 1	1	(49) 45	(34) 31	(18) 16	(4) 3	(2) 2	(2) 2	(65) 60	(39) 35	(5) 5
Item 3	2	(33) 30	(36) 33	(23) 21	(8) 7	(7) 6	(2) 2	(25) 23	(80) 73	(4) 4
Item 17	2	(46) 42	(23) 21	(26) 24	(7) 6	(7) 6	. . .	(68) 62	(37) 34	(4) 4
Item 2	3	(37) 34	(31) 28	(25) 23	(12) 11	(2) 2	(2) 2	(40) 37	(64) 59	(4) 4
Item 19	3	(36) 33	(32) 29	(27) 25	(9) 8	(3) 3	(2) 2	(41) 38	(60) 55	(8) 7
Item 13	4	(31) 28	(36) 33	(28) 26	(7) 6	(5) 5	(2) 2	(12) 11	(92) 84	(5) 5
Item 18	4	(35) 32	(32) 29	(30) 28	(5) 5	(5) 5	(2) 2	(85) 78	(20) 18	(4) 4
Item 21	4	(33) 30	(34) 31	(21) 19	(10) 9	(8) 7	(3) 3	(21) 19	(82) 75	(6) 6
Item 24	5	(29) 27	(33) 30	(21) 19	(10) 9	(11) 10	(5) 5	(20) 18	(82) 75	(7) 6
Item 14	5	(32) 29	(31) 28	(28) 26	(10) 9	(6) 6	(2) 2	(71) 65	(36) 33	(2) 2
Item 5	6	(31) 28	(30) 28	(30) 28	(9) 8	(5) 5	(4) 4	(52) 48	(47) 43	(9) 10
Item 9	7	(24) 22	(35) 32	(31) 28	(10) 9	(8) 7	(1) 1	(17) 16	(91) 83	(1) 1

TABLE 30--Continued

Survey Item Number	Rank	Number () and Percent ^a for Each Value Choice											Current Use						
		1		2		3		4		5		No Re- sponce		Yes		No		No Re- sponce	
Item 4	8	(19)	17	(38)	35	(30)	28	(11)	10	(8)	7	(3)	3	(23)	21	(84)	77	(2)	2
Item 16	8	(30)	28	(26)	24	(31)	28	(12)	11	(7)	6	(3)	3	(35)	32	(70)	64	(4)	4
Item 6	9	(29)	27	(23)	21	(26)	24	(17)	16	(13)	12	(1)	1	(14)	13	(94)	86	(1)	1
Item 12	9	(18)	17	(34)	31	(28)	26	(17)	16	(11)	10	. . .		(37)	34	(69)	63	(3)	3
Item 22	9	(22)	20	(31)	28	(32)	29	(10)	9	(11)	10	(3)	3	(33)	30	(72)	66	(4)	4
Item 15	10	(17)	16	(22)	20	(20)	18	(15)	14	(31)	28	(4)	4	(26)	24	(78)	72	(5)	5
Item 23	11	(22)	20	(29)	27	(34)	31	(15)	14	(8)	7	(1)	1	(13)	12	(92)	84	(4)	4
Item 7	12	(18)	17	(29)	27	(38)	35	(14)	13	(9)	8	(1)	1	(39)	36	(68)	62	(2)	2
Item 8	12	(22)	20	(26)	24	(30)	28	(13)	12	(16)	15	(2)	2	(35)	23	(82)	75	(2)	2
Item 10	13	(18)	17	(13)	12	(28)	26	(12)	11	(36)	33	(2)	2	(2)	2	(104)	95	(3)	3
Item 11	14	(27)	25	(19)	17	(15)	14	(21)	19	(26)	24	(1)	1	(4)	4	(104)	95	(1)	1
Item 25	15	(12)	11	(17)	16	(25)	23	(23)	21	(30)	28	(2)	2	(93)	85	(12)	11	(3)	3

^a Approximate percent

APPENDIX B

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE ON
ARTICULATION

APPENDIX B

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE ON ARTICULATION

Charles, A.D. "Achieving Articulation of Subject Matter," School and Community. 54:16, February 1968.

A survey of 72 junior and senior high principals and teachers in St. Louis (Missouri) County revealed that about 50 percent considered articulation of the curriculum as a major problem, with senior high personnel considering it more important than junior high personnel. Forty-two principals listed the following problems in articulation.

1. Lack of time for teachers to meet.
2. Lack of supervisory personnel.
3. Lack of money.
4. Frequent curriculum changes.
5. Senior high attempts to dictate to the junior high school.

The article points out that articulation is not concerned with having all schools study the same subject at the same time. It is concerned with the effective transfer of the student from one unit to another.

The following are suggested as ways to promote articulation:

1. Develop a common philosophy of objectives.
2. Organize a curriculum department for the system.
3. Hold workshops between units.
4. Use intervisitation of teachers.
5. Coordinate the guidance program.

Good articulation minimizes conflicts and readjustment problems. It aids in reducing failures and drop-outs.

Committee on Educational Research, Minnesota Studies in Articulation, University of Minnesota Press, 1937.

Human learning is a continuous process, and the pattern of learning is seldom represented by the form of school organization. When the natural, continuous processes of learning are divided by the near gridiron pattern of school structure so expedient in the management of large numbers of students, an artificial stratification of education develops and injects obstacles into the normal process of development.

Dixon, Lyle J. "Articulation Between Elementary and Junior High School Programs in Mathematics and Associated Problems,"

School Science and Mathematics, 67:341-5, April 1967.

It is pointed out that authors of elementary textbooks rarely write junior high textbooks, thus there is a problem in transition. The teacher manuals are also lacking here. These and other conditions make a smooth articulation from elementary to junior high school difficult for the child. Another is the lack of agreement among educators as to what should be taught at each given level.

One of the suggested solutions is specialized in-service education for both elementary and junior high teachers, which may be part of the school's overall in-service program or workshops and summer sessions offered by teacher education institutions. Teachers must work together to concur on the sequence of subject matter, either in the development of guides or in the careful selection of textbooks. It is suggested that every teacher have on her desk a copy of the textbook used by her class the year before and a copy of the text that will probably be used the following year.

Foshay, Arthur W., "A Note on Articulation, Educational Research Bulletin (Ohio State University) 35:187-90, 1956.

The basic solution to the problem of inarticulation in the school program requires changing the attitudes of the people involved. It is helpful to view inarticulation as a "break" in the program of a student preventing him from moving smoothly from one phase to another.

In a very real sense, the student must undertake transition in the American public school system almost continuously, at the end of the school term, at the end of the school day, and even at the end of each unit under study.

Each division is arbitrary. Each was developed to fulfill collective, rather than individual needs of students in a program of universal education. Many exist simply to meet institutional necessities of faculty size, physical space, and curricular specialization. And in the interest of that mass education and of that expedient functioning of its institutions, the individual student's needs are very frequently subordinated.

It is important to note that the break is not intended to meet the needs of the individual students, one at a time. Every time we change things for students on a mass basis, we are in trouble precisely because we have dealt with the mass instead of with the individual.

We who make these decisions for the mass, have to recognize that we place our own values in conflict--we act

in terms of the good of the mass and the institution instead of the good of the individual, despite our belief in the sacredness of the individual and the necessity of a school that allows at every point for individual differences. This value conflict is at the root of the problem when each year teachers and others involved raise the question concerning articulation and usually come out with the same answer: "Let's get together; let's introduce some flexibility."

Another source of difficulty relative to the topic of articulation has to do with philosophical differences held by the elementary teacher and the secondary teacher. The elementary-school teacher is concerned with the child as he has been, or possibly as he is, whereas his secondary-school teacher is concerned primarily with preparing him for what he will be. A well-educated elementary-school teacher derives her authority from close study of the children she faces; a well-educated secondary-school teacher faces exactly in the opposite direction. While she acknowledges the differences in achievement and potentiality of her students, she derives her authority from an analysis of the future which the student will be expected to meet and cope. She knows the demands to be made on the student will be quite arbitrary. The trouble is that the teachers are back to back, trying to communicate with each other. If this picture of the two be accurate, then the solution to the problem of bringing about better articulation is for them to adopt a posture that permits them to face toward one another. Elementary teachers must take a long, hard look at what lies ahead for their children - not only to the secondary school but beyond into the workaday world or college. Secondary teachers must take a long, hard look at the facts and principles of human development and act on them. If these changes in posture were made, elementary and secondary school teachers would be looking at the past, present, and future of children.

"The task of articulation involves the taking of a broader point of view than ordinarily is held. Only if teachers summon the open-mindedness required can they pursue effectively the ideal of a common school program."

Gow, J. Steele, Jr., "Articulation Between Secondary Schools and Colleges," National Association Women Deans Counselors 24:11-15, May 1960.

Basic to much of the interference with the natural continuity of learning is the traditional, seemingly indispensable, and widely assailed presupposition by curriculum planners that each student has mastered the content of the preceding grade level. Accordingly, the graduate

school continues to blame the college, the college the high school, the high school the elementary school, and so on, presumably back to some prenatal casualty, thereby relieving everyone of responsibility for inadequate educational preparation--everyone but the student.

As the student arrives at a higher educational unit unprepared for its curriculum, the unit accommodates itself by the repetition of subject matter and duplication of effort thus perpetuating the articulation problem. Rather than improving articulation between schools in order to remove the cause of inadequate or improper preparation, each educational unit looks to its own remedial program to alleviate the effect.

Hodge, Marion W. "Articulation of Secondary and Elementary Schools," California Journal of Secondary Education, Vol. 31, No. 6, October 1956, pp. 322-325.

Whittier Union High School District (California) organized a voluntary program of articulation between and within elementary and secondary schools. Sound articulation measures were developed within the various academic departments of the schools concerned. The departmental activities were carefully planned by committees representing all segments of the school, with different subject areas receiving major emphasis each year. The measures included such things as curriculum development, visitation, workshops, in-service meetings, exchange of statements of philosophy, and others. Many tangible outcomes emerged from this project, such as bibliographies, community resource files, tape recordings, classroom guides, and other materials designed to coordinate various aspects of the program.

The guidance personnel responsible for stimulating interest in articulation were charged with developing continuing plans for coordination. Arrangements were constantly sought to have teacher and pupil inter-visitation between the elementary schools and the high schools and to provide added information about high school courses so that eighth graders might make more intelligent choices.

Hunter, Ernest L. "Articulation for Continuity in the School Program," The National Elementary Principal, Vol. XLXI, No. 3, January 1967, pp. 58-60.

Among the reasons why articulation problems exist are:

1. Failure of teacher education to develop a sensitivity for problems at various levels.
2. Failure of college faculty to understand and emphasize the interrelationships among the disciplines.

3. Inadequate attention in teacher education programs to principles of child and adolescent development and to the various theories of learning.
4. Inability or unwillingness of teachers to determine what is being taught at other levels.
5. Failure to plan curriculum on a K-12 basis.
6. Shortsightedness of administrators in recognizing the problems of articulation.

Some suggestions for improved articulation are:

1. Coordination and cooperation at administrative levels.
2. System-wide curriculum planning.
3. In-service plans for teacher exchange.
4. System-wide coordinators.

This paper points out that the main reasons for poor articulation is the widespread lack of understanding of the problems encountered by colleagues at different levels. The situation can be remedied if the profession desires to exert the effort.

Juckett, Edwin A. "A Pleasant Bridge in the Hyde Park Schools," Clearing House, 29:81-3, October 1954.

Hyde Park (New York) schools reported a successful plan to reduce the articulation problems between its elementary and junior high schools. The plans were largely confined to grades six and seven. Some of the methods used to effect articulation were:

1. Teachers from grades six and seven met at least three times each year for discussion and work sessions.
2. Elementary and junior high teachers exchanged classrooms for a few days each year.
3. English and reading curriculum guides were completed for grades six and seven.
4. Sixth grade teacher-prepared reports on each child were forwarded to the seventh grade teachers.
5. Each sixth grade classroom selected a member to go to the junior high school for a day and report back to his class on his observations and reactions.
6. Sixth grade music groups presented a Christmas concert to the junior high school.

In the final analysis, the report stressed the need for teacher planning, initiation, cooperation, and understanding to make articulation work.

Keller, Charles R., "Articulation," Harvard Graduate School of Education Bulletin, 3:14-17, September 1958.

The benefits that can come from improvement in articulation are optimistically stated by Keller. "With improvement in the art of articulation, students will gain,

teachers will gain, schools and colleges will gain, and there will be a real advancement of education." He dwells considerably on what he calls "academic gaposis" as well as the wasteful duplication of efforts, materials and instruction in many school systems.

Romine, Stephen A. "Articulation: A Look at the Twelve-Year Program," The North Central Association Quarterly, 35:274-7, April 1961.

If a private, creative enterprise were operated with no more articulation and cooperation than typically characterizes American education, it would soon fail or go bankrupt. Schools should review the losses (both economic and human) that results from their inefficiency in achieving effective articulation.

It is not enough for each grade level to do a good job independently, the instructional program must be coordinated and be a continuing effort. Some of the factors that need to be considered are:

1. The learner is really the only element that extends throughout the K-12 program. Most of what we do focuses on the environment around the learner. We need to do more about those things within the learner.
2. The factor that receives too little attention is the teacher. Altered schedules, K-12 curriculum guides, and articulation policies may be good, but it is all to no avail if the teacher does not function effectively in bringing about articulation.
3. Curriculum development is usually a piecemeal activity at best. In most cases the individual teacher works on it without much guidance other than the adopted text.
4. Too many courses have recently been "pushed down" to lower levels to make room for advanced placement programs in the senior high school. This frequently is done without any appraisal of their intrinsic value at any level.

Romine suggests that many of the problems would be lessened if we would place more emphasis on learning and less on teaching. Upper levels (junior and senior high schools) cannot rely on the elementary school to develop all the skills of learning that are necessary for success in school. Teachers, administrators, and guidance personnel must work together within their schools with the other educational institutions in the community to make articulation a reality.

Shane, Harold G. "A Curriculum Continuum: Possible Trends in the Seventies," Phi Delta Kappan, 51:389-92, March 1970.

There are several reasons why urgent priority should be given to a genuine continuity in education. Some of

these are:

1. Learning is a continuous process. There is no reason-except administrative convenience-for it to be broken into four or six-year time blocks.
2. Articulation cannot be achieved as long as we have a "graded" and "segmented" school configuration.
3. The present uncoordinated divisions are barriers and hurdles in the educational progress of children and youth.
4. The challenge of building a sound, well-conceived curriculum continuum is one which can help educators orient themselves in a confused and confusing culture.

Shane describes the curriculum continuum as learning that extends throughout the year. It is personalized (as contrasted with individualized) and it is characterized by psychologically supportive qualities of the continuum. In the program there would be no failures, no annual promotions, and no drop-outs. Special education and remedial education would cease to exist, and compensatory education would terminate, for the education of every child would be personalized.

Sobel, Thomas. "The Broader Meaning of Articulation," Phi Delta Kappan, 53:25-29, September 1971.

Sobel insists that the real articulation problems in our schools are not the "gaps" in the content of the subject matter but the "gaps" in society. He points to the widening gulf between the "haves" and the "have nots" as well as between the blacks and the whites. He points to another gap--the yawning gap between school and life. Still another rift is to be found in the school between intellectual (cognitive) emphasis and the expression and development of feeling and intuition. There are many ways that the school can lessen these gaps, but it cannot be done without plans and continuing effort.

Strickland, JoAnn H. and William Alexander. "Seeking Continuity in Early and Middle School Education," Phi Delta Kappan. March 1969, pp. 397-400.

This paper lists five purposes of the middle school while pointing out that there are many similarities between these five aims and certain inherent aspects of early childhood education. The continuing curriculum of the middle school fits well into the elementary school's multi-age grouping, team teaching, instructional strategies. and other elements.

The following suggestions are made for improving continuity in learning through pre-adolescence education, and possibly even extending into the high school.

1. Alternative models of schooling should be developed which utilize coordinated program and staffing patterns for the total K-12 sequence.
2. School faculties from the several school levels should cooperatively construct curriculum sequences which allow for differences in communication skills, cognitive processes, creativity, and so forth.
3. Local school systems should coordinate facilities, programs, and services throughout the total system.
4. Teacher education should provide experience in team work for several age levels.
5. Program planning for all levels should draw heavily upon family and community involvement, giving emphasis on the common efforts of the school, home, and community in the growth and development of the child.

Stutz, Rowan C., "Strategies for Strengthening Small Schools," North Central Association Quarterly, Vol. XLII:196-199, Fall 1967.

In this article, Stutz deals with strategies for bringing about change and some of the implications of innovative change. Since continuity and its often demand for flexibility by staff are basic to a sound and strong program of articulation, this article merits attention. A requisite for change is "gaining commitment to a new set of goals." Individuals and systems tend to function to maintain the integrity of institutionalized value system. The tendency to resist pressures to change important values is great.

Another is producing environmental conditions and mobilizing the resources necessary to the attainment of new goals. Because a school exists in and is dependent for support upon a situation that is external to it, the sources of an innovation will depend to a considerable degree upon the ability to mobilize the resources and support of the community, school district, or state for the attainment of a given set of goals.

Changing the value system and retraining staff are other important factors to be considered in innovating change. Innovation is not likely to survive unless there is a strong staff commitment to the change, at least on the part of those teachers involved. Where innovations have failed the weak point has usually been human rather than theoretical. The capacity, energy, and commitment of the teacher still are the crucial elements in effective instruction.

When program change is made, integrating the change with all other units of the system is important. One can safely assume that the introduction of an innovation will disturb an equilibrium and that accommodations through out the system will be necessary in order to create a new equilibrium. Many good instructional programs have failed because of failure to properly integrate them with other aspects of the program.

Wilhelm, Fred T. "Elementary and Secondary School Principals-Partners in Pressure," The National Elementary Principal. Vol. XLVII, No. 6, May 1968, pp. 75-79.

New demands on the secondary school have major implications for the elementary school. The trend toward the middle school provides a buffer to some degree, but even the middle school is constrained to respond to the pressures of the senior high school. The high school itself is being pressured to provide better vocational preparation, to develop a social studies program that "works," and to place a major emphasis on a unified humanities program.

The educational and societal changes today make it more important than that elementary and secondary principals work more closely together, not only on curricular problems but also in facing those stresses that evolve from teacher militancy and contract negotiations. In the face of mounting problems, it is questionable that one group of educational leaders can go it alone. Hence elementary and secondary school principals must band together with other educational leaders to exert their maximum force on behalf of good education for all youth.

APPENDIX C

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Fellow Teacher:

Attached is a questionnaire entitled "A Basis for Articulation in Community Unit #2 Schools." It is a tool designed to assist me in analyzing the present and needed practices of articulation in Unit #2, a project approved by the Superintendent of Schools and one to be a part of a "field study" in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Specialist in Education Degree for which I am a candidate.

However, of more importance to you, this study will attempt to identify some of the present anticipated weaknesses of articulation in Community Unit #2 Schools which will include the new middle school in the fall of 1973 and to make recommendations for same. Your response to this questionnaire will be most helpful and greatly appreciated.

The term ARTICULATION as used in this survey instrument and study is defined as, "The degree to which the interlocking and interrelation of the successive levels of the educational system facilitate continuous and efficient educational progress of pupils."

Before you fill out the check-list type questionnaire attached, please be sure to designate your grade or subject taught current year, number of years taught in system including this year and the highest educational degree currently held. Kindly check the degree of importance to our local situation in your judgement each item given. The items are each given a value with one (1) as the most important, two (2) very important, three (3) important, four (4) fairly important, and five (5) least important. Check your value choice at the right of each item and under the appropriate number heading. Do not omit an item.

Also, please check the "yes" or "no" box whether the technique or concept to the best of your knowledge is currently being applied on a regular basis in Unit #2 Schools.

Example:

1. Anecdotal records can play a great part in facilitating pupil progress from one level to another.

1	2	3	4	5
		✓		

Yes	No
	✓

Sincerely yours,

Carl E. House

QUESTIONNAIRE

"A BASIS FOR ARTICULATION IN COMMUNITY UNIT #2 SCHOOLS"

Grade Level: _____ and/or subject taught: _____

Years taught: _____ In System: _____ Highest Degree _____

1. Faculties serving the various levels should cooperatively and continuously construct curriculum sequences K-12.

2. Plans for coordination among primary, intermediate, middle, and high school levels include ways of jointly and efficiently using special services and facilities such as health, guidance and testing services, media centers and libraries, laboratories, gymnasiums, auditoriums, etc.

3. De-emphasize the "graded and segmented" concepts by interest groups developing alternative modes of schooling utilizing closely coordinated programs and staffing patterns focused upon the learner not levels.

4. Staffing practices embodying the principles of sharing teachers, multi-grade level assignments, team teaching, intravisitation by teachers.

5. The "Administrative Team" concept implemented through periodic meetings of the chief administrative officer with principals, coordinators, department heads and/or others in a supervisory-administrative capacity functioning as a decision making and policy recommending body on administrative matters.

	1	2	3	4	5	Yes	No
1. Faculties serving the various levels should cooperatively and continuously construct curriculum sequences K-12.							
2. Plans for coordination among primary, intermediate, middle, and high school levels include ways of jointly and efficiently using special services and facilities such as health, guidance and testing services, media centers and libraries, laboratories, gymnasiums, auditoriums, etc.							
3. De-emphasize the "graded and segmented" concepts by interest groups developing alternative modes of schooling utilizing closely coordinated programs and staffing patterns focused upon the learner not levels.							
4. Staffing practices embodying the principles of sharing teachers, multi-grade level assignments, team teaching, intravisitation by teachers.							
5. The "Administrative Team" concept implemented through periodic meetings of the chief administrative officer with principals, coordinators, department heads and/or others in a supervisory-administrative capacity functioning as a decision making and policy recommending body on administrative matters.							

A curriculum specialist assigned to the central office staff designated as "Curriculum Coordinator", "Supervisor of Instruction" or some similar title whose chief function would be in the area of curriculum coordination and supervision K-12.

Specially planned and conducted programs of complete orientation to the next organizational level for students and parents at the "break points" (8th grade, 5th grade and possibly 3rd grade) should be held.

A district wide continuing curriculum planning group composed of teachers, administrators and students (and perhaps parents) whose chief function is to serve as a recommending body on all curriculum matters.

A district wide program of communications be established through various media devices originating from the central office presenting policies, philosophy, reports, recommendations, new programs and directions, budgetary considerations, etc.

An on-going exchange-teacher day or days whereby a secondary school teacher would serve as an elementary or middle school teacher and the fellow teacher would take over his colleague's classes at the high school level, etc.

All non-teaching certified personnel in the district (principals, assistants, coordinators, superintendent, etc.) be expected to actually substitute teach a specified number of days each year as an avenue of contact.

	1	2	3	4	5	Yes	No
A curriculum specialist assigned to the central office staff designated as "Curriculum Coordinator", "Supervisor of Instruction" or some similar title whose chief function would be in the area of curriculum coordination and supervision K-12.							
Specially planned and conducted programs of complete orientation to the next organizational level for students and parents at the "break points" (8th grade, 5th grade and possibly 3rd grade) should be held.							
A district wide continuing curriculum planning group composed of teachers, administrators and students (and perhaps parents) whose chief function is to serve as a recommending body on all curriculum matters.							
A district wide program of communications be established through various media devices originating from the central office presenting policies, philosophy, reports, recommendations, new programs and directions, budgetary considerations, etc.							
An on-going exchange-teacher day or days whereby a secondary school teacher would serve as an elementary or middle school teacher and the fellow teacher would take over his colleague's classes at the high school level, etc.							
All non-teaching certified personnel in the district (principals, assistants, coordinators, superintendent, etc.) be expected to actually substitute teach a specified number of days each year as an avenue of contact.							

Student "visiting days" to the middle school and the secondary level for the purposes of welcoming, assisting and orienting.

More systematic and efficient system of planning and purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment allowing for coordinated use and control, avoiding duplication and waste.

A person assigned the responsibility and authority to coordinate and schedule all after school hours extra-curricular activities and facilities throughout the Unit.

Departmental chairman at high school level and head teachers at the middle school and elementary levels provided adequate released time for coordinating instructional efforts both vertically and horizontally.

A formal program of evaluation for total Unit to analyze program effectiveness in relation to established goals.

To achieve a maximization of communication and understanding, attention should be given to the development of a communication model for the Unit emphasizing wide participation and involvement of all parties associated with the educational process.

	1	2	3	4	5	Yes	No
Student "visiting days" to the middle school and the secondary level for the purposes of welcoming, assisting and orienting.							
More systematic and efficient system of planning and purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment allowing for coordinated use and control, avoiding duplication and waste.							
A person assigned the responsibility and authority to coordinate and schedule all after school hours extra-curricular activities and facilities throughout the Unit.							
Departmental chairman at high school level and head teachers at the middle school and elementary levels provided adequate released time for coordinating instructional efforts both vertically and horizontally.							
A formal program of evaluation for total Unit to analyze program effectiveness in relation to established goals.							
To achieve a maximization of communication and understanding, attention should be given to the development of a communication model for the Unit emphasizing wide participation and involvement of all parties associated with the educational process.							

A basic approach toward eliminating the problems of articulation within the Unit is a philosophy of learning away from the stratified "graded" or "levels" of learning approach to the "nongraded" or "continuous progress" approach throughout the school system.

The use of grades or marks in evaluating the progress of students aids the continuity of learning experiences as student progresses through the educational program.

1	2	3	4	5

Yes	No

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brimm, Paul R. "Fostering Articulation Within and Between Schools." Occasional Paper Number One. Commission on Schools: North Central Association (Chicago).
- Charles, A. D. "Achieving Articulation of Subject Matter." School and Community 54 (February 1968):16.
- Committee on Education Research. Minnesota Studies in Articulation. University of Minnesota Press, 1937.
- Cow, J. Steele, Jr. "Articulation Between Secondary Schools and Colleges." National Association Women Deans Counselors 24 (May 1960):11,15.
- Dictionary of Education. rev ed. (1959) s.v. "Articulation."
- Dixon, Lyle J. "Articulation Between Elementary and Junior High School Programs in Mathematics and Associated Problems." School Science and Mathematics 67 (April 1967): 341-5.
- Foshay, Arthur W. "A Note on Articulation." Educational Research Bulletin 35 (1956):187-90.
- Hodge, Marion W. "Articulation of Secondary and Elementary Schools." California Journal of Secondary Education 31 (October 1956):322-25.
- Hunter, Ernest L. "Articulation: For Continuity in the School Program." National Elementary Principal (January 1967) 58,66.
- Illinois. The Illinois Program for Evaluation, Supervision, and Recognition. (Springfield:1973) Illinois Office of Education.
- Juckett, Edwin A. "A Pleasant Bridge in the Hyde Park Schools." Clearing House, October 1954, pp.81-3.
- Keller, Charles R. "Articulation." Harvard Graduate School of Education Bulletin 3 (September 1958):14-17.
- Romine, Stephen A. "Articulation: A Look at the Twelve Year Program." North Central Association Quarterly (Spring 1961):274-77.

- Shane, Harold G. "A Curriculum Continuum: Possible Trends in The Seventies." Phi Delta Kappan, March 1970, pp. 389-92.
- Sobel, Thomas. "The Broader Meaning of Articulation." Phi Delta Kappan, September 1971, pp. 25-29.
- Strickland, JoAnn H. and William Alexander. "Seeking Continuity in Early and Middle School Education." Phi Delta Kappan, March 1969, pp. 397-400.
- Stutz, Rowan C. "Strategies for Strengthening Small Schools." North Central Association Quarterly (Fall 1967):196-99.
- Wiles, Jon. "The Middle School: Alternative within the System." National Elementary Principal (November 1971): 46-51.
- Wilhelm, Fred T. "Elementary and Secondary School Principals-Partners in Pressure." National Elementary Principal (May 1969): 75-79.