



University of Nebraska at Omaha  
DigitalCommons@UNO

---

Student Work

---

5-1-1988

# An Assessment of the Core Curriculum in the Junior High Schools of the Omaha Public Schools

Timothy Collins

*University of Nebraska at Omaha*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

---

## Recommended Citation

Collins, Timothy, "An Assessment of the Core Curriculum in the Junior High Schools of the Omaha Public Schools" (1988). *Student Work*. 2649.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2649>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact [unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).



AN ASSESSMENT OF THE CORE CURRICULUM  
IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS OF  
THE OMAHA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A Field Project Proposal

Presented to the

Department of Educational Administration and Supervision

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Specialist in Education

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Timothy Collins

May 1988

UMI Number: EP74193

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP74193

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

FIELD PROJECT ACCEPTANCE

Acceptance for the faculty of the Graduate College, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Specialist in Education, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

Name	Department
<i>Blaine E. Ward</i>	<i>Ed admin + Supervision</i>
<i>Dorothy Fellows</i>	<i>Ed Adm.</i>
<i>Sam R. Jani</i>	<i>Teacher Education</i>

*Blaine E. Ward*  
Chairman

*April 18, 1988*  
Date

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Acknowledgements . . . . .	.iii
List of Tables . . . . .	iv
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	.1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	.2
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	.3
Significance of the Problem . . . . .	.4
Assumptions . . . . .	.6
Definition of Terms . . . . .	.6
Delimitation of the Study . . . . .	.7
Method of Study . . . . .	.7
Organization of the Study . . . . .	.8
2. REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE	10
3. PROCEDURES AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY . . . . .	28
Development of the Instrument . . . . .	28
Validation . . . . .	28
Description of the Survey Population	
Administration of the Instrument . . . . .	29
The Treatment of Data . . . . .	30
4. THE ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	31
Common Characteristics of the	
Original Core Program . . . . .	32
True Core Curriculum and	
Certification Data . . . . .	46
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	51
Restatement of the Problem . . . . .	51
Principal Findings and Conclusions . . . . .	51
Recommendations for Future Research . . . . .	55
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	57
APPENDIX A . . . . .	59

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people deserve thanks for their assistance with this project.

The writer's faculty committee chairman -- Dr. Blaine E. Ward was helpful in providing direction, encouragement and giving technical advice and leadership in all aspects of the project.

Dr. Thomas Petrie was especially helpful during the development of the project proposal, helping the writer to give shape to his ideas and chapter 1.

Finally, the writer's family - Helga (my lovely wife), Raymond (son), Steven (son), and Kristina (granddaughter) -- deserve thanks for their support during a time when their husband, father, and grandfather spent more evenings and weekends in the library or at the computer keyboard than at home. Their prayers, words of encouragement and understanding were a comfort and a blessing.

TABLES

Tables	page
1. Common Characteristics of the Original Core Program . . . . .	35
2. 7th and 8th Grade Core Teachers Ranking of Seven Definitions of the Term "Core" . . . . .	44
3. Teaching a True Core Curriculum and Certification . . . . .	48
4. Certification Information . . . . .	49

## CHAPTER ONE

### Introduction

The origin of the term "Core," is uncertain, but programs bearing that label began to appear in 1929 and 30. The progressive movement was partially responsible for a movement to integrate and fuse courses in order to make them more meaningful and useful. Thus courses in the science were combined into general science and history, geography, government and economics into the social studies. It was also hoped that these fusions would more closely meet the needs of all youth. This trend led to the "core curriculum," in which subject matter lines were diminished. Although relatively few core curricula were inaugurated, some of them were centered around the study of the problems of youth and society. They drew their content from whatever subject fields were pertinent to the problems under study. In other instances, they merely represent the combination of two or more courses or subjects to form an interdisciplinary double-period course (Clark, Klein and Burks 1972).

The core program was introduced in the Omaha Public School system with the opening of Monroe Junior High School in 1956. The schedule was a three-period



block with one teacher in grades seven and eight. This "Core Block" was to provide for the gradual transition of students from the self contained elementary school classroom to the completely departmentalized program of 9th grade. The core program was interdisciplinary in nature and one in which language arts and social studies were combined subjects. A two or three hour block of time permitted correlation and integration of subjects and skills taught in the core block. The extended block of time also allowed time for group guidance and more personalized teacher-student relationships. The program was designed also to help students deal with both personal and societal problems under a teacher who knew the students well.

Today, in the Omaha Public School system the core program is a part of the seventh and eighth grade curriculum offerings in nine of the ten junior high schools. The one remaining junior high school is a ninth grade center. A staff of 90 teachers provide educational experiences in the core block.

#### Statement of the Problem

The problem was, to what extent do the ten common characteristics of the original core program guide the structure and instruction in the Omaha Public School

Junior High Schools.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent the following ten common characteristics of the original core program were being met, not being met, or being modified to meet or exceed the original goals by the Omaha Public School system. A true core program possesses the following characteristics (Alberty 1959):

1. Learning activities cut across conventional subject-matter lines.
2. The core utilizes a relatively large block of time in the daily schedule in order to make possible diversified activities such as trips, library work, discussions, demonstrations, and experimentation, without disruption of other scheduled classes.
3. The core provides for the extensive use of teacher-student planning in terms of the long-range needs, problems, and interests of students.
4. The core teacher engages in frequent cooperative planning and teaching to maximize the use of the specialized abilities of the teaching staff.
5. The scope and sequence of learning activities are determined by the needs of the students rather than by the logical organization of any one subject or

field.

6. The core organization discourages the use of long periods for drill or laboratory exercises which do not contribute directly to the central problems involved in the unit.

7. The core absorbs the activities generally assigned to homerooms, such as class business, social affairs, and the recording and reporting of student progress.

8. Core programs include the guidance and counseling function.

9. The core organization encourages the development of broad comprehensive resource units which teachers may draw upon in planning learning activities.

10. A distinction is frequently made between the core period, which embraces many marginal and related activities (e.g., drill, leisure reading, supervised study), and the core unit of work which serves as the unifying center of the activities of students.

#### Significance of the Problem

"What is Core"? "Core, what is that"? "Are you sure we are teaching core"? These questions are raised more and more as new teachers come into the Omaha Public School system. If teachers and laymen alike are

confused about any particular area of the secondary school curriculum, it is about the core curriculum. The confusion probably arises because the word "core" was originally used to denote the "central core of the curriculum," that is, the subjects required of all boys and girls (Clark, Klein and Burks 1972). These questions are deserving of considered response and must be answered, at least tentatively, in order to determine what curriculum is actually being utilized at the seventh and eighth grade level. It may well be that the Omaha Public School system is using some other type of curriculum under the guise and name of the core curriculum. This study will attempt to address this.

This study will be useful for the district curriculum workers, administrators, teachers, and others interested in the core curriculum. This study could afford the teachers an opportunity to examine basic philosophical and implementing ideas for the core curriculum in their building. If the information from this study is mutually acceptable, it could be used as a basis for discussion among core teachers, principals and instructional supervisors.

### Assumptions

There are five assumptions relating to this study.

Assumption 1. Adequate in-service assistance had been provided for all new teachers coming into the core program.

Assumption 2. The building principal had provided sufficient guidance and leadership to the core program.

Assumption 3. Adequate numbers and adequately prepared core teachers were available in each building in the district.

Assumption 4. Each core teacher, by preparation had wide interests and experiences and several specific skills.

Assumption 5. Each core teacher was competent in at least two different subject areas, if not, team teaching was used.

### Definition of Terms

Core: is a form of curriculum organization usually operating within an extended block of time in the daily schedule in which learning experiences are focused directly on problems of significance to students.

Block of Time: A double period or more of time

for students which meets daily: two to three hours of uninterrupted class time.

Components of the Core Program: The seventh and eighth grade curriculum is based on three correlated areas: social studies, language arts and "built in" guidance.

Structured Core Program: The staff decides in advance which broad problem areas or centers of experience the students will explore.

Unstructured Core Program: Teacher and students are free to examine any problem they consider worthwhile.

#### Delimitation of This Study

1. This study was limited to the nine junior high schools, grade levels seventh and eighth in the Omaha Public School system.

2. Only seventh and eighth grade core teachers and the core supervisor in the Omaha Public School system were invited to participate in this study.

#### Method of Study

Specifically, this study attempted to determine which of the ten common characteristics were being met, not being met, or being modified to meet or exceed the common characteristics of the original core program by

the Omaha Public School system. The following procedures were implemented:

1. A questionnaire was developed to be used by the core teachers to determine the extent to which beliefs and practices in their classroom conformed to the ten common characteristics of the original core program.

2. Consultation with the district core supervisor was conducted to ascertain the type of core program being utilized in the Omaha School system.

3. Each core teacher in the nine junior high schools of this district was asked to complete the questionnaire.

4. The data were tabulated and analyzed to determine if the ten common characteristics were being met, not being met, or being modified to meet or exceed the common characteristics of the original core program.

#### Organization of the Study

This study was divided into five chapters. The introduction, purpose of the study, definition of terms, methods of the study and the organization of the study are found in chapter 1. Chapter 2 contains a review of related literature. Chapter 3 describes the procedures of the study. Chapter 4 presents the

findings of the study. Chapter 5 contains the summary, conclusion and recommendations.



## CHAPTER TWO

### Review of Related Research and Literature

In the past twenty-five years very little research has been done on the core curriculum.

The core curriculum grew out of a dislike for the piecemeal learning promoted by the subject-centered curriculum. In an attempt to find better ways to serve the needs of all youth, proponents of the core curriculum felt that unification of subjects and new methodology were needed. They felt that as society had become increasingly fragmented with increased emphasis on science and technology, the only logical approach was through a core pattern of organization. Although some experimentation within the secondary school curriculum began before 1900, the impetus for improving the area of general education came in the thirties. Educational leadership encouraged schools to try new approaches to curriculum organization. Educators were dissatisfied with the organization of the curriculum in sequential courses because this organization stressed specialization rather than general education. It limited the number of subjects or fields explored by any given students, and led to covering large amounts of detailed knowledge; but it frequently failed to give

students an understanding of the significance of the field in relation to the problems of daily living. Furthermore, logical, sequential organization of knowledge in any given area proved to have meaning and significance only to a small number of individuals. Schools tried ways of breaking down barriers between subjects (Lounsbury and Vars, 1978).

Departures from the subject-matter organization of the central courses of the curriculum (those subjects required of all students) were sometimes referred to as experiments with the "core" of the curriculum. Thus the term "core curriculum" has widely come to mean any curriculum approach that departs from the logical, sequential organization of knowledge (Vars 1972).

To many curriculum workers a core meant something transcended subject lines to reach the needs of the individual--an idea fed by many psychological beliefs of the time (Goodlad 1987). To others, however, core meant practice in the democratic principles that were believed to be at the heart of individual revolutionary and philosophical beliefs, especially with respect to tyranny and the idea of social order (Goodlad 1987).

In Goodlad's inquiries into the core curriculum

(1987), he observed the strands of thoughts which is listed in the above paragraphs in selected excerpts from the curriculum literature from 1938 to 1956.

The emphasis upon the development of a unified program of studies . . . has resulted in the organizing of a common core of experiences drawing content from all the major areas of human living, a curriculum which disregards subject matter lines and which is generally required of all pupils a substantial part of each day (Brown 1938, p. 210).

The core curriculum, then, is made up of those educational experiences which are thought to be important for each citizen in our democracy. Students and teachers do not consider subject matter to be important in itself. It becomes meaningful only as it helps the group to solve the problems which have been selected for study (MacConnell et al. 1939, p. 25).

A core represents the sum total of personal youth. A true core curriculum attacks the problems common to all youth. It is a functional approach to harmonizing the concerns of youth, on the one hand, with the demands of society, on the

other, without unduly emphasizing one or neglecting the other (Burnett 1951, p. 97).

The core curriculum may be regarded as those learning experiences which are fundamental for all learners because they are drawn from their common individuals and social needs as competent citizen of a democratic community (Kessler 1956, p. 43).

The above statements differ so markedly in concept from what is so widely discussed today as core that they seem to be of another era. In a very real sense, they are Goodlad 1987).

Core is recognized by many curriculum experts as one of the few genuinely different approaches to education that have appeared within this century (Vars 1972). Vars (1972) suggested that, although core roots have been traced far back into education theory, it was a distinct feature of the secondary educational programs that evolved during the era of progressive education. In its emphasis on student needs, rational inquiry, and democratic processes, core paralleled the elementary school innovations of this period, such as the "activity movement," "the project method," or the "experience curriculum."

Unconventional programs have always had limited

popularity. They constituted approximately 12 percent of the junior high block-time programs identified through surveys carried out in the late 1950's and mid 1960's (Lounsbury and Douglass 1965). The stress on academic learning that followed Russia's space challenge temporarily diverted attention from the core idea, but current efforts to "humanize" and "personalize" education may be viewed as a revival of the core philosophy (Lounsbury and Douglass 1965). Lounsbury and Douglass (1965) further suggested that many of the so-called "compassionate critics" of education appear to be reinventing the core curriculum under such labels as "humanistic education," "open education," "free form education" and even "career education."

#### The Core Component

If teachers and laymen alike are confused about any particular area of the secondary school curriculum, it is about the core curriculum (Alberty 1953). The confusion probably arises because the word "core" was originally used to denote the "central core of the curriculum," that is, the subjects required of all boys and girls. In any case, the word "core" was quickly applied to many curriculum devices and designs by which

all or part of the general education portion of the curriculum was presented (Alberty 1953). In analyzing the current uses of the term, Alberty (1953) found that programs called core could be fitted into the following six basic categories:

1. The core consists of a number of logically organized subjects or fields of knowledge, each of which is taught independently.

2. The core consists of a number of logically organized subjects or fields of knowledge, some or all of which are correlated.

3. The core consists of broad problems, unit of work, or unifying themes which are chosen because they afford the means of teaching effectively the basic content of certain subjects or fields of knowledge. These subjects or fields retain their identity, but the content is selected and taught with special reference to the unit, theme, or problem.

4. The core consists of a number of subjects or fields of knowledge and are unified or fused. Usually one subject or field (e.g., history) services as the unifying center.

5. The core consists of broad, preplanned problem areas, from which are selected learning experiences in

terms of the psychological and societal needs.

6. The core consists of broad units of work, or activities, planned by the teacher and students in terms of needs as perceived by the group. No basic curriculum structure is set up.

#### The Characteristics of the "True Core"

In spite of the confusion and different definitions of core, experts in the field seem to be fairly well agreed that the "true core" is considerably more than a mere rearrangement of subject matter (Faunce and Bossing 1958). Faunce and Bossing (1958) define the core curriculum as a "pattern of the experience curriculum" organized into a closely integrated and interrelated whole. Although some writers differ with the two concerning the scope of the core curriculum, all signs indicate that any core program that does not conform to the experience curriculum way is not truly a core and is not really worthy of the name (Clark, Klein and Burks 1972).

In Clark, Klein and Burks' (1972) analysis of the core curriculum, they concluded the following nine characteristics are essential to a true core:

1. The core must be common to all pupils. The true core program is for all pupils, and all pupils are

involved in it. It is by definition general education, the core which all pupils must take. A "core program" that does not include all the pupils is an anomaly, not a core.

2. The Core occupies a large block of time, perhaps as much as one-third to one-half of the school day. Almost all authorities agree that a core class needs a large block of time, at the very least a double period each day. Because of the need for greater flexibility--and scope in core programs, the double--or triple period class is probably the most common characteristic of courses called core curriculum.

3. The core is guidance-oriented. Because a true core has to do with the problems and immediate concerns of youth, it is usually considered an excellent medium for guidance activities. Because it gives pupils and teachers an opportunity to get to know each other well, the long block of time lends itself admirably to teacher counseling. Both individual and group guidance services are integrated into the core.

4. The true core is problem-oriented. The content of a true core program consists of the problems of youth and society. Ideally the pupils and teachers have a great amount of latitude in the choice of



problems.

5. The core ignores subject matter line but rather considers all knowledge to be its province. The true core utilizes the methods of problem solving throughout. To carry this method out successfully the problems that the pupils investigate must be real, live, open-ended problems. Advocates of the core support this type of methodology because of the belief that problem solving is the best way to arrive at clean concepts and true understandings, and the philosophical notion that only by learning to solve problems in experience-centered situations can boys and girls learn to face the problems of life efficiently and effectively. Creative learning rather than instruction is the rule for the true core program.

6. The core involves pupils-teacher planning. Problem-centered courses requires teacher-pupil planning because an essential element of problem solving is the forming of the problem. Whatever the broad areas prescribed for the particular grade, the pupil and teacher in the program together work out the problems to be solved, the scope and sequence, the methods, and procedures to be used in studying them, and the criteria for evaluating the success of their

study and the conclusions or solutions arrived at.

7. In the core, subject matter and skills are taught as they are needed rather than in any fixed sequence. Because the problems of youth and society determine the subject matter of core programs, the specific skills and concepts are not taught in any fixed order, but rather are taught as they are needed. To many this seems to be a very dangerous technique. However, authorities on the core, such as Lurry and Alberty (1957), insist that the fundamentals are well taught in core programs. Research indicates that their claims are correct (Clark, Klein and Burks 1972).

8. The true core requires considerable teacher preparation. Core programs must be taught in relation to other courses in the curriculum. To place the core in a separate compartment, isolated from the other subjects in the curriculum, violates the basic principle on which core theory is founded. Therefore, core teachers and teachers of specialized subjects must plan with each other so that they all can profit optimally from each other's work. In addition, the flexibility of the problem approach makes it imperative that the teacher be more than well prepared in order to cope with the many contingencies that may arise.

9. In the core, individual differences are provided for by the method rather than by curriculum structure. Core programs are common to all pupils, but the pupils do not all study identical subject matter. Differentiation to suit the needs, interests, and abilities of the pupils is provided by one variation or another of the unit method.

#### Two Types of Core

A core curriculum may be classified either as structural or unstructured, depending upon the limits of planning set in advance by the staff.

In a structured core program, the staff decides in advance which broad problem areas or centers of experience range from those which are primarily of immediate and direct personal concern to adolescents, such as "Personality Development" or "Sex," to broader social problems like "Pollution," "Population," or "Human Rights." Some of these problem areas may be required at a particular grade level; others may be optional. Within a chosen area, students and teachers cooperatively plan learning units focused on the specific problems and concerns of members of a particular class (Lounsbury and Vars 1978).

In an unstructured core program, teachers and

students are free to examine any problem they consider worthwhile (Lounsbury and Vars 1978).

### The Core: Pro and Con

Advantages of the Core What advantages can be gained from adopting core programs? Many, according to core enthusiasts (Vars 1982).

1. One of the most powerful arguments for the core program is that it makes possible the selection of units vital to the general education of the pupils from an overwhelming hodgepodge of subject matter.

2. Student motivation is enhanced, since they have direct input into the content, structure, methodology, and evaluation of the educational experience. What they learn is more likely to result in actual changes in behavior.

3. Students learn integrative thinking by doing it under the guidance of an adult who is also grappling with concepts and skills outside his or her original field of expertise. Modeling is supplemented with first-hand experience.

4. Students learn how the various disciplines contribute to the solution of real human problems and therefore have more respect for the traditional fields of study. This carries over into their study of other

courses, including those in their major.

5. The instructor is challenged to grow in breadth of scholarship as well as depth in the skills of group work and problem solving.

6. Cores provide an excellent medium for conducting an essential part of the guidance program. The long block of time associated with the core program allow the pupils and teachers to get to know each other well, and the flexible nature of the core program allows ample opportunity for conferences and counseling.

7. A final argument is that the core program encourages intrastaff cooperation and coordination. The format of the core seems more congenial to cooperation than the separate subject approach.

Limitations of Core: In spite of the many arguments put forth in its favor, the core has aroused much opposition. Some of the opposition is based upon unthinking reaction against the core simply because the core departs from the traditional. Nevertheless, a good share of the opposition to the core is sincere, reasoned opinion based upon what, to the critic, appear to be sound premises. These objections deserve serious consideration (Clark, Klein, and Burks 1972).

1. Core requires highly dedicated staff members who are broadly cultured and skilled in both group and individual problem solving processes. Such staff members are rare, although they can be trained if both staff members and the institution are willing to make the investment.

2. If the core class is guided by a faculty team, all the problems associated with planning correlated and combined courses are present, such as philosophical differences and exorbitant demands for planning time.

3. If each core class is guided by one staff member, there are great demands on that person for mobilizing resources and planning experiences outside his or her field of expertise. This can be an unsettling experience for the instructor and may lead to errors of fact and judgement by both students and instructor.

4. Housing the core program on campus and providing adequate staff rewards are even more difficult than with combined courses.

5. Graduate schools may be unwilling to accept credits earned in core as the basis for advanced work in any of the disciplines. No two core classes are likely to have identical experiences, so it is

difficult to use them as the basis for further work in either general education or the major.

6. In unstructured core, the faculty have relinquished control over the scope and sequence of that aspect of the program. This may result in gaps in students' general education.

7. A final argument is based upon a difference in philosophical beliefs, that the core is soft and leads to undisciplined behavior and slovenly habits of thinking. Believing as they do, that the content of the core program lacks rigor, these critics fear that it will sap the pupils' intellectual strength.

#### Popularity of the True Core

The true core program has never been really popular in the United States schools, and has not been gaining popularity. Nevertheless, schools and school systems that have well-developed core programs seem to be faithful to them. The truth seems to be that core programs are more difficult to launch than are the traditional programs or programs backed by millions of federal dollars (Vars 1962). Some core programs have been so poorly designed, hastily built, and inadequately captioned that they have capsized before they got off the waves. Those programs that have been

well designed, carefully organized, and strongly led have proved to be amply seaworthy (Clark, Klein, and Burks 1972).

#### Future Developments in the Core

The core movement has never been as great a force as its proponents had hoped it would be. Nevertheless, Faunce and Clute (1958) seem to be convinced that the core, although still a goal rather than an achievement, is the program of the future in the junior high school. However, Goodlad (1986/87), presents a different view. Goodlad feels that because of changes in student populations, economic realities, ideology, and entrepreneuring educators acting in coalition with responsive groups in the community, the established array of courses constituting the common curriculum of secondary students have been badly mauled. Although the idea of a common core of learning experience still survived, what emerged in concept and recommended practice was a far cry from the traditional core of subjects.

As a nostalgic footnote on the core curriculum movement that died in the 1950's, Goodlad (1986/87) quotes from a 1961 paper.

Today in many school systems, the term core is



used in reference to a block of time. That is, it refers to the period of the curriculum which uses two or three class periods with the same teachers and students for two or more subject areas (Taylor 1961).

The core concept was intended not to corrupt the curriculum but to make it more accessible (closer to the heart) and more useful (for work, play, family life, and citizenship) was reduced to an organizational arrangement. Goodlad (1986/87) raises the question as to the degree the forgoing conceptions of core curriculum were translated into school and classroom practices. No reliable data appear to be available. At a conference of professors of curriculum in the late 1950's, this question was asked of Nelson Bossing, an ardent advocate and chronicler of this core curriculum movement. He responded that only junior high schools had implemented anything close to the full array of key concepts for at least a significant part of the curriculum and that, at the movement's peak, perhaps 10 percent of the junior high schools in the country met these criteria. It is fair to say, however, that large numbers of secondary school educators (both junior and senior high) were exposed to and influenced by the

progressive ideas on which these core curriculum practices were based (Goodlad 1986/87).

What the future of the core curriculum will be is still not yet decided. Current trends toward humanizing secondary education are favorable to the core idea. A number of attempts to make modern secondary schools "relevant" are actually versions of the core curriculum idea under one guise or another. It may well be that the core movement is about due for a revival, perhaps under another name (Clark, Klein, and Burks 1972).

## CHAPTER THREE

### Procedures and Design of the Study

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the procedures used in assessing to what extent the original core curriculum guided the structure and instruction in the Omaha Public School Junior High Schools. A questionnaire instrument was developed for use in this study.

#### Development of the Instrument

The instrument used was a numerical rating scale constructed to include the ten common characteristics of the original core program and other information obtained through the literature review. A copy of the questionnaire is contained in Appendix A.

#### Validation

The Core Supervisor and District Research Official were consulted prior to the construction of the final instrument for their recommendations and approval. Two seventh grade and two eighth grade core teachers at R.M. Marrs Junior High School pretested the questionnaire in order to determine if it was satisfactory. It was administered under conditions as similar as possible to those anticipated in the final study. The participants were interviewed to obtain the

reasons for their answers and to obtain their overall reaction to the questionnaire (e.g., its length, format, content). This pretest data was used to identify such problems as misinterpretations of instructions, items left blank, ambiguities in items, and completeness of information sought. A particular item was retained if the four participants were in unanimous agreement that the item reflected the objective. In the identification section of the instrument, the respondent's name, name of school and grade level were obtained.

#### Description of the Survey Population

There are nine junior high schools using the core curriculum at the 7th and 8th grade level in the district. The school districts' eighth and seventh grade core teaching population is 90 staff members. Each core teacher was invited to participate in the survey.

#### Administration of the Instrument

The personnel office of this district was contacted to verify the number of core teachers. Survey instruments with a cover letter were distributed to each building administrator. The cover letter stated the purpose of the study, and an appeal for

prompt cooperation in completing and returning the instrument. Participants were also informed that they would receive a summary of the results of the study. The building administrator or designee returned the survey forms within one school week. Follow-up calls were made to two of the nine junior high schools reminding the building administrator about the deadline of returning the completed instruments. Three more follow-up calls and five additional instruments were forwarded to participants who had misplaced their original questionnaire. This action resulted in a return rate of 80 percent of questionnaire instruments that were sent out.

#### The Treatment of Data

Mean ratings, percentages and actual frequencies were calculated for each item individually and by category to determine the rate of occurrence under each category (never, seldom, occasionally, frequently, always). The results are displayed on tables included in the next chapter for comparison purposes.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### The Analysis of Data

This investigation was designed to assess to what extent the ten common characteristics of the original core program guided the structure and instructions in the Omaha Public School Junior High Schools. The analysis of data obtained through the implementation of a questionnaire is presented in this chapter.

Analysis of the data in this chapter is divided into four major sections. The first section is the common characteristics of the original core program and to what extent these characteristics guide the instruction in the Omaha Public School Junior High Schools.

The second section deals with data relative of the meaning to the term "core" in which respondents compare their own definition of the term with definitions provided.

The third section concerns data relative to the respondents' perception of a true core curriculum which also includes their opinions of whether they are teaching a true core curriculum.

The final part of this section provides an analysis of respondents under graduate and graduate

degrees.

### Common Characteristics of the Original Core Program

The first set of data consists of 22 questions pertaining to the ten common characteristics of the original core program to which 73, 7th and 8th grade core teachers responded. The frequency of occurrence for these common characteristics are always, frequently, occasionally, seldom, or never. Always was assigned the value of nine, frequently, the value of seven, occasionally, the value of five, seldom, the value of three, and never, the value of one. The actual frequency is the number of responses to each question.

Analysis of the Ten Common Characteristics of a True Core Program. According to Alberty (1959) a true core program must possess the following ten common characteristics.

1. Learning activities cut across conventional subject-matter lines.
2. The core utilizes a relatively large block of time in the daily schedule in order to make possible diversified activities such as trips, library work, discussions, demonstrations, and experimentation, without disruption of the other scheduled classes.

3. The core provides for extensive use of teacher-student planning in terms of the long-range needs, problems, and interests of students.

4. The core teacher engages in frequent cooperative planning and teaching to maximize the use of the specialized abilities of the teaching staff.

5. The scope and sequence of learning activities are determined by the needs of the students rather than by the logical organization of any one subject or field.

6. The core organization discourages the use of long periods for drill or laboratory exercises which do not contribute directly to the central problems involved in the unit.

7. The core absorbs the activities generally assigned to the, homerooms, such as class business, social affairs, and the recording and reporting of student progress.

8. Core programs include the guidance and counseling function.

9. The core organization encourages the development of broad comprehensive resource units which teachers may draw upon in planning learning activities.

10. A distinction is frequently made between the



core period, which embraces many marginal and related activities (e.g., drill, leisure reading, supervised study), and the core unit of work which serves as the unifying center of the activities of studies.

The data in Table 1 revealed that characteristic 1 which relates to question 1 of the questionnaire received an average rating of 8.63 on a 9 point scale. Characteristic 2 which relates to questionnaire questions 5 and 10 received average ratings of 6.7 and 4.71 respectively. Characteristic 3 which relates to questionnaire question 3, received an average rating of 4.44. Characteristic 4 which relates to questionnaire question 7 received an average rating of 3.59. Characteristic 5 which relates to questionnaire question 8 received an average rating of 5.07. Characteristics 6 which relate to questionnaire question 2, received an average rating of 5.67. Characteristic 7 which relates to questionnaire question 5 received an average rating of 6.7. Characteristic 8 which relates to questionnaire question 4 received an average rating of 3.77.

Table 1

Common Characteristics of the Original Core Program

Common Characteristics	Frequency of Occurrence					Means
	A Always	B Frequently	C Occ.*	D Seldom	E Never	
1. To what extent are your core classes two or more periods?	67 94.4	1 1.4	0 0	0 0	3 4.2	8.63
2. To what extent are your core classes based on common learning activities, rather than on specific subject-matter content?	3 4.3	27 39.1	29 42.0	10 14.5	0 0	5.67
3. To what extent does the core program in your classroom provide for extensive use of teacher-student planning?	4 5.5	10 13.8	28 3.9	22 3.1	8 1.1	4.44
4. To what extent is personal and social guidance being provided by you as the core teacher?	8 1.6	4 8.2	33 67.3	3 6.1	1 2.0	3.77
5. To what extent does core absorb the activities generally assigned to homerooms?	22 30.1	29 39.7	12 16.4	9 12.3	1 1.4	6.7

\*Occ.=Occasionally

Table 1

## Common Characteristics of the Original Core Program (Cont'd)

Common Characteristics	Frequency of Occurrence					Means
	A Always	B Frequently	C Occ.*	D Seldom	E Never	
6. To what extent does the core program in your building integrate language arts and social studies?	14 20.2	32 46.4	17 24.6	5 7.2	1 1.4	6.18
7. To what extent does your core classes encourage and provide for cooperative planning and teaching in terms of the most effective use of the specialized abilities of other teaching personnel?	2 2.7	7 9.7	19 26.4	34 47.2	10 13.9	3.59
8. To what extent are the scope and sequence of learning activities in your core classes determined by needs of the situation rather than by the logical organization of any one subject?	2 2.8	27 38.6	21 30.0	19 27.1	1 1.4	5.07
9. To what extent in your core classes is the acquisition of skills based on the resolving problems presented?	4 5.8	15 21.7	32 46.4	18 26.0	0 0	4.86

\*Occ.=Occasionally

Table 1

Common Characteristics of the Original Core Program (Cont'd)

Common Characteristics	Frequency of Occurrence					Means
	A Always	B Frequently	C Occ.*	D Seldom	E Never	
10. To what extent does block time core organization encourage the use of long periods for drills or laboratory exercises which contribute to the central problems involved in the units?	5 6.9	24 33.3	29 40.3	12 16.6	2 2.7	4.71
11. To what extent in your core classes is the least dominant feature of the teaching-learning situation the subject matter?	0 0	5 7.6	26 39.4	31 47.0	4 6.0	3.59
12. To what extent are the needs of students first identified, then the scope and sequence of the program developed in your core classes?	3 4.2	23 31.9	30 42.0	15 20.8	1 1.4	5.26
13. To what extent does the core program encompass learning activities of all skill levels in your core classes?	8 11.7	35 51.5	18 26.5	7 10.5	0 0	5.86

\*Occ.=Occasionally

Table 1

Common Characteristics of the Original Core Program (Cont'd)

Common Characteristics	Frequency of Occurrence					Means
	A Always	B Frequently	C Occ.*	D Seldom	E Never	
14. To what extent is your core classroom considered a learning laboratory, where problems are presented for solutions?	4 5.6	24 33.8	31 43.6	12 16.9	0 0	5.41
15. To what extent is teacher-pupil planning a fundamental technique of identifying problems for study in your classroom?	1 1.4	3 4.3	26 37.1	29 41.4	11 15.7	3.53
16. To what extent are the basic principles of child growth and development and principles of learning given recognition in the instructional process in your classroom?	13 17.8	27 36.9	16 21.9	13 17.8	4 5.5	5.87
17. To what extent in your core classes do you present facts as a means to an end, not an end in themselves?	12 17.9	35 50.7	17 24.6	4 5.8	1 1.4	6.18

\*Occ.=Occasionally

Table 1

## Common Characteristics of the Original Core Program (Cont'd)

Common Characteristics	Frequency of Occurrence					Means
	A Always	B Frequently	C Occ.*	D Seldom	E Never	
18. To what extent is evaluation perpetual and cooperative between you and your students?	10 14.5	37 53.6	22 31.8	0 0	0 0	6.29
19. To what extent does the core organization in your building encourage the development of broad comprehensive resource units which may be drawn upon in planning learning activities?	8 11.7	12 17.6	22 33.3	21 30.8	5 7.4	4.05
20. To what extent is a distinction made between the core period, which embraces many marginal and related activities (e.g. drill, leisure reading, supervised study), and the core unit of work which serves as the unifying center of the activities of students?	3 5.7	10 19.2	23 44.2	3 5.7	13 25.0	3.21

\*Occ.=Occasionally

Table 1

Common Characteristics of the Original Core Program (Cont'd)

Common Characteristics	Frequency of Occurrence					Means
	A Always	B Frequently	C Occ.*	D Seldom	E Never	
21. To what extent do you use the social studies and language arts OIPs in integrating and correlating language arts and social studies? For example, use of the social studies-language arts combination to give the students content to write effectively?	10 14.0	33 46.4	19 26.7	8 11.3	1 1.4	6.04
22. In your opinion, to what extent does the social studies and language arts OIP statements encourage the integration and correlation of social studies and language arts?	1 1.4	27 38.0	25 35.2	15 21.1	3 4.2	5.08

\*Occ.=Occasionally

Table 1

Common Characteristics of the Original Core Program (Cont'd)

Common Characteristics	Frequency of Occurrence					Means
	A Always	B Frequently	C Occ.*	D Seldom	E Never	
Grand Total (FR)	204.0	447.0	495.0	290.0	70.0	
(%)	13.5	29.7	32.9	19.2	04.6	

Top Number - Actual Frequency

Bottom Number - Percentage

The mean was derived by multiplying always responses by 9, frequently by 7, occasionally by 5, seldom by 3, never by 1 and dividing the total by the number of responses.



Characteristic 9 which relates to questionnaire question 19, received an average rating of 4.05. Finally, characteristic 10 which relates to questionnaire question 20 received an average rating of 3.21.

Table 2 displays an analysis of the selection and comparison of seven definitions of the term "core" by 7th and 8th core teachers in the Omaha Public School system. The term "core" was given widely different interpretations in programs bearing that label starting in the 1930's to the present. The following definitions of the core curriculum were taken from selected excerpts from the curriculum literature from 1938 to 1978.

- A. Core is used in reference to a block of time. That is, it refers to that period of the curriculum which was two or three class periods with the same teachers and students. (Taylor 1961, p. 99).
- B. Core is the organizing of a common core of experiences which draws content from all the major areas of human living, a curriculum which disregards subject matter lines and which is generally required of all pupils a substantial part of each day. (Brown 1938, p. 210).
- C. Specifically, core is a form of curriculum organization, usually operating within an extended block of time in the daily schedule, in which learning experiences are focused directly on problems of significance to students. (Lounsbury and Vars 1978, p. 68).

- D. The term core is applied in some fashion to all or part of the total curriculum which is required of all student at a given level. In other words, the core is used to designate all or part of the program of general education. (Alberty 1953, p. 82).
- E. The core curriculum is made up of those educational experiences which are thought to be important for each citizen in our democracy. Students and teachers do not consider subject matter to be important in itself. (MacConnell 1939, p. 25).
- F. A true core curriculum attacks the problems common to all youth. It is a functional approach to harmonizing the concerns of youth, on the one hand, with demands of society, on the other, without unduly emphasizing one or neglecting the other. (Burnett 1951, p. 97).
- G. The core curriculum may be regarded as those learning experiences which are fundamental for all learners because they are drawn from their common individual and social needs as competent citizens of a democratic community (Kessler 1956, p. 43).

Question one asked, Which of the above meanings come close to your own? (If necessary use up to three definitions.)

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ (2) \_\_\_\_\_ (3) \_\_\_\_\_

Question two asked, Which of these meanings is least like your own? \_\_\_\_\_

Table 2

## 7th and 8th Grade Core Teachers Ranking of Seven Definitions of the Term "Core"

Definitions of Core Since 1938	Beveridge	Bryan Jr.	Hale	Lewis & Clark	Marrs Jr.	Mc-Millan	Monroe	Morton	Norris	Total
A	15	11	9	15	16	16	11	15	8	13
	5	4	3	5	6	7	4	5	5	44
B	3	2	6	2	0	2	3	7	0	3
	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	3	0	10
C	0	7	4	3	0	6	4	9	0	4
	0	3	2	1	0	2	2	4	0	14
D	10	3	8	2	3	5	9	0	4	5
	5	1	4	2	1	2	3	0	2	20
E	0	5	3	2	0	7	0	5	0	2
	0	3	2	1	0	3	0	2	0	11
F	0	3	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	.9
	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3

Table 2  
7th and 8th Grade Core Teachers Ranking of Seven Definitions of the Term "Core"

Definitions of Core Since 1938	Beveridge	Bryan Jr.	Hale	Lewis & Clark	Marrs Jr.	Mc-Millan	Monroe	Morton	Norris	Total
G	13	4	10	8	0	8	2	7	10	7
	5	2	4	4	0	4	1	4	4	28
Total Numbers of Responses	16	16	17	15	7	19	12	18	11	5
Sample Size	8	11	10	8	5	8	9	11	7	

Top Number - Weight value based on 3 for first choice, 2 for second choice and 1 for third choice.

Bottom - Number of Responses (three choices were possible but not all were indicated).

\*In the total section of this table, the bottom number represents the return percentage.

The respondent's first, second, and third choices are given weight values of 3, 2, and 1 respectively.

For an analysis of question one, the respondents selection rate for definition A was 34 and percentage rate 47. The second definition selection choice was definition G with a selection rate of 18 and percentage rate of 12 percent. The third choice definition was D, with selection rate of 9 and percentage rate of 12 percent.

For question two (Which of the meanings is least like your own?), definition E received the largest number of responses for an actual selection rate of 13 and percentage of 18 percent. Definition D received the smallest selection rate of 5 with percentage rate of 7 percent.

#### True Core Curriculum and Certification Data

Table 3 displays the respondents' perceptions of whether they were teaching a true core curriculum and their major area of clarification.

Forty-four respondents, with a percentage rate of 60.0 believed they were not reaching a true core curriculum.

Twenty-six teachers were certified to teach both language arts and social studies, for a percentage rate of 35.6. Forty-seven teachers were not certified in both disciplines. This was a 64.4 percent rate.

Table 4 presents information relevant to the respondents' under graduate and graduate level. At the undergraduate level 30 respondents for a percentage rate of 41 were certified in social

studies/social science. In social studies and language arts combination, the number was 28 for a percentage rate of 38.4. For certification in the Core Curriculum the number was 2 for a percentage rate of 2.7. At the graduate level, eight respondents for a percentage rate 11.0 held graduate degrees in Guidance and Counseling which is the largest group. The second largest group of core teachers held graduate degrees in Education Administration with 6, for a percentage rate of 8.0.

Table 3

Teaching a True Core Curriculum and Certification

---

Q 24: In your opinion, do you believe you are teaching a true core curriculum?

YES	29
	39.7%
<hr/>	
NO	44
	60.3%

---

Q 25: Are you certified to teach both language arts and social studies?

YES	26
	35.6%
<hr/>	
NO	47
	64.4%

---

---

Table 4

Certification Information

---

<b>Under-Graduate Degree:</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Social Studies and Language Arts	28	38.4
English or Language Arts	9	12.3
Elementary Education	3	4.1
Core Curriculum	2	2.7
Reading	1	1.4

---

<b>Graduate Degree:</b>		
Social Studies or Social Science	4	5.5
English or Language Arts	4	5.5
Secondary Education	3	4.1
Guidance and Counseling	8	11.0



Certification Information (Cont'd)

---

Graduate Degree:	Number	Percent
Education Administration	6	8.2
Urban Education	2	2.7
Elementary Education	3	4.1
Media	1	1.4
Curriculum and Instruction	1	1.4
Special Education	1	1.4
Reading	1	1.4

---

---

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Summary, Conclusion, and Recommendations

#### Restatement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine to what extent the ten common characteristics of the original core program guided the structure and instruction in the Omaha Public School Junior High Schools. The significance of this problem is the amount of confusion the term "core" is causing not only to new teachers coming into the district, but tenured staff members as well. In light of the fact that forty percent of the respondents were not sure what type of curriculum is actually being utilized at the seventh and eighth grade level, it may well be that the Omaha Public School system is using some other type of curriculum under the guise and name of the core curriculum. This study addressed this question.

#### Principal Findings and Conclusions

The first section of this study assessed the frequency of occurrence of the common core characteristics to which the respondents felt occurred in their classrooms. The study revealed that 13 percent of the common characteristics occurred always, 29 percent frequently, 33 percent occasionally, 19

percent seldom, and 5 percent of the characteristics never occurred.

The second part of the study examined the seven definitions for the term "core" dating from 1938 to 1978. For the most part, 34 respondents chose definition A (Core is used in reference to a block of time. That is, it refers to that period of the curriculum which uses two or three class periods with the same teachers and students. Taylor 1961), for a rate of 47 percent as the closest to their own definitions. It is of special interest to note that the most current definition, definition C, (Specifically, core is a form of curriculum organization, usually operating within an extended block of time in the daily schedule, in which learning experience are focused directly on problems of significance to students. (Lounsbury and Vars 1978) of the seven, had a selection rate of only 8 for 11 percent as opposed to the top selection, definition A (1961).

The third part of the study assessed the respondents' perception of whether they were teaching a true core curriculum and information relevant to the respondents' under graduate and graduate level.

The data revealed contrary to the writer's expectations, that 60 percent of the respondents believed they were not teaching a true core curriculum.

Thirty-five percent of respondents are certified to teach both language arts and social studies, while 65 percent are not certified in both disciplines. It must be noted here that this 65 percent rate is an indication of the limitation of the core program in view that a requirement exists for core staff members to be skilled in both language arts and social studies (Vars 1982).

The final analysis assessed the information relevant to the respondents' under graduate and graduate level. At the under graduate level 41 percent are certified to teach social studies or social science, with a 38 percent rate certified in the social studies and language arts combination. It is clear that the respondents certified in the social studies are in the majority in the core program in the district. Only two respondents, or 2.7 percent hold under graduate degrees in the core curriculum. At the graduate level, the largest group with eight respondents, or 11 percent, hold graduate degrees in Guidance and Counseling. The second largest group

consisted of six respondents, for 8 percent hold graduate degrees in Education Administration.

The results of this study also revealed that the respondents continue to teach subjects (language arts and social studies) separately rather than in correlation. This evidence substantiated the fact that the teachers in the core program are subject matter specialist, which is due primarily to not being trained for core work. This practice violates one of the basic principles on which the core theory was founded. This problem has been compounded even more by the inability of the district to hire teachers who are trained and qualified to teach in a true core curriculum. Such staff members are rare (2.7 percent) due to the institutions of higher learning discontinuing the training of core teachers (Vars 1982). The number of programs identified as "core" has decreased in school districts since 1938 as well.

This study also revealed that the so-called core curriculum in the school district is primarily in name only and not a true core curriculum. As stated in the above paragraph, frequently the subject matter of the two subjects (language arts and social studies) are not at all integrated or even correlated. In effect they

are simply two courses taught in consecutive periods by the same teacher to the same pupils. A course of this sort would be more properly called a block-of-time course, not core. It does have the advantage of giving teachers considerable time to manipulate their groups into desirable teaching arrangements, giving more time for teachers and pupils to know each other, and of making a more gradual change from the self-contained classroom of the elementary school to the departmentalization of the junior high school.

The results of this study suggest that the school district is using a highly successful block-of-time curriculum in lieu of a core curriculum, even though it also requires the teacher to be competent in at least two different subject areas.

#### Recommendations for Future Research

The result of this study raise some interesting questions for further investigation. Anyone who has worked with the core curriculum knows that much research is needed, and the need for more research becomes even more apparent when existing outdated studies were examined for answers to the question that motivated this study. Some of the areas needing further investigation are:

1. The status of the core curriculum. - There is a need to up-to-date studies to discover the present status and practices of core.

2. Scope and sequence. - There is a need for studies seeking to develop the broad problem areas which ought to be the concern of the core curriculum.

3. Effectiveness of the core curriculum. - There is an urgent need for more studies to evaluate the effectiveness of the core curriculum in terms of achieving its commonly accepted objectives.

4. New techniques of evaluating. - There is a need for studies to compare core with conventional classes in order to find common grounds for comparison. At the present, comparing core with conventional classes is limited in value, since the objectives are different.

5. Name change. - In view of the confusion with the definition of "core" in the district, there is a need for an up-to-dated study to consider a proper name change which would correctly fit and identify the type of curriculum that is being used at the seventh and eighth level in this school district.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alberty, H. (1953). Designing Programs to Meet the Common Needs of Youth. Chicago. University of Chicago press.
- Alberty, H. & Alberty, E. (1962). Reorganizing the High School Curriculum. (3rd ed.). New York: MacMillan.
- Brown, W. B. (1938). The Core is not all of the Curriculum. Curriculum Journal, 9, 210.
- Burnett, L. W. (1951). Core Programs in Washington State Junior High Schools. The School Review, 59, 97.
- Clark, L. H., Klein, R. L., & Burks, J. B. (1972). The American Secondary School Curriculum (2nd ed.). New York: MacMillan.
- Faunce, R. C., & Bossing, N. L. (1958). Developing the Core Curriculum (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1986/87). A New Look at an Old Idea: Core Curriculum. Education Leadership, 8-16.
- Kessler, H. L. (1956). Why a Core Curriculum for a Democratic Community? High Points, 38, 43.
- Lounsbury, J. H., & Douglas, H. R. (1965). Recent Trends in Junior High School Practices, 1954-1964. Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 92.
- Lounsbury, J. H., & Vars, G. F. (1978). A Curriculum for the Middle School Years. New York: Harper.
- Lurry, L. L., & Alberty, E. J. (1957). Developing a High School Core Program. New York: MacMillan.
- MacConnell, C. M. (1940). The Core Curriculum. Educational Trends, 8, 25.
- Smith, N. L. (1945). The Core Curriculum. Social Studies, 36, 10.



- Taylor, C. L. (1961). The Case For and Against Core Programs and Block-time Classes in the Junior High School. Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 45, 96-100.
- Vars, G. F. (1972). Curriculum in Secondary Schools and College. Associations for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 233-255.
- Wright, G. S. (1958). Block-time Classes and the Core Program in the Junior High School. U.S. Office of Education Bulletin, 6, 15.

APPENDIX A

OMAHA PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
Division of Research  
Omaha, Nebraska

**TO:** Mr. Tim Collins, R.M. Marrs Junior High School  
**FROM:** Irving C. Young  
**DATE:** January 15, 1988  
**SUBJECT:** Core Curriculum Evaluation Inventory

This is to advise you that we have reviewed your Core Curriculum Evaluation Inventory survey instrument. We feel your study has merit and permission is herewith granted to proceed with the project, as proposed.

Participation in your survey will involve core curriculum teachers of the Omaha Public Schools and should be maintained on a voluntary basis.

As we understand, this study will form the basis for graduate level work you are performing in partial fulfillment of requirements for the Educational Specialist's Degree at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. May we wish you every success in your efforts.

Upon completion of your study, please forward a copy to Division of Research offices. We will send a duplicate copy to Mrs. Louise Hairston.



cc: Louise Hairston

R.M. MARRS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL  
5619 South 19th Street  
Omaha, Nebraska 68107

January 21, 1988

Letter to Building Principles

Mr. or Mrs:

I am currently in the Specialist in Education Degree Program at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Part of my program includes a field project on the Core Program in the Omaha Public Schools. I am conducting a survey to determine which of the ten common characteristics of the original core program are being met, not being met, or being modified to meet or exceed the original common characteristics. In order to determine this, I will require each core teacher in your building to complete a questionnaire and return it to you or designee within five days. I will personally pick-up the questionnaires after that time.

Any information acquired during the study will be known only to me and kept strictly confidential. Only group statistics will be reported in the study. Each core teacher's anonymity is assured.

Attached for your information is a copy of the letter of approval from the Division of Research. If you have any questions, please call me at 978-7168.

Thanking you in advance for your help in making this study a success.

Sincerely yours,

Timothy Collins  
8th Grade Core Teacher

1 Atch.  
Ltr of Approval.

## CORE CURRICULUM EVALUATION INVENTORY

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

### DIRECTIONS:

In partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Specialist in Education Degree Program at University of Nebraska at Omaha, I am conducting a survey to determine which of the ten common characteristics of the original core program are being met, not being met, or being modified to meet or exceed the original common characteristics. I need your opinions in order to determine this. Your responses will be confidential.

Please mark your assigned school:

- |  |                                   |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Beveridge       | <input type="checkbox"/> McMillan |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bryan Junior    | <input type="checkbox"/> Monroe   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hale            | <input type="checkbox"/> Morton   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lewis and Clark | <input type="checkbox"/> Norris   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Marrs Junior    |                                   |

Indicate the grade level you teach:

- |                                       |                                      |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Seventh Core | <input type="checkbox"/> Eighth Core |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|

Listed below are a series of statements that relates to the core curriculum. Please respond to each statement by circling the appropriate number for items 1 to 22.

- 1 = NEVER
- 2 = SELDOM
- 3 = OCCASIONALLY
- 4 = FREQUENTLY
- 5 = ALWAYS

- |           |  |
|-----------|--|
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 1. To what extent are your core classes two or more periods?   |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 2. To what extent are your core classes based on common learning activities, rather than on specific subject-matter content?   |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 3. To what extent does the core program in your classroom provide for the extensive use of teacher-student planning in terms of the immediate and long-range needs, problems, and interests of the students? |

- 1 2 3 4 5 4. To what extent is personal and social guidance being provided by you as the core teacher?
- 1 2 3 4 5 5. To what extent does core absorb the activities generally assigned to homerooms, such as class business, social affairs, and the recording and reporting of student progress?
- 1 2 3 4 5 6. To what extent does the core program in your building integrate language arts and social studies? This involves "putting two or more subjects together."
- 1 2 3 4 5 7. To what extent does your core class encourage and provide for cooperative planning and teaching in terms of the most effective use of the specialized abilities of other teaching personnel?
- 1 2 3 4 5 8. To what extent are the scope and sequence of learning activities in your core classes determined by the needs of the situation rather than by the logical organization of any one subject?
- 1 2 3 4 5 9. To what extent in your core classes is the acquisition of skills based on resolving problems presented? These problems are taken from the learner's environment, so they are meaningful to him/her; however, the problems can be extremely broad in scope and do not necessarily have to be limited by geographical environment of the student.
- 1 2 3 4 5 10. To what extent does block time core organization encourage the use of long periods for drills or laboratory exercises which contribute directly to the central problems involved in the unit?
- 1 2 3 4 5 11. To what extent in your core classes is the least dominant feature of the teaching-learning situation the subject matter?
- 1 2 3 4 5 12. To what extent are the needs of students first identified, then the scope and sequence of the program developed in your core classes?
- 1 2 3 4 5 13. To what extent does the core program encompass the learning activities of all skill levels in your core classes?
- 1 2 3 4 5 14. To what extent is your core classroom considered a learning laboratory, where problems are presented for solutions?
- 1 2 3 4 5 15. To what extent is teacher-pupil planning a fundamental technique of identifying problems for study in your classroom?

- d. The term core is applied in some fashion to all or part of the total curriculum which is required of all students at a given level. In other words, the core is used to designate all or part of the program of general education.
- e. The core curriculum is made up of those educational experiences which are thought to be important for each citizen in our democracy. Students and teachers do not consider subject matter to be important in itself.
- f. A true core curriculum attacks the problems common to all youth. It is a functional approach to harmonizing the concerns of youth, on the one hand, with demands of society, on the other, without unduly emphasizing one or neglecting the other.
- g. The core curriculum may be regarded as those learning experiences which are fundamental for all learners because they are drawn from their common individual and social needs as competent citizens of a democratic community.

Q1: Which of the above meanings come close to your own? (If necessary use up to three definitions.)

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ (2) \_\_\_\_\_ (3) \_\_\_\_\_

Q2: Which of these meanings is least like your own? \_\_\_\_\_

Please circle the appropriate response:

24. In your opinion, do you believe you are teaching a true core curriculum?

YES

NO

25. Are you certified to teach both language arts and social studies?

YES

NO

26. Your under-graduate degree is in:

a. Social Studies/Language Arts

b. English/Language Arts

c. Social Studies/Social Science

d. Other \_\_\_\_\_

27. Your graduate degree is in:

a. Social Studies/Language Arts

b. English/Language Arts

c. Social Studies/Social Science

d. Other \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for your prompt cooperation. Please return this instrument to your building principal or designee.

Timothy Collins  
8th Grade Core Teacher  
R.M. Marrs Jr. High School