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MINUTES OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING

Marriott Hotel-Key Bridge
Arlington, Virginia

October 14-17, 1971

Dr. Alvin D. Loving, Sr., President, Presiding

Thursday, October 14, 1971

1. Approval of Minutes

a. St. Louis Meeting - March 4, 5, 11, 1971

MOVED by Mrs. Link to remove from the table the Motion made at Williamsburg to postpone acceptance of the St. Louis minutes pending a subcommittee report on the matter of nominations to the Board to clarify Agenda Item #3. SECONDED by Dr. Davis. MOTION CARRIED.

MOVED by Mrs. Link that the Executive Council appoint Robert Haynes as a member of the Nominations Committee. SECONDED by Mrs. Fields. MOTION CARRIED.

MOVED by Dr. Davis that the minutes of the St. Louis meeting in March 1971 be approved as amended. SECONDED by Mrs. Fields. MOTION CARRIED.

b. Williamsburg Meeting - May 20-23, 1971

MOVED by Dr. Frymier that the minutes of the Williamsburg meeting in May 1971 be approved. SECONDED by Dr. Davis. MOTION CARRIED.

2. Call for Additional Agenda

Suggested item on fundamental issues regarding supervision and curriculum taken under advisement as an additional agenda topic.

Agreed that the Council would discuss, in Executive Session, the experimental position of Senior Associate and prepare to report back to the Board as directed at St. Louis. Also agreed that the original subcommittee that worked with Dr. Wilhelms in establishing this position
(Dr. Frazier and Mrs. Fields) would be expanded by one member to facilitate development of a framework for reporting to the Board.

3. **Executive Council Memo**

   MOVED by Mrs. Link that the Executive Council continue its policy of communicating its actions to the Board of Directors, but that the method or specific timing of such communication not be institutionalized. SECONDED by Mrs. Fields. MOTION CARRIED.

   The subcommittee for communicating to the Board is to remain the same as established at Williamsburg, i.e., Mrs. Link, Chairman; Mrs. Fields, Dr. Greene, and Dr. Ponder.

4. **Reports from Subcommittees**

   Discussion deferred until later in the meeting.

5. **Development of Procedures for Commendations**

   Dr. Loving appointed the following subcommittee to develop procedures for commendation of ASCD members who have made a contribution to the work of the Association: Dr. Davis, Chairman; Dr. Ebersole, and Dr. West.

6. **Proposal from Working Group on Goals in American Education**

   The proposal had been reviewed by Dr. Loving and Dr. Greene who gave it tentative approval. The requested budget of $1,600 was seen as in line with other allocations to working groups made at Williamsburg.

   There was discussion of such a study of goals by this particular working group in light of the Association's larger emphasis in the area of priorities, the subject matter for National Study Day, etc. It was pointed out that the group's charge had been to develop a process for arriving at goals rather than a flat statement of goals; also that the subject of goals was not a part of any other working group's plans this year. Concern was expressed about making a commitment of $1,600 before all budgetary matters to come up at this meeting had been discussed.

   MOVED by Dr. Davis that approval of the proposal from the Working Group on Goals in American
Education be deferred until other budgetary implications of this year's program have been considered. SECONDED by Dr. Frymier. MOTION CARRIED.

7. Progress Reports

a. Oppressive Practices Project

Dr. Frymier reported that the committee had held one two-day meeting and has scheduled two more. At the next meeting there will be one general proposal presented and eight or nine pieces of proposals in an effort to achieve a rationale for how the project is to be accomplished. He indicated they are trying to develop an instrument to sharpen their sensitivity to oppressive practices and to identify oppressive policies. He has met with three state associations, reporting on progress and inviting them to assist in the collection of data, and has a long list of names of people willing to help.

Discussion concerned the committee's affirmative response to the suggestion that the study include a look at positive practices as well, and the fact that money sources were less interested in a solely negative study than in a balanced one; the need to honor the Board's concern for oppressive practices at the same time we respond to the great interest in reporting positive aspects.

Dr. Frymier reported that the target date for beginning the study is immediately following the Philadelphia conference.

b. Program Ideas from Senior Associate

Dr. Wilhelme referred to Tab 3 which outlines some activities to date - the project proposal on "Curriculum Modernization" which is under consideration by the Danforth Foundation and which has enthusiastic endorsement from NASSP; the Interpretations on Cable TV; the possible cooperation with the ERIC on Educational Management in distributing abstracts on supervision and the administration of curriculum.

He indicated that lack of funds had limited the operation of the Senior Associate's function in terms of field work, seminars, special publications, etc., and suggested that when the Council re-examines the Senior Associate role they consider whether such a position can be effective without sufficient funding.

He suggested that the Association's best strategy for improving its financial condition would be to concentrate on building its
comprehensive membership by "creaming up" the offerings such membership provides, and he stressed the need for enriching our overall communication with all our members.

He reported an enthusiastic response from readers to an item in the News Exchange, based on the NSF conference on elementary science education, but leading into the idea of the need for heightened dissemination of interpretive reporting of research in all curriculum areas.

Future plans include several more issues of Interpretations and developing copy for larger publications on such subjects as Supervision in a New Key (getting key people together for a seminar); a round-up of the Humanities; grouping (in a new perspective); behavior modification programs in the classroom (getting together a task force on this); trying to involve textbook publishers in a "consumer" review of their products; etc.

He indicated that one of the difficulties of the Senior Associate function is how to validate one's choice of activities.

Discussion concerned: the possibility that our idea of getting curriculum information into the classrooms might be hooked into the Teacher Center projects being funded by USOE; that the proposal on Curriculum Modernization had been sent to the Ford Foundation (no response) and to the National Humanities Faculty (who might be interested in one part of it dealing with the humanities); that Lou Rubin of the Communications Coalition has advised breaking the proposal up into separate smaller pieces; the suggestion of the Council appointing a subcommittee to work on the procurement of grants; the establishing of criteria for decision-making on publications; that ASCD explore other media for communication besides publications.

8. ASCD Resolutions: Review and Reappraisal

Larry Finkel, chairman of the Resolutions Committee, discussed their efforts to devise ways to get as many people as possible involved in the development of resolutions, and to give all members a chance to vote on all resolutions. Discussion concerned: the need for consensus on whether resolutions should be statements of stance or directives to the Board; the problem of providing members a mechanism for making their concerns known to the Board and the Council, at the same time respecting the governance role of the Board and Council; the need to make all members aware of the resolutions procedure, perhaps by having detailed descriptive materials available at registration; the question of whether resolutions should all be submitted to the membership for a
vote regardless of action at the Business Meeting; whether the Council should put a re-examination of resolutions on the agenda for the Board in Philadelphia.

It was agreed that the Council would not place on the Board agenda next March an item asking that consideration be given to a new procedure for re-examining the resolutions being sent to members for a vote, but that concerns about any resolutions could be expressed spontaneously at the Board meeting by anyone who wished to do so.

It was agreed that the announcement of the resolutions carry an explanation of how the resolutions are gathered, and stating clearly a set of procedures to be adhered to at the Business Meeting, i.e., no substantive changes in the resolutions, adherence to Roberts Rules, etc. It was agreed later to communicate this action to the Review Council.

9. Restructuring Program Development Procedures

Dr. Atkins referred to Tab 5 which outlines the need for devising a new program development procedure, and a suggestion from the staff that one way to do this would be to write to a select group of members asking them to identify specific jobs related to ASCD priorities, and to suggest methods and personnel or groups to get the task done. Clusters of concerns could thus be developed and 20-25 respondents could be invited to meet to further define the tasks. These suggestions would then be offered to the Council for its consideration. Other mechanisms involving members in the restructuring of program development were also discussed.

The Council felt that such plans would constitute a delaying action in getting something going, and decided to bypass this interim step and constitute itself as a brainstorming group to develop tasks for action. (The suggested actions and subsequent decisions concerning restructuring were deferred until later in the meeting.)

10. Research Activities of ASCD: Review and Reappraisal

Fred Rodgers, Professor of Education, University of Illinois, was invited to share his insights on the role of research in ASCD with the Executive Council.

The discussion centered around the kinds of things ASCD should be involved in that have a research base. Among those mentioned were:

* Translating research findings into language that is useful for classroom practices as it relates to all aspects of curriculum development.
* Initiating what we consider needed research by assisting
groups who have an interest in such research activity.

* Promoting the use of in-service training in the use of
research.

* Sharpening methods of evaluation on new projects and
proposals and developing some kind of feedback system.

In reviewing the distinguished contribution of the Research Council
to ASCD over the years, it was pointed out that concentration of the
effort of that group on dissemination through Educational Leadership
had been a very difficult thing to get going. Now that that procedure
is firmly established, we might want to consider moving it out of the
responsibility of a working group into an advisory panel to the Editor.
Then we could talk about what new activities we might ask of working
groups or individuals in research that could move beyond the dissemination
function.

Dr. Rodgers commented that research is an individual thing, yet we
talk about what we are going to do as a group. He suggested that as
the Council looks at the question of restructuring ASCD's research thrust
from the point of view of resources, human and material, they ask the
question, "Should we try to influence the profession on the use of
research in decision-making, both internally and externally?"

While he felt it was good the Council wanted to redefine what ASCD
is doing in research, he felt we should look at the issues.

The question of why we have so few ASCD members as compared with
the number of persons involved in curriculum development was brought up
as an example of an internal issue that should be based upon research.

A number of decisions of the Council ought to be based on the best
information that is known. The Council should not shift without some
kind of proof.

If ASCD is going to get off, we'll have to be serious about knowing
ourselves. It might get two or three persons willing to do the kind
of study that should be done. If research of this type is to be done,
then we should commission an individual. Dr. Rodgers felt that the
Research Council could serve as the group who recommends individuals
to the Council for specific research tasks.

In discussing what other kinds of roles a research group might do,
Dr. Rodgers suggested it could identify certain areas of research and
suggest people, without necessarily expecting all of them to be accepted.
It could be possible to plan a monograph, but perhaps recommend that
someone be commissioned to actually do the writing. It could identify program ideas for national conferences in the area and recommend people for leadership roles.

The Council members expressed concern about research as a very integral part of the ASCD operation, feeling it ought to have a much more significant thrust than it does now. Some suggestions for making research a part of the life-stream were: select model schools for anecdotal studies; translate from practice to theory to practice; encourage community involvement; and, collect data from ASCD state meetings. The purpose would be to influence each of us as we make decisions. In the curriculum area, encourage people to look at research data and the pioneer work of a few outstanding schools. One reason not enough attention is given to research is we don't imbed the research along with the other resources for good judgment making.

In reply to the question, "Do we need to review the charge originally made to the Research Council as we seek new ways to diversify the research aspect of ASCD's program," Dr. Rodgers observed that the charge should be reviewed and restated, and should be more specific - focused. Dr. Rodgers suggested ASCD also consider their public relations function - membership. Some members are held in the organization by research problems. Whenever you make a decision about research, find out how much of your money you're getting rid of.

It was asked whether the Council needs a group, no matter how flexible, to do these kinds of things as functions of research. Dr. Rodgers requested that the people who are presently on the Research Council be given a clear explanation of whatever the Council decides to do because of their past contributions.

11. Selection of Site for 1976 Conference

Following discussion of the various aspects of Miami Beach and New York City as conference sites - local transportation, weather, convenience of meeting facilities and hotel locations, etc. -

It was MOVED by Dr. West that the 1976 Annual Conference be held in Miami Beach.
SECONDED by Dr. Greene. MOTION CARRIED.

12. Review of Conference Site Policy

Since there had been discussion of changing the present policy of rotating conference sites to different parts of the country, Tab 6 had been prepared to present the history of that policy. It was felt that
establishing one site for all the annual conferences would eliminate the role of the local planning committees, would prevent the Council from staying close to the grassroots, would cause financial hardships for members who could not attend conferences that were not near their homes. There seemed to be no strong arguments for a change in the present policy.

MOVED by Dr. West that the present policy of rotating the conference sites be continued, but that we also continue our review of the policy.
SECONDED by Dr. Greene. MOTION CARRIED.

13. Executive Session

As a result of the Executive Session of the Council on Saturday afternoon and Sunday morning, the following actions were taken:

Dr. Loving appointed Mrs. Unruh chairman of the subcommittee of which Mrs. Fields and Dr. Frazier are currently serving which is charged with reviewing the experimental position.

[Subcommittee meeting scheduled for December 1, 1971]

MOVED by Mrs. Unruh that we endorse the recommendation of Dr. Atkins in principle and that a subcommittee be appointed charged with the responsibility of assessing the entire staffing structure concerning all the functions that were discussed during the Executive Session, and present a recommendation at the first session of the March meeting including job descriptions, budget, as well as the additional manpower needs.
SECONDED by Mrs. Fields. MOTION CARRIED.

Dr. Loving appointed Dr. Greene, Chairman, Dr. Frymier, Dr. Della-Dora, Mrs. Link, and Dr. West as the subcommittee.

[Subcommittee meeting scheduled for January 15-16, 1972]

MOVED by Dr. Frymier to receive the report made by Mrs. Fields on the functioning of the Council while in session and direct it to the subcommittee on Staffing Structure for review.
SECONDED by Dr. Norris. MOTION CARRIED.

14. Center for Educational Associations - Reston, Virginia

Dr. Atkins referred to the background material in Tab 7 which includes the three board motions pertaining to the proposed new
headquarters site at Reston; a summary of the developments subsequent to those motions; a report on the handling of ASCD's unincorporated status as it relates to holding land by the naming of trustees; a report of the incorporation of the Center for Educational Associations and the corporation's activities to date; and, a recording of the Building Fund account which indicates $21,000 remaining in the fund. Dr. Atkins recommended that at this point the Council take steps to select an architect, as it is authorized to do by Board action, in order to get some rough sketches and cost estimates to use in the building fund campaign. He suggested that a subcommittee be appointed to work with him in interviewing architects who are interested.

Discussion concerned whether the physical specifications of the building should be developed prior to the engaging of an architect; a strong feeling that the way ASCD sees itself functioning in the future should have an important bearing on the specifications, and that a group drawn from among the many ASCDers who have had experience in planning buildings should be appointed to draft an analysis of these functions and present it at Philadelphia; the fact that it will be a headquarters building assumes certain specifications needed for service to members; the necessity for having someone in the national office assigned the time needed to coordinate these activities; what bearing ASCD's relationships with other associations should have on the specifications, perhaps in terms of shared facilities.

MOVED by Dr. West that a subcommittee be appointed to assist the Executive Secretary in screening and selecting an architect for the building at Reston. 
SECONDED by Dr. Davis. MOTION CARRIED.

It was agreed that Dr. Atkins would announce publicly that we are accepting applications from interested architects; that he and the subcommittee would screen these applications down to three or four to be interviewed. They would then come to the Council with a recommendation.

MOVED by Mrs. Fields that a broad-based functions-planning group be set up to develop ideas about ASCD's future functions in order that these may be reflected in the type of headquarters facilities that is built. It was agreed that this planning group should have representation from the Board.
SECONDED by Dr. Greene. MOTION CARRIED.

Also discussed was formation of a committee of 47 unit representatives, comprised of one person selected by each unit on the basis of experience in planning buildings.

The staff was instructed to develop an overall time-line study of what needs to be done in planning the new building; this study to be
presented at Philadelphia. It was agreed that Council members would communicate with the national staff any additional ideas they wish to be incorporated in the planning.

**Fund Raising Campaign Plan**

Dr. Frymier, chairman of the subcommittee on fund raising, reported that in appearances before state associations he has tried to sensitize the states about the need for building a new headquarters site, and he suggested that all Council members make use of opportunities to do this. He presented a list of responses from persons with whom he had discussed fund raising.

Dr. Atkins reported the results of the mail ballot from the Board re: proceeding with the fund raising campaign: out of 180 ballots sent out, 101 were returned. The vote was 99 yes; 2 no's.

Dr. Frymier reported that the subcommittee had not had funds to meet to discuss how to proceed and requested authorization to hold a meeting for this purpose. Dr. Loving authorized a two-day meeting of the subcommittee to prepare materials for a report in Philadelphia.

15. **Affiliation Matters**

**ACSA**

Dr. Atkins reported that ACSA has appointed Helen James to their Board of Directors, and that she would act as liaison with the ASCD national office with regard to reconciling the membership qualification differences between the two associations. He reported that the ACSA board had taken the following action regarding membership: "...that for membership clarification, all personnel, certificated and noncertificated be considered eligible for ACSA membership, except classroom teachers who have no administrative or supervisorial responsibility."

The Council felt that the fundamental differences still remained. Mrs. James had requested that ASCD representatives meet with the ACSA officers in December, and it was agreed that Drs. Loving, Atkins, and Wilhelms would attend that meeting.

Discussion concerned a reluctance to simply write off the ASCD members in California, and that many individual members of CASCOD want to reconstitute a unit; that ASCD could maintain relations with individual members and work with organizations within the state; that it is important for ASCD to have some way of influencing administrators and to help bridge the gap between administrators and teachers that is splitting the profession; that the group meeting with ACSA should have
some alternative relationships to offer; the suggestion of ACSA being an affiliate under the "other groups" provision of the constitution which would establish a liaison, but would not permit representation on the board.

WCCI

Dr. Loving reported that since WCCI had developed out of an ASCD commission, it was ASCD's responsibility to stay with it for a year to get it started, but that now it has organized itself there was no further responsibility. He said he would suggest that WCCI affiliate with WCOTP and thus would maintain a relationship with ASCD through our affiliation with WCOTP.

 MASSACHUSETTS ASCD

Dr. Atkins reported that the Massachusetts ASCD had requested direct affiliation as a state unit. Their membership has grown to such an extent that they would like their own representation on the Board. Their disassociation from the New England regional unit had been amicable and they plan to maintain a loose alignment with that group. It is expected that similar requests for direct affiliation will be received from Connecticut and Rhode Island, but that the three northern states, with fewer members, would continue as a regional unit.

It was agreed that the MASCD request would be presented to the Council when it prepares the agenda for the Board meeting in Philadelphia.

16. Cooperative Relationships with Other Organizations

Dr. Atkins referred to Tab' 9 which reviews the policy on cooperative relationships with other organizations which had been adopted in 1965. He recommended that because there are so many new and different levels of cooperation now developing the Council appoint a subcommittee to establish a more definite policy. Dr. Loving asked for volunteers for such a subcommittee, and the members will be Dr. Greene, Chairman, Dr. Della-Dora, and Dr. Davis.

The development of CONEA and CUP were discussed at length. Since CONEA represents efforts to maintain a united profession, there was consensus that ASCD should join in making it a viable organization. Discussion concerned the fact that it would keep ASCD in touch with the kinds of teachers who are less militant and more interested in curriculum and instruction; that CUP was less representative of the profession as a whole and included the tensions associated with ACT interests, thus it would not be as useful; that some of the special subject matter groups in CONEA were organizing supervisory sections, thus providing a common interest with ASCD.
17. **Association Business**

a. **Membership and Promotion**

Dr. Atkins reported that the renewal rate of 58% (June-September) was 10% higher than last year for comparable dates, but it does not reflect the total renewal rate because dues continue to come in. The record on the results of the combination Publication/Membership brochure indicates that over 600 memberships and subscriptions have been received in the past month.

b. **Budget**

Dr. Atkins reported that as of the end of August 1971, the budget showed the Association had been able to operate through a 15-month period on a 12-month budget caused by shifting the fiscal year by diverting $20,000 from the allocation to the building fund for operating expenses. An accounting of the budget will be mailed to Council members.

c. **Review Council**

Tab 12 reported on the Review Council’s plans for 1971-72, and there was agreement that communication between the two Councils should be given careful attention.

d. **Cooperative Program Activities**

The Continuous Education Conference (specifically authorized by the Council and budgeted for $2,000) will be held October 28-30, 1971. Mr. Stodghill reported that they have 150 registrants, which is about the break-even point, and they hope to get a good publication out of the conference.

The first of the series of one-day workshops on "The Emerging Adolescent Learner in the Middle Grades," sponsored jointly by ASCD's Working Group on the Emerging Adolescent Learner and the Educational Leadership Institute, will be held November 13, 1971. Mr. Stodghill reported that the financial arrangements of this profit-sharing venture were proving most satisfactory, that ELI was underwriting the consultant costs, and that to date ASCD's only costs had been for publicity. The materials derived from such workshops would be available for use by other ASCD groups. The Council discussed such cooperative arrangements as a good example of using other organizations as a vehicle for getting ASCD materials to an outside audience.

The organization and planning of the Supervision Seminars are being done by the state ASCD units, with minimal investment by ASCD national. Mr. Dobson reported on the success of the first seminar held in
Charlottesville, Virginia, which was well organized, well attended, and informative. The 125 paid participants appeared to like the emphasis on the skills area which gave them specifics to take home with them. Future seminars are planned for New York and Texas.

e. Transfer of Nonprofessional Employees to TIAA/CREF

MOVED by Dr. Della-Dora that each nonprofessional member of TIAA/CREF who leaves ASCD within five years of entering the plan be entitled to payment equal to what his contributions have been plus 20% of the employer's contribution after the first year, 40% after the second year, 60% after the third year, up to a maximum of 80% after the fourth year, if agreement between the participant and TIAA/CREF be reached for repurchase. Other conditions for repurchasing, as defined by TIAA/CREF will be applied.
SECONDED by Dr. Frymier. MOTION CARRIED.

18. Professional Liability Insurance Proposal

Dr. Atkins reported on a professional liability insurance plan which AASA and NAESP had investigated and were inviting ASCD to join in. Our only responsibility would be to advertise the availability of the plan and to provide a list of members to the insurance company. He requested authority to offer the plan to ASCD members.

MOVED by Dr. Frymier that Dr. Atkins be authorized to involve ASCD in the Professional Liability Insurance proposal.
SECONDED by Dr. Della-Dora. MOTION CARRIED.


Dr. Leeper reported that the two main things in production currently are the 1972 Yearbook and the book of readings on curriculum concerns. In response to a question about pricing, he indicated that ASCD prices are still lower than commercial publications because we do not have as high development costs nor do we pay royalties; that we have been using a rate of five times the cost of production.

20. National Career Education Project

Mrs. Urquah reported receipt of an invitation from USOE to participate, as a representative of curriculum interests, on a national
steering committee for this national career development project. Under a grant made to a group at the University of Missouri to develop a national resource for career education, the chief state school officers would each appoint two or three people from his state to explore the state programs, and Mrs. Unruh had suggested that the national ASCD office contact the ASCD unit presidents to try to make sure there would be curriculum people represented in each state group. Dr. Atkins had mailed the list of unit presidents to the coordinator of the project.

Dr. Atkins reported that the Association had received many requests from USOE to participate in such activities, that he and Mr. Dobson had each attended some, and that although it was felt that USOE was actually calling the professional organizations in for advice only, after they had already made decisions, it was important to continue to participate as much as possible with the hope of having some influence at some point. It was decided that Dr. Atkins, Mrs. Unruh, and Mr. Dobson would keep the Council informed of further developments in this project.

21. **National Study Day**

The only progress thus far that Dr. Wilhelms could report was that there seemed to be much more interest from other professional associations (several of whom had asked for additional copies) than had appeared from our own members.

22. **Schools for Tomorrow**

Dr. Frymier reported that he has formed writing teams of two or three people each who are taking ideas from the original paper and preparing 40-50 page papers to be finished by February 15. He expects to have a book of between 200 and 300 pages, but doesn't know exactly what form it will be in or whether it should be published. He has talked to other persons about taking the manuscript to the March meeting and beginning to convert it into instructional materials. He agreed to make a formal request to the Publications Committee, through Dr. Leeper, to consider publishing the manuscript.

Dr. Frymier reported that he has been approached by schools in Cleveland, St. Louis, Columbus, and Rochester, Minnesota asking to serve as models - to have someone come in and help them convert their school into the proposed kind of operation. Of these, the most exciting possibility is Rochester.

A subgroup of NSPRA has approached him about working with the project and using it as case study material to collect data of a public relations nature regarding curriculum development. They would like to provide assistance and technical help.
23. **Progress on the Philadelphia Conference**

Reported by Tab 14 of the agenda book.

24. **Possible Personnel Appointments: Vacancies on Existing Working Groups**

MOVED by Mrs. Unruh that Dr. Raymond Muessig be appointed to the Working Group on World Cooperation in Education for one year.
SECONDED by Dr. Greene. MOTION CARRIED.

MOVED by Dr. Greene that Dr. Robert D. Price of the University of Cincinnati and Dr. Helen Brown of Baton Rouge, Louisiana be appointed to the Resolutions Committee for three years.
SECONDED by Dr. Frymier. MOTION CARRIED.

**Reports from Subcommittees** (Agenda Item 4)

a. **Preparation and Publication of the Executive Council Memo**

Mrs. Link reported the Committee agreed to publish another Executive Council Memo. The Committee proposed to highlight items like: the Williamsburg meeting and this meeting; reaffirmation of the priorities for action; the President and President-Elect's concerns, report made by Mrs. Unruh on the USOE's career development guidance, counseling, and placement project; the concern on legislative curriculum activity for programs; Schools for Tomorrow; and, the Reston story. The Memo would have two thrusts...the organizational decisions and the forward-moving part of the Association, and how we see ASCD in relationship to these activities. Dr. Loving and Dr. Frymier were asked to do the President and President-Elect's concerns; Mrs. Unruh was asked to prepare a statement on the USOE's career project; Dr. Frymier would cover Schools for Tomorrow; and, Dr. Atkins would handle the Reston story. Mrs. Link stated the Committee would like to get the Memo out as soon as possible.

b. **Nominations Procedures**

Dr. Frymier stated the subcommittee had explored a number of possibilities, including the suggestion Dr. Atkins made, and finally agreed upon the following:

(1) The Executive Council should not be able to perpetuate its own ideology by dominating appointments to the Nominations Committee; rather, such authority should rest primarily with the Board of Directors.
(2) The methods for accomplishing the nominations should be practical, i.e., possible to get it done.

(3) The methods for accomplishing nominations should be consistent first, with the Constitution; second, with the decisions of the Board of Directors; third, with the decisions of the Executive Council; and, fourth, in keeping with the traditions of ASCD.

After lengthy discussion concerning the procedure for the preparation of a slate for the Executive Council and the Review Council, the following motion was made:

MOVED by Dr. Frymier that the President shall appoint a four-member committee, including the President-Elect and three members of the Executive Council who have been elected to the Executive Council from the Board, to select a three-member Nominating Committee from among the Board of Directors who are not members of the Executive Council to prepare a slate of persons to be elected from the Board of Directors to the Executive Council, and another slate of persons to be elected to the Review Council. SECONDED by Dr. Davis. MOTION CARRIED.

Dr. Ebersole reported on the subcommittee's recommendation concerning the selection of a slate for the national election.

Each year the Executive Council would appoint four persons to the Nominating Committee to prepare a slate for the President-Elect and the Executive Council members elected at large at the March meeting, and the Board of Directors would appoint four persons to the Nominating Committee who shall be added to the one person who was kept over on the Nominating Committee from the previous year. On the odd-numbered years, one person selected by the Executive Council would serve a two-year term, and on the even-numbered years one person of the Board of Directors would serve a two-year term.

It was noted that certain terms in the Constitution are not clearly defined, e.g., "jointly appointed," "establish working groups," etc., and because this is a very fundamental problem perhaps some other committee might consider the same charge to clarify this area, including the possible modification of the Constitution. It was suggested this problem be given to the Review Council and ask them to interpret terms like "jointly appointed", and to report on this when they meet in December (9-10). It was decided that Dr. Frymier would contact Dr. Alexander, chairman of the Review Council, and present the problem to him.

MOVED by Mrs. Fields that we follow the same procedure as last year in order to present a Nominations Committee for the national election in March. SECONDED by Dr. Davis. MOTION CARRIED.
Dr. Loving suggested that Dr. Ebersole, Dr. Ponder, and Mrs. Link meet at the Washington ASCD office and select three persons from the Board to serve with them in selecting a Nominating Committee to be presented to the Executive Council and the Board for ratification. [Meeting scheduled for Tuesday, December 14 at 2 o'clock.]

c. Student Rights Committee

Dr. Frymier, chairman of the Student Rights Committee, reported a file of data had been collected which would be distributed to Mrs. Link, Dr. Norris, James House, and Gene Shepherd with a request that each of them read the materials and pass them along. Dr. Frymier suggested that a new document be published on curriculum and student rights and decision-making and that, perhaps, Dr. Wilhelms might develop it. Money was requested from program contingency funds to hold a one-day meeting in Dayton to bring the Committee together for the first time. Other suggestions:

- formal program in Philadelphia on student rights
- try to find ways to involve students
- identify list of organizations that people can turn to
- ask the radical caucus to prepare a carefully developed paper on student rights.

d. Development of Procedures for Commendations

Dr. Davis, chairman of the Commendations Committee, recommended that the Committee not be called a Commendations Committee, but rather it be called the Recognition Committee. This Committee will report at a later date.

Restructuring Program Development Procedures  (Agenda Item 9)

Dr. Ebersole suggested that one program be presented to the Board of Directors at the March meeting in Philadelphia that would take into account the priorities study, the program ideas of Williamsburg and Annapolis, the President and President-Elect's concerns, proposals by the ad hoc group, possible publication themes, the list developed by the Council during this meeting, and any feedback from surveys to see what this whole picture indicates to us. We could tie together the broad concepts with the general concerns about education in the United States. It was suggested these materials be gathered together by January, and that two weeks prior to the March meeting, a complete program be sent to the Board of Directors. At the Annual Conference, then, certain agreement could be reached on the direction of the program (short and long-range); we could then solicit individuals and groups who might help us accomplish the objectives; and, when we come away from the March meeting many, many people would be involved and participating. (The list of actions suggested by the Council is attached to these minutes).
MOVED by Dr. Norris that the Executive Council meet for two days prior to the Annual Conference in March 1972 for the purpose of program and restructuring.
SECONDED by Mrs. Link. MOTION CARRIED.

After discussion, it was agreed the Executive Council would meet January 21-23, 1972, with arrival on the evening of Thursday, January 20.

MOVED by Dr. Norris that before the Executive Council meets, the staff of the Washington office would provide the Council members with a report regarding all the elements included in Dr. Ebersole's memorandum, and that this report be provided to the members two weeks prior to the meeting so that everyone would have time to study the situation and come to the meeting prepared.
SECONDED by Dr. Prymier. MOTION CARRIED.

Confirmation of Approval of Proposal from Working Group on Goals in American Education (Agenda Item 6)

MOVED by Mrs. Fields that we confirm the Working Group's decision regarding the Stuart Rankin proposal.
SECONDED by Dr. Ebersole. MOTION CARRIED.

MOVED by Dr. Prymier that the meeting be adjourned at 12 noon, Sunday, October 17, 1971.
SECONDED by Dr. Ebersole. MOTION CARRIED.
Executive Council Meeting
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Suggestions for Action in Relation to 12 Priorities:

Mrs. Link - re Item 6
Proposes we have four case studies of site work, involving key ASCDers who are working at these sites (ex. Glatthorn and Foster).

Dr. Frymier - re Item 5
We might make a contract with someone (like Bill Glasser, an ASCD member) to conduct specific workshops around the country under the auspices of the individual and the association, with the profits to be divided between the individual and ASCD.

Mrs. Unruh - re Item 6
We need an anecdotal record of what goes on in new schools involved in pioneering practices, especially those where students are involved in planning governance, codes of ethics, etc. Suggests we contact students for their viewpoints. Dr. Greene suggests talking with parents, too.

Dr. Frymier - re Item 2
Have a traveling workshop—to be put on the road for in-service education. Select different sites to present the same set of ideas—gives a high level of program competence at the same time you get common understandings disseminated.

Dr. Greene - re Item 2
Refers to work in Mobile on practice-into-theory in pre-service, which is entirely different from what is currently being done. Interest in this might provide a great deal of build-up of interest to be useful in the kinds of things Glens mentioned. Discussion of advantages of timing such activities into other ongoing things to capitalize on total community interests.

Dr. Ebersole - re Item 2
Should we involve someone from ASCD with USOE to try to get some of the money they are going to put into the teacher centers?

Dr. Frymier - re Item 12
Get one or more ASCDers to prepare videotapes for use on educational TV.

Dr. Loving - re Items 11 and 12
Sees increasing stress arising from problems of urban desegregation of schools. (Re the ruling to integrate the whole Detroit area). We need models of school-community cooperation in this matter—could make films of such situations (i.e., Charlotte, Nashville, Mobile).

Dr. Frymier
Suggests having someone make a study of the judicial decisions affecting school desegregation and the profound implications of these. This would be a one-man task to monitor such decisions and prepare an abstract.
Dr. Loving
Designing models of community-school cooperation gets you into program planning, too. We could put focus on those models where it is working.

Mrs. Link - re Items 11 and 12
Suggests considering ways of hooking into the work of Lou Rubin's Communication Coalition for Educational Change. Their first issue to be published will focus on the California decision and the financing of education.

Mrs. Fields - re Item 11
Would there be some way to observe models now in operation and establish the fact that they indeed have a special contribution to make? Is there a guideline for looking at models already developed or would the task include the development of such guidelines. Dr. Loving felt that the group taking on this task would have to develop guidelines.

Dr. Frymier - re Item 2
Suggests we get into contact with other associations to sponsor in-service staff development programs.

Dr. Ebersole
Suggests contacting disciplines groups as to what they are doing with their programs so far as individualized instruction is concerned. Dr. Wilhelms suggests we might find ASCD members who are also members of such disciplines associations and have them work on that.

Dr. West - re Items 11 and 12
We have gone through development of a unitary school system—total decentralization of the central city is underway. Suggests providing curriculum consultant for program development between grouped schools. It is not enough to have one community working with one school—they need to talk with other communities, share meetings with parents from all areas. We need case study for reference by others moving in this direction.

Mrs. Link - Items 10 and 11
The hottest curriculum issue may be the increasing attacks on innovative curriculum in the country. (Ex. Montgomery board meeting). There is an organized movement back to the "3 R's". New philosophies being attacked in highly organized ways. Could there be a support system of professions to go into communities to help teachers and curriculum workers. Could we organize teams in various parts of the country who go in to help communities look at decision-making and the new philosophies in curriculum.

Dr. Loving (?)
Innovation gets into difficulty because it is introduced by educators and imposed by them. How do you develop skills for a community to get into the planning stages. When they are involved it works more smoothly.

Mrs. Link
Sees two jobs: we need to find ways to work with communities to help them understand alternatives in decision-making on curriculum, and at the same
time support efforts already going on. We need training models for going out to get communities involved in curriculum decision-making.

Dr. Davis
We ought to find some way to speak to the fact that there are districts where the increasing need to buy busses means they are cutting out programs and teachers.

Dr. Ebersole - re Item 1
Suggests a one or two-week workshop sponsored by us at a college where people could bring in examples of school policies, objectives, etc., and working with a consultant could work over these ideas and perhaps come out with new formats.

Dr. Prymier - re Item 9
Have ASCD record two or three hours of cassette on individualized instruction.

Mrs. Link - re Item 9 and others
Suggests getting authors or teams from good yearbook committees and having them record companion cassettes to go with the yearbooks. Might test out the idea on our best sellers.

Dr. Davis
Suggests a team to visit sites where team teaching and individualized instruction are advertised as being done and expose the fraud that most of them are. Need to get a good definition of individualized instruction.
Dr. Atkins suggested having teams visit schools listed in the latest issue of Education USA as being involved in such practices.

Dr. Loving
Expressed need to find examples of how you develop multi-ethnic curriculum in homogeneous communities. (Referred to two districts in the Seattle area.)

Mrs. Unruh - re all 12 items
Suggests using all 12 items of priorities as a matrix and have visiting teams, properly trained, go to X number of communities, interview people, visit classrooms, etc., to find out in what ways their activities fit into the 12 priorities we think are important. We could get examples of multi-ethnic curriculum.

Dr. Loving
Kentucky and Maryland have state legislation requiring the teaching of multi-ethnic curriculum in every school in the state.

Mrs. Link
We could propose to Public Broadcasting Co. that this issue of multi-ethnic curriculum be presented on the Advocates program, with Dr. Loving participating.

Dr. Prymier - re Item 10
We ought to commission someone to monitor performance contracting publications and report on it to the March meeting. Performance contracting interests are already preparing materials in anticipation of a meeting scheduled for February and we need to give visibility to the other side.
Dr. Greene - Item 8
A major curriculum area is still reading. Suggests a task force, headed by Mrs. Fields, to test the hypothesis that if we had as many techniques for teaching a child to talk as we have for teaching him to read, would we not have as many non-talkers as we do non-readers.

Dr. Davis
An analysis of national assessment is needed. Dr. Wilhelms felt much of what they publish for guidance of people using it could be cut out; also we should consider how it is being misused.

* * * *

Mrs. Link
Suggests that if we do come up with specific tasks we could have a special issue of News Exchange announcing these and asking for self-nominations for joining the teams.

Dr. Prymier
Suggests commissioning six issues of Interpretations to deal with some of these areas to inform membership on what we are talking about.
Executive Council Meeting
October 15, 1971

Additional Suggestions for Action in Relation to 12 Priorities

Dr. Frymier
Identify ASCD leaders to speak on a variety of points of view on selected priority topics. (15 minute cassettes)

Dr. Ebersole
Staff member(s) through selected state ASCDers solicit a roundup of what is happening to curriculum workers in the decision-making process.

Dr. Frymier
Establish something like the AASA National Academy.

Dr. Ebersole
Strengthen relationships with the current efforts of the NEA (through the newly formed Instructional Division) to involve curriculum workers in their activities.

Dr. Davis
Explore possibility of getting some of our best ASCD thinkers into the thinking of political candidates to make educational issues important again.

Mrs. Link
Inquire from USOE about the creation of teacher centers and centers for multi-ethnic curriculum with the possibility of offering the services of ASCD people. This information to be shared with state presidents.

Dr. Frymier
Issue of curriculum manifesto - a set of concepts boldly stated.

Dr. Davis
Explore possibility of a Canadian-American conference on environmental education, jointly funded, to suggest materials and programs in this area. (see NCSS Journal, October issue).
Mrs. Link
Explore the possibility through our North American membership - Canada, Mexico and the United States - to survey developing materials and programs on common curriculum topics such as drug education, environmental education, manpower problems, etc.

Dr. Ebersole
Establish a network of colleges and high schools to evaluate students who have come through the "new school" movement, particularly relating to criteria for administration.

Dr. Della-Dora
Replicate the eight year study in miniature.

Dr. Frymier
Consider a special issue of Educational Leadership spoofing the accreditation procedures (NCATE), etc.

Mrs. Link
Request professors of curriculum groups to take Priorities Nos. 2, 3, and 9 and generate systems of input for us.

Dr. Greene
Ask the ASCD Speakers Bureau people to prepare replies to several mail inquiries on selected topics - revise and update the Speakers Bureau.

Dr. Norris
Offer services of ASCD people to the American Bar Association on curriculum concerns.

Dr. Norris
Offer special session at annual conferences on legal problems involving curriculum (NALPE).

Dr. Frymier
Identify 20 or 25 people in in-service education and ask them to describe their models of in-service programs.

Dr. Greene
Solicit information on pre-service programs based upon practice into theory.
Dr. Davis
Review Skinner "Beyond Freedom and Dignity" and Illitch's "The Deschooling of Society" in tandem.

Dr. Wilhelms
Ask for self-nominations from the membership on a variety of topics in News Exchange to "watchdog" certain developments.

Mrs. Link
Design a handbook of models around curriculum issues on school community decision-making models primarily meant for PTA type groups.