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ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Minutes of the Executive Council Meeting

Capitol Hilton Hotel
Washington D.C.
June 9, 10, 11

Presiding: Elizabeth Randolph, President

The Executive Council convened in the Capitol Hilton Hotel with the following members present:

Elizabeth Randolph, President ASCD; Donald Frost, President-Elect;
Philip Hosford, Past President; Joseph Bondi; Dorothy Bryant;
Gerald Bryant; John Codwell; Diane Gess; James House; Edward Karns;
Sister Elaine Kohn; Dolores Silva; Chon LaBrier.

Also attending were:

Gordon Cawelti, Executive Director ASCD; Chuck Speiker; Geneva Gay;
Robert Leeper; John Bralove; Sara Arlington; Virginia Berthy; Carl
Grant; David Ballesteros.

President Randolph called the Executive Council meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.,

It was MOVED by Mr. Bondi and SECONDED by Mr.
House "to approve the previous minutes that had
been distributed". MOTION CARRIED.

President Randolph called for additions to the agenda for this meeting. Mr.
Speiker responded saying that he would like to add a liaison report on AOTE to
agenda item #14. Mr. House raised a question about an agenda item calling for
the Executive Council to define the terms curriculum worker and supervisor. He
questioned who on the Council can do that. Libby Randolph explained how it came
about by saying that the Executive Council deferred until June. Mr. Cawelti
said that there is not any structure on the Executive Council to do that but
added that a subgroup should be created to look into this. Ms. Silva pointed
out that Ben Ebersole and Gerald Firth had been members of the Board subcommittee
which drafted a document attempting a definition and that the Executive Council
could use this draft in whatever further work they did on the task.

Mr. Cawelti raised the question about the definition of the term Life Long Learning
which was added at the Board meeting in Houston to the original four programmatic
focus points. The person who made the motion was a career education person. Mr. Speiker pointed out that several states have adopted this as a goal.

1. Publications Report

Mr. Leeper reported that it had been a satisfying year in publications, his correspondence in reference to next year's journal issues was well along. Mr. Frost raised the question about the process of reviewing manuscripts and whether that is any value to us or are we already committed to publish the manuscripts that are sent out for reading? Dr. Leeper pointed out that when these manuscripts are sent out for reading, they are sent out unedited. Some discussion followed about one of the forthcoming booklets, Curriculum Theory - Emerging Reform. It was pointed out that the manuscript had aroused some conflicting opinions about whether or not to publish it by those who had been asked to read the manuscript. Mr. Cawelti pointed out that although some people did not appreciate the book on theory, an appreciable portion of our membership, or about 20% of those who are involved in higher education, would rather have this kind of publication than something more practical. Ms. Silva said that what she usually hears is that we are too practical but that we are always going to hear this. She doesn't see how we can have one without the other. Ms. Gay pointed out that a few years ago the board adopted cultural pluralism as the main focus or thrust of the organization and wanted to know whether any consideration was given to that concept in the subject matter of our publications. Ms. Randolph asked whether a solicited manuscript had the assurance that it would be published. Mr. Leeper answered that we try to keep our word but offer no guarantees. Ms. LaBrier said that she felt that if we did invite these people to write we had a basis for doing so and maybe should commit ourselves beforehand to publish if we had done sufficient screening; and that this was a human concern that she had. Mr. Karns referring back to a question Ms. Gay had raised earlier said that it had been a task assigned to the Multicultural Commission to check publications on her point about cultural pluralism. Mr. Leeper added that he would ask Carl Grant to speak to that point when he makes his report tomorrow.

2. 1981 Yearbook Approved

Mr. Hosford started by wondering whether there had been discussion of the issue of what's the role of the college to be and who is going to conduct in-service. It was important to address at least the outline of the problem. Mr. Bondi said that item #4 in the list of factors was biased. We have learned too much from industry already. Ms. Gay suggested that maybe that topic should be what not to learn from industry. Mr. Leeper pointed out that this is not a final outline. Mr. Frost said that he would like to add something that is often overlooked. The only reason for staff development is the effect it has on the learner. Ms. Gay asked whether the approach to this yearbook topic would be proactive or reactive. Were the purposes crisis-oriented or was it going to say -- here are some things we can do in the future?

Mr. House MOVED and Mr. Codwell SECONDED "to approve the theme and purpose for the 1981 yearbook as outlined."

Ms. Randolph pointed out that Mr. Leeper already said that he would take the comments back to the committee. Mr. Speiker said that he did not think that this yearbook
proposal should be approved, although he realized that his was obviously a minority opinion. He felt that by 1981 the topic was going to be old, its stand reactive and the list outdated. Mr. Leeper said that this has not been true of other yearbooks. The committee will grow and change and that he was confident that the book that they will come out with will be a fine book. Mr. House added that he hoped it would not be true. If we are going to improve in education we have got to improve in leadership. He hoped that this book would do that. Ms. Silva added that as long as schools exist, staff development will occur. She felt that this could be a very exciting publication.

The MOTION CARRIED.

3. Chairperson for the 1981 Yearbook

Mr. Leeper recommended Elizabeth Dillon to be the Chairperson for the 1981 yearbook with James Olivero as alternate in case Ms. Dillon could not accept.

At this point Mr. Bondi MOVED "to approve Mr. Leeper's recommendations". Ms. LaBrier SECONDED that motion but added that she would like background information on the people she was voting on and felt uncomfortable in not knowing the candidates.

Ms. Silva added that she felt uncomfortable in not knowing the people she was voting for and asked if the minutes could show that the recommendations for these people came from the staff and that we would rely on them for our knowledge. At this point Ms. Bryant said that if we are to be open at this meeting, she would like to recommend Richard Foster to be considered as Chairperson of this committee. Mr. Bondi said that he would be glad to withdraw his motion if his colleagues would like to recommend additional names at this point. Ms. LaBrier, the second of the motion, said that was alright with her. Ms. Bryant then reiterated that she would like Dick Foster to be considered. Ms. Randolph asked about Ron Brandt who was the third name on the recommended list but Mr. Leeper said that there was another task in mind for Brandt. He is a member of a Publications Committee. Mr. Cavelti said that the minutes certainly would show that Mr. Leeper recommended Ms. Dillon.

Ms. Gess MOVED, Mr. Bondi SECONDED "to accept the recommendation of staff member Robert Leeper concerning the appointment of Elizabeth Dillon as Chairperson of 1981 yearbook with Mr. Olivero to be an alternate chairperson if Ms. Dillon doesn't accept".

Mr. House had asked whether a minority person had recently been chairperson or co-chairperson of a yearbook.

He then AMENDED the MOTION to add the name of Mr. Joseph Liggins of Houston to be Co-chairperson of the 1981 yearbook.

Dr. Liggins is the Assistant Superintendent for staff development for the Houston schools. Mr. Hosford, in a point of order, added the words "provided he agrees"
with the intent being that if Dr. Liggins couldn't accept we would have one chairperson for the yearbook.

There was a show of hands and the MOTION CARRIED as AMENDED with Ms. Silva abstaining.

The council wanted clarification on how committee members were to be selected by the chairperson. Dr. Leeper explained the procedures that were gone through and said that a list of suggested names would be sent to Ms. Dillon along with a letter asking her to serve. Ms. Bryant asked whether the list of names included some background statements on each of the person. Ms. Gay, in an idea for future use, asked whether it was conceivable to transmit to the Publications Committee the concerns of the council and ask each of the future authors for a one-page prospectus of what they would do in the area in which they are asked to write. Mr. Leeper answered yes, but he would recommend against it and added that he doesn't have the authority to approach candidates without the authority of the Executive Council. Mr. Hosford said that as long as we have been very careful in appointing a Publications Committee it seems a process we would want them to follow. He said that he would feel very comfortable in accepting their recommendation. Ms. Randolph said we would take this suggestion under advisement for the future.

4. Report on Videotape Project

Mr. Cawelti made some brief remarks on the videotape project. A year ago the council authorized $5,000 to explore the possibilities of putting out a videotape on the middle schools. A staff person was hired, a tape was produced and to date has sold 60 copies. The staff is now working on a second videotape project on humanistic education with the Working Group on Humanistic Education serving as a source.

5. Appointment of Publications Committee Members

Mr. Leeper recommended that two members from the 1976-77 Publications Committee be reappointed to serve on the committee for 1977-78. He recommended that Sue Robinson serve again and Ronald Brandt continue to serve as Chairperson Elect. Mr. Leeper also pointed out that Glenys Unruh, current Chairperson of the committee, is ill and that an alternate Chairperson should be appointed. Mr. Codwell suggested that a subcommittee be appointed to develop a recommended group of people to report back to the council. Mr. Bondi suggested that Ms. Silva and Mr. Codwell perform this task and President Randolph agreed.

NOTE: Following the Executive Council meeting, Mr. Cawelti received a request from Glenys Unruh that she be relieved as Chairwoman of the Publications Committee. Based on this information, and recommendations from Mr. Codwell and Ms. Silva, President Randolph agreed to the following persons to serve on the committee:

Ron Brandt           Lincoln, Nebraska
Phil Robinson        Detroit, Michigan
Robert Esparga       Santa Fe, New Mexico
Elliot Eisner        Palo Alto, California
Louise Nieterle      Normal, Illinois
Mary Jane Egan       Ballston Lake, New York
John Charc           Charlotte, North Carolina

Dr. Leeper is contacting these persons to see if they will serve.
6. **Latino Working Group Proposals**

David Ballesteros reported on behalf of an Ad-Hoc Latino Committee which had met in Washington on May 19-21. They had been asked to reassemble after the inability of the officially appointed Latino Working Group to convene to make recommendations. Mr. Ballesteros said that the group was making a two year proposal which would be aimed at increasing Latino representation in the association. The budget the committee was recommending was approximately $9,000 for two years and this would be used to help plan publications and to prepare a videotape on parental involvement. Mr. House raised the question as to whether or not this kind of activity could not be carried out within the Multicultural Commission. Discussion ensued in which some recommended the need for a production of good classroom materials while others felt that there are a great many materials already available on the market. President Randolph said that the proposals would be reviewed by the Program Development Subcommittee and that Dr. Gay would be getting in touch with members of the Latino committee.

7. **The Executive Council went into executive session at this point.**

Mr. Cawelti said that there was a possibility of employing Dr. Veronica Zepeda to replace Ruth Long who has only been hired for one year because of her being on sabbatical leave. This would entail somewhat of a change of policy of hiring fairly recently graduated Ph.d's in the salary range of $15,000 - $20,000. He asked that the Executive Council reconsider this in order that they be permitted to pay a somewhat higher salary since Dr. Zepeda has had several years of experience at the university level.

Mr. Hosford pointed out that four persons had been interviewed for the position and that the officers felt that both Mr. Roosevelt Ratcliffe who was employed to work with the affiliate units in the year ahead and Ms. Zepeda were very strong candidates and that he had no reservations about employing Ms. Zepeda.

It was MOVED by Mr. Codwell and SECONDED by Ms. Silva "that the Executive Director should negotiate with Dr. Veronica Zepeda to become the Associate Director at the end of Dr. Ruth Long's term". The MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Cawelti called the group's attention to the proposed job description for the position of Governmental Relations Coordinator. He said that 108 applications had been received and that 17 persons were interviewed by himself before bringing four in for interviews the previous day with the officers of the association. President Randolph said that in addition to making this decision on the person to be employed, the board had directed that the council should form a committee to work in the Governmental Relations area and that this group should be appointed at this meeting. She recommended that John Codwell, Joe Bondi and Ed Karmns serve on a Legislative Subcommittee of the Executive Council.

It was MOVED by Ms. Bryant and SECONDED by Ms. Labrie "that this committee be appointed". The MOTION CARRIED.

8. **Mr. Cawelti pointed out that he had written in the job description that academic training be required in the area of political science or law plus the mandatory requirement of having experience on the Hill. He then recommended Steve Hallmark for the position. The officers who had interviewed the candidates agreed**
that each of those they had seen were strong but agreed with the Hallmark recommendation.

It was MOVED by Mr. House and SECONDED by Ms. Gess "to employ Steve Hallmark in the position of Governmental Relations Coordinator".

Before acting on the motion it was agreed that there would be the need for some secretarial help and travel expenses and that ASCD's purpose in undertaking the Governmental Relations function was to provide information and advocacy in the areas of curriculum, supervision and instruction.

The MOTION CARRIED.

9. Mr. Cawelti then discussed the Personnel Committee he appointed from the staff to make recommendations for FY'78 dealing with budget, inservice education and inter-office communication. The group had met over the noon hour for the past several weeks and had made a report to him recommending an across-the-board increase of 9% plus other suggestions. Mr. Cawelti said that although the national cost-of-living increase from February to February was 6%, the increase for the Washington metropolitan area was 6.8%. He therefore recommended that the Executive Council approve an 8% increase for the staff except the slightly smaller percentages would be given to the employees in the higher salary brackets, and that those employees with substantially less than one year's duration as an employee receive slightly less. All raises would be based on satisfactory performance. He also indicated that it is time to move toward a more formal appraisal procedure which is now being done by Dr. Cawelti in consultation with the persons directly supervising other employees. Ms. Bryant expressed a reluctance for a differentiation in raises and others concurred with this point of view.

It was MOVED by Mr. Hosford and SECONDED by Ms. Silva "that we approve an across-the-board salary increase of 8%".

It was agreed that the balance of Dr. Cawelti's proposal was to be included in the sense of this motion except to remove the provision of giving a slightly smaller percentage to higher salaried employees.

The MOTION CARRIED.

10. Mr. Cawelti then distributed a job description for the Associate Director position which includes the editorship for ASCD publications and raised the question as to how the search process should be undertaken and what type of person should be sought. He indicated a preference for making this appointment during the San Francisco conference and requested that the Executive Council give thought to this for discussion at its fall meeting. Mr. Cawelti pointed out that Mr. Leeper will be involved in the process of establishing the job description and there will be a "reach out" attempt on a broad basis to assure that the views of the members are reflected as the Executive Council attempts to make a final decision on this important appointment. The group generally approved of this process.

At this point Mr. Cawelti left the room for the officer's report on the evaluation
of the Executive Director. The officers pointed out that there had been a total review. The officers had reviewed Dr. Cawelti's calendar and the purpose for his activities. They discussed balance and found the calendar to be acceptable. They talked with the staff and reviewed Dr. Cawelti's travel vouchers and found that there were no discrepancies. Everything was in order. There was nothing significantly different from last year's report. Dr. Cawelti is doing a fine job and the officers reported that the sessions with Gordon were free and open.

President Randolph is to write a letter of appreciation and encouragement from the Executive Council to Dr. Cawelti. President Randolph verbally expressed thanks to Gordon for a job well done from the Executive Council. The Executive Session of the Executive Council was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

11. Report on Affiliated Units

Mr. Speiker reported on the probationary status of units in North Dakota, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. He said he had heard nothing from the latter but that North Dakota had reported that an effort was going to be made to get a unit started and that the District of Columbia was forming a new unit which was going to install its officers on this day in the Capitol Hilton Hotel. He recommended that the probationary status be lifted as a sign of good faith in the District of Columbia unit but was reminded that this can only be done by the Board of Directors since they had been placed on probation for a year by the board. Mr. Speiker indicated that he had made some commitments during the fall to help out state units and the council members expressed deep appreciation for his excellent work in helping to strengthen a number of the affiliated units. Mr. Bondi suggested efforts should be made to enlist more members from Canada and the importance of the Detroit conference was mentioned.

A MOTION by Mr. Codwell, SECONDED by Mr. Bondi "to lift the probationary status was withdrawn in favor of the decision to send a letter of encouragement to the District of Columbia unit. MOTION CARRIED.

12. Notice of Constitutional Change Sent to Members

Mr. Cawelti reported that the constitutional requirement on notifying members of a pending change in the constitution had been accomplished by virtue of a memo outlining the proposed changes. This has already been sent out and has been done in sufficient time ahead of the elections in the fall at which time members will receive the same issue with a ballot for recording their vote.

13. Report of Conference Planning Committee

Mrs. Arlington discussed the evaluation system used in Houston which obtained evaluations of the major sessions and assemblies. She reported that the attendance was approximately as projected and that many school districts had to cancel sending persons because of financial restraints. The question was raised as to the quality of action labs. Mr. Bryant asked whether ASCD stipulated its expectations for the persons giving action labs and special sessions. Mrs. Arlington said that the information sent out described the nature of action labs which requires considerable...
participation and that persons were only approved for these small group sessions where there was some information indicating that they could do a good job of presenting. Mr. Speiker asked how many proposed speakers had been denied because of feedback on bad performance and Mrs. Arlington reported that there were 18 such denials this year. She said that there are a number of sessions which do repeat which are regarded as repetition by long term ASCD 'ers but because so many ASCD 'ers are new they are well attended even though they may address a topic already covered.

Mr. Ballesteros reported for the San Francisco planning efforts and distributed information showing a breakdown of their planning process. It was pointed out that in this year's program all of the general sessions are in the afternoon and that the board meeting had been moved up from Tuesday to Monday as approved in Houston. Some discussion ensued regarding the possibility of eliminating the Wednesday activities but there seemed to be agreement to continue the overall format as has been during the San Francisco conference. Mr. Ballesteros then discussed the two day post conference session in Hawaii. Mrs. Arlington will coordinate the arrangements for this session which will be advertised in ASCD publications for the conference.

President Randolph said that the group would adjourn for the evening.

The group resumed its discussion on the Annual Conference in open session at 11:30 a.m. Friday morning. Mrs. Arlington suggested that the conference program not be mailed to all members but rather that it be presented at registration during the conference. This would result in a savings of some $8600 if this were done. Mr. Hosford said that this might be acceptable if a several paged brochure highlighting the conference were sent out ahead and it was agreed that the present brochure could be expanded to provide this information by briefing the preview now used. Sister Elaine said that she studied the conference program carefully before coming and that several others might miss having it available beforehand. She then asked if the program could be mailed only to those who pre-registered. Mr. Cawelti said then that he sensed that it would be acceptable to try out expanding the brochure sent to all members and the staff would work out the details of sending the full conference program only to those who have pre-registered.

Mrs. Randolph raised the issue of only a limited number of persons being able to attend the Professors of Curriculum sessions during the Annual Conference. Mr. Hosford pointed out that the group was limited to 100 persons but that within that quantity it was an open membership. It was suggested that there be an action lab or special session dealing with other member's needs in this area. He urged Ms. Arlington to assure that such a session was in the program. Ms. Silva said that she thought that it would be useful to have something everyday in this area.

Discussion then turned to the registration fee and Mr. Bralove presented a staff recommendation which called for an increase of $5 for members and non-members and $10 for students. There would be no change in the non-teaching spouse fee. He also said that there would have to be a $3 bus service in San Francisco. He said that this fee increase was necessitated by increasing costs involved in putting on a conference such as rental of space and other services in the convention hall.

It was MOVED by Mr. Bondi and SECONDED by Ms. Bryant "to accept the recommendations of the staff in the matter of raising fees". MOTION CARRIED.
Ms. Arlington then recommended that Lucille Jordan be appointed as Conference Chairperson for the Atlanta meeting. Ms. Randolph said that because Ms. Jordan is on the Review Council, she should be given the choice of which group she prefers to serve on.

It was MOVED by Ms. Bryant and SECONDED by Sister Kohn "that this be done". MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Hosford said that he didn't know if the Executive Council had the authority to do that since she was elected to the Review Council. Mr. Cawelti suggested that he talk to Ms. Jordan in an attempt to resolve a matter without interfering with her prerogative as an elected official.

NOTE: In a subsequent discussion with Ms. Jordan, she indicated a preference for staying on the Review Council but that she will help with Atlanta planning through her role on the state planning group.

Mr. Cawelti said that the possibilities for the 1982 conference site which would be decided in October included Las Vegas, San Francisco, Los Angeles and Anaheim. Mr. Karns said that it was difficult for public schools to get approval to attend Las Vegas for obvious reasons and recommended against its consideration. Mr. Cawelti suggested to expedite matters that Ms. Berthy be instructed to only consider Anaheim and San Francisco in further study and preparation in making a staff recommendation on the matter. Ms. Berthy said she would pursue further work on the Anaheim and San Francisco sites based on this conversation.

The group adjourned for lunch.


Mr. House reported that his subcommittee had reviewed the process of reviewing requests for various program development activities including the mini-grant process. He indicated that these would not be ready until after July 1 which has been set as a deadline for receiving responses to the projects proposed. He said that his committee was recommending that the following groups be funded for the reasons indicated.

- Multicultural Education Commission: $8,400
- Research and Theory Working Group: 7,500

(These groups are recommended for approval because they have been authorized previously for an extended period of time.)

- Emerging Adolescents: 900
- Supervisory Practices: 1,800
- Black Concerns: 600

The committee was recommending approval of these funds because the groups indicated a need for that amount of money to finish up current projects during EY'78. The group also recommended that $3,000 be appropriated for the Urban Curriculum Leader's Conference and it was agreed that it would be shown as a separate item on the budget.
The committee also simply observed that the following funds are appropriated for mini-grant projects: state mandated competencies - $5,000, supervisory skills media project - $3,500, individualized instruction dissemination - $4,000 and curriculum development designed for NCSI - $4,000. In response to an inquiry by Sister Kohn about the goal and purpose of the Research and Theory Group. Ms. Gay pointed out that it had evolved to a point where they were attempting to conceptualize a research agenda for the association. Mr. Cavelti said that the original purpose of the group was to develop a research design for studying the relationship between affective education and cognitive gains in achievement because of the press for improvement in the basic skills among the schools served by many members. Mr. Hosford said that his original concept was that there was a need to point out ways to measure total progress rather than simply cognitive gains and that the answer commonly given for not doing this was that affective areas were difficult to measure. President Randolph suggested that a representative of the committee be present at the next meeting of the Executive Council to explain the progress of the group.

Carl Grant, Chairman of the Multicultural Commission, then reported on the efforts of the commission. He said that a position statement of the commission during the past year. He also reported that a manuscript of multicultural education would be coming out this summer and that the committee had done some work in attempting to conceptualize a videotape in this area. He also expressed thanks to Ms. Gay for her efforts on behalf of the commission and suggested that since she was leaving ASCD that she be placed on the commission. Mr. Cavelti said that he had planned to use Geneva in the transition period between Associate Directors since he wanted Mr. Ratliff to be the staff liaison with the commission after he began work next January.

Mr. Bondi MOVED and SECONDED by Mr. Hosford
"that the recommendations of the Program Development Committee be followed". MOTION CARRIED.

It was pointed out that this left funds in the program development area for additional proposals which have been received. Several other groups have requested funds for a variety of projects other than the mini-grant projects distributed by the national office. Mr. House pointed out that the remaining funds would be used by the subcommittee in making recommendations on approval of as many as could be funded. Mr. House said his committee would come up with a full recommendation on the balance of the expenditures. Approximately $7,000 was shown to be remaining in the amount depicted in the budget proposal for FY'78.

It was MOVED by Jim House and SECONDED by Gerald Bryant "that the procedure outlined is the one the committee is leaning toward".

1. Give those RFP's the opportunity to rewrite them where we don't have enough information.
2. Review the proposals looking at our priorities and determine the amount for each.
3. Make our recommendations to the Executive Council at the October meeting.

(Item #4 was added by Geneva Gay to the motion.)
4. Whatever small grants are approved in October be given 1½ years to complete their projects because they won't get started before January, 1978 and otherwise would have only part of the year to work”.

MOTION CARRIED.

Ms. Gay gave a short summary of how far along several of the working groups are in accomplishing their tasks. The Supervisory Practices Group has a booklet in its preliminary stages. Mr. Speiker reported on the Working Group on the Accreditation of the Curriculum Workers saying that they are working on a model for accreditation and will have a modest 40 page manuscript which they will have printed and distributed. Ms. Gay said that the Working Group on Humanistic Education will have a manuscript delivered to Mr. Leeper before the end of June. Mr. Cawelti wondered if it would not be well to devote ASCD resources to fewer more well defined projects, saying that education is so complex that unless you make a bold stroke -- nothing happens.

15. A Report on the National Curriculum Study Institutes

Ms. Gay distributed some information about the National Curriculum Study Institutes for the past year and Mr. Codwell commented that the financial status was excellent. Mr. Bondi agreed saying that originally the institutes were designed just to break even and have gone well beyond that. Mr. Cawelti praised Ms. Gay's work in running the institutes saying that reports on her work were always good. A list of next year’s NCSI’s was also distributed. Ms. Gay said that she would welcome recommendations on names because although the invitations were already out for institute participants she was anticipating that some of those invited would not be able to make it. It was also pointed out that Executive Council members can attend any of the NCSI's held in their area without paying the fee.

16. Liaison Reports

Mr. Speiker reported first on liaison with NCATE and said he hoped the Executive Council will allow this project to go along with him when he leaves ASCD, so that he could have a chance to complete it. Ms. Randolph said that there appeared to be no objection to this so the council approved it by consensus. Mr. Speiker distributed copies of a memo regarding an AOTE proposal. He recommended that the council take formal moves to become a member of this group but said that the minutes should show that this be deferred until another date. Mr. Bondi said that in his view liaison was not something we should spend $900 on. Mr. Cawelti requested that we refer this to the larger issue of with whom are we going to align and why. Many groups want to align with ASCD.

Mr. Cawelti expressed thanks to Mr. Speiker because he kept up the kinds of linkages that are important for any association to have with other professional associations. He also said that the work with the affiliated units is going more smoothly because of Mr. Speiker's work and expressed deep thanks to him and to Geneva Gay also. Mr. Hosford said that the minutes should reflect the council's thanks to these two Associate Directors for their professional service.
Mr. Frost then MOVED and Ms. Bryant SECONDED
"that the minutes show a formal resolution on
the part of the Executive Council to express
appreciation to the Associate Directors and
the Chairperson of the Resolution Committee for
their good work". MOTION CARRIED.

17. 1977 Resolutions Considered

Acceptance of Resolution #7 had been deferred during the March meeting for
further study by the Executive Council.

Mr. Frost MOVED and Mr. Bondi SECONDED "to
accept as is Resolution #7 changing the word
'workers' to 'leaders' wherever it appears".
MOTION CARRIED.

18. Resolution Process

Larry Finkel, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, for the past several years
resigned as of March, 1977 from that position. President Randolph recommended
that Carolyn Hughes of Parma, Ohio be appointed Chairperson in his place. Ms.
Randolph said that all previous members of that committee have been contacted and
all want to continue membership on that committee. Richard Kalectaca's term has
expired and Rodney Tillman resigned. She suggested that four new members of the
committee be appointed: Richard Olson, Francis Hunkins, Dorothy Huenecke and
LaBarbara Gragg.

Mr. Bondi MOVED and Mr. Codwell SECONDED
"that these people be appointed with Carolyn
Hughes as Chairperson". MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Cawelti pointed out that the council was assembling an expensive committee
since the members recommended were from separate parts of the country. Ms.
Randolph said that that could be handled by letting the Chairperson know how much
money was available for meetings and letting her take it from there.

Mr. Bondi then MOVED and Diane Gess SECONDED
"that the President and Executive Director
get together to come up with alternative ways of
bringing the Resolutions Committee together".
MOTION CARRIED.

Some discussion followed about the resolution process and the necessity for
developing some procedure so that the resolutions would be more succinct and
to the point. A letter concerning the resolutions process that had been sent
to Mr. Hosford from Edmund Lewis of the California School Board Association was
then discussed and President Randolph said that the minutes should show that this
letter had been forwarded to the Resolutions Committee for their consideration.

The board action deferring the resolution concerning the definition of curriculum
worker until the Executive Council meeting in June was now discussed. Mr. Speiker
said that the working group on accreditation of curriculum workers was now meeting
and recommended that the council ask Al Sturges and the Professors of Curriculum to take on this task and report back to us. The consensus of the council was that this should be done.

The council then turned to the agenda attachment concerning the proposed long range task force. After some discussion they decided to adjourn until 8:30 a.m., Saturday morning.

19. Executive Council to Undertake Long Range Planning Project

The meeting was called to order on Saturday morning at 8:30 a.m. The group continued discussion of the long-range planning task force. Mr. Cavelti said that an attempt needs to be made to see what ASCD will look like five years from now. Ms. Randolph said that the criticism heard from all sides is that ASCD does not seem to have a sharp focus, does not stand for anything but stands for everything. Mr. House asked how this committee would differ from what the Executive Council does and said that instead of establishing an Ad Hoc Committee, perhaps the Executive Council should be doing the long-range planning but that he needed to hear some other viewpoints before making up his mind definitely. Ms. Gess said that she feels that the board is saying in recommending such a planning committee that the Executive Council is unresponsive. Ms. Silva said that she felt uncomfortable with an outside group coming in to direct long-range planning. Mr. Cavelti said that in Houston he felt good for the first time about the processes that took place in the board meeting; but now that the processes were set up, it was important not to stay on processes forever. Mr. Hosford said that we are the only group left with the principle task of improving instruction regardless of the level or status position of our members, and was happy to see that. One of the proposals in the agenda attachment concerning the long-range planning task force spoke to this. However, he was uncomfortable with the recommendation of the Review Council which called for a system of standing committees and Ad-Hoc groups, since it seemed to return the organization to a structure it had in the past and had since moved away from. Mr. Codwell said that he did not feel uncomfortable with that function but was concerned with the need for the Executive Council to convey to others where we are going and have a visible position. Mr. Frost agreed that from his background of the state organization, better national communication is the key. He said he would like the group to do two things: take the agenda item as a whole and do some brainstorming about all the items either as a group or in subcommittee, perhaps starting with the Program Development Subcommittee. Mr. Karns said that the average Mr. & Mrs. ASCD don't know what the Executive Council is doing. He suggested starting the October council meeting one day early to think through the long-range planning task force proposal and come up with some suggestions without having to go to an outside group. Mr. House said that he liked the suggestions that he had been hearing and asked whether the group would consider having a process person with some knowledge of the history of the association come in to help. Mr. Hosford said that he consulted the board minutes from Houston and the board had authorized the Executive Council to form a task force. He said that it is now up to us whether to appoint ourselves as the task force and that we must in any case report to the board in March. Mr. House asked whether the council couldn't appoint themselves and invite two or three state presidents to join them. Ms. Randolph added that a process person as Mr. House had suggested be included also. Mr. Cavelti said that he saw the process person as being someone less interested in the historical perspective than in working with Libby to keep the group on course. Ms. Gay said that it was fine to be task oriented if we know exactly what the task is. Perhaps we need that historical perspective. She suggested that the
extra day at the beginning of the October meeting be devoted to the preliminary step of carving out the task that is to be done. Ms. Bryant asked whether it would be possible for this group to meet prior to October to address themselves merely to this issue since when the group attempts too much at one meeting, fatigue sets in. Mr. Codwell suggested that representatives from the Review Council, Board of Directors and the state units be present either as process observers or input persons to better represent the diversity of interests in the association. Ms. Gay reiterated that it was crucial for the group to get its hands on where the association has been, perhaps by doing some homework prior to getting on the task. Mr. Karns said that such a history could be written up in a few pages and sent out prior to the October meeting. Ms. Randolph asked how much time the group was willing to devote to this task before the October meeting or whether anybody agreed with Ms. Bryant's suggestion about a separate meeting. Mr. Hosford asked how much it would cost to bring in an outside task force. Mr. Cawelti encouraged the plan of the officers getting together with a process person to go through the process and do the October agenda at the same time in order to save money. Mr. Karns said he would not like the group to spend a lot of time on the history of the association, since it matters less than where we are now and where we are going. Ms. Gess strongly recommended that the process observer bought in not be someone who is emotionally tied in with the association.

Mr. Frost then MOVED and Ms. LaBrier SECONDED "that the Executive Council plan to come in one day early for the October meeting, meet Wednesday through Sunday, with a process observer present with the purpose to be to get through the agenda but additionally to give time to do this work. In addition, the officers are to get together during the summer to prepare the agenda".

Mr. Hosford pointed out that leaving on Sunday would leave two full days to accomplish this large task. Ms. Silva suggested that the Executive Council should have time on the agenda for every meeting specifically set aside for this kind of thing. Ms. Randolph agreed that this was a good idea. Mr. Cawelti said that he would like to see such time devoted to a discussion about specific curriculum and supervision issues and those present agreed.

The MOTION CARRIED.

20. **Review of the Budget**

Mr. Bralove explained several of the 1977 budget items. Mr. House asked why there was a discrepancy of $105,000 in membership promotion between what was budgeted and what was the actual expenditure. Mr. Bralove explained as in past years we budgeted for only one membership campaign with the understanding that if it were successful there would be one or two other mailings. He explained that a good deal of ASCD income is from membership increases, and that the revenue increases as these members renew, since our greatest expense is in initial acquisition costs. Mr. House said that he liked that rationale but that some portion of the increased revenue should be used to increase program development, since that figure has not gone up significantly. Mr. Bralove said that last year's figure was $35,000 for non-NCSI program development and the budget will specify $47,000 projected for the coming year. He pointed out that these are direct costs only and that the figures do not reflect logistical support which if counted would double the amounts. Mr. Frost asked whether program development was controlled by the figure given. Mr. Bralove answered that that is not the intention of the budget and that the Program Develop-
ament Subcommittee should not be bound by the figure given but use it as a starting point. Ms. LaBrier said that she couldn't see from this budget whether there were any carry-over funds and Mr. Cavelti replied that this year there will be little if any carryover monies. He said that a year ago or so a small amount was transferred from the budget to the portfolio, but this budget would not make that kind of contribution to that fund. Mr. Cavelti said that he was not surprised by the figures. In regard to the membership promotion he said that he expected that some day the saturation point would be reached but that has not happened yet. A 2% return is expected on mailing lists but our best results come from personal recommendations. Mr. Bralove said that it was misleading to compare projected budget against actual budget and that he would come back in October with the recasting of the budget to display it on a program basis. A discussion then centered around the 1978 proposed budget. He explained that the proposed $60,000 for membership promotion was for one membership mailing with the understanding that if it were successful, the money would be reinvested in an additional one or two promotional mailings. Mr. Frost said that in view of the fact that the association is increasing revenues from membership and the institutes, he recommended a change allocated to program development of an additional $13,000 to bring the total spent for 1978 to $60,000 to show the membership our commitment in this area. Mr. Hosford asked whether this would go under the item marked "other" in program development, changing the amount of $15,000 to $28,000. Mr. Bralove said that that was appropriate. Mr. Frost further recommended balancing the total budget by dropping $1,000 here and $1,000 there to compensate. Mr. Cavelti responded by saying that the total 1978 proposed budget was based on a projected growth and he asked that the council be cognizant of that.

Mr. Frost then MOVED and Mr. House SECONDED "that in the budget presented the line item under program development "other" be increased from $15,000 to $28,000 with no increase in the total budget for 1978".

Mr. House said that this motion showed good faith. Each year in the board there is some concern for program development and we must be vigilant in terms of areas where we underspend as well as overspend. Mr. Bralove asked the group to give the staff some direction where the money is to come from to balance the budget.

Ms. Silva then made an addition to the MOTION "that the budget cuts made to balance the budget be left to the staff's discretion using this discussion as a guide". MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Hosford said that it was important that the membership be notified via the News Exchange of this 100% increase in the line item of program development.

Mr. House then MOVED and Mr. Bryant SECONDED "to submit the 1978 budget to the board as amended". MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Frost said that he would like to compliment the people who made up the budget.

21. **Dues Increase**

Mr. Cavelti recommended no dues increase this year but said this is the last year that we can hold the line. Although the council has the board's authority to go ahead with the dues increase, he said he would feel more comfortable if the Execu-
tive Council took action to go to San Francisco with a detailed financial statement and have the board enact an increase effective in the new fiscal year. Mr. Bralove said that by March he would have much more information and hard data to take to the board. Mr. Cawelti said that we do not need to make use of the authority that was given to us to enact this increase if needed.

Mr. Bryant then MOVED and Mr. Codwell SECONDED "that the Executive Council authorize the staff to go to the board in San Francisco, accompanied by a rationale from the staff, that they adopt the staff's recommendation as stated on the bottom of page 33".

In a reply to a question from Mr. House about how we would deal with disclaimers if this doesn't become necessary, Mr. Cawelti replied that we will need it next year. Mr. Bralove said the council will have time in March to deal with recommendations for an increase. Ms. Silva recommended going to the board with the statement "it seems to be given out best knowledge at this time, that it will be necessary to increase dues for the next fiscal year". Mr. Cawelti said that he wanted it to be apparent that we planned for it. Mr. Hosford said that in other words we don't need to do until next year what the board authorized us to do this year.

The MOTION CARRIED.

22. Joint Husband-Wife Membership

A sheet containing recommendations on joint memberships was passed out. Mr. Cawelti said that one small problem occurs when two individuals who are married and both members of ASCD and they get two sets of publications. Mr. Bralove said that this affects so few people that it is not worth doing in light of the administrative problems that it would create. Ms. LaBrier said that comprehensive membership for one member of the couple and a regular membership for the other would take care of the duplication of publications except for the journals. Ms. Randolph said that the minutes should show that the Executive Council accepted the recommendation of the staff as contained in the handout.

23. President's Fund

Past President Hosford reported that he has spent the ASCD funds that the council had authorized him to spend during his year in office in reimbursing his institution for the time he had spent away from his job there. He said the cost of his trip to Turkey to attend the conference on world education will come to approximately $1500 of which $750 has already been provided through the budget. He requested permission to spend from the balance of the President's fund approximately $700-$800 for the remaining expenses of the WCCI conference, plus $100 for secretarial service during the coming year.

Ms. Silva MOVED and Mr. Codwell SECONDED "that this be granted". MOTION CARRIED.

President-Elect Frost then said that he was in the process of working out his duties with his institution to give him time to carry out the presidential duties of the association. He asked that his President's fund of $11,000 be established to draw
upon as needed for anticipated expenditures.

Mr. Codwell MOVED "that this request be granted". MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Hosford commended the Executive Council for establishing that fund saying that it certainly has been well spent.


Mr. Hosford reported that this committee composed of the officers of the association plus the Program Development Chairperson met all day Thursday. However, the Chairperson of the Program Development Committee had a conflict and was at his own meeting that day. The purpose of this committee is to evaluate each year at the time of the June meeting, the performance of the Executive Director. Also this committee reviews the Executive Director's activities each time the Executive Council meets by looking at his calendar for the last three and four months. Third, they look at the overall question as to where we want to go as an association. At this meeting the committee reviewed and revised the working paper from three years ago and agreed upon the relationship between the Executive Council and the Executive Director. The general process has been that this relationship is like a superintendent staff relationship. The views of the Associate Directors are sought and this year the two Associate Directors who are leaving were requested to share their expertise and comments and suggestions in writing with the Executive Council. They did such a comprehensive job that they will be reproduced and sent to each member of the Executive Council to be read over this summer. Permission was obtained from the Associate Directors to make these letters an agenda item for the October meeting for discussion and action. As part of this evaluation, the subcommittee also looked at staff morale and recommended two or three actions. First, they suggested a change in their own title from Audit Subcommittee to Evaluation Subcommittee. Also that the letters from Mr. Speiker and Ms. Gay be given out to the Executive Council and finally, they were dismayed by the fact that the Review Council had apparently been reviewing ASCD office staff matters on site just the week before the Executive Council meeting. Some discussion of this last point followed with the consensus that better communications between the Executive Council and the Review Council is needed. It was felt that each year the President and the Review Council should communicate about role definition. In connection with this Audit Subcommittee Report, Ms. Randolph shared with the rest of the council a memo sent from the Review Council to the Executive Council concerning urgent matters which require the immediate action of the council. Ms. Randolph said some of the matters were already being addressed by the council and that her perception was that the Review Council is getting into the Executive Council's job. She asked for some direction in how to respond. Ms. Gess pointed out that the formal evaluation of the conference already has gone beyond what the Review Council has suggested. Ms. Bryant said that the Review Council should be made aware of the time schedule of this committee. Ms. Gess asked whether it would be appropriate to list ways in which these concerns are being or are already met. Ms. Randolph agreed that this was a good idea. Ms. Gay said that this problem comes up repeatedly because the parameters of each council are not clearly enough defined. It was agreed that this territory definition was the problem with Item #3 in the Review Council memo, since those are the kinds of concerns discussed with the Executive Director in the Audit Committee meeting. Mr. Hosford suggested that the Executive Council take a look at this in October.

Sister Kohn MOVED and Mr. Karns SECONDED "to change the name of the Audit Subcommittee to the Evaluation Subcommittee". MOTION CARRIED.
Discussion followed about evaluation of individual sessions and speakers at the Annual Conference. Ways to maintain a stricter quality control of these presentations were discussed. Mr. House said that he found it helpful when he as a member of the Executive Council was called upon to chair some of the session at the conference to communicate with the presenters prior to the conference, asking questions and giving suggestions about participation and so forth. Ms. Randolph said that that certainly can be implemented. Ms. LaBrier said that it was important to keep in mind that this is a contribution to the association. We don't pay the presenters, and the percentage of the good is high compared to the poor.

25. Liaison Reports

Mr. Hosford gave a brief report on the Joint Committee on Developing Guidelines and Standards for Educational Evaluation.

Mr. Cawelti said that the Institute for World Order wants to piggyback on one of our mailings, sending out a free pamphlet. It is small so the postage would not be that much extra. Mr. Frost asked for some of the names of the people involved in this organization and Mr. Cawelti said Dillon, Boulding, Hesberg. He pointed out that we rarely piggyback something like this but think in this case it would be worthwhile. The council had no objections to this.

Mr. House said that two of the program development groups which had been funded, Multicultural Education and Research and Theory, had requested the services of Geneva Gay. He asked for the council's response to those requests since the Program Development Subcommittee would be writing to say that the groups had been funded. Mr. Cawelti said that he would like authorization to continue to use Ms. Gay somewhat as Mr. Speiker would be used as continuing liaison. After which he would clearly enter the recommendation that she be a full member of the Multicultural Commission. Ms. LaBrier pointed out that we may need her for program development after the calendar is set.

        Sister Kohn then MOVED and Ms. LaBrier SECONDED
        "to authorize the Executive Director to negotiate
        with Ms. Gay to use her as needed". MOTION CARRIED.

Ms. Randolph said then that because of the heavy agenda for October, the Executive Council would meet in Washington and not in North Carolina to take advantage of the accessibility of the headquarters office and staff. Mr. Cawelti then said that the October meeting would begin on October 12 and would continue through October 16 in order to give the council time to accomplish the long-range planning task it had set for itself. He pointed out that the Program Development Subcommittee will have their work done by then on the mini-grants. The Evaluation Subcommittee will then begin their work at 1:00 p.m. on October 12. The rest of the council will arrive on Wednesday evening and start the Executive Council meeting on Thursday morning.

Mr. Codwell then reported on the subcommittee to suggest and recommend names for the Publications Committee and said that they needed ten to 15 additional days to complete their task and get the information needed from the staff. President Randolph agreed to that procedure and adjourned the meeting at 12:10 p.m. She expressed appreciation to the council for its cooperation at her first meeting as President and commended them on a great job.