Information about salaries of supervisors and other public school curriculum workers is contained in two recent reports of the Research Division of the National Education Association. These reports are: *Salary Schedule Maximums for School Administrators, 1958-59, Urban Districts 100,000 and Over in Population* and *Classroom Teacher Salary Schedules, 1958-59, Urban Districts 30,000 to 100,000 in Population*.

*Images of the Future* is now available, upon request and without charge, from the Commission on the Experimental Study of the Utilization of the Staff in the Secondary School, 200 Gregory Hall, Urbana, Illinois. The report outlines a number of areas in which unified research is required to improve secondary schools.

The April *Review of Educational Research* treats "Educational Programs: Early and Middle Childhood." This special issue was by a committee under guidance of Arthur W. Foshay. Order from the American Educational Research Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C., at $2 per copy.

The Texas ASCD is demonstrating a leadership role in an important area of curriculum development—the improvement of instruction through more effective instructional materials. It is joining with audio-visual specialists and school librarians to sponsor a conference on this problem to be held in Austin during the week of July 19. Gladys Polk, president of TASCD, reports.

Those concerned about new approaches to individualizing instruction will be interested in the workshop conference sponsored by Teachers College, Columbia University, and directed by Helen Mackintosh, chief, Elementary Schools Section of the U. S. Office of Education. The workshop to be held July 20 to July 31 will consider the problem of individualizing reading instruction in elementary and junior high schools.

**CAPCI News**

Indiana ASCD, through its CAPCI Committee, is undertaking a survey of promising curriculum projects currently under way in that state. Two purposes are to be served by this effort: (a) to identify key schools and leaders who might cooperate with a national program; (b) to stimulate additional interest within the state through improved communication.

Individuals continue to raise the question of how state and local units can best relate their efforts to CAPCI and still fulfill their responsibilities to help members with local and state curriculum problems.

Jane Fransesth's remarks at the opening session of the Cincinnati conference stressed an important factor in an answer to this question, a factor which was underscored in the original document proposing a cooperative action program. Readers will recall that this proposal called for a new "unity and focus" in curriculum improvement efforts.
One difficulty is that of translating this aspiration into concrete plans and operations. Sometimes, case studies are helpful in this respect. Although space here does not permit a full case study report, there may be some value in sketching the sample case of a state unit at work in one of the three problem areas, Evaluation of Learning.

In this state, four sectional meetings were held in September at which time a problem census was made. Other members were reached through a questionnaire. The state unit’s executive committee and its research committee worked together to plan and carry out this census.

Two problems emerged quite clearly from the survey: (a) What is the role of the newly-appointed supervisors throughout the state? (b) Are we achieving the educational goals we desire in our programs of instruction? An analysis of these problems revealed that they were related to some deep concerns of individuals and not just academic questions. Legislation had been enacted which, for the first time, permitted each county to employ several supervisors. Many of the supervisors employed had no clear-cut concept of their functions. Many teachers and administrators felt threatened rather than helped by the new “services.”

The second large area turned up by the analysis might be broadly labeled “evaluation.” There was widespread questioning of this kind: Are we really achieving what we aspire to? How do we know whether or not we are on the right track? How can supervisors work with us to improve evaluation in our classrooms and schools? and so on.

At first, the state ASCD Executive Committee in joint session with its Research Committee viewed these two problems as being discrete, and as being almost too complex to tackle. Then, further study helped the group recognize that both problems might be studied simultaneously; that, in fact, one might identify an important aspect of the work of a supervisor if he could begin to see how such an individual could help teachers and administrators engage in more effective evaluative procedures.

Such a synthesis of problems is not always possible, but in the case of this state study, it permitted a strong focus on one of the problem areas of the national CAPCI and at the same time gave the state unit a chance to work with a persistent concern of members within the state.

In brief, the program of the state unit moved ahead with an autumn work conference centered on the topic, “Designing More Effective Approaches to Evaluation.” Pre-conference planning had identified 10 groups of individuals who would attend the conference as teams. In these teams were supervisors as well as teachers. A major goal of this conference was the development of a clear-cut plan for collecting information about the whole matter of evaluation in the state.

A new commission, known as the Evaluation Commission, was organized. This commission was charged not only with continued planning for a fact-finding survey within the state, but also, with communication with the Washington staff of ASCD to tie in with CAPCI efforts in other states and to tap more fully the many resources of the national organization.

As might be anticipated, this fact-finding operation turned up much information about what schools in the state were doing to evaluate learning. Two categories of material came out of
an analysis of this information: (a) information to be shared with others at the state and national levels—the "effective practices" picture; and (b) information which identified clearly a series of persistent problems, questions and issues that teachers and supervisors faced in the area of evaluation.

At this point, one might view this entire venture as moving into a second phase. The new commission worked closely with a Washington staff member and consultants from the state unit's pool of leadership personnel. Frequent newsletters kept ASCD members and others who were interested informed about every stage of the undertaking. By mid-year, this commission had identified three tasks for the state organization: (a) to disseminate information about good practices in evaluation; (b) to encourage and give specific leadership in the planning of a number of action-research projects designed to experiment and find solutions to some of the most pressing problems identified in the survey; and (c) to provide opportunities for direct training in evaluation skills and procedures.

The Evaluation Commission and the Executive Committee of the state unit saw in this analysis of tasks a model for projecting work to be done during the rest of the year and for a two-year period beyond that. Three task forces were organized with the involvement of additional ASCD members. The projected work of these groups constituted the content of the annual spring conference of the state organization. At this conference, plans were also made for a summer workshop which, it was decided, should be a training institute to develop competencies to help members face the third task identified by educational workers in the state.

And so, with this kind of momentum the state unit moved ahead, making a vigorous contribution to CAPCI and, at the same time, providing curriculum leadership in its own state and region. In no other state is a program likely to develop in just this way, but are there here some suggestions for releasing the potential of state ASCD units as they confront their own unique problems and ask what their relationship to a large cooperative action program might be?

—PAUL R. KLOH, assistant dean, College of Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus.
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