FOR the past four years, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Department of Audio-Visual Instruction have been examining ways to improve and increase cooperation between the two organizations. From 1957 to 1959, a Joint ASCD-DAVI Committee, centered in the New York area, explored questions of common concern.

Since that time, a joint committee in Michigan has continued the earlier efforts and, in addition, has experimented with specific approaches in working together. The official relationship at the national level included only DAVI and ASCD. The joint committee, however, with encouragement from the national level, often considered the work and role of other professional organizations, especially the American Association of School Librarians and, in many instances, state school librarian organizations have cooperated in joint conferences.

Experiences of the Joint ASCD-DAVI Committees over a four-year period have been enlightening. Not once in that time has there been basic disagreement between committee members. Continually, the emphasis has been placed on finding ways in which one organization can complement the efforts of the other organization. This basic feeling of cooperation and concern for increasing cooperation has made it possible for the committees to develop several basic generalizations:

1. *Few concerns in education fall within the province of only one professional organization.* Certainly, the current discussions on teaching machines and educational television deeply involve audio-visual personnel. Yet, the 1961 ASCD yearbook devotes many pages to this topic. Educational television and teaching machines are but one example of mutual interests. The list of other common concerns is endless.

A review of the programs of the state and national conferences of either ASCD or DAVI or an examination of the publications of either organization gives ample evidence that the two organizations are concerned with many similar problems. These similarities show that the basic foundation for a cooperative relationship has already been laid. The fact that, on occasions, differences in the approach to problems appear indicates a need for closer cooperation; not because the differences should be discouraged, but rather because the varying viewpoints and potential solutions should be shared.

2. *When teachers, audio-visual personnel, librarians and curriculum personnel work and plan together, the impact upon students and the public will be increased.* A cooperatively planned and coordinated approach to instruction, us-
ing all available resources, would improve the educational experiences of students. A teacher provided with types of support that supplement and complement one another will be a more effective teacher. Further, lay citizens, recognizing that professional organizations have mutual acceptance of the roles of one another, will be more inclined to accept the contributions of all professional education organizations as valuable.

3. When curriculum personnel, audio-visual personnel and librarians work and plan together, the impact upon teachers will be increased. Typically, the classroom teacher gets bombarded from all sides with meetings and proposals for improving teaching. Unfortunately, these meetings and proposals often do not have a unifying purpose and, sometimes, they have conflicting purpose. A cooperative approach to in-service training would be more apt to improve teaching.

4. When librarians, curriculum and audio-visual personnel participate in cooperative activities, the professional growth of individual participants will be increased. Discussing common concerns and planning cooperatively with members of other organizations add new dimensions to one's personal learning. Discovering the new breadth and depth of problems, exploring different approaches to evaluation and determining alternative solutions to problems are outcomes that can be expected.

5. The level at which greatest specific impact can be obtained is the level of the local school system. Joint national and state committees and joint national and state conferences have value and should be encouraged. Real value exists, however, only when audio-visual, library and curriculum personnel in a local school system work together to improve instruction. All efforts toward cooperation
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at state and national levels should have as their ultimate goal the development of sound relationships in school systems throughout the country.

6. Administrators, as well as teachers, librarians, audio-visual personnel and curriculum personnel, need to be involved in planning at the local level. All efforts toward improving relationships between other personnel in local school systems or schools are pointless unless they have the approval of top administrators. Administrators can help or hinder the development of sound working relationships by the type of curriculum policies that are established, by the type of organization structures that are developed or by the type of buildings that are planned.

7. National and state organizations can implement and support action in the local school system. Although the ultimate goal is the improvement of working relationships in the local school system, state and national organizations must play a leadership role. While individual members of organizations do not totally subscribe to all beliefs expressed by their organization, they often look to the national or state organization for general statements of philosophy and policy. Such statements can help clarify controversial issues and identify alternative approaches for solving problems.

8. The major concern of all professional organizations should be to improve instruction rather than merely to maintain their organization. All professional organizations continually reaffirm their concern for improving instruction and for improving the curriculum. However, each organization tends to have its unique point of view which it strives to maintain. Occasionally, organizations become disturbed to a degree, if other or-
ganizations become too much like them. The Joint ASCD-DAVI Committee does not propose a merger of the two organizations. It does propose that they enthusiastically work together on common problems rather than tend to back away from similarities out of concern for duplication and for maintaining a unique organization.

9. Existing organizations, other than ASCD and DAVI, can be involved to further cooperative relationships in local school systems. The Michigan Education Association has been vitally interested in working with the ASCD-DAVI Committee. Next year, several MEA regional conferences will include group meetings of audio-visual, curriculum and library personnel, as well as teachers and administrators. In Michigan, the Department of Public Instruction has taken leadership in encouraging librarians, curriculum people, audio-visual personnel and teachers to work together through its Instructional Materials Committee. The publications of this committee have influenced school systems throughout the state.

10. The need to improve communications within professional organizations as well as between professional organizations exists. Many fine and forward looking activities using the joint resources of professional organizations are currently taking place. Knowledge of the experiences acquired from past attempts at using the resources of many organizations would be of value in planning future efforts. The official relationships established at the national level and the cooperatively planned activities on all levels need to be published widely within and between organizations. The joint ASCD-DAVI Committee is currently writing a report of efforts at cooperative relationships.

11. No one person can attend all meetings of professional organizations, but the basis for making intelligent choices is limited. Clearly, limitations of time, energy and money make it impossible for any given person to attend all meetings and conferences which are held. Unfortunately, a member of ASCD has no basis for determining whether the DAVI Conference would be more meaningful for him next year and a member of DAVI is not regularly informed of the specific conference plans of ASCD. On the state level, the same problem exists. The ASCD-DAVI Joint Committee is attempting to communicate regularly the plans of one organization to members of other organizations and to assure some degree of cooperative planning of activities.

12. There is a high degree of overlapping of content and resources in the meetings of various organizations. Even though it were possible to attend all meetings, it would not be desirable to do so. During any given year, some professional organizations will be discussing the same topics and using the same resource personnel. However, attending one's own conference to hear a discussion and to agree with kindred souls is a far cry from discussing the same topic at the conference of another organization. The latter circumstance provides an opportunity for appreciating, evaluating and clarifying differing points of view. Cooperative planning at the national and state levels would encourage more efficient use of resources, would encourage conference attendance by members of other organizations and would encourage the development of a common point of view.

13. The concern for finding solutions to common problems and for establishing joint working relationships is increasing.
Again, a review of conference programs and publications is cited as evidence of the degree to which professional organizations share common problems. Experience indicates that organizations are anxious to work together to solve these problems. The fact that a joint ASCD-DAVI Committee has been established indicates that the national organizations recognize a need for the impact of cooperative efforts.

During the past four years, numerous other joint activities have been held. A Tri-State Conference for leaders of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut affiliates of DAVI, ASCD and AASL was held in New York in 1958. In December of 1960, Michigan held its second conference cooperatively sponsored by the MASCD, MAVA and MASL. A conference sponsored by the Indiana ASCD, audio-visual association and school librarians was held in May 1960. Texas had a similar cooperative conference in the summer of 1958. Such conferences have been held in other states.

A team of audio-visual, library and curriculum personnel, representing the Michigan Instructional Materials Committee, used a cooperative approach in presenting a series of one day meetings during county institutes in Michigan's Upper Peninsula. The team approach to instructional materials was also used in Michigan Education Association regional conferences. Current proposals for research on air-borne television call for another type of relationship between MASCD, the Michigan Audio-Visual Association, Michigan Education Association and the United States Office of Education. Research efforts will be coordinated through the use of liaison personnel.

14. Those who have experienced joint meetings have been high in their praise. Evaluation by persons who have participated in cooperative meetings has consistently been good. Evaluations of the Tri-State Conference held in New York commended the idea of the conference. The fact that Michigan has held its second joint conference indicates that value was found in the first. The president of the Indiana ASCD writes, "By pooling our resources, we feel that we have had one of the most successful meetings in the history of our organization." One county that failed to participate in the meetings held in the Michigan Upper Peninsula requested that the team return and work with the schools. Teachers have requested that the joint meetings become an annual feature of the MEA Regional Conference. Without question, the past efforts toward cooperation have had sufficient value to warrant the planning of further activities.
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The possibility of a joint national conference in the future should not be ruled out. However, major efforts should be directed toward sharing resources at every operational level to solve common problems. The Joint ASCD-DAVI Committee feels that the ultimate goal is to improve the working relationships in local school systems.

—JOHN R. COCHRAN, Assistant Superintendent, Public Schools, Kalamazoo, Michigan.
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commissioner and the state board who were authorized by the state department to make the final decision. Recommendations for new requirements in one state were required to pass through a superintendents' advisory commission and a state association of school boards before reaching the state department of education.

One state indicated that the state department of education was the final authority in the approval of new requirements, but did not describe procedures.

State legislatures. In five states the staffs of state departments, steering committees, and local school districts, along with other groups, made recommendations concerning changes in minimum requirements which were then made official through legislation.

State committees or commissions. A state accreditation commission, which was a standing committee of the state education association, worked closely with state and local groups in one state. Final passage of a recommendation by this commission was subject to the approval of a house of delegates of the state education association.

Miscellaneous authorities. Two states listed four authorities jointly responsible for establishing minimum curriculum requirements, including state boards of education, state departments of education, state legislatures, and state curriculum committees. In one of the states, proposals for new requirements originated with a secondary education council or a state examinations board through the state commissioner. In the other state, proposals were reviewed by a state council on education after approval was reached in the state commissioner's office.

In two states some requirements were mandated by law, while others were approved by the state board of education after being processed through a steering committee and the state department staff. In another state some requirements were mandated by law, others being jointly approved by the state department and the state board. Recommendations to the state department and state board passed through a state committee on accreditation standards.

The state board and state department of education were described as jointly responsible for minimum requirements in one state. Recommendations to these authorities originated with selected state committees.

In summary, 40 of the 50 states indicated a single responsible agency; 25, the state board of education; nine, the state department; five, the state legislature; and one, the state curriculum committee. Combined authorities were reported by six states, with four states reporting no agency.

No clear pattern of procedures for establishing minimum requirements was common to a majority of states. Most of the procedures, even though described in broad terms, were common only to a small number of states.