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Much of my recent writing has focused on the rise and evolution of supervision and its efforts to professionalize. An analysis of the history of public school supervision reveals the influence of two rather complementary factors: bureaucracy and professionalism. Both are important for understanding changes in the division of labor within schools and in supervision in particular.

In many ways the basic character of public school supervision has changed little since the late 19th century. Among the similarities include the fact that in the 1890s supervision was cast within a bureaucratic organizational framework, and in the 1990s bureaucracy remains a potent force in supervisory practice. Perhaps equally troubling is the fact that in the 1890s, superintendents/supervisors paid little attention to curriculum. Curriculum development and educational supervision seem to have been on separate evolutionary paths and were viewed as disparate functions. Likewise, there presently appears to be an "estrangement between the two functions which is evident not only in the division of labor, policies, roles, and relationships within schools but also in our fundamental thinking and theorizing about curriculum and supervision." Supervisors today, as in the 1890s, are not actively engaged in curriculum development. "The more things change . . ."

A fundamental premise underlying this article is that the most effective path to educational improvement necessitates supervisors and curricularists working with teachers on the improvement of classroom instruction by coop
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eratively developing curriculum. Curriculum development and educational supervision must be viewed as integral partners in providing effective instruction in schools. Curriculum efforts that eschew necessary supervisory strategies are an abysmal failure. The notion that the instructional process can be enhanced without the cooperative engagement of teachers, curriculum workers, and supervisors is false.

Currently there are too few efforts at coordinating supervision and curriculum development in the public schools. Certainly there are many factors that need scrutiny to understand the "estrangement between curriculum and supervision." A thorough solution will not be forthcoming without analyzing social, political, economic, and philosophical forces and trends. The purpose of this article, however, is to probe the historical antecedents for collaborative efforts between curricularists and supervisors. Although curriculum and supervision today appear fragmented, this was not always the case. My intent is to analyze past efforts by supervisors and curriculum people to work collaboratively in public schools, focusing specifically on developments in the 1930s and 1940s. This analysis will not only reveal productive collaborative efforts between the two functionaries, but will hopefully indicate future possibilities whereby teachers will once again engage in continuous and fruitful curriculum development, working cooperatively with curricularists, supervisors, administrators, parents, and pupils.

**THE EMERGING FIELD OF CURRICULUM MAKING**

The origins of curriculum as a distinct field of study are disputed. According to Hollis L. Caswell, prominent professor at Teachers College who organized the new Department of Curriculum and Teaching and became its official head in 1938, "curriculum has been a subject of study and innovation since the beginning of organized education." Mary Louise Seguel, in her landmark study of the origins of the curriculum field, argued that the Herbartian movement in the late 1890s can be credited with establishing curriculum as a professional field of study. However, Lawrence Cremin, distinguished educational historian and former president of Teachers College, stated that although the roots of curriculum date back to the late 19th century with the efforts of William Torrey Harris and others, curriculum did not emerge as a distinct
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field of study until the "widely publicized program of curriculum revision that Jesse Newlon introduced at Denver in 1922." Cremin observed that Newlon's program was "probably the first in which classroom teachers participated significantly in a system-wide effort at reform." Cremin continued, "Once the Denver pattern caught on, it was obvious that specialists other than the superintendent would be needed to manage the process, and it was for the purpose of training such specialists that the curriculum field was created."*8

My own research reaffirms Cremin's observations. Courses of study, selection of textbooks, and other matters related to the instructional aspects of schooling were controlled in the early part of the 19th century by laymen, school boards, and, in the latter part of the century, by the school superintendent. Curriculum development was minimal and episodic. The supervisor's duty was to carry out the rigid and fixed courses of study determined by the superintendent. Curriculum was construed as that aspect of instruction controlled by administrators. In other words, both curriculum and supervision were under administrative control. This, of course, does not imply that school people were not concerned about curriculum. On the contrary, the evidence suggests that curricular matters were important concerns.9 Systematic attention to curriculum became a national concern in the late 19th century. Curriculum thinking was influenced by educators such as Francis Wayland Parker and William Torrey Harris, as well as by Herbartian philosophy. Curriculum issues were considered at various national and local meetings. However, despite some attention to curriculum, it remains undeniable that school people were chiefly interested in structural, administrative reform to achieve their goal of standardization and uniformity of urban education, and that the superintendent took major responsibility for determining the course of study.

By the 1920s, however, curriculum was receiving growing attention. This was evidenced in a number of ways. (1) the widely disseminated work of Thorndike, Strayer, and Terman in scientific methods of education, (2) Bobbitt's work in Los Angeles, as well as his important book, The Curriculum, (3) curriculum revisions in city systems, such as Denver and Detroit; (4) the formation of curriculum bureaus; and (5) the important role played by national committees and commissions, as well as the growing number of state curriculum projects.10 Clearly the watchword of the day was curriculum. In place of Payne, Harris, McMurray, and Butler were educators such as Kilpatrick,
Cocking, Charters, Harap, Dale, and Lindquist, who were now concerned with curriculum development in schools. The administrative structure of schooling was secure; instructional and curricular issues now received emphasis.

Although interest in curriculum increased nationwide, there was no central clearinghouse or organization to meet the needs of curriculum workers. W.W. Charters stated in *Curriculum Construction*, published in 1923, that there was an insufficient number of studies in various curriculum areas. Charters said, "But with no central magazine existing devoted to curriculum construction, or other central agency, it is impossible to be certain that all significant studies have been secured." Charters felt that some sort of agency of curriculum was needed. Similarly, Henry Harap, professor at the Cleveland School of Education, in a book published in 1928 entitled *The Technique of Curriculum Making*, stated at the outset that "there is a great need for continued study in the field of curriculum making." Harap emphasized that "we have not yet entirely cleared the woods," and much remains to be done. Harap considered work in curriculum to be a "pioneer" venture. His own book was not a "theoretical treatise" but rather a "workbook." Its chief aim was "to help students to make a new course of study, to revise a course of study, to evaluate a course of study and to interpret intelligently the extensive revision of curricula which is now in progress." Harap, like Charters, inexorably tried to establish some sort of curriculum agency.

The publication of two volumes by the National Society for the Study of Education in 1926 contributed to the increased interest in curriculum across the country. Harold Rugg and George Counts, in a discussion of the then current methods of curriculum-making, stated that "a nation wide movement is under way, . . . whatever the causes, the movement for curriculum-revision is here." Still, Rugg and Counts were highly critical. They said, "partial, superficial, and timorous 'revision' rather than general, fundamental, and courageous reconstruction characterizes curriculum-making in the public school." The authors criticized the methods used across the country as being of the "scissors and paste" type. The yearbook unequivocally advocated for trained, competent, professional curriculum specialists.

Curriculum planning and development grew steadily, achieved wide popularity, and, most important, was perceived as a useful function in reconstructing courses of study. Special training in curriculum was viewed as a desirable and sought after skill. Teachers did not, for the most part, perceive
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curriculum specialists as intruders, as supervisors were, but as integral partners in the educational process. Attention in educational circles, therefore, focused on curriculum development as a professional enterprise.

THE STATUS OF SCHOOL SUPERVISION

In the late 19th century, education became synonymous with schooling, and the locus of authority shifted from home and parent to state and bureaucrat. The newly formed cadre of professionals who represented the growing corporate structure promulgated standardization and efficiency as watchwords of the day. Schooling underwent previously unseen or unimaginable expansion and transformation, setting the framework for a centralized bureaucratic system that would remain the dominant mode of school governance throughout the coming century.

Reformers seized control of urban schooling in the late 19th century by arguing that the ward board system of organizing schools was corrupt, inefficient, and unprofessional. Ellwood Cubberley, for example, called for a total school board reorganization and demanded that authority to make educational decisions be placed in the hands of progressive business and professional leaders. These leaders shared a common ideology, arguing that a structured administrative hierarchy composed of professional school managers would bring order to an otherwise chaotic and corrupt system of education.

Although this story has been told before, an important part of it has not received adequate attention—that is, the importance of supervision in the attempt to gain control over urban education. Supervision was viewed as essential to coordinate and implement bureaucratic school management. During this era, the superintendent of schools was the primary individual who performed supervision. William Howard Payne, for instance, conceived supervision as synonymous with the work of the superintendent. Superintendent/supervisors in the late 19th century encouraged authoritarian rule in urban education. Supervisors established evaluative rating schemes and other administrative techniques to bring order and control to a school system perceived to be chaotic and unprofessional. Supervision reflected the general tendency toward bureaucratization and was characterized by autocratic methods and procedures.

After 1900, as urbanization intensified and as the school system grew more complex, the superintendent lost contact with the day-to-day operations.
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of the schools. As a result, he had to establish certain administrative and supervisory positions. In other words, supervision of schools after 1900 was the responsibility of someone other than the superintendent. Much statistical evidence illustrates this increase in supervisory personnel. Principals and general supervisors, who later became known as assistant principals and district office supervisors, assumed responsibility for the day-to-day supervision of schools.

Supervisors, greatly influenced by the work of Franklin Bobbitt, who conceived the school as a factory and the supervisor as foreman, adopted methods of supervision that became production oriented. The production-efficiency model of supervision was based on fixed, quantifiable measures of results. Teachers were seen as "cogs in the machinery" rather than as autonomous professionals. Using this model, supervisors in the early decades of the new century devised somewhat elaborate evaluative measures for rating teachers. Supervisors met much opposition from teachers and others regarding their use of rating devices that relied on quantitative distinctions.

Supervisors quickly realized that they were using inappropriate methods for improving instruction and sought alternative means of supervision. The theme for supervision advocated after 1920 was improvement of instruction, not rating efficiency. Supervisors, seeking to professionalize, wanted to disassociate themselves from bureaucratic and production-oriented role relationships. To do so, they emphasized democratic and cooperative supervision. The work of John Dewey contained the most profound and comprehensive treatment of democracy in education. Writing in 1903, Dewey explained that "modern life means democracy, . . . how does the school stand with reference to this matter? Does the school as an accredited representative exhibit this trait of democracy as a spiritual force?" Dewey lamented the fact that schools, "as currently constructed," do not foster democracy. James Hosic, largely affected by Dewey, wrote an article in School and Society entitled "The Democratization of Supervision." Hosic cautioned the supervisor to eschew his or her "autocratic past." "The fact that he is invested for the time being with a good deal of delegated authority does not justify him in playing the autocrat. . . . To do so is neither humane, wise, nor expedient." Continuing to build a philosophic rationale for the supervisor's involvement in "democratic pursuits," Hosic explained that it was no longer viable to apply techniques of
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the past. Hosic believed, as did John Dewey, that it was possible to reshape a school system based on the idea of bureaucratic maintenance to comply with the principles of democracy.\(^{20}\)

**COLLABORATION BETWEEN CURRICULUM WORKERS AND SUPERVISORS**

Before about 1920, there was not much emphasis on coordinating the work of supervisors and curriculum workers. In the late 19th century, both supervision and curriculum were under the purview of the superintendent. Superintendents during this time had neither the inclination nor the insight to integrate supervision and curriculum for the improvement of instruction. As explained earlier, superintendents were busily establishing the overall structure of public schooling. Curriculum revision and supervision were subservient to the more urgent agenda. Even after the proliferation of supervisors in the early 20th century, supervisors did not see curriculum development as essential for school improvement. This was attributable to the compartmentalized view of supervision and curriculum established by the hierarchical bureaucracy and production model of schooling. Under the rubric of bureaucracy, the separation of teaching, curriculum, and supervision was understandable. Teachers were “delimited primarily to the delivery of instruction,” supervisors were assigned to monitor teacher efficiency, and curriculum development was “left largely to educational policymakers and subject matter specialists.”\(^{21}\)

The interests of supervisors and curriculum people remained remarkably disparate. Supervisors seemed to neglect problems concerning courses of study and curriculum. On the other side, curriculum people paid little attention to administrative and supervisory aspects that facilitate the implementation of curriculum theory. In other words, curriculum specialists and supervisors usually went about their work in schools without considering the necessary interrelationships between the two.

By the 1930s, due largely to the perceived need by supervisors to alter their inspectorial and production-oriented methods in favor of more democratic and collegial ones, it was apparent that supervisors and curriculum workers needed to unify their efforts. Supervisors could no longer involve themselves in instructional matters without attention to and knowledge about curriculum. Curriculum workers also realized that an affiliation with supervision would be necessary to effectively carry out curriculum revisions in the schools. As a result, coordinated efforts between supervisors and curriculum experts were under way in different parts of the country. One of the early efforts at combining supervisory methods with curriculum revision was


undertaken in the Detroit public schools. Stuart A. Courtis, educational consultant for the Detroit school system, reported that the Detroit schools were unique in that supervisors were busily engaged in assisting curriculum specialists in revising the courses of study. Courtis asserted that these efforts were "indicative of the prevalent trend at coordinating supervision and curriculum." 22

Perhaps the most widely publicized attempt at coordinating activities of supervision and curriculum took place in Denver under the leadership of Jesse Newlon, superintendent of schools, and A. L. Threlkeld, deputy superintendent in charge of supervision. Newlon stressed that his school system accepted these coordinated efforts because the schools were democratically administered. Thus, efforts to combine the talents of supervisors and curriculum workers were welcomed. A conducive environment was present, said Newlon, that encouraged "curriculum experimentation, continuous curriculum revision, and teacher participation." Newlon and Threlkeld believed that supervision had a vital role to play in curriculum implementation. 23 Newlon believed that these coordinated efforts would prove especially beneficial for supervisors. According to Newlon, supervisors' involvement in curriculum gave them opportunities to work with teachers in a "joint, cooperative effort." This, Newlon felt, would enhance the perception of supervision among teachers. In an article written in 1923 entitled "Reorganizing City School Supervision," Newlon asked, "How can the ends of supervision best be achieved?" He maintained that the school organization must be set up to "invite the participation of the teacher in the development of courses...." The ends of supervision could be realized when teacher and supervisor worked in a coordinated fashion. Newlon developed the idea of setting up "supervisory councils" to offer "genuine assistance" to teachers. In this way, he continued, "the teacher will be regarded as a fellow-worker rather than a mere cog in a big machine." 24

The idea that curriculum development is an important part of the work of a supervisor quickly spread across the country. Many school systems encouraged supervisors to engage in curriculum work. An increasing number of educators also realized that the image of the supervisor would dramatically


improve if the supervisor worked cooperatively with teachers and other school personnel. A. L. Threlkeld contended that autocratic supervision was no longer viable, nor desirable in a school system. Schools, said Threlkeld, "are committed to a democratic philosophy in curriculum construction." Supervisors, said Threlkeld, were likewise committed to democratic ideals. He explained, "Curriculum revision emphasizes the idea of constant change and improvement rather than the idea of maintaining the status quo. This constant search for a better way tends to cause supervision to depart from methods that are primarily inspectional. " Threlkeld continued, "Curriculum construction promotes the spirit of research. . . a research attitude is developed which should be welcomed by any constructive supervisor."

A review of the literature of the period suggests a clear change in conception of public school supervision. Not only were supervisors calling for more democracy, but much emphasis was placed on greater cooperation with teachers and curriculum workers to improve curriculum making throughout the schools. An editorial appearing in The Journal of Educational Method in April 1929 stated that "the supervisor should be, first of all, a curriculum expert. . . . The supervisor should be able to take the lead in some part of the educational work of the system." In an address delivered before the Northern California Conference of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction in 1933, A. H. Horall, assistant superintendent of schools in San Jose, discussed in great detail the various duties of the supervisor in curriculum revision. These duties were noted as follows:

- choosing the course to be revised
- determining who shall do the revising
- helping to revise the course
- following up the tentative course
- revising the tentative course after an adequate trial
- submitting the final revised draft to the superintendent
- directing the printing of the new course in loose-leaf form
- assisting the teacher in properly using the printed course

Horall explained that the supervisor need not be an expert in the particular subject to be revised because his expertise is more concerned with supervising the program to ensure its completion. "The supervisor should act to organize committees, provide stimulus, chair committees, and see that the course of study is completed satisfactorily."27


Prominent professor of education Gordon N. Mackenzie analyzed this changing conception in supervision. He argued that although "much supervision [retained] the autocratic characteristics reminiscent of an earlier period," supervision appeared to be taking a whole new direction. Mackenzie explained this new direction in terms of an alliance with the "modern curriculum," in which supervisors sought to promote its "development and improvement." Mackenzie saw this amalgamation of supervision and curriculum as an important step in the professional development of supervision. When supervisors participate in democratic relationships in schools, maintained Mackenzie, "supervision is bound to realize its full potential." He further stated that "supervisory leadership should be democratic in a society which has a school curriculum aimed to attain democratic ideals." Mackenzie asserted that "democratic leadership does not proceed on the basis of authority. It suggests, guides, and gives opportunity for experimental learning. It is cooperative and it encourages individual initiative...." Mackenzie concluded his article by saying that "the fact that the new curriculum presents a challenge to supervision is clear," and "supervision must meet this challenge." According to Mackenzie, "Supervision faces a two-fold task: one, to provide leadership in adapting the curriculum to the needs of this society, and two, to adjust and adapt its own philosophy and methods so that they will harmonize with this developing curriculum and improve its vitality and functioning quality."28

Two of the most prominent educators of the time concurred that the conception of supervision was radically altered. Helen Heffernan of the California State Department of Education and William H. Burton of the University of Southern California, who were both active in the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction, clearly stated that "the supervisor is increasingly the person responsible for the development of curriculum materials and experience. In fact the heart of modern supervision is in the curriculum program."29 Henry Harap, one of the foremost scholars in curriculum development, stated that "it is being recognized that the study of the curriculum offers an opportunity to combine disjointed professional activities and courses around the learning activities of children." He continued, "Administrative and supervisory agencies are realizing that the study of the curriculum, more than any other phase of education, emphasizes learning as opposed to instruction; and cooperative professional growth as opposed to critical supervision."30

Writing two years later, Dorothy Heubauer, curriculum director in Illinois,
stated that "we cannot define supervision nor indicate its function apart from our educational philosophy and our conception of the curriculum."31

More and more school people were realizing the necessary interrelationships between curriculum and supervision. Hollis L. Caswell of Teachers College, Columbia University, said that "the public school curriculum has developed under the influence of specialization." Improvements in curriculum will occur, said Caswell, only when there is a mutual support on the part of both supervisors and curriculum workers.32 Three years later Caswell expanded on this theme by stating that "a good educational program cannot be developed when curriculum work and supervision are considered as separate. Supervision is a means of developing the curriculum and should take its setting in a total curriculum program." He continued. "Curriculum development must involve supervision if changes actually are to be accomplished. It is necessary, therefore, if good supervision is to be provided, that the activities of supervisors be related to fundamental educational issues and problems such as are involved in a curriculum program." Caswell concluded, "Such a relationship gives added significance to supervisory activities and makes curriculum programs actually effective in modifying instruction."33

Thus, curriculum development became an essential activity of the public school supervisor. As a result of a number of successful coordinated efforts across the nation, supervisors and curriculum workers began to urge greater organizational unity between the two groups. Supervisors understood that association with the curriculum specialist would enhance their status with teachers and fortify their efforts to professionalize. Curriculum developers realized that successful implementation of curriculum revision depended on being attentive to administrative and supervisory matters. They therefore welcomed an alliance with supervisors. That curriculum work and supervision are complementary processes was clearly evident in the 1930s.

THE SOCIETY FOR CURRICULUM STUDY AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE

In 1929, a group of college professors under the leadership of Henry Harap, then of Western Reserve University, formed the National Society of Curriculum Workers. Three years later, after a merger with a public school curriculum group chaired by Walter Cocking, then professor of education at George Peabody College, the new association was called the Society for Curriculum Study. The final agreement was stated as follows:
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1. The new executive committee shall consist of the combined executive committees of the public school group and the college group.
2. That the combined executive committee be progressively reduced to seven by decreasing the number of replacements by half each year.
3. That the officers of the current year shall be Henry Harap, Chairman, Prudence Cutright, Vice-Chairman.
4. That the chairman continue the duties that he performed in the past and that he keep the vice-chairman informed of all important action taken.
5. That the present programs and activities of the two groups be immediately consolidated.
6. That the name of the society shall be THE SOCIETY FOR CURRICULUM STUDY....

"The purpose of the Society," according to a News Bulletin published in 1935, "is to enable those interested in curriculum making to be of mutual help to each other, and to advance the movement of thorough and progressive curriculum revision." The Society was made up of "curriculum directors, administrative officers in charge of curriculum making, supervisory officers in charge of curriculum making, special or general consultants in curriculum revision, authors or investigators in curriculum making, and instructors in curriculum making." It was not until a year later that the Society included teachers in its organization. The Society was composed of a rather small and select membership. The annual dues, by the way, was one dollar. When the Curriculum Journal began publication in 1935, the Society had 682 members. Membership reached a high point of 807 in 1939. J. Galen Saylor described the leaders of the Society as "liberal in point of view on educational matters and probably to a considerable extent in political, economic, and social issues." He continued, "They were dynamic persons, many of whom were actively engaged in curriculum planning."

Parenthetically, supervisors had a separate organization called the National Conference on Educational Method, launched by James F. Hosic in the early 1920s. Through this organization, which in 1928 changed its name to the National Conference of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction, supervisors promulgated new methods of democratic relationships. In 1929, the name was altered by replacing "National Conference" with "Department."

Unlike the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction, the Society for Curriculum Study did not publish yearbooks. They did publish mimeographed news bulletins from 1931 to 1935. The bulletin consisted of brief descriptions of the curricular activities of people like Cocking, Dale, Harap, and Courtis. The bulletin coordinated the curricular interests of a wide variety of people by reporting on conferences, outstanding courses of study, and state curriculum projects. "I have just received the News Bulletin and once again let me say how important I think this publication is," stated Paul...
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Hanna. "There must be a tremendous lot of curriculum work going on in the country and it ought to be reported in our News Bulletin.""

With the publication of volume six, the "News Bulletin officially changed and initiated the name Curriculum Journal which carried lengthier 3-8 page articles." The Society for Curriculum Study also published a number of books on curriculum issues, the first appearing in 1935, entitled The Workbook. This was followed by A Challenge to Secondary Education, 1935, Integration Its Meaning and Application, 1937, The Changing Curriculum, 1939, Family Living in Our Schools, 1941, Consumer Education, 1942, and An Evaluation of Modern Education, 1942.

The Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction and the Society for Curriculum Study operated as two separate organizations with little interaction. Educators, as we have documented, long considered curriculum and supervision as two unrelated and distinct functions. Each group would engage in their own activities without considering the significant interrelationships involved in the planning of curriculum and the supervision of instruction. Yet, by the mid 1930s these apparently disjointed and unrelated groups formed an alliance based on a common effort "to establish a strong, viable, dynamic organization...." A committee was formed, for the first time, in 1936 to discuss issues that affected both supervisors and curriculum workers. The two organizations decided to undertake this joint effort for a number of reasons. First, there was an awareness that a unified and powerful organization was needed to serve the best interests of curriculum making in the nation's schools. As separate groups, the organizations realized their political clout would be minimal. A coalition would command more prestige and recognition. Second, the organizations had overlapping memberships, especially by the late 1930s. For example, Rudolph Lindquist of California was both president of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction and an active member in the Society for Curriculum Study. Hollis Caswell was chairman of the executive committee of the Society for Curriculum Study in 1936-37, and earlier served as the first vice-president of the supervisory group, as well as a member of the Board of Directors from 1935 until the merger. A third reason for the collaborative effort between the two associations was that these people really believed that a unified effort between supervisors and curriculum workers was needed to successfully carry out the instructional aspects of schooling. It became evident that to talk about curricular change without considering school governance, administrative program-
ming, and other institutional variables related to supervision would be sense-
less and educationally unsound. Fourth, both groups had rather obvious
limitations. The curriculum group had a small and limited membership,
although at first it wanted a select membership. The supervisory group had a
considerable membership, but was unable to realize its professional objectives.

The joint effort was begun early in 1936. Paul Rankin, of the Department
of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction, and C. L. Cushman, of the Society
for Curriculum Study, met in February to discuss plans for a joint yearbook
to summarize and update work done in curriculum construction. Final
arrangements were made and a group of 10 people formed the Joint Commit-
tee. Of the members, two were assistant superintendents, six were professors
of education, one was a supervisory director of curriculum research and one
was a dean. The chairman, Henry Harap, stated that “all the conferences were
held in an atmosphere of comfort, friendliness, and geniality, but pleasantness
did not dull the edge of criticism.” The volume that resulted from this joint
effort indicates that, in fact, there was little disagreement about the methods
of curriculum development.

The book was divided into two parts. The first presented a theoretical
base for the curriculum and the second an appraisal of current curriculum
projects across the country. “In a very real sense the committee wishes this
volume to be regarded as a report of progress,” said Harap. As a whole, the
volume demonstrated the “current social orientation toward curriculum.” The
committee felt that the central problem in education was the “achievement
of a good society.” School life should be “social-centered rather than child-
centered.” Some of the other themes were (1) the teacher must participate
in a cooperative manner with other school people to work on curriculum
construction, (2) evaluation was an important aspect of curriculum building,
(3) the learner should play an active role in the instructional process, and (4)
curriculum was a paramount issue in education.

In a review of the book in December 1937, J. Paul Leonard of Stanford
University stated that “certain chapters are far superior to others, not only in
their style of writing but also in the clearness with which they present their
thinking.” He continued, “there is a need for more definitive language in the
treatment of modern curriculum theories and practices . . . .” Leonard went
on, “one also feels that the yearbook missed an opportunity to be more critical
in its evaluation of present theories and practices. The volume appears to be
more of an explanation and a defense rather than an appreciative but critical
study of the present curriculum movement.” Despite these criticisms, Leonard
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Joint Committee on Curriculum of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction
and the Society for Curriculum Study, The Changing Curriculum (New York: D. Appleton-
Century Company, 1937), p. vi

Ibid., pp. vii, 54, 331
stated that *The Changing Curriculum* was a significant contribution to curriculum thought.43

Following this joint effort, a merger seemed inevitable. Voiced opposition to a merger was apparently limited and was quickly overlooked. In a letter to Galen Saylor dated March 3, 1967, Helen Heffernan of the California State Department of Education, and a very active member in the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction, voiced her opposition. She stated that the supervisory organization was the stronger of the two, due to a more substantial membership, and merger would not aid their efforts toward professionalism. In addition, Heffernan stated that "curriculum development and supervision seemed to be related but not identical functions. Both required a distinctive type of expertise.... I have never been enthusiastic about the 'big umbrella.'"44 Of equal interest, Dr. Alice Miel, Professor Emeritus at Teachers College, Columbia University, a prolific writer on both supervisory and curricular matters, and later president of the newly formed Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), maintained in an interview in 1976 that an important reason for the conflict about merger centered on male-female relationships. The supervisory group, comprised of many special supervisors, feared that merger with the curriculum group, mostly male, would eventuate in a male-dominated organization.45

Regardless of these criticisms, merger was inevitable, and most supervisors and curriculum workers welcomed the merger. Many realized that the goal of professionalism that both groups hoped for could now be attained. In May 1943, an editorial in the *Curriculum Journal* stated: "The editor feels somewhat like the parent who is about to give away a favorite child in marriage. He approves his going, but parts with him reluctantly."46 Thus, the merger took place. The new organization was called the Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development. Three years later, the name was changed to the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.47

**FUTURE POSSIBILITIES**

Over the last 70 years, scholars have viewed supervision and curriculum development, theoretically, as interrelated, complementary processes, as they
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certainly are. Lamentably, however, it is my view that in practice, curriculum coordinators and supervisors have not worked as partners in designing curriculum and improving the instructional process. Educational problems cannot be solved by focusing on curriculum apart from supervision.

This faulty premise of dualism between curriculum and supervision has been promulgated, in large measure, by the bureaucratic legacy of public schooling, with its segmented and hierarchical structure. Administrative reformers in the late 19th century were concerned primarily with the establishment of a highly standardized, centralized bureaucratic system, not with issues of acceptable pedagogical practice, improvement of learning, or curriculum development. Each of these only became important after the fundamental structure of schooling was set in motion, and then, only when they fit neatly into the compartmentalized hierarchical structure. Curriculum making, which began as a subfield of administration, was not a priority of urban school reformers. The idea of having teachers involved in systemwide curriculum reform in conjunction with curriculum specialists and subject supervisors was decades away. The roles and responsibilities of supervisors and curriculum people within the new school bureaucracy were defined very narrowly and delimited in function. Collaboration between the two functions was not even seen as necessary.

This separation is clearly dysfunctional, as evidenced on a number of fronts. Although I do not intend to elucidate the many areas of dissonance between supervision and curriculum, allow me to briefly highlight three areas of concern.

As an academician, it disturbs me that the guiding work of Jesse Newton in the early part of this century in viewing supervision and curriculum development as an interactive process has been forgotten. Equally striking is the fact that many universities have not followed the ground-breaking efforts of Newlon and Caswell in the establishment of the department of curriculum and teaching at Teachers College, where the improvement of teaching, curriculum, and supervision are seen as interconnected and vital to one another. Daniel and Laurel Tanner recently attested to the fact that "in other universities, curriculum and supervision are most frequently—and unrealistically—located in different administrative units of colleges of education."48 Further, from my own college teaching experiences, I have observed the lack of attention various courses give to training supervisors in curriculum development. This fact is inextricably connected to my second observation of the lack of integration between curriculum and supervision.

As a practicing public school supervisor, I can readily attest to the lack of support and interest in curriculum revision and reform both at the school and district levels. Public school supervisors today, especially in large urban
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areas, are deluged with "administrivia" that obfuscate their attention to meaningful curricular matters. Much of their time is spent on disciplining students, distributing textbooks, supervising the cafeteria, and so on. We need to reconceptualize and refocus interest on the notion that the responsibility of a building-level supervisor is to improve instruction by working collaboratively with teachers and curriculum specialists. An assistant principal's day, for example, is spent "mired in mindless routine," where there is little, if any "opportunity or incentive to engage in leadership activities, such as curriculum development,..."\(^{49}\)

A counter argument might be proffered that assigns responsibility for curriculum development to district office supervisors rather than building-level supervisors. District supervisors, some assert, are in a better position to offer meaningful curriculum reform. However, studies and practical experience prove otherwise. District-level supervisors rarely initiate school-level curriculum development activities. When they do, they mainly deal with minor curriculum concerns, such as keeping track of textbooks and ordering curriculum supplies.\(^{50}\) Meaningful educational improvement occurs, in my estimation, when supervision and curriculum development are interactive at the building level in the hands of principals, assistant principals, and curriculum specialists.

A third area concerns the fundamental mindset, or thinking, about curriculum and supervision as integral functions. Speaking with colleagues at conferences, union meetings, and university gatherings reveals the estrangement between supervision and curriculum. It simply doesn't seem to be a major concern of many of my colleagues. Moreover, even a cursory perusal of articles published in major educational journals indicates the lack of attention to the important interrelationships between supervisors and curriculum developers. Supervisors have long bemoaned the inattention to the inherent and necessary interconnectedness of both functions, as well as the apparent neglect of supervision itself. In the February 1976 issue of *Educational Leadership*, Robert J. Krajewski, professor of education at Texas Tech University, urged that if supervisory leadership was to be restored, then greater emphasis must be placed on supervision as a field of study. In an article entitled "Putting the 'S' Back in ASCD," he observed that "curriculum has taken priority over supervision consistently." The tone of the article was doleful, to say the least. The article indicated dissatisfaction with ASCD as a professional organization supposedly formed to meet the needs of both curriculum specialists and supervisors. Indeed, in October 1947, when the organization changed its name from a department to an association the object of the association was


\(^{50}\)See, for example, Jane Hannaway and Lee S. Spoull, "Who's Running the Show? Coordination and Control in Educational Organizations," *Administrator's Notebook* 27 (1978-79), pp. 6-11
clearly stated: "The object of the Association shall be the general improvement of instruction and supervision." The object of the association, according to Krajewski, was not carried out. "There is no time to falter now," insisted Krajewski, "... present indicators look promising for putting the 'S' back into ASCD."

What can be said of future possibilities? For starters, educators need to eschew ahistoricism as a fundamental way of coming to grips with current problems. As I expressed 15 years ago, supervisors need to "become 'conscious' of their intellectual traditions and inherited modes of operation" by understanding "how their field came to be as it is." Future choices can only be made intelligently by examining the past. In this article I have attempted to remind readers of a time when interrelating curriculum and supervision seemed a natural and effective strategy for improving instruction.

What is the likelihood of reintegrating supervision and curriculum development in schools today? I contend that the time is propitious for doing exactly that. In light of recent developments advocating developmental supervision and school-based participatory management, it is perhaps more feasible today than in recent years to reestablish the interchange between curricularists and supervisors.

One of the proposals aimed at dismantling bureaucracy has been the advocacy of greater teacher participation in decision-making processes in the schools. Advocates claim that participatory decision-making would legitimately challenge the current hierarchical structure of schooling by making the organization more responsive to its "first line managers." Moreover, supervision based on participatory democracy would assume an entirely different character, in which a collaborative effort would bring together teachers and supervisors in a political alliance that could challenge current bureaucratic constraints with pedagogical and curricular alternatives. The benefits of greater teacher involvement have been elaborated by Conley, Schmidle, and Shedd:

The more teachers are involved in planning, implementing, and evaluating school and district policies, programs, and resources, the more influence the school and the district can be expected to have on the classroom. This influence, moreover, need not be exercised through more directive supervision or more detailed bureaucratic prescriptions. One of the greatest strengths of participation as a managerial strategy is that it tends to build consensus on goals and agreement on priorities, allowing the relaxation of controls over the means that individuals will use to serve those ends. The importance that recent research on school effectiveness ascribes to goal consensus and a sense of school mission and the need to allow teachers wide discretion over how they orchestrate their classroom activities thus further support the argument for increasing teacher participation in school and district decision making.

--
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Educational reform in the New York City public schools, for example, has taken on greater momentum since the arrival of Joseph Fernandez, Chancellor of the Board of Education. Fernandez has advocated "school-based management/shared decision-making" (SBM/SDM) as an alternative to traditional school management. Under this plan, teachers, parents, and supervisors would work collaboratively towards increasing productivity and enhancing the professional status of teachers. The idea of giving "ownership" over major decisions to teachers has gained wide acceptance among educational reformers. Reformers are convinced that "restructuring" cannot and will not succeed unless teachers are given opportunities for meaningful decision making. Joseph Fernandez recently explained:

The shared decision-making model embraces the old saying 'two heads are better than one.' With SBM/SDM, teams of people from different positions in the school community—the classroom, the cafeteria, the guidance office, the security desk, and the principal's office—work together to devise solutions to problems that no one of those constituencies alone could possibly solve. SBM/SDM calls not for one leader, but for a group of leaders. This group must be able and willing to share among its members the authority and power that come with leadership. Fundamentally, then, SBM/SDM requires a rethinking of traditional definitions of leadership.

It is under these conditions that a partnership between curriculum people and supervisors is likely. The famous program of curriculum reform that Superintendent Newlon introduced in Denver in 1922, in which curriculum development and supervision were conceived as interrelated processes, can once again flourish. However, collaboration of this nature can only be possible where there is a collaborative approach in administration and supervision. Supervisors concerned with improving teaching and promoting learning must accommodate to the idea of partnership and collegiality. Democratic school governance resolves the dualism between curriculum and supervision by fostering an educational environment where teachers work continuously with curricularists, supervisors, parents, and students on curriculum improvement. This will be our challenge in the '90s.
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