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CHAPTER I

Introduction

This research study examined the attempt in Ohio to bring about major curriculum reform at the local level. Using a case study approach, the dissertation followed the development of the graded course of study in social studies in three school districts. This chapter will provide background information about the topic, a description of the problem, and a listing of the research questions. It will also include a brief description of research methods and conclude with a discussion of the study's significance and limitations.

Background

The field of curriculum is a rich one, and we are constantly expanding our knowledge of the curriculum development process. Initially, and for the larger part of this century, Bobbitt and Tyler's linear view dominated our thinking about curriculum develop-
ment. More recently, Schwab and Reid have extended our view with their discussions of deliberation.

The deliberative process is a nonlinear one; it has no step by step procedures to follow. One can start anywhere in the process and move backwards and forwards with ease. Deliberation is concerned with finding the best solution possible for this particular problem at this particular point in time given these particular conditions. The resulting action will probably be inappropriate for a similar problem under different circumstances and at a different time. Law-like theory is not a goal of the deliberative process. Instead, the goal is to help us make the best decision that is humanly possible to solve our current dilemma.

Empirical studies by Walker and Reid and Walker have tended to confirm and expand the conceptual work on deliberation. These works focused on curriculum development projects at the university level. Today, however, emphasis is on building or school district level development. Teachers are getting involved as part of the curriculum development team. They are no longer content to be simply curriculum implementors.

State legislators are mandating some of the curriculum changes that are occurring across the country. Many states have state mandated curriculum.
Other states are taking intermediate steps in this direction, Ohio included. We don't know how deliberation looks under these circumstances and at this level. What is missing in the literature is a rich description of how the process appears at the elementary/secondary level, particularly when conditions are strictly imposed by agencies outside the districts.

The Problem

This study will describe what one curriculum development process looks like in three school districts when a state mandates that curriculum change must occur and also sets the parameters on the process. The three school districts are in Ohio. Each was responding to an Ohio Department of Education (ODE) mandate that every school district in the state of Ohio must have a graded course of study in every subject area taught in that school district:

The Revised Code, Section 3313.60, requires boards of education to prescribe a graded course of study for all schools under their control. The mandate applies to boards of education of all county, exempted village, and city school districts. According to the Revised Code, courses of study are subject to the approval of the State Board of Education. Courses of study submitted to the Ohio Department of Education are reviewed by the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education. In addition, Minimum Standards for Elementary and
Secondary Schools require that a course of study be adopted for each subject taught.\textsuperscript{1}

Although there have been ODE mandates before, the department wanted to ensure that this one would be strictly enforced. To accomplish this, the Minimum Standard 3301-35-02 Educational Program (B) (3) was written which stated: "Daily lesson plans shall give direction for instruction and implementation of courses of study."\textsuperscript{2} As the Ohio Department of Education conducts reaccreditation visits, inspectors question the classroom teachers to see if, indeed, their lesson plans do reflect the graded course of study.

The new standards, with their accompanying weight of enforcement, caused school districts throughout Ohio to participate in some sort of curriculum development, no matter how extensive or minimal. School districts, at the very least, had to examine each discipline taught and bring written documents into compliance with the ODE mandate. The mandate required the presence of certain components in a graded course of study in a kindergarten through grade 12 master plan (the specific components will be


\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p.11.
discussed in Chapter IV). The actual content of the old document might remain with minimal changes or expansion. It might only need to be manipulated into the new format. On the other hand, schools might take advantage of this mandate to evaluate and make major changes in the K-12 curriculum in each discipline.

The new document was to be a prescriptive one, according to the standards. To help each district make the required changes, the Ohio Department of Education published a prescriptive document of their own, Process Model for Course of Study. It provided the legal basis for course of study development, a list of topics mandated for incorporation in the course of study, and a curriculum development model and cycle. With this in hand, school districts undertook various curriculum development projects.

Within the context just presented, the problem studied in this dissertation was to describe the nature of deliberation at the local school district level. The literature portrays this model well in university settings. There is no indication of how it looks, however, in grades kindergarten through twelve in school districts.
Research Questions

The overarching question of this study revolved around what did deliberation look like under the conditions specified above (further details of the conditions are found in Chapter IV). Public schools in Ohio were under mandate to revise their curricula in every subject following the guidelines established by the state accrediting agency. This agency had the backing of the state legislature. No funding was provided for the curriculum development, and strict deadlines weighed heavily over each of the districts.

Deliberation is a complex process consisting of many components. It was not possible to examine all of those components within one study. Therefore, the specific questions addressed in this study are:

1. The deliberative process is an arduous and time consuming task. How did each of the three districts deal with this time factor?

2. Deliberations need to consider multiple perspectives as represented by the commonplaces. What perspectives were represented in the issues brought up by the participants in my case studies?

3. The curriculum specialist plays an important co-ordinating and leadership role in deliberation. What role did the leaders play in the public school committees?

4. Ends and means are intertwined in deliberation, representing consistent value positions, such as described in Walker’s notion of platform. Can the platforms of the participants in the three school districts be identified?
These four questions were explored in analyzing the data from the transcripts of the three public school districts studied. Chapter IV will deal with the first question, which will also help the reader to understand further the context in which each of the districts accomplished their tasks. Chapter V will examine the remaining three questions.

Methodology

This study was concerned with the process of writing a graded course of study rather than with the appearance of the completed document or its implementation. I studied three public school districts during the process of writing their graded courses of study in social studies. I attended all sessions in each district throughout their work. I collected data by continuous contact with the committee members in the setting where the graded courses of study were written. Sessions were audio taped and later transcribed. These transcriptions formed the major portion of my data. Categories emerged from the transcriptions, thus following an interpretive approach using a qualitative research design.

Two models of curriculum design were used to analyze the data and resources available to the commit-
The traditional model of Ralph Tyler was used to examine the Process Model for Course of Study. This was the document created by the Ohio Department of Education as a guideline to be used by all school districts in writing their own graded courses of study. It contained not only suggestions for writing the individual documents, but also mandated components to be included in specific ways in each graded course of study. There were direct parallels between the organization required by the ODE and the "Elements to be Organized" section of Tyler's book. Tyler's major elements were the concepts. The State Department called them program goals in its publication. Tyler had two different levels of subcategories under each identified concept, although he did not specifically label these. The State Department called them program objectives and subject objectives.

The second model was the deliberative model as defined by Schwab and further refined by Reid and Walker. This was used to analyze the data in the transcripts. The various empirical studies done by both Reid and Walker suggested that actual curriculum

---

development appeared to look more like Schwab's idealized model than Tyler's model. Their studies were done in university settings. This was an opportunity to see if curriculum development at the elementary/secondary level also appeared to be more closely aligned with Schwab.

Significance of the Study

One major significance of the study was that it did examine curriculum change at the elementary/secondary level in the light of the deliberative model. If this model is truly to provide an alternative to the traditional or Tyler model, it must be tested in a natural, practical setting where variables are not being controlled and manipulated. Studies both here and abroad suggest that the Schwab model is a viable alternative in the university setting; but there is a void in the literature about the public school level in the United States.

Public schools, by their very nature, are closely controlled by state legislatures and educational bodies. Even publically supported universities have more autonomy than public schools. This study was able to look at the curriculum development process in districts under specific conditions set by the state.
Although specific conditions will differ from state to state, it does give us one picture of the process under representative constraints.

The traditional literature assigns teachers the role of curriculum implementors rather than creators. Teacher empowerment seems to be the trend of the late 1980's and at least early 1990's. Increasingly teachers are accepting and even demanding a role in curriculum change. If they are going to be accountable for the results of the curriculum development, they want to have a say in what that curriculum is. What does their involvement look like? The school districts participating in this study were composed of teacher committees with one administrator and one or two curriculum consultants. The teachers were, then, the major force behind the curriculum development.

Limitations of the Study

There are a number of limitations of this study. First of all, it looked at only three cases, or actually three incidences of a single case. All districts were in Ohio, where the same mandate and constraints applied. Curriculum development at this level in other states would be affected by that state's constraints and rules.
The deliberative model is complex and encompasses many elements. This study focused on those few elements listed in the research questions. Other studies of Ohio schools and public schools in other state focusing on other elements will be needed for a more complete picture of what deliberation looks like at the elementary/secondary level.

Data collection was limited to the taped transcripts of each of the meetings, minutes, worksheets created for coding and keeping track of subject objectives, and the final documents. Interviews, for example, were not conducted with any of the participants in the study. My impressions as a participant observer were the key in the data analysis.

Although the role of participant observer allowed me to see things an outsider would not have noticed, it also presented certain limitations. As a representative of the county office, I had obligations regarding the quality of the completed document. I had to listen closely and respond to comments of others on the committee. It is hard to participate and make extensive field notes, as any recording secretary of a committee will affirm.

In addition, some impressions that I might have had if I could have done more observing at times, and a
little less participating, were probably missed. Although I tried to maintain a close relationship with the members, I was in and out of their districts. I could not participate fully in all of the informal, out of committee sessions interactions that occurred that affected later deliberations. I was involved in the process. Although I tried to maintain as much objectivity as was humanly possible, some impressions may have influenced my data analysis.

The final section of this chapter will provide the reader with sketch of the remaining chapters. It will briefly describe the major focus of each of the chapters.

Overview of the Chapters

Chapter I discussed the background information of the study and described the problem and the research questions. It also gave a brief summary of the research methodology and the significance and limitations of the study.

Chapter II explores the pertinent literature including that of the traditional curriculum theorists Tyler, English, and Beauchamp. It will also review the writings of those concered with deliberation, including Schwab, Reid, Walker, and Hannay.
Chapter III will describe in detail the research method chosen for this study and the rationale behind that decision. It will discuss the issues that influenced the method chosen.

Chapter IV will provide the reader with an understanding of the context of the study. First it will describe the constraints and conditions set up by the Ohio State Department of Education. Then it will describe the local districts and how they responded to those conditions.

Chapter V will analyze the data in terms of the last three research questions described in Chapter I. It will describe the data that relate to platform, the commonplaces, and the leadership role and give examples from the data to support the conclusions.

Finally, Chapter VI will draw general conclusions and implications from the study. It will also give suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

In this chapter, two main categories of literature will be reviewed. The influence that traditional writers such as Tyler, Beauchamp, and English have had on the process of curriculum development and attitudes about roles of educators will be explored in the first section. The second section will examine the writings of the less traditional works of Schwab, Reid, Walker, and others who seek to understand the nature of deliberation and changing roles of educators in the process of curriculum change.

Curriculum Models

The number of books and articles written on curriculum development in this century could fill a whole library by itself. Just about everyone has written about the subject from Apple to Zais. After a while, the books begin to sound like one another, distinguished only by the differing chapter orders. In
the last several decades, however, some writers have been considering the field in a new way. These writers have been dissatisfied with traditional views of curriculum and curriculum development.

The writings of the traditionalists are important to review in this study because of the influence they had on the thinking of teachers, administrators, and ODE personnel. These people were educated by professors and textbooks who passed on the views and attitudes of these "curriculum experts." The writings contained not only directions for how to do good curriculum writing, but about who was most qualified to do this work. It also influenced how we educated people to fill the various roles that occur in education. Those who were merely to implement the curriculum needed to be trained to do so. But those who would actually create the curriculum needed a different kind of advanced education.

These writings are also important to examine because they influenced the guidelines created by ODE to help school districts write their documents. The directions and suggestions found in the Process Model for Course of Study have many parallels from Tyler, for instance. Presentations made by ODE staff at in-
services also followed traditional steps for curriculum development.

But does this traditional literature accurately depict how curriculum development occurs at the local level, even in light of the guidelines provided by the state? In a large number of cases, committees in Ohio's local districts involved people not traditionally included in the development process. Might this influence what that process looked like? Schwab proposed an idealized description of what curriculum development should actually embody which differs from the picture the traditional literature paints. Reid and Walker provide us with empirical studies which show that university curriculum groups tend to function more like Schwab's description than traditional literature would suggest. Might these descriptions more accurately reflect how curriculum change looked at the local level in Ohio?

Both schools of thought are important in examining curriculum change at the local, public school level. Both have significant contributions to make in analyzing this phenomenon. Therefore, this chapter will be divided into two sections, each looking at important representative literature of the two schools.
Traditional Curriculum Thought

Probably the name that comes to mind first when speaking of the traditionalists is Ralph W. Tyler. His *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* has become the primer in curriculum studies. Tyler has readily admitted that what he did in that book was to summarize and synthesize such earlier writers as Bobbitt, Charters, and Rugg,¹ all of whom advocated a prescriptive model of curriculum development. Tyler said that any local curriculum committee should ask itself four questions:

1. What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?

2. How can learning experiences be selected which are likely to be useful in attaining these objectives?

3. How can learning experiences be organized for effective instruction?

4. How can the effectiveness of learning experiences be evaluated?²

In Tyler's view, each question must be answered completely before going on to the next, for the answer


to the next question is dependent on the previous answer.⁶ Rightly or wrongly, this condition has lead curriculum developers to interpret this as requiring a linear progression in the total development process.

Tyler's third step had a strong influence on the State Department of Education's mandate for graded courses of study. In expanding on how to accomplish this step, Tyler stated:

There are three major criteria to be met in building an effectively organized group of learning experiences. These are: continuity, sequence, and integration. Continuity refers to the vertical reiteration of major curriculum elements....Sequence is related to continuity but goes beyond it....Sequence as a criterion emphasizes the importance of having each successive experience build upon the preceding one but to go more broadly and deeply into the matters involved....Integration refers to the horizontal relationship of curriculum experiences. The organization of these experiences should be such that they help the student increasingly to get a unified view and to unify his behavior in relation to the elements dealt with.⁷

As we shall see in chapter IV, these criteria were very much a part of the State Department of Education's requirements.

Schubert pointed out how Tyler has often been misused by those seeking to do curriculum reform:

Tyler's original emphasis on a broad notion of behavior (including how learners think and feel),

---

⁶Ibid. p. 3.

⁷Ibid. pp. 84-85.
his attention to their experiences in and out of school, and his advocacy of the need for active involvement of students in their own learning experiences became overshadowed by cookbook approaches that translated the Tyler Rationale into a theoretic recipe for curriculum development.  

Moving even further away from direct student involvement in curriculum development, the 1982-83 president of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), O. L. Davis, Jr., stated in his forward to the 1983 ASCD Yearbook that local curriculum problems are similar from site to site and that the emphasis in the past few decades has been to make standardized curriculum decisions accompanied by standardized prescriptions.

Objectives developed, say, in Rochester and computer-accessed in Los Angeles could be effectively applied in Lometa and Kent and Orlando. Materials developed in Cambridge or San Francisco could be used as effectively and without adaptation in Atlanta and Ozona and Provo.  

The purpose of this yearbook, then, was to summarize the most commonly applied elements of curriculum development from the positivist's point of view in a readable, usable, and practical manner; and included in

---


the book were articles by Tyler, several by Fenwick English, George Beauchamp, and others.

The language and word choices used in the first English article were very technocratic. He spoke of curriculum as a "management tool," and said that curriculum practice involved issues that were ideological (referring to values), technical (which are design questions), and operational (or dealing with delivery/management issues). He later quoted another of his articles in which he compared curriculum, the management tool, to corporate policy development. English did point out, however, that one's way of thinking and speaking about curriculum is closely tied in with one's choice of curriculum models. In a quote about Macdonald's value positions of making curriculum decisions as a behaviorist, a gestaltist, a psychoanalyst, or a third force psychologist, or self-realization, English stated:

These value positions lead to approaches to curriculum development that are centered in control, consensus, or emancipation. The results are a model of curriculum that is either based on expertise, consensus, or a dialogical process.¹¹


¹¹Ibid., p. 8.
English was consistent in his writings in his beliefs and the way he viewed the curriculum. His approach to curriculum development was centered in control and based on the expertise of those chosen to revise the curriculum.

George Beauchamp, in his chapter on "Curriculum Thinking," suggested a six step plan for curriculum analysis that suggested a linear process and one centered in control.

First, a leadership group or a curriculum council may be needed to organize the work phases and to coordinate various subgroup efforts. A second step might be to conduct a listing and appraisal of the current curriculum practices in the school(s) as a focus for further deliberation. A third phase may be termed a study phase. Here, the curriculum planners investigate curriculum ideas and practices not present in the analysis of their own practices....A fourth phase may be the formulation of criteria for the selection of curriculum ideas to be included in the new curriculum. A fifth phase is the actual writing of the new curriculum. A sixth step is sometimes recommended, and that is to follow the writing phase with a testing period before the curriculum is officially implemented12.

Beauchamp pointed out that not all these phases might be included in every curriculum project, but one can still see a controlled rigidness in the plan, even when a few steps are omitted.

---

Carr and Kemmis discussed the great influence that Tyler and the traditional models had on behavioral psychology and beliefs about teaching and curriculum. The aim of the curriculum had been to develop the cultivated person. With the advent of the Tylerian model, goals were to be decided before curriculum development could take place, leading to a conformity of a preset image of the educated person which was implied by the goals. Teaching and the curriculum became instrumental, a delivery system, a means to achieving these given ends.13

This also changed the way the role of teachers was perceived according to Carr and Kemmis:

In this shift of emphasis, teachers became actors on the stage of education or, to use an unkind image, operatives in its factories. The profound questions of education became the preserve of the academic designers of curricula, not teachers themselves. To the extent that teachers were to be concerned with these questions (during their teacher education, for example), it would be so that they could appreciate the educational designs worked out by the curriculum specialists. Teachers would not generate educational ideas in their teaching or school curricula, they would use the curricula developed by others.14


14 Ibid., p. 15.
Teachers, then, were to be consumers and implementers of curriculum, not creators. Their teacher education courses were to reinforce this role, teaching them only enough about curriculum development to help them appreciate the preset goals and materials they are given to work with in the classroom. As Carr and Kemmis stated, "Teachers, although they can be expected to adopt and implement educational decisions made on the basis of scientific knowledge, would not themselves participate in the decision-making process." 15 The scientific view of educational theory dictates a narrow role for teachers:

In short, the role of the teacher is one of passive conformity to the practical recommendations of educational theorists and researchers. Teachers are not themselves regarded as professionally responsible for making educational decisions and judgments, but only for the efficiency with which they implement the decisions about how educational practice can be improved that are made by educational theorists on the basis of their scientific knowledge. 16

This view of teaching and education in general is consistent with the technological view of society. As we have moved from an Agricultural Age to the Industrial Revolution to the Age of Technology, our attitudes and expectations of life have changed. Industry

15Ibid., p. 70.
16Ibid.
is organized around a means-ends view of production. In a society that has used the factory metaphor for so long when referring to the organizational structure of schools, it would seem only natural to transfer the production design intact from business to schools. In this view, "Teachers' knowledge is assumed to be about the means available and their relative effectiveness under different circumstances."¹⁷ The question to be asked here is, has the factory metaphor outlived its usefulness or was it ever really appropriate in the first place?

There is a consistency in this literature in the way society, teachers, and schooling are viewed. It is a very technocratic orientation where only the experts make decisions and everyone else carries them out. Decisions are made in a step by step manner, making both the decision-making process and the implementation of the decision simple enough for anyone to follow. But the business world is changing (although industry may still not provide us with an adequate analogy). Witness the recent popularity of the Tom Peters books, video tapes, and television (usually PBS) documentaries on the shared decision-making and team

¹⁷Ibid., p. 35.
efforts of more successful businesses. As business owners and managers are beginning to view their employees in a different light, so certain educational leaders are calling for a new way of looking at education and the members of that profession. The literature proposing changes in the way we make decision and treat teachers is beginning to increase. One such large body of literature deals with the deliberative model of decision-making.

The Deliberative Model

The language of the practical has its roots in Aristotelian thought, but it has become more prominent in recent years due to the writings of Joseph Schwab. Schwab took up the cause of the importance of the language and methodology of solving practical problems (or as he called it "the practical") in curriculum and education. He viewed the realm of the practical as having a different focus than the theoretical, and therefore needing its own language and methodology.

Schwab discussed at great length the seemingly dichotomous relationship between the theoretical and the practical in the first of a series of articles on The Practical. The theoretical was found lacking when it came to solving curriculum problems: "...theoreti-
cal constructions are, in the main, ill-fitted and inappropriate to problems of actual teaching and learning."\textsuperscript{18} He further stated that theory cannot be applied, as principles, to solutions of problems concerning real individuals or institutions. Theories are borrowed from fields outside of education and are often inadequate and incomplete. Theories are specialized and only take into consideration one area, whereas problems in education deal with several areas at the same time. Usually each discipline from which the theories are borrowed have several competing theories, each looking at different aspects of the subject and treating it in a different way.\textsuperscript{19}

In summarizing the difference between the theoretic and the practical, Schwab said:

> The radical difference of the practical from the theoretic mode is visible in the fact that it differs from the theoretic not in one aspect but in many: It differs from the theoretic mode in method. Its problems originate from a different source. Its subject matter is of a distinctly different character. Its outcome is of a different kind.\textsuperscript{20}


\textsuperscript{19}Ibid., pp. 288, 311.

\textsuperscript{20}Ibid., p. 228.
He also delineated several specific points on which they differ. Among those are that theoretic statements are supposed to hold true for long periods of time and apply unequivocally to each member of a large class and for all occurrences or recurrences of the situation. In the practical, the end or outcome is a decision, a guide to possible action. Those decisions can only be judged to be better or worse relative to their alternatives or consequences. And, it applies to only the one case for which the decision was sought.

Another point Schwab made was that the subject matter of the theoretic is universal and is investigated as if it were a constant and impervious to changing circumstances. The subject matter of the practical, however, is always concrete and particular and treated as subject to circumstances, and therefore highly liable to unexpected change. Theoretic problems are states of mind; practical problems arise from states of affairs in relation to ourselves. The methods of the theoretic are numerous, but they are always characterized by control by a principle. That principle of the enquiry determines the general shape of the problem, the kind of data to seek, and how to interpret these data to a conclusion. The practical has no such guide
or rule. One may only be conscious that a practical problem exists, but not what the specific problem is. That problem slowly emerges as one searches for data and the direction of the search is given by the formulation of the problem. As these steps become clear, the process becomes more of a search for solutions.\textsuperscript{21}

What Schwab recommended to bridge the gap between the practical and the theoretical was the eclectic which "recognizes the usefulness of theory to curriculum decision, takes account of certain weaknesses of theory as ground for decision, and provides some degree of repair of these weaknesses."\textsuperscript{22} This is a complex process, and the method by which that end can be achieved is through what Schwab calls the "arts."

These arts can be divided, though only for purposes of discussion, into two sorts: arts of the practical and arts of eclectic. The former are arts which supplement theory, which do for practice and the charting of practice what theory cannot do. The eclectic arts are arts by which we ready theory for practical use. They are arts by which we discover and take practical account of the distortions and limited perspective which a theory imposes on its subject.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{21}Ibid., pp. 288-290.

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., p. 295.

\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., p. 323.
The practical arts, then, are those which are concerned with the areas of the practical omitted by theory. The eclectic arts are concerned with the incompleteness of the subjects of the behavioral sciences.

Finally, Schwab listed the five bodies of experience which he said must be represented in any group which is undertaking curriculum revision. These consist of the four commonplaces of the subject matter, the learners, the milieus, and the teachers, as well as the process of curriculum making itself. The following is a description of those five bodies.

1. Subject matter: Schwab said that a scholar familiar with the body of knowledge which composed that discipline which is under scrutiny must be present on the committee. That scholar should also understand what it is to be a member of that body of scholars subsumed under the title of that discipline. This scholar should be able to speak from the point of view of the knowledge and the structure of that discipline as his/her contribution to the committee's deliberations.

2. Learner: Another member of the committee should be someone who speaks for the children. This should include someone who is familiar with the general body of knowledge of child growth and development so
that s/he understands the characteristics of the age
groups of the children who will be affected by the
decisions of the committee. Beyond that general knowl-
dge, however, there should be someone present who also
has specific knowledge of the particular children who
will be directly affected by the work that the commit-
tee is designing.

3. Milieu: The milieux include a myriad of
places where the learning will take place and where the
children will eventually apply the learning. These
encompass not only the school and classroom, including
the interactions with the other children and the
classroom environment, but also the family, community,
and other primary and secondary groups in which the
child participates. Someone who understands the com-
plexity and interactions of these milieux must also be
represented on the committee.

4. Teacher: The final commonplace, the
teachers, involves a person who understands what the
teachers are likely to know, their backgrounds and per-
sonalities, how they teach, and how they relate to the
children. Because these commonplaces are complex,
there may need to be more than one representative from
a commonplace on the committee assigned the task of revising the curriculum.24

5. Curriculum specialist: Co-ordinating all the efforts of the representatives of the commonplaces is the leader, the curriculum specialist. To this person is assigned a threefold task. As each of the representatives of the commonplaces will be lobbying for the dominance of his/her position, it is the task of the leader to act as a countervailing force, monitoring the proceedings and seeing that a balance is maintained during all the deliberations. Secondly, the leader must help the others to understand the meanings communicated by the language used. This language can never fully encompass the intentions of the parties participating in the deliberations.

It is the function, then, of the curriculum specialist to help each of the representatives to discover the experiences of the others. The specialist chairs the process of the deliberations as all the members come to understand the curriculum. The specialist also helps the members see the underlying values

inherent in the positions held or suggestions made during the process. It is important, then, that the task of curriculum design be done by a group, because only as a group can it gather together all the kinds of evidence and expertise needed for strong deliberations.

Reid agreed with Schwab that curriculum tasks were practical tasks because in order to solve those problems, action must be taken. He saw the conflict between the theoretical and the practical thusly:

Theory might be useful in carrying out those curriculum tasks that can be thought of as 'proactive': where we can take an initiative, relatively free from constraint.... But the most important curriculum tasks, those that determine what is actually realised in action, are 'reactive' in nature: an immediate, on the spot response has to be made to events that may be wholly or partly unforeseen. And these seem to escape from popularly held categories of situations in which theory can be helpful.25

If teachers are being presented with mandated change which is essentially proactive from the stance of the ones requiring the change, it poses a dilemma for those teachers who are committed to meeting the needs of the students in their heterogeneous classrooms. As Reid pointed out:

If the experience of a curriculum is to be worthwhile for students, two obligations have to be accepted by teachers. First, and most obviously,

they have to be in a position to justify what is taught and how it is taught. But actions can only be justified if they are consciously chosen.... Second, they have to be capable of modifying their behaviour in order that activities not seen as worthwhile can be avoided, and because they have to adapt themselves to changing definitions of what is worthwhile.\textsuperscript{26}

Reid also acknowledged the importance of commonplaces in any curriculum development project. He said:

"Reform which proceeds on a secure foundation of knowledge of the nature of children, teachers, schools and classrooms has a better chance of becoming adopted into the system and affecting practice in enduring and intended ways."\textsuperscript{27}

Reid delineated for us seven common features found in practical problems whether they are everyday ones or ones of international importance. Those were:

1. They are questions that have to be answered - even if the answer is to decide to do nothing. In this they differ from academic, or theoretic, questions which do not demand an answer at any particular time, or indeed any answer at all.

2. The grounds on which decisions should be made are uncertain. Nothing can tell us infallibly whose interests should be consulted, what evidence should be taken into account, or what kinds of arguments should be given precedence.

3. In answering practical questions, we always have to take some existing state of affairs into account. We are never in a position to make a completely fresh start, free from the legacy of past history and present arrangements.

\textsuperscript{26}Ibid., p. 15.

\textsuperscript{27}Ibid., p. 18.
4. Following from three, each question is in some ways unique, belonging to a specific time and context, the particulars of which we can never exhaustively describe.

5. The question will certainly compel us to adjudicate between competing goals and values. We may choose a solution that maximises our satisfaction across a range of possible goals, but some will suffer at the expense of others.

6. We can never predict the outcome of the particular solution we choose, still less know what the outcome would have been had we made a different choice.

7. The grounds on which we decide to answer a practical question in a particular way are not grounds that point to the desirability of the action chosen as an act in itself, but grounds that lead us to suppose that the action will result in some desirable state of affairs.\(^2^8\)

And how do we solve practical problems?

The method by which most everyday practical problems get solved has been variously called 'deliberation' or 'practical reasoning'. It is an intricate and skilled intellectual and social process whereby, individually or collectively, we identify the questions to which we must respond, establish grounds for deciding on answers, and then choose among the available solutions.\(^2^9\)

This is what Schwab called the practical arts.

Both Reid and Schwab agreed that the ends of education are never fixed, which is the opposite of the belief of those who would promote a traditional model of curriculum decision making. Reid said that not only are

\(^{2^8}\)Ibid., p. 42.

\(^{2^9}\)Ibid., p. 43.
educational ends not fixed, but that this is not a temporary situation that can be changed with additional knowledge, more resources, or better enforcement of an official ideology. Instead, it is desirable, given the complex nature of education. Similarly, in Carr and Kemmis's discussion of praxis, they pointed out that this way of looking at the practical allows the ends and not just the means to be problematic. It also allows the ends to be a matter of choice, their appropriateness determined by the situational context, rather than become "the" right choice.30

One of the advantages of using the deliberative method to solve the practical problems of education is that:

The curriculum thinker and the curriculum maker are not cut off from others who should contribute to the solution of curriculum problems as they are when curriculum theory is construed as a special kind of applied technology available only to initiates.31

The latter is similar to the traditionalists' view explained by Carr and Kemmis of teachers as operatives in a factory, there only to implement and carry out the directives of the experts, not to create on their own.

30Carr and Kemmis, Becoming Critical, p. 17.
31Reid, Thinking About the Curriculum, p. 67.
Schubert also commented on the dichotomy between these two points of view. He said that it is the theoretic researcher's reverence for induction that separates the inquirer from the situation that is being studied in the name of "objectivity." The end of inquiry in the theoretic paradigm is knowledge merely for the sake of knowledge. The practical researcher, however, sees immersion in the problematic arena itself as essential. S/he is interested in a sense of meaning, direction, and improved decision making and action as an outcome of the inquiry. In fields such as curriculum, the practical researcher will argue that inquiry must address issues as the quality of life and worthwhile experience in actual dilemmas.³² Specifically Schubert said:

"Practical inquiry centers on deliberation, the human search for meaning and understanding that enriches groups and institutions as they continuously refine their sense of value and direction and the means to move toward it. In deliberation, human beings are creators of knowledge who inform actions in situations they encounter. ...Central to deliberation within such a milieu is an ethical commitment to contribute good and worthwhile decisions that enable those involved and those affected by action that emanates from these decisions to grow in increasingly human ways."³³

³² Schubert, Perspective. p 174-175.

³³ Ibid., p. 288.
Because the inquiry method is one of interaction with what is being studied, practical curriculum inquiry must be done primarily by those who live in the educational setting in question. In addition, Schubert stated that "...practical inquiry is based on the assumption that situations are essentially unique."\(^{34}\) And because of this, Schubert saw rigid curriculum guides as inhibiting the classroom as a milieu for curriculum deliberation. An enriched environment, however, which includes a variety of books, audio visual materials, worksheets, etc., enhances deliberation.\(^{35}\)

In summing up practical inquiry, Schubert listed four assumptions of practical curriculum inquiry:

1. The source of problems is found in a state of affairs, not in the abstract conjuring of researchers who tend to imagine similarities among situations that cannot be grouped together defensibly.

2. The method of practical curriculum inquiry is interaction with the state of affairs to be studied, rather than detached induction upon it and deduction about it.

3. The subject matter sought in the process of practical curriculum inquiry is situational insight and understanding, instead of lawlike generaliza-

\(^{34}\)Ibid., p. 288.

\(^{35}\)Ibid., p. 289.
tions that extend across a wide range of situations.

4. The end of practical curriculum inquiry is increased capacity to act morally and effectively in pedagogical situations, not primarily the generation of generalized, publishable knowledge.\textsuperscript{36} (italics in original)

Walker, after working on a number of curriculum development projects at the university level, suggested a process model that he called a "naturalistic model". It consists of three elements, the curriculum's platform and design, and the deliberation associated with it.\textsuperscript{37} His definition for deliberation came directly from Schwab, but he developed specific definitions for platform and design.

The platform represents the values and beliefs that each member or curriculum developer brings to the task. "The platform includes an idea of what is and a vision of what ought to be, and these guide the curriculum developer in determining what he should do to realize his vision."\textsuperscript{38}

The curriculum design is made up of the abstract relationships embodied in the object being

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p289.


\textsuperscript{38}Ibid.
designed. "The design is the theoretically significant output of the curriculum development process." It is the series of decisions and choices that are a part of the creation of the curriculum.

Walker's model is primarily a descriptive one. The traditional or classical model is prescriptive. He further described the difference in the two models as follows:

This model is basically a temporal one: it postulates a beginning (the platform), an end (the design), and a process (deliberation) by means of which the beginning progresses to the end. In contrast, the classical model is a means-end model: it postulates a desired end (the objective), a means for attaining this end (the learning experience), and a process (evaluation) for determining whether the means does indeed bring about the end. The two models differ radically in the roles they assign to objectives and to evaluation in the process of curriculum development.40

Walker's model was based partly on his work with a two year elementary art curriculum development project funded by the Kettering Foundation. This project did not take place in a school district, using the public school personnel, however. It took place on a university campus with a professor of art education, five graduate students in art education, two graduate students in general curriculum, a product designer who

39Ibid., p. 53.

40Ibid., pp. 58-59.
was employed half-time by the Project,"¹¹ and Walker himself. Actual elementary classes were used occasionally to field test lessons designed during the two years of the project.

Reid and Walker did include two studies in Case Studies in Curriculum Change that occurred in secondary schools. However, one was in England and the other was in Scotland. These also dealt with implementing curriculum and the question of how to get teacher to accept innovations created by others. Neither addressed the creation of the curriculum change.

This chapter attempted to share with the reader some of the relevant literature revolving around two different models of curriculum decision-making, one prescriptive, one descriptive. Both types of models were necessary to understand the data analyzed in this study. The next chapter will talk more specifically about the methodology followed in this study.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

In 1983, the Ohio Department of Education mandated curriculum reforms throughout the state that were meant to change the way teachers made daily decisions about the content of their lessons. This would occur through the development, locally, of Graded Courses of Study for every discipline taught in the classrooms. The process used to develop these courses of study were also a matter of local control, but their adoptions would give clout to the department of education in its role as an accrediting agency.

Reforms this far sweeping ought to be documented in a number of ways so that their efficacy can be determined. What led up to a decision of such magnitude -- why were the reforms believed to be necessary? How were the graded courses of study developed in the local school districts -- how were decisions of inclusion and exclusion made as far as content, and
what process was used? How are such documents used? What are implications for daily implementation of the contents of the courses of study and did they really make a difference in the actual classrooms? Each of these questions in itself suggests a number of different subcategories that ought to be the subjects of a variety of separate studies.

In this study, I chose to examine the process used in three school districts to develop their courses of study in the discipline of social studies. Once the major focus of the study was decided upon, a decision had to be made as to the research design that would best fit such a comprehensive investigation.

A number of factors were considered in making this decision. In choosing to study the process of the development of a course of study, I was aware of what a complex phenomenon I was trying to document. The process occurred in a dynamic setting, with no possibility of controlling and manipulating variables. Committee members had never participated in this type of curriculum planning before under the new state mandate. They were entering unknown territory and had no clear way of anticipating specific means and ends. As a representative from the county given the responsibility of being one of the committee members
who would help to guide this process, I was in a unique position to be an "insider" to the deliberations that occurred. Therefore, a qualitative, naturalistic research design was chosen. Further, a case study approach was deemed to be the most appropriate way to study the three districts involved in the study, with the researcher in the position of a participant observer.

Entry

Gaining entry to the sites turned out to be an amazingly easy task. I shared my desire to audio tape the social studies graded courses of study in the school districts to which I had been assigned with my associate superintendent (at the county level). She was enthusiastic about my topic and very supportive of my efforts to complete my graduate school requirements. She thought that the best plan was for her to present my request at the local superintendents' meeting. I would appear only if they had questions or reservations about the study. They all readily agreed, however, without the need for my presence.

The only stipulation they made was that I was to secure the participants' agreement at the first meeting in each district. It would be my job to
explain the purpose of my study, how I would assure them anonymity in the final dissertation and any subsequent publications, and secure their permission to audio tape. All committee members seemed satisfied with my explanations and agreed to let me conduct my study according to my plans. One district was particularly curious about qualitative research, and members asked more about it for their own interest, but no one seemed concerned about possible negative affects of the study on them or the school districts.

Because I had only been working for the county for about three months, I was a bit surprised by everyone's ready agreement. I was not about to look a gift horse in the mouth, however, and I was grateful for this ease of entry. I think some of their trust was more a function of their general feelings for the county office and how it had treated them in the past, as well as their confidence in their superintendents who seemed to think that I would be fair with the participants. I was determined to do nothing that would undermine this trust at any time during the process of data collection and reporting.

Data Collection

I began audio taping the session as soon as permission was granted by the group. I used a small
cassette recorder about the size of a five by eight
notecard. I sat at one end of the table and placed the
recorder next to my working papers. It was relatively
unobtrusive, and members seemed to quickly forget about
its presence. At first, there were a few comments
about whether or not I got something on tape. These
were said jokingly. There might have been an underly-
ing nervousness in these remarks, but it didn't seem
so. And even that ended after the first session.

Because small tape recorders do not have
sophisticated controls and warnings, I had to watch the
recorder carefully after each forty minutes or so to
see when the recorder would stop. I then had to turn
the tape over or replace it with a new one. I also had
to watch the battery light closely. I always carried a
supply of extra batteries in my briefcase, and
occasionally I had to change the batteries during ses-
sions. I usually tried to change them before we
started or during a break when I thought they might be
getting low, but sometimes I would miss that
opportunity. Committee members did not seem to be dis-
tracted by these procedures, however, and meetings con-
tinued without interruption.

I began to transcribe the audio tapes myself
but found very quickly that this was not feasible. I
continued to transcribe Carson committee's deliberations, but I turned the other two districts' tapes over to a typist who did not live near any of the districts and would not know any of the people involved. She transcribed them with speed and accuracy.

The audio tapes represented approximately ninety-two hours of meetings among the three districts. Within this total time was a wide variation in times for each district. Carson met for about ten total hours, Monroe about fifty-six hours, and St. Michael approximaely thirty hours (more details about time will be found in Chapter IV). From this, sixty-six double-sided audio tapes were produced. By the time the transcriptions were finished, over 550 single-spaced pages awaited my analysis.

**Data Analysis**

As the final tapes were being typed, I began to read the transcriptions to derive some preliminary findings. There was so much rich data that at first it was difficult to decide how to use it. At first, I analyzed the data looking for evidence of Schwab's practical arts which had been further described by Pereira. But those categories did not prove to be descrete enough, and this line of research was abandoned.
All the pages of evidence had been read once, then, before choosing the categories of platform, commonplaces, and curriculum leader from the works of Walker and Schwab.

After that selected sections from each of the school districts were reread to find evidence of the categories. Deliberations about program philosophy were purposely selected as being the most likely place to find examples of platform formation. Pages were also read that dealt with coding the objectives by grade level, as this was where the commonplace of the learner was most likely to be found. Random sections were chosen from the rest of the transcripts to see what evidence of commonplaces and curriculum leadership were present.

The final step was to decide which examples of each category from the school districts would go into the written document. After systematically examining my transcripts for confirming and disconfirming evidence in relation to my categories, I had long lists of possible quotes to use for each district and each category. I could not include them all in this document, so I tried to pick typical examples from each category which would show both similarities and differences among the three districts. Ultimately, it is
the reader who will decide if the examples included in
Chapters IV and V are adequate to support my conclu-
sions.
CHAPTER IV

Findings: The Context of Deliberation

To understand the constraints and concerns of the school districts in Ohio in writing their graded courses of study, it is important to know the conditions set up by the Ohio Department of Education. In the first section of this chapter I will delineate those requirements. I will also share some of the suggestions given by the ODE. This is to help the reader understand the context in which committee members approached the task which to them was new and ambiguous.

The remaining sections of the chapter will describe the three settings in which the study was conducted and compare these settings to the university settings on which Walker based his naturalistic model.

State Context

Although the actual contents of the graded courses of study were to be a matter of local control,
the Ohio Department of Education required that certain components be present in each course of study. Those components were: Cover sheet; statement of approval by the local board of education; table of contents; introduction; district philosophy and goals; program philosophy; program goals; scope and sequence, including program objectives and subject objectives; and a pupil evaluation policy. The statement of approval by the local board of education was a requirement under the Revised Code. The district philosophy and goals, scope and sequence, and pupil evaluation policy was a requirement under the Minimum Standards for Elementary and Secondary Schools.

Minimum Standards 3301-35-02 (B) (2) established additional requirements for the competency based education programs of English composition, reading, and mathematics. From the subject objectives key objectives were identified that would require demonstrated mastery by every student. From these objectives, pupil performance objectives were then developed. As with the subject objectives, the pupil performance objectives (PPOs) had to state an observable behavior/performance. A PPO had to have two additional components, a condition and a criterion level. The condition level delineated the circumstances under which the
student would be required to perform a task or use a skill. The criterion level set up the degree of mastery or level of proficiency that the student must reach in performing the task.\textsuperscript{42} Because this study dealt with the discipline of social studies, PPO's were not required and, therefore, will not be discussed again.

The Ohio Department of Education's publication, \textit{Process Model for Course of Study}, was intended to help school districts understand how their documents were to be organized. Personnel from the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education were also available for guidance. They were willing to provide workshops for course of study committee members or to sit in on a working revision session and answer questions or offer explanations. The Ohio Department of Education library was also open to all school districts, and sample courses of studies from other Ohio schools could be checked out.

The composition of the committee or person(s) who wrote the course of study was left to the discretion of the individual school district. In other

words, how the document was developed was a matter of local control. The process model did suggest guidelines, however. "School districts are encouraged to include representatives of the community, parents, and board members as well as school administrators, classroom teachers, and education specialists on their course of study committee."\(^4\) It also suggested that the expanded group be responsible for developing the program philosophy and goals, and that a working committee continue and develop the scope and sequence. The working committee should work through subcommittees composed of grade level or subject teachers to develop subject objectives.\(^4\) In actuality, the committee might be as small as one teacher, such as an industrial technology teacher who might be the only one in that district to teach the subject. If a committee was formed, that committee might also decide to work together on the whole document without using subcommittees.

The graded courses of study, then, were prescriptive documents according to the Ohio Revised Code. The process model booklet published by the ODE was also

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 15.

\(^4\)Ibid.
a prescriptive document. It provided the legal basis for course of study development, a list of topics mandated for incorporation in the course of study (career education, citizenship, human relations, multicultural education, energy and resource conservation education, and study skills), a curriculum development model and curriculum cycle, and an explanation of the process of developing PPOs for the competency based education program. In addition:

Chapter Three deals with a process model to be followed in developing courses of study. Each component of a course of study is specified and described, along with a series of activities delineating the steps that can be followed to develop the component.\(^5\)

Diagrams, figures, and sequenced activities frequented the pages of the process model, helping the curriculum developers step by step through the procedure of writing the document.

The Ohio Department of Education, through its publication, set the process of writing the courses of study as a linear one. For example, one figure shows how to write a program philosophy: "Activity 1, Review district philosophy; Activity 2, Review program evaluation information; Activity 3, Identify role of program in total school curriculum; Activity 4, Write program

\(^{45}\text{Ibid.}, \text{ p. 7.}\)
philosophy; Activity 5, Compare philosophies of district and program."\(^{46}\) This is typical of the directions for each of the required components throughout the booklet.

The definitions of the components also support the linearity of the process. A subject objective is defined as "a specific learning outcome statement based on a program objective." The program objective is "a broad outcome statement derived from a program goal." What is a program goal? It is "a broad statement defining the overall nature and content of one aspect of the program based on the program philosophy."\(^{47}\)

Ultimately we are led back to the district philosophy. It would be difficult, then (although not necessarily impossible), to go against the linear process set up by the ODE and begin by writing subject objectives or program goals and working backwards, hoping that when you reached the top (the program philosophy), it would flow smoothly from the board of education written district philosophy. It would be a little like having two people standing at opposite ends of the room, and without agreeing on a starting place,

\(^{46}\)Ibid., p. 23.

\(^{47}\)Ibid., p. 8.
drawing a straight line through the room by meeting in the middle. We did develop the Trans-Continental Railroad this way, but look at all the problems encountered along the way (especially the one of trying to get it to meet in the middle).

Once written, the graded course of study was submitted to the Ohio Department of Education for approval. One person there was given the responsibility of approving all graded courses of studies. He checked to see that the mandated parts of the course of study were present but did not approve content.

This is the process established by the ODE for writing graded courses of study. Members that served on curriculum revision committees had not done this type of work before under these conditions. They were happy to have the help provided by the process model to guide them through their unknown journey. It provided them with a clear map, and this was how they used it in writing their documents. With this understanding in mind, let us now look at the three school districts and their work.

**Local Context**

This section will describe the three public school districts that participated in the study and
discuss how they dealt with the time factor in accomplishing their mandated task (research question 1). Each of these schools was part of the county school system. In the state of Ohio, smaller districts must participate in the county system. The county must provide certain services and personnel to each county district so that children will not be deprived of the same educational opportunities as those in independent city schools.

My role in each district was as a curriculum consultant, working with teachers as a resource person. In the context of the graded courses of study, I was the county consultant of record on the committees. I was to help them in writing their documents and help them to understand, along with the local administrator of record, what the ODE was requiring them to do.

Each district has been given a fictitious name as have the members of the committee. Only my name is not fictionalized in any quotes from the transcripts. We will now look at each district in turn.

St. Michael Local School District

This district, located in the town of St. Michael, had a total enrollment of about 850 students. The district consisted of an elementary building (K-5),
a middle school (6-8), and a high school (9-12). All of these buildings were located on the same campus site.

Four teachers were assigned to the committee. Two of them were females from the elementary school; a fifth grade teacher who had previously taught several other grades, and a learning disabilities (LD) teacher. Each had been teaching for a number of years. Another teacher was the seventh and eighth grade social studies teacher. This was his first full-time teaching position, although he had substituted in the district before. One of the male high school social studies teachers was the other teaching member of the committee.

The administrator of record was the superintendent, a former science teacher with a special interest in social studies. He put himself on the committee because he enjoyed curriculum work, although he was not a specialist in this area. I was there, as the representative from the county office.

All the members of the St. Michael committee, especially the superintendent, were well aware of the budget and time frame constraints to their task. Because all disciplines had to have a graded course of study within a five year deadline set by the ODE,
school districts had to write at least two courses each year. A district might write one each semester or have two committees running concurrently. In any case, no school district could afford, either financially or personnel-wise, to have course revisions run over their tight time limits.

The St. Michael committee met during the school day from 8:00 to 3:00 with an hour for lunch. This meant that the school district had to provide substitutes for each of the teachers involved on those meeting days. This came out of the school budget; the state mandate included no reimbursement or grant monies to fund each of Ohio's 600+ school districts. In a small district like St. Michael's, this could also represent a large expenditure of personnel. The routine absences of other teachers still had to be covered. Small districts traditionally do not have high salaries, especially for substitutes, and therefore have small substitute lists.

Mr. Jones, the superintendent, assured us that we would have whatever time was needed to complete the course of study, and he never said or did anything that would negate this statement. We had five meetings altogether representing 60 hours of total committee work. Between meetings, committee members were asked
to keep their respective colleagues appraised of their progress and asked for any feedback to help them make better decisions during meetings. Conversations in meetings refer many times to comments, concerns, or suggestions made by colleagues.

Monroe Local School District

Monroe was the largest district involved in this study. It had just over 2,000 students enrolled in one of the two K-5 elementary schools, the 6-8 middle school, and the 9-12 high school. The high school, middle school, and one of the elementary schools was located on the same road within a half mile of each other. The other elementary building was several miles away.

Monroe also had the largest committee. Eleven teachers represented the four schools. Three of the four high school social studies teachers were on the committee, two female, one male. Two teachers were from the middle school, the female sixth grade teacher, and the male seventh and eighth grade social studies teacher. Four elementary teachers, all female, completed the committee. Two of them taught second grade (from different buildings), one taught fourth grade, and the other taught fifth grade.
The administrator of record in Monroe was the assistant to the superintendent, Dr. Barton. He worked on all the graded courses of study committees, headed all the curriculum work in the district, and was in charge of overseeing all the federally funded projects in Monroe.

The researcher/county consultant was also on the committee. The early childhood county consultant was present at the first meeting. At the second meeting, the secondary consultant joined the group on a permanent basis. He was asked to do so by Dr. Barton so that the committee could form subgroups of elementary and secondary teachers.

Both of the county consultants had very strong feelings about the lack of articulation and communications that could occur from not working together as a whole (based on experience from another school district in the county system that was not part of this study). We convinced Dr. Barton to keep the group together for all their session. This was the most directed thing the consultants did. Dr. Barton was a strong personality, however, and he would not have changed his mind if he did not think the arguments were valid and did not respect the opinions of the two consultants.
Monroe faced the same budget and time constraints that St. Michael had. Because it was a larger committee, the substitute teacher question was a very important consideration. But the school district committed itself to a fair representation from buildings and grade levels. The mathematics graded course of study also met on alternate weeks during the year, adding to the budgetary strain.

As had Mr. Jones in St. Michael, Dr. Barton often reassured the group that they would have all they time they needed to write a high quality course of study. He never rushed the group through their task. In fact, ten meetings were held during the year, one each month from September through April, and two in May. Meetings started at 8:30 (although the first one started at 8:00), and lasted until 3:00 (the first one went until 3:30). We took about one hour and fifteen minutes for lunch (restaurants were not as closely located as in St. Michael). The last meeting went from 8:30 to 1:30 and adjourned to a nice restaurant to celebrate our work. Our meetings represented approximately 56 hours of work.

As in St. Michael, Monroe teachers also felt responsible for keeping non-committee members informed of their progress and asked for suggestions. These
comments and suggestions were regularly shared at committee meetings and taken into consideration in the deliberations. We will also find this true in Carson.

Carson Local School District

Carson had a K-12 enrollment of just under 1000 students, almost equally divided between the elementary and the junior/senior high school. All students were housed basically in different wings of one building, although a new senior high school used for music, physical education, and a few other areas was built within a thousand yard of the old building several years before. Funds were not available to make its full time use possible.

The elementary wing was a K-6 building. It had its own administrator and staff. The junior and senior high comprised one administrative unit. They were housed together in the larger wing of the building. They shared administrators and staff.

Five teachers were assigned to the Carson committee. One was from the junior/senior high school. He was the chairman of the three man social studies department. The other four members of the committee were women from the elementary school. They taught first, second, fourth, and sixth grades.
The administrator of record was the high school principal, Mr. Young. He served on all the graded courses of study committees and had asked for this assignment. This was to be his last year, however, as he was retiring at the end of that school year. I was the only county representative on the committee.

Mr. Young wanted to finish the social studies graded course of study during the first semester and have the mathematics graded course of study conducted during the second semester. He made it clear to the teachers that he did not want the two committees to overlap in time. Consequently, he kept the meetings moving. The committee met three times in the afternoons between 12:30 and 3:30. A fourth meeting, to finish coding, polishing, and editing the document was held at one of the teacher's homes. A party atmosphere prevailed, but the work was completed to their satisfaction first. Approximately 10 hours work went into their document. This, of course, as with the other committees, did not count the time back in their buildings checking with their colleagues.

We now have a picture of the three public school districts included in this study, their committee members, and how they dealt with their concerns about time and money. It is time to compare their con-
ditions with the university context in which Walker did his research.

University Context

Walker studied several different curriculum development projects at the university level which led to the development of his naturalistic model. The specific references in this section refer to an art curriculum project for elementary school aged children which took place at Stanford University. This seemed typical of the kinds of projects he worked on at this level and provided more descriptive detail of the events of the deliberations.

As we have seen in each of the public school cases, committee membership consisted primarily of teachers. In contrast to this, Walker's empirical research was based upon an art curriculum revision group which included five graduate students in the field of art and an art education/curriculum professor. They could specifically represent the the accumulated and most up to date information that the field of art had to offer. Two additional graduate students from curriculum added the dimension of the latest in curriculum expertise. A half-time product designer with his special knowledge to help the process progress and
Walker, now an acknowledged contributor to the curriculum field, completed the committee. The membership of this group appeared more like the traditional literature's approach to curriculum leadership. To repeat an earlier quote from Carr and Kemmis, "The profound questions of education became the preserve of the academic designers of curricula..."48 rather than teachers as was the fact in St. Michael.

Another contrast revolves primarily around the question of time and conditions. Walker's group was funded by a grant which allowed them to meet over a two year period. They met two to three times a week for a period of one to three hours each time. Between meetings, members met in small groups or pairs to work on their assigned sub-tasks. One characteristic of a large university is that one department can work on projects with little or no co-ordination with other departments or colleges within the university. They can isolate themselves from these outside pressures and concentrate on their own work and time frame.

There was a great variation in the time spent by the school districts on their task, from 10 hours in

one district to 56 hours in another. Even the greatest amount of time spent in the largest district is small compared to the university setting. In both settings, members had other responsibilities and duties than the curriculum revision tasks. The public schools, however, had to compress the time they devoted to their curriculum development task.

Walker's committee wrote lesson plans which they periodically field tested in actual elementary classrooms. He described the freedom they felt to design the flow of their work and the wording of their products. They decided to write many lesson plans first rather than preparing flow charts or rationales or other documents.

As was described in the first section of this chapter, Ohio's school districts were under more constraints in procedure. Although they did not have to write the document in the order given by the department of education, it would be difficult to produce a coherent document without following that order. School districts were also under constraints of word usage in many cases. After all, they were producing many different kinds of objectives rather than the more creative lesson plans.
Leaders on the public school committees were well intentioned committed people. They had varying degrees of expertise in social studies and curriculum development. All had masters' or a doctorate degree in administration, not in curriculum. To receive an administrative degree in Ohio when these men did, only one curriculum development course was required. Walker's committee had a leader who was a recognized expert in both curriculum and art education.

Conclusions

The contexts of the local elementary/secondary level and the university setting seemed to produce only contrasts, not similarities. Although time frame varied slightly from district to district, all worked occurred within one school year. In Walker's study, time was more flexible. His committee worked over a two year period. Their meeting times could be set up at the convenience of the committee members. In the school districts in this study, meetings took place during the actual school day. Two districts conducted all day meetings. This at least allowed the teachers to debrief themselves to some extent of the concerns of their classrooms. In the third district, teachers taught all morning and had to change quickly from
thinking about specific classroom problems to overarch-

ing curriculum concerns.

Other differences between the school districts and university setting revolved around the academic backgrounds of the committee members, the kind of product each group was expected to produce, and the constraints or freedom placed on each group by either the funding or accrediting agency requesting the projects. In the light of the contrasts between the two studies, it will be interesting to examine the remaining research questions in the next chapter to see how the elements of the deliberative process looked in the local districts.
CHAPTER V

Findings: Characteristics of Deliberation

Conditions vary greatly between Walker's university setting and the local elementary/secondary school district, as the previous chapter pointed out. Given the contrasts, however, does this mean that the local districts cannot look at actual issues that Walker and Schwab described as central to good curriculum making? This chapter will examine the remaining three research questions as they relate to the three districts in the study. First it will investigate Walker's concept of platform and finally the five bodies of knowledge proposed by Schwab.

Platform

Walker described platform as the system of beliefs and values that members of a curriculum committee bring to their task. These are internal and not necessarily known by the other members of the committee at the beginning of the process. These beliefs and
values, however, form the agenda of each member as the platform is his/her vision of what ought to be. These will be the basis of the issues and ideas that the individual members will offer during the revision process.

Members of the committee in Walker's study volunteered to be part of the art curriculum development project. They were all familiar with the work and ideas of the project director. Therefore, for purposes of his research, Walker identified statements from articles written by the project director which represented a variety of Eisner's beliefs. He then had the members of the committee react to the statements to see which of those ideas they accepted as their working basis. These statements represented issues that Walker expected were likely to appear as platform in the deliberations of the group. They were not necessarily the only platform issues Walker expected the committee members to discuss, but probable reflections of their beliefs.

The school districts in this study had pre-written statements in the form of the local board's

---

philosophy of education statement. These were generally broad, all-encompassing statements supporting mom, apple pie, and the flag. They talked about the importance of recognizing the individuality of all students and the need for a variety of teaching methods to be used. It would be difficult to find anything in any of the statements that would be offensive to anyone.

The most unstructured part of the document that the committees would write, and the part where they would be the most free to express their own ideas and beliefs, was the program philosophy. Although it had to be consistent with the board’s philosophy, it also dealt with the specifics of the discipline. It would be unlikely that one would write specific statements that would contradict the general and vague statements of many board philosophies. Although platform statements can occur anywhere in the deliberations, they would surely be present in the discussion and final statements of the program philosophy. This is where we shall look to find platform statements in our three districts.

The discussion in St. Michael revolved around the pervasiveness of social studies ideas and ideals in our everyday life. They discussed issues such as the integration of social studies into all other subject
areas, local and national heritage, representation of other cultures, individual potential, bringing the world into the classroom, and the world as the classroom. The topic of a life worth living was also important. They discussed this theme in terms of goal-setting, vocational choices, mates, friends, and even child rearing.

St. Michael's program philosophy was worded in terms of "we believe" statements except for the opening sentence. It incorporated most of the issues discussed in their first session. Other issues were saved for the broader program goals. For instance, the philosophy began: "Social studies is everything we are, and everything we do, have done, or will do in the present, past, or future." The notion of the importance of the interdisciplinary nature of social studies was brought out not only in the philosophy, but in one of the program goals. This, of course, meant that it was also carried through in the program and subject objectives.

The St. Michael committee was also concerned with accepting responsibility, moving to intrinsic motivation, and becoming citizens of the world -- in other words, preparation for life. Their goals and objectives reflected this concern. For instance, one
of their program goals was: "The program will provide opportunities to develop self-motivation in students."
One of the program objectives under that was: "The students will be able to understand the rewards systems of society". Two of the subject objectives that followed were: "The students will be able to understand the positive and negative consequences of behavior in our democratic society"; and, "The students will be able to evaluate and appreciate the various systems of economic rewards attainable while respecting the rights of others".

St. Michael's course of study became a process-orientated document with a high level concept development. Subject objectives were stated in terms of the interrelationship of at least two and usually three or more concepts, as the above examples illustrate. The committee's beliefs about the role of social studies in people's lives led them in the direction of overarching ideals and concepts, rather than low level skills.

Fairly early in their deliberations, the members recognized that they were going in a non-traditional direction with their document. They were concerned about how to help teachers use it with ease. They decided that they would have to write a curriculum guide to accompany it, even though that was not a
requirement from the department of education. They planned it as they worked on the course of study, and when one document was finished, they immediately began working on the guide. They also began thinking of the kind of in-service the teachers would need and their responsibility to design a program that would provide on-going help for the teachers, rather than a one-shot workshop. In the following example, the committee is even discussing the possibility of having an inservice during the writing process to receive input from teachers. They are sensing some frustration from their colleagues and are trying to find ways to help them deal with the direction of the document.

Ron: I was having a bit of difficulty with the other teachers on not having this on Thursday. They were doing lesson plans Friday and midterms concluded yesterday. ...

Mr. Jones: Before we get a completion type thing, a closure on these things, that is what is going to have to happen. We don't have any inservice days scheduled. In fact we can't schedule them. We just can't do it. So it's going to have to be done on a pass around type thing or two or three people sitting down in the lounge and hacking it over.

June: It may be that we could set aside a half an hour after school.

Mr. Jones: In your staff meetings, yes. That's a possibility.

June: Because I think they're willing to do that. I just haven't had a chance in the three or four days -
Mr. Jones: They are going to have to do it in the sense that they're going to have to live with it. They want to have some input. They're going to have to live with it.

Kate: With the primary, they just feel like they've never taught social studies, especially kindergarten and first, and they don't even know what we're talking about. In looking at this, they got very confused about what we were going after, and I got sort of frustrated with it, because it seems like I feel like we've done a wonderful job in relating everything to an upper level, but I think we've got real problems on the primary.

Mr. Jones: There are two things here that are going to create problems for the "traditional" teacher of social studies. Number 1 -- as you say, and I am aware of what you are saying as far as the primary is concerned, and it would be true, I think of some others as well as primary. I think it is going to show up in the intermediate level, too, and that is that they teach a lot of social studies without knowing that they're teaching social studies. They're involving the social sciences everday from kindergarten day one, and before that during the kindergarten readiness period. They're involved with it. I think it is going to be our task to relate this to those levels. The social interaction type thing is going to have to be done. The second thing that we're doing that is foreign to them is that we're approaching it from an entirely different perspective. Literally we're giving the teacher, I think, the opportunity to develop their program better than they may have had in the past. When you create a course of study so rigid that they know that they're going to have to teach American History in the 8th grade, they're confined from teaching some other things because they feel they have to get that out of the way. If we can design this in such a way -- I think this was our original intent -- was to develop this in such a way and develop a curriculum guide so that they can see the whole scope of things that they're going to teach.

St. Michael's committee spent a lot of time discussing the issues which eventually became their
philosophy. They developed them with reference to their own beliefs and ideals rather than relying on other previously written materials. To differing degrees, the other two districts brought in written philosophies from other districts, as well as their own, and other related documents from their own districts.

Everyone on the Monroe committee from the district brought the previous curriculum guide to each meeting and referred to it often. When issues were suggested, they usually came from another district's philosophy or from the broad instructional goals (a term used before the new mandate) from their last curriculum guide. Even these issues were not discussed in as much depth as occurred in St. Michael. They did not use their discussions to examine their beliefs and values very much, but seemed to accept them as usable because they were used in something else. The following quote is taken from midmorning of their first meeting. In discussing issues for their philosophy, they refer to pages from their old curriculum guide.

Pete: When we critiqued this, we had a question as to whether that section that you are looking at -- the objectives, belong with the philosophy.

Ann: When we got in small groups we were wondering
Pete: When does it belong on the next page with instructional goals and objectives? It is one of those -- is it how you make your judgment? ... I think they would belong better on page 14?

Dr. Barton: You think they belong on page 14?

Carl: I agree with it. I'm not sure that you are talking about philosophy in the objectives. Like program objectives, educational objectives --

The issues that attracted them, however, did have some influence on their course of study work. They discussed such issues as life styles today and how we might have to change our traditional definition of what constitutes a family. They were concerned about resources and their conservation, and about responsibilities of citizenship. As with St. Michael, they were also concerned about students accepting responsibility for their actions and preparing them to live successfully in society. All of the issues were eventually included in their program objectives in some way. (These are listed on pages 11 and 12.)

The Monroe committee relied on the process model provided by the ODE more than St. Michael had. Much of their discussion about what should be contained in the philosophy came from six questions listed in the ODE document under thing that should considered when writing this element. They dealt with such things attitudes and values, controversial issues, and co-operation versus competition.
Pete, the middle school social studies teacher on the Monroe committee, was more vocal about his personal beliefs than the others. He brought up some interesting issues that might not have been directly written into the course of study, but did affect the way members viewed things during the deliberations and the way they wrote the document. One thing Pete talked about what he called "the joy of learning." He said:

The phrase I came out with was the joy of learning. You tend to forget that one of the reasons I became an educator was I was always so thrilled to go to school.... So many times you forget the joy of what it means to learn something new. What a gift that is to give somebody, and I can tell on the days when it actually happens in my classes .... How many times do we talk about the joy of learning in our classes? How is it exciting, why it is exciting, and then to make it exciting.

His statements early on the first meeting day did seem to set a tone to a lot of the work that was done. The phrase would come up periodically in subsequent meetings, and the teachers would ask if they might be losing sight of "the joy of learning" or if something they were talking about reflected the joy of learning. That one might not be able to identify a direct link between Pete's statement and a specific item in the final document seemed to be in agreement with the way Walker discussed the role of platform and its relationship to curriculum development.
The central role in which the platform was cast throughout the previous section may have left the reader with the impression that the rest of the curriculum making task could be little more than logical deduction from platform beliefs. Such an impression would be misleading. The platform is necessary and it facilitates the work but its application to the practical problems of curriculum making is by no means automatic, for several reasons. First, the platform is incomplete. One cannot anticipate all the working principles he will need. As the work progresses the need for principles of some unexpected kind will become acute and they will be devised and incorporated into the platform. Second, platform statements are too vague and imprecise. One must have some guidelines to interpret general principles and make them bear sharply on concrete situations. Any concrete situation falls under several principles. ...Interpretation is required to disentangle the overlapping jurisdictions and to establish hierarchies among the elements of the platform. In short, the platform must be elaborated and interpreted before it can be applied to concrete problems.  

Pete also had a strong belief about being realistic in written statements that they would make, even in the philosophy. He said:

Values consistent with purposeful democratic creed. I hate statements that are null and void. What is that? I don't even know..... I don't like it when they throw in educational jargon.

Monroe's philosophy and subsequent work was somewhat global and thematic, but still more concrete than St. Michael's. Monroe's writing in the various

---

elements did not contain jargon or anything that Pete might have considered null and void.

Monroe built their program objectives around eight themes: resources, settlement patterns, economic processes, basic institutions, individual differences, citizenship, and social science reference and study skills. These same themes were found in their old document and are very closely related to the various disciplines which make up the social studies. For example, the program goal about settlement patterns read:

The social studies program will provide students the opportunity to understand how geographic factors and societal influences determine the settlement patterns of peoples.

Geography and history are important disciplines in meeting these goals. Example subject objectives under this goal are: "The students will -- examine important events that were instrumental to the growth of the U.S.; recognize the geographical influence on settlement patterns and a group's culture; and, describe the role cities play and the problems of urbanization". Although thematic, they are more concrete, easier for a social studies teacher to understand without extensive in-servicing or supplemental explanatory materials.
Like St. Michael’s committee, the Monroe committee also did one thing different from the way the ODE had planned the document to look. It was not as revolutionary, however, as St. Michael. Each program goal was to have its own set of program objectives and subsequent related subject objectives. After writing their three program goals, the committee decided that they were all-encompassing and applicable to any program objectives that they might write. Their program goals were listed together in their course of study, and then program objectives were given with their related subject objectives immediately below.

If Monroe often relied on other written information in preparing their document, then Carson relied on that kind of information almost exclusively. They spent almost all of their deliberations deciding how to turn what they already had into what the ODE was now requiring. When we talk about the role that the Carson leader played later in this chapter, it will be obvious why the committee worked in this manner. But a consequence of this was that they never really aired their own beliefs and values and certainly did not have a chance to discuss and examine them. They focused more on format than on issues.
In writing their philosophy, they examined their former philosophy and some examples from other districts. They picked out one phrase in particular from their old philosophy that influenced the organization and emphasis for their new course of study. Pat, a teacher, said:

I think the first statement on that page gives a very good statement. It says that each student should be EXPOSED to the concepts in all the social studies disciplines. And then it names them. And I think that's a good opening sentence.

It did indeed become their opening statement. The members wrote down what she said immediately, no discussion about it, and continued from there.

This statement also became the organization for the entire course of study. Their one program goal was: "The Social Studies Program will provide the opportunity for students to know, understand, and apply the fundamentals of geography, history, political science, behavioral science, economics, anthropology, and conservation". Each discipline mentioned became a program objective with the same initial wording -- "The students will know, understand, and apply the fundamentals of ______" (fill in with the name of the discipline).

Subject objectives became statements which primarily identified basic social studies skills but
were written with cognitive verbs, as in: "The students will be able to -- read and interpret maps, identify political boundaries, know and understand the organization of governments, be aware of institutions in society," and so forth. After a discussion of the terms used in Bloom's cognitive taxonomy, words such as interpret, apply, analyze, and synthesize were incorporated into the subject objectives; but no discussion occurred indicating how this affected their beliefs about education or social studies education in particular. They were just current jargon terms that the committee felt compelled to use to show that they were aware of higher level thinking skills.

All elements in the deliberative model constantly intersect and influence one another. The organization of this chapter creates artificial divisions in the categories for the purpose of understanding those elements. But it is obvious in Carson that the role of time and leadership inordinately influenced the writing of their document. How can members feel free to make many changes if they have been told from the onset of their work that they would be very limited as to their time frame? In ten total hours of work, how deeply can one explore one's beliefs and values?
When the leader starts the first session by telling you that the work has essentially been finished and there is very little left to do, how many changes are you going to ask to make? To be fair to the Carson committee, they did the best they could.

The three public school districts started out with the same mandate but ended up with different products. St. Michael's course of study had an interdisciplinary/thematic approach to teaching social studies. Monroe's was disciplinary/thematic, and Carson's was disciplinary/skill-simple concept level in its orientation. These orientation seemed to have a lot to do with the discussions, or lack of discussion, around beliefs of the committee members -- their platforms.

In two of the school districts and at the university, the platforms did provide some basis for the committees' subsequent work. In Carson, however, platform was far less significant than the need to meet a bureaucratic requirement for quick completion of the task. It would seem that Walker's refinement of Schwab's original work, that of the place of platform, is an interesting one. It does have some influence at the elementary/secondary and the university levels.

It is now time to move to the last two research questions and examine Schwab's five bodies of knowledge
in relation to the work of the three public school districts. Most of Schwab’s work, as Walker’s, was done at the university level, so it will be interesting to see how these districts relate to the five bodies of knowledge. We will look at the commonplaces first and then the curriculum specialist.

The Teacher

The commonplace of the teacher, Schwab said, must be represented by someone who understands what the teachers are likely to know, their backgrounds and personalities, how they teach, and how they relate to the children. In each of the school districts, the teachers on the committee obviously represented this commonplace. Each district had a very low teacher turn-over rate, so the teachers certainly knew a lot about their colleagues, meeting Schwab’s requirements for this commonplace.

In Schwab’s article about curriculum building, he defined the commonplaces, but he did not give examples of the types of issues about which he thought each commonplace would be most concerned. This section will describe some of the teacher-related concerns that teachers in the three districts discussed in their deliberations.
A number of concerns centered around the Department of Education's mandate itself. They had never been involved in this kind of curriculum development before. They knew that they were creating a document that would have to be used by others. They knew that the ODE inspectors would be looking for evidence of its usage in reaccreditation visits. They felt pressure to "do it right."

One consideration, for example, was about the relationship of something said in one part of the document to the rest of the elements. As Mr. Jones, in St. Michael, said in reply to another teacher's query:

That's quite right, because if we put it in the program goals, it has to be reflected in the program objectives and the subject objectives, which means in the year every scope and sequence, somewhere in there, we are going to be repeating the same thing over again. It has to be said someplace. I guess my question is, where are we going to put this?

Teachers had to be concerned about not only what went into the course of study but where as well. Internal consistency was stressed in the mandate. This is related to the concern of "Are we getting it right? Will the state department okay our completed work?"

Because the graded courses of study would have to be incorporated into the daily lesson plans of each of the teachers, another concern revolved around a way
to help teachers use the document. This also included how to help them understand the importance of the content, even though they did not have direct input into that contents. Perhaps, even unconsciously, this was why all the committees were careful to solicit input and reactions about content from their colleagues between meetings.

The following conversation from St. Michael is a good example of how concerned the teachers in each district were about the bindingness and liability of word choices:

June: That word 'must' is going to kill you, Mr. Jones.

Mr. Jones: All right - the term was thrown out 'should', and I didn't put it down because nobody yelled to put down 'should'.

June: With 'must' you're committed, boy. Boy, you had better have those kids ready to do that.

Mr. Jones: I think 'should' is the better term there.

Ron: Should contribute?

Mr. Jones: Should be able to --

June: You can't say 'must' because that means you are going to get them --

Kate: You are going to guarantee that.

Mr. Jones: You are liable.

Notice that although Mr. Jones readily suggests another term, June is so concerned about this point
that she has trouble moving from her warning. Because of the way this document would now be required to be used by the state, words choices became critical issues in some cases.

Monroe had a similar concern about the importance of word choices from another perspective. One of the local residents was very involved with censorship -- she wanted to see more of it in the schools. Word choices might affect Monroe teachers by embroiling them in heated community debates about sensitive issues.

The Carson teachers were concerned also about word choices. They spent five minutes, for example, discussing whether they should say "influence OF an area" or "influence ON an area". Theirs was a more general concern, however, on picking just the right word. In fact, most of the teacher concerns in Carson revolved around procedural issues and keeping the group moving. When someone in the group would mention an issue, someone would ask how it should be worded to write down in the course of study without questioning if it was something they wanted in the document.

Pete, in Monroe, was also concerned with the trend that might be coming in the area of Ohio curriculum change. He wondered if this might be only a transition to a larger change.
Pete: Can we speculate into the future? What I heard was - you know, you filter things through your own perceptions - he said we had everybody doing graded courses of studies. ... What I got was kind of like, and the state approving all of these - I didn't get the sense of local control... what I got was somewhere down the line we're all going to blend our graded courses of study.

Kathy: You mean like a state course of study?

Pete: It boils down to that, doesn't it? To me - I'm seeing a logical progression.

Pete went to various workshops and listened carefully between the lines. The loss of local control was an important issue to him. He also expressed that later on in his discussion of the role of the Educational Testing Service and their growing control of what we put into the curriculum. Others in Monroe echoed his concern.

The majority of concerns of the teachers in each of the districts could be categorized as procedural or technical ones. This sounds more like the work of Tyler than of Schwab. It would be interesting to find out if this category predominated in curriculum change in other states with different kinds of mandates simply by the virtue of the legislative control of public schools.

Teacher concerns were definitely a represented commonplace in the deliberations in the three school districts. The concerns might not be the kinds of con-
cerns, however, that Schwab had in mind. Let us now look at the next commonplace to see if that is represented more in the way that Schwab intended.

The Learner

Schwab stated that the person that represented this commonplace should have general knowledge of child growth and development and specific knowledge of the particular children affected by the committee's work. No school psychologist or other individual was chosen to be on any of the committees for his/her knowledge in this area. Instead, the teachers had to wear this hat in addition to the above commonplace. These teachers did have specific knowledge of the children in the community. Hopefully at least the elementary teachers had general knowledge about child growth and development. How well, then, were the children represented on this committee?

The answer, unfortunately, is not very well. The children were not even discussed from these perspectives. Here is a typical example of a missed opportunity to bring out this kind of knowledge on behalf of the students. In St. Michael, it was one of the few times that even this much mention was made of the students.
Mr. Jones: ... Before we get it in final form, let's hash it out. What do you think, Paul?

Paul: Would that be something that you would expect of a middle school student to be able to do?

Mr. Jones: By the time he gets there or when he leaves?

Paul: By the time he leaves.

Mr. Jones: And certainly at the level --

Paul: At the level --

Mr. Jones: How about the term -- instead of communication skills, conversant?

Here was an opportunity to talk about the characteristics of the middle school child and whether or not this was an appropriate concept for him, and the conversation abruptly went off in another direction. We never did return to this dilemma in the course of subsequent discussions in St. Michael.

In Monroe, Pete discussed the middle school student also. At least he did give the group some insight into the was that age child looks at the world. He was discussing how he taught about the legal system. He pointed out to the others that although our system says that one is innocent until proven guilty, seventh and eighth graders tend to presume guilt until proven innocent. This begins to help one understand the viewpoint and maturity level of this age student.
In Carson, the administrator asked the teachers when children could begin to synthesize, thinking in terms of Bloom's cognitive taxonomy. One of the elementary teachers told him that children could and should do this as early as kindergarten. This is consistent with Bloom and other knowledge we have about child growth and development.

These were really the only examples of looking at the child from this perspective. The remainder of the time decisions on what to teach when were based on when concepts appeared on standardized tests, what was currently done in classes in regard to the concept, and what was expedient so that there would be enough time to cover other objectives dependent on students knowing the ones that came before. If decisions were based on knowledge of the child, they were made in more of an intuitive manner; it was more tacit than explicit.

Most of the teachers on these committees were experienced teachers. They spent many years interacting with their students in the school system. They were all caring people. Some of the decisions they made probably intuitively or tacitly contained elements of good practice based on sound principles of child growth and development. But no one on the committee,
at a conscious level, spoke as an active child advocate. Let us now see if subject matter did any better.

The Subject Matter

According to Schwab, this should be a scholar familiar with the body of knowledge in the discipline under consideration. That person should also understand what it means to be a member of the body of scholars in that discipline and should understand the structure of that subject.

The structure of an synthetic subject such as social studies is more difficult to deal with than that of an analytic subject such as mathematics. Synthetic subjects have no logical progression, and the structure is created and organized by individuals and not by the discipline. The content is less hierarchical and does not lend itself to task analysis or easy sequencing.\(^5\) This makes the task of our committee even more difficult.

The only subject matter specialists on each of the committees were the high school and middle school teachers. In St. Michael's committee this included one middle and one high school teacher. The former was a

new teacher, but the latter, Ron, was an experienced teacher who was also active in the state professional organization for social studies. He was known throughout the community for the creativity and enthusiasm in his teaching.

In Monroe, the three high school teachers and one middle school teacher acted as our subject matter specialists. All were experienced teachers. The middle school teacher was also a very creative teacher who had a special interest in economics. Because of his expertise, he led one of the workshops at the social studies update sponsored by the county office at the beginning of the school year. All of the social studies teachers in this district were active in their professional associations. In Carson, the high school teacher, also an experienced teacher, had to take on this role.

All the social studies teachers acted as resource persons for the other committee members. They clarified concepts and ideas when questions arose. Their contributions to the deliberations certainly reflected their knowledge and commitment to the field; however, it was not at the conscious level that would allow the rest of the members to expand their understanding of the value perspectives of the subject. It
did not give the deliberations the balance that Schwab talked about.

One issue that was discussed by both St. Michael and Monroe was the requirement that each district teach economics. The teachers realized that the placement of this course in various departments would change the emphasis of the course, as the following conversation from St. Michael shows.

Mr. Jones: ...as far as economics is concerned, it must be taught. There are no odds and ends about it. It isn't a business course. It's an economics course. It is very much delineated.

June: The whole nature of that course can be changed, though, by being in the business department as opposed to social studies. Or the math department.

Mr. Jones: Yes, that's why we attack it.

Kate: I mean, it's a completely different class.

June: And with many of our elementary people building economic and ...

Kate: Yes. They are really not excited about that class. They are kind of kept moving on it.

June: Right, and the projects such as the Teachers-in-the-Workplace and some of those things, I think you'll find it's going to generate interest and understanding for the need to have a better background.

St. Michael's elementary teachers also recognized the need to bring this subject down to the elementary level. Even within the subject matter, there was a teacher concern about helping elementary
teachers become more knowledgeable and comfortable with this subject. In addition, there is an implied concern about students' understanding of economics depending on which department designs the course. Here is an example of how the subject-matter, student, and teacher commonplaces overlap in concern over this one issue.

Teachers also incorporated ideas they received from the county in-service social studies update. In addition to the economics issue, there was a great deal of discussion in all the districts about global education. All incorporated this concept into their final documents.

Unfortunately, a lot of the decision making about the subjects proceeded the way Carson's did. The following conversation will show what usually happened.

Pat: OK. We went through, I asked the other two sixth grade teachers what they felt, as far as using atlases, tables, etc., to teach the geographic skills.... it's important to enable students to read maps. Like we take the different countries around the world and study them six weeks, and I think it's important for students to read those maps in each country that we study, to read and understand the boundaries, and to read and understand directions. Pretty much on that level. So we've figured that's important all the way through. To be able to read the maps.

Mr. Young: OK, so you're saying one of the critical skills at your level is very definitely have to learn how to read the maps, charts, and graphs.

Pat: Right. Yes.
Mr. Young: Now let me ask you this question. Should these be three different objectives, or can we make this one objective? The student will be able to read maps, charts, and graphs. Can that be one objective?

Decisions on what knowledge would be included in the course of study, and at what level it would be appropriate to teach that knowledge, were made on the basis of what was already being taught in those grades. At that point, what was being taught was usually what was in the textbook. So even though committee members did not go to meetings with their textbooks and write subject objects from the table of contents, at least unconsciously they were letting the textbooks drive their decisions. This was most true of Carson.

One might think that this would be more difficult to do in Monroe with the more thematic approach. But in the beginning of their scope and sequence section, they listed the focus of each grade level. It was: Kindergarten, the self; first grade, the family; second grade, neighborhood and community; and so on, following Paul Hanna's notion of Expanding Environments. This is the same sequence followed by social studies textbook series, no matter who the publisher is.

There was much less of this kind of decision making in St. Michael where they had an interdis-
disciplinary/thematic approach. But even there is did occur to some extent. The reality was that no matter how the committee wrote the course of study, teachers would still need resources, and a major resource was the textbook. It was also less expensive than buying only a variety of supplemental materials for each teacher.

The subject matter specialists in each of these districts were knowledgeable in their fields and active in their professional associations. The concerns of the subject matter certainly did not overwhelm the concerns of the other commonplaces, as Schwab warned might happen. The subject matter specialists did not try to force issues or intimidate others by their specialized knowledge. Perhaps this is because of the synthetic nature of social studies. But they also did not help to make other committee members aware, on a conscious level, of the value perspectives offered by social studies. This was unfortunate for each of the groups. But if none of the commonplaces has done very well so far, the milieu is certainly the worst.

The Milieu

The milieu includes the classroom environment, the community, and other primary and secondary groups
in which the child participates. Who represented this commonplace in the three districts studied? The same people who represented all the other commonplaces. No representatives from the communities were invited to participate on the committees, not even board members.

In St. Michael, at least one of the teachers had lived in the community for a number of years. Three of the four teachers taught in the district for many years. Anyone who has ever lived in a small town, such as St. Michael, can verify the fact that everyone is always aware of what others in the community do and how they feel about any issue. The teachers were knowledgeable about this community and certainly about their classroom environments. But with so many issues to deal with, it was easy for these issues to fall through the cracks.

Several Monroe and Carson teachers lived in those communities, also. All the teachers in the two districts had taught there for a number of years. Monroe might have been a little larger than St. Michael and Carson, but the small town way of life was very similar. Teachers interacted with community members and tried to be sensitive to the pulse of their communities. But as with the other value perspectives,
translation of these issues in the courses of study were more tacit than explicit.

In St. Michael, about the only time an issue was discussed which addressed community values and beliefs was around the word 'ethics' used in the board philosophy. June asked about the background of that choice of words. Mr. Jones shared with them a previous problem with regard to the distrust community members had developed because of some of the way a past board dealt with an issue. This was a general word meant to convey to the public that this board and its staff could be trusted to be fair and open in its relationship with the community.

Kate then discussed the relationship of that problem to controversial issues that they might want to teach in social studies. Mr. Jones assured her that that was not the motivation for this word choice. He stated that the community was more concerned with the notion of what was acceptable behavior for the students' role models, and hence, the students themselves.

Monroe teachers were aware that there were ultra-conservatives living in their districts who wanted to see more censorship in the schools. Here is an example of the way they tried to influence what was taught in social studies:
Pete: I went to hear some of those testimonies given when they were coming up with the new minimum standards.... That group got up and spoke against humanism.... They thought it was not appropriate that time was being spent in school teaching American students what life was like in other countries and in other cultures. It was incredible.

Sue: She made that real clear, too, when they had that community meeting. There is no reason for any child to know what Japan is like. That we should be isolated, and the only thing they should be concerned about is America.

The Monroe Board of Education had a written policy regarding the teaching of controversial issues. It had been written a few years before to protect themselves and their teachers from this kind of thinking. The teachers must have felt safe, because this was the only time this issue was brought up. Even then, it did not affect what went into the course of study. The next person to speak in this conversation took the group on to another subject.

Monroe teachers also mentioned the future milieu of the students who were now in school. What would the world be like when they were graduated? They talked about the fact that the jobs that their present kindergarteners would occupy had not been invented yet, and the importance of preparing students for the future.

I think it is safe to say that in all the districts, teachers included topics that they thought
would help students cope with citizenship and living skills when they became adults. St. Michael talked about it in their platform when they discussed such things as goal-setting and vocational choices. The Carson committee's subject objectives' skills were ones they felt people needed in order to get along in society.

The milieu, then, was primarily represented by the teachers' understandings and concerns for the community in which they taught, and in some cases, lived. As with all of the other commonplaces, it was the tacit inclusion of issues and objectives that would reflect community concerns. It is difficult to tell from the transcripts just how conscious teachers were of the various value perspectives in the statements that they made. Teachers might have been very aware themselves that they were saying something because of their knowledge of issues from a commonplace, but did not share that with the others.

Issues also overlap commonplaces. Almost all of the issues could ultimately be seen as teacher concerns. Goal-setting can be a concern of the milieu in helping students be better contributors and adaptors to the milieu in which they will one day themselves. It can also be a student concern -- helping students live
up to their full potential according to their own unique development patterns. It is not always obvious why the teachers in each district brought up the issues that they did, especially if we look at each teacher as a representative of all of Schwab's commonplaces.

There was one body of knowledge, however, that Schwab required on curriculum committees that did not fall to the teachers in the three districts studied. This was the curriculum specialist. Each district had an administrator of record that served as the leader of the committee. We will examine this position next.

The Curriculum Specialist

The curriculum specialist must be sure that everyone on the committee understands the various value perspectives proffered by each of the commonplace representatives, and that these perspectives are critically examined by all. The leader must also see that there is a balance regarding these issues maintained throughout the deliberation.

Because none of the committee members were chosen specifically to meet Schwab's value perspectives, it seems unfair to judge the leaders actions too strictly in this light. If I may be a little more liberal in the interpretation of the intention behind
Schwab's definition, I would like to ask if our leaders encouraged everyone to participate and check to see if others on the committee heard and understood one another's contributions. Were they also concerned with the process of writing the document as well as the product itself?

Mr. Jones, in St. Michael, did appear to be at least as concerned with the process as he was with the product. From the beginning he told the group that they would be allowed to have as many meetings as they needed to complete their task. He never said or did anything in subsequent sessions which negated that statement. He never mentioned anything about taking too long on any issue or sub-task or about problems covering classes at any time during the process.

He also explained to them at the first session that there would probably be times that they would want to go back and reexamine an issue and make changes. Or, they might want to drop an issue and come back to it at a time when they felt it was more vital. True to his word, there are many cases when the committee would go back and rewrite sections thought to be finished because they changed their minds in the light of new discussions. For example, here he refers to a change
made in a previous session to encourage June to feel comfortable about the change she is about to suggest:

Mr. Jones: Now this is what was -- we made some changes last time because when we got into the program objectives we found out either our goals were too shallow or too broad and made some corrections. Let's go on to the program objectives which you were referring to, June. Now the program down one side and the program objectives in the middle and let's take any changes that you see there. What was the one you saw, June?

Mr. Jones was also careful to see that no one was left out of the discussion. For instance, he knew that Paul, being new and rather reserved in personality, might feel overwhelmed by the others' experience. Mr. Jones knew his staff well. He would specifically call on Paul, if he had not contributed much to that point, in areas that he knew Paul was interested in and would feel more confident in speaking. Paul did become more vocal as the committee work continued.

Mr. Jones would also refer to things said by committee members and rephrase them or ask clarifying questions to make sure that others were aware of what implications existed in those statements. He was at all times encouraging, making positive comments like "sounds good," or "that's very true." He set the tone for the committee's work, and that positive tone was picked up by all on the committee. They all commented, in informal discussions at lunch or back in their
buildings, about how much they looked forward to their meetings. Mr. Jones gave me the impression that, if he had read Schwab's work, he would have tried conscientiously to be the kind of curriculum leader described in his articles.

Mr. Jones also encouraged everyone on the committee to explore their own ideas. This was their chance to completely revise their work in social studies if they wished -- and they did! The committee members never brought their old curriculum guides with them to the meetings, and Mr. Jones never referred to them. No one seemed to be carrying old baggage to the new committee meetings. Members were free to proceed without being constricted by previous St. Michael documents. The only restrictive document they had to follow was the prescriptive model of the ODE mandate. They proved, however, that even with such restrictions, they could find creative solutions unanticipated by the mandators.

As with Mr. Jones, Dr. Barton, in Monroe, was not interested in hurrying the process along. He promised the committee at the beginning of their work that they would have as much time as they needed, and he kept his word. Monroe had more meetings than any other group. Dr. Barton would ask clarifying or
prompting questions to make sure that what was being said was being understood by all the members. This would often make discussions longer, but he wanted to be sure everyone was clear about the intentions of the speaker. He would sometimes play devil's advocate to make sure the committee looked at issues without blindly accepting statements.

Dr. Barton knew his committee members well. Most were very vocal, but a few were more reserved and shy. He made sure that those members were not overwhelmed by the others and deftly called on them for opinions when they had been silent for a long time. He would preface it with some directional comment such as, "Kathy, you went to a workshop this summer. How did your experience relate to this." Or, "Sue, we were talking in my office not long ago about ____. Why don't you share some of the thoughts you shared with me." He didn't just say, "Carolyn, we haven't heard from you for a while. How do you feel about this?" This could easily have left that person struggling for something profound to say so s/he wouldn't embarrass her/himself. Over the months, even the shy members became more naturally vocal.

Dr. Barton was more concerned with the product, however, than was Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones gave the
impression that if the process worked well, the product would take care of itself. Dr. Barton did not seem to be able to live with as much ambiguity as Mr. Jones, and he was very concerned with the objectives and measurable verbs that could be used, especially in the cognitive and affective domains.

Dr. Barton also believed that much of the work of his committee was already done five years ago. Each committee member brought the old curriculum guide with them to meetings, and a lot of the work was turning old broad instructional objectives into the new format.

Dr. Barton set that mind set up during the first morning.

Dr. Barton: I think we begin with the philosophy, and I think maybe this afternoon we might critique that philosophy. I think there are about six questions we ask ourselves. ....Quite frankly our graded course of study already has subject objectives in there. Because five years ago when we wrote our graded course of study in social studies, we insisted at that time if you remember that every subject objective began with a what? A measurable verb. Remember that? ....in your language arts graded course of study, we worked very diligently in developing the pupil evaluation policy. That policy will be able to apply to any graded course of study we write in this district. It is also done. It is a very interesting policy on pupil evaluation, but it must be in social studies graded course of study. So as you can see, some of the things are done. This is simply a format. This is done. Our big work is going to become on reviewing program philosophy and program goals and seeing that our program objectives and subject objectives all line up. This is done.
According to Dr. Barton, they only need to review the program philosophy from five years ago. The six questions he spoke about in the beginning of the speech came from the process model booklet. Their program and subject objectives were completed from the old format. They just needed a bit of work to make sure they fell in line with one another. All they needed to do was to write some program goals. The group could talk all they wanted to about various issues, but ultimately the content of the new course of study looked very much like the old.

Dr. Barton was genuinely proud of the old document (he had also led that group). He felt that they had broken a lot of ground at that time. And according to the state department mandate, you only had to review your courses of study every five years. You did not have to rewrite them. Dr. Barton felt there was no reason to reinvent the wheel. All they needed to do was to basically make format changes to fit the new mandate. So after all the discussion, Dr. Barton brought members back to the task of changing the old into the new.

This characteristic was even more prominent with Mr. Young in Carson. Between the work that had been done on the language arts graded course of study
the previous year and the content of their old social studies curriculum guide, this committee’s work was essentially done for them according to Mr. Young. The following speech occurred during the first fifteen minutes of the Carson’s first meeting.

Mr. Young: Really what we’re going to be doing, we have to keep in mind is, we are not necessarily going to reinvent the whole wheel again. We are a REVISION committee, which means we can make extensive revisions on the model, as much as we want. But we ought to keep in mind that what some here is good also. A correction would be number 10. Evaluation. And this is pretty much the format that we will follow. We’re just going to take the document and go through those areas which are to be included in the graded course of study. And this is what is prescribed by the state. So we will revise in that sequence. Then under definitions, there’s three definitions that we need to keep in mind. What a goal, objective, and pupil performance objective is. And the difference between those two, three. So that’s just for the benefit, if we get hung up on a goal or objective or pupil performance objective, we may refer back to this as a definition. We may clarify. The instructional intent, I say, interject here, is that we have come up on a format on the language arts, which we feel is a format that applies to any of the graded courses of study. Now we think it’s concise, to the point, and easily usable. So we’ll probably stick with the same format, as far as the scope and sequence is concerned. And in this scope and sequence, and all of you except Bob, has a copy of. You have copies of the graded course of study in the language arts. Now the instructional intents that we used in that document are listed there. And, uh, the only question I raise is, do you want to include "extend"? Now this word cropped up primarily during the revision of the reading in which we finally put the language arts document. We do not have to stick to that. If it has meaning to social studies, if it has meaning to this group, that’s fine. We want to leave it in. If not, I, it doesn’t make any difference, I don’t
think it’s that, it’s not so important we ought to leave it in. It does not need to stay in. So you need to be thinking about that.

The stage was set for the teachers on the committee. They had been told that many decisions had already been made by the previous committee such as format, introduction, and evaluation. Yes, they were free to make changes if they liked, but... The few questions Mr. Young did ask were really rhetorical questions; he rushed through them, they were inconsequential (do we want to keep the word "extend"?), and the teachers didn’t have enough information to know what he was talking about at that point, let alone to make a decision. After Mr. Young’s long monologue, the teachers were given a chance to make minor revisions in the introduction. The introduction to what? They hadn’t been given the opportunity to explore the nature of the task for themselves, their roles, or possible pertinent issues. They were asked to refine a component in a void of information.

Although this occurred at the beginning of the first meeting, this was typical of the way Mr. Young ran all of their meetings. All committee members brought their old documents to each meeting, and they manipulated the old content into the new format. Issues that were identified were quickly written down
for inclusion in the document with little discussion about their merits.

Mr. Young kept the meetings moving. He was a very task-oriented person. He would cut off discussions at time with statements leading the group back to writing things down in the course of study. He was the only member of the group that had worked on a course of study before under the new mandates. The rest of the group didn't question what he did, probably because they thought he was the only one that knew how the work ought to proceed.

Mr. Young also tightly controlled the time. Instead of telling the committee that they would have as much time as they needed, he stressed that they really needed to have the work completed within the first semester so that the mathematics committee could work second semester. He set up two other meeting dates at the first session and told the group that they could have more if they needed. However his actions showed that they would still have to be finished within that semester time frame.

Three different leadership styles were represented in the school districts. Mr. Jones and Dr. Barton were more similar than the third, but even their differences in style led to very different products.
Mr. Jones was process oriented. Other than periodic checks with the process model to make sure the committee's documents would contain all of the elements required, Mr. Jones relied more on the ideas and wishes of the group to create a meaningful document. Interestingly, he was the only leader among the three who had not yet written a graded course of study under the new mandate.

Dr. Barton was careful to nurture the process along, but product still predominated. Although he had led two revision committees the previous year under the new mandate, he still felt the need to rely heavily on the ODE publication. He also wanted to have the contents of the old document in the new and was very directive in his instructions about reworking certain old elements into the new format.

Mr. Young was very directive and task-oriented in the way he ran the group. He had directed the writing of two courses of study the previous year under the new standards. He knew how this should be done, and he was determined to finish this document as quickly as possible and move on to the next one. His committee's method of working appeared much closer to that advocated by Tyler than any of the other groups.
Conclusions

There are great differences in the conditions and experiences of those working at the university level as opposed to the elementary/secondary level. Does this mean that the deliberative model is inappropriate and impossible at the local school district level? No, it just may look a bit different or need some direction to implement it better.

Platforms in each study, within the limits described by Walker, could still give some direction to the focus of the work. Many platform issues were easily identified by the reader because of the research instrument that Walker developed. Walker's group indicated their level of agreement with statements collected from Eisner's writings. He also had included some other statements in his instruments. Walker found, however, that all of Eisner's statements were generally endorsed.⁵² These issues, along with others, became part of the deliberations during their art curriculum development process.

Walker also stated that the way platform became operating policy in this committee was that the members

argued about it. Their arguments often revolved around how their beliefs could be implemented in the classroom through their lesson plans. In other words, they deliberated for many hours about what their final product would look in the light of their beliefs about what was important for the elementary child in his/her study of art.

When allowed the time, such as in St. Michael and Monroe, members shared their beliefs and values with each of the others on the committee. When things were said in the course of committee work, members were in a position to understand better why certain people said what they did. Although not brought out in the findings of this report, members on all of the committees respected (not always agreed) one another's ideas and worked very well together. This is also the sense I have from reading Walker's account of his project. Perhaps platform had something to do with this mutual understanding and respect.

As far as the commonplaces were concerned, perhaps our teachers would have represented better the various perspectives if they had known from the beginning that they were expected to do so. If the leader had said at the first session that everyone needed to be aware of these four value perspectives, and because
of their years of experience in the district, needed to be sure and think about issues in terms of them, a more conscious effort might have been made to do so. On the other hand, one also must entertain the idea that our committee members might not have been capable of doing this. Since the state mandate did not preclude inviting community members or experts in different commonplaces to be included on the committees, that might have been the only way the commonplaces would have been adequately represented.

As it was, teacher issues revolved mostly around word choices and formatting in their concerns for accountability and Ohio Department of Education accreditation. No matter how the commonplaces were represented, given the tone of the mandate, these concerns probably would have still been prominent. Issues in the other areas still basically came down to teacher concerns. Student and subject matter issues became what do WE think they should learn when. Milieu, if given any attention, was also what do WE think will be needed to prepare students for the world of he future. Subject objectives chosen were based, ultimately on the opinions of the committee members.

The leader in Walker’s group was a man knowl-edgeable in the subject, curriculum, and the students.
He was also aware of Schwab's work. He was in a better position to see that the various value perspectives noted by Schwab were represented and balanced in their work.

The reality of the elementary/secondary level is that the leader is usually more knowledgeable in administration than curriculum. Several decades ago, many school districts had supervisors in the various subject areas who were more knowledgeable in both the subject and curriculum. They were among the first to be cut during financial crises, which were usually the norm. Two of the leaders in this study would probably have been interested in Schwab's work, however. It is not unlikely that they would have used this knowledge to make sure they had more of a balance on their work. The third one, however, would have preferred to stay with Tyler.

Although this study found that deliberation did not occur in these three districts in a way that closely matched the university or idealized model of deliberation, it cannot show that it is completely outside the realm of possibility. One cannot discount the usability of the deliberative model on the elementary/secondary level from this study. This study looked at limited elements of the deliberative model.
Interesting things did happen in curriculum development in these districts. Other elements of the model need to be examined in these districts and others to give a more complete picture of the model in the context of the local schools. These and other implications will be examined further in the next chapter.
CHAPTER VI

Conclusions and Implications

This chapter will be divided into three sections. The first will review briefly the findings in the three districts and draw some conclusions about the deliberative process at the local level. The second part will suggest some implications for changes in the way educators are prepared for their roles based on the previous section's conclusions. Finally, because one study is insufficient to make broad generalizations about deliberation, I will make some recommendations for future studies.

Conclusions at the Local Level

The context of deliberation at the local level, specifically under the Ohio mandate for change, was quite different from the university level. Walker's naturalistic model was based on his work on various projects which all took place on the university campus. Schwab's idealized model was also an outgrowth of his many years of work at the university level. Did the
difference in contexts preclude the implementation at the local level?

Deliberation generally looked different at the local level within those few elements examined in this study. Platform was the one element that provided similarities. In the school districts, examples of platform were given which arose from the interchange of ideas among the members primarily in their first meeting. In Walker's model, he described an instrument he used to help identify issues that were likely to appear as platform issues. Walker did not give many actual examples of these issues' treatment during the deliberations, but his discussions lead one to understand that these issues did indeed give direction to the committee's work as in two of the three school districts in this study.

Walker was quoted in the previous chapter as stating that it was not always easy, for a variety of reason, to see the direct link between platform and the final product of the deliberations. The single irony in my study seemed to be that the one school district in which the greatest amount of direct linkage could be found, St. Michael, also caused the most uproar from the ODE. St. Michael's committee seemed to be allowed more time and freedom to explore their platform. They
were not restricted by previous documents and were permitted to follow their beliefs through the process to create a high-concept, interdisciplinary course of study. The other school districts received a blanket approval from the ODE on their courses of study. St. Michael received a strong letter of concern. To add insult to injury, because they were part of the county system, not only did the superintendent of St. Michael and the county superintendent receive the letter, but the other four local superintendents within the county system did as well.

Despite the rigid regulations required by the state, St. Michael's committee developed a creative document emphasizing a high level of concept development. It did not take an inordinate amount of time to do this, either. They spent almost half the time that Monroe did in developing their graded course of study. Although the local districts did not have the time and freedom that the university committees had, it was still possible to accomplish interesting things in curriculum development.

Leadership style influenced how the committees worked and their final projects more than the time factor. The leader either encouraged explorations of ideas and styles of writing, or he encouraged a strict
task orientation of immediately relating everything to what had to be written to satisfy state standards. In St. Michael and Monroe, the leaders not only allowed time for the exploration of ideas, but they would often bring up disparate points to be sure their members had looked at issues from different viewpoints. Even in Monroe, the final document represented a higher level thematic concept development than the low level skills of Carson's course of study. Schwab recognized the importance of the leadership role when he set such high expectations for his curriculum specialist. As Mr. Jones, and to some extent Dr. Barton showed, it is possible to approximate Schwab's standards for the leader at the local level. With a better background in Schwab's work, it probably would have been possible to come even closer to Schwab's standards.

This brings us to Schwab's commonplaces, the most disappointing element in the deliberative model as far as the three districts were concerned. In Schwab's idealized model, different people would be chosen for their expertise in representing the four commonplaces. In the three districts studied, the only representatives were teachers. Although the teachers had knowledge of the various perspectives represented by the commonplaces, they were not consciously made aware that
it was their job to see that all of them were fairly represented. Even so, it is difficult to have to wear so many hats at one time. Schwab does say that the group can be smaller than five "to the extent that two or more of the required bodies of experience may be found in one person." But committee members must be aware of what they are representing to even begin to do an adequate job. With this knowledge, I think it is fair to say that most, if not all, the teachers in the districts would have tried to create a more balanced representation of these perspectives.

Could the process in the three districts have looked different if everyone involved had had more knowledge of alternative models of decision-making? If school district educators are to expand on their traditional roles, is there something that can be done to prepare them better for their new roles in curriculum development? These are some of the issues that will be explored in the next section.

---

Implications for Change

Including teachers on course of study committees is not the only place in curriculum development that teacher roles are changing. In the last decade, teacher empowerment has gained in strength. Articles on teachers rights and corresponding responsibilities are found in growing numbers in various professional journals. The literature-based reading approach has had most of its momentum at the grass roots teacher level, for example. Teachers are beginning to expect to take the lead in curriculum change. They believe it is their right as the experts in the field. They also believe that if they are going to be held accountable for the implementation of curriculum, they have a right to be part of the decision-making bodies. The new teacher certification board in Ohio will have several teachers appointed to its membership.

Those who work with teachers who have been empowered in various areas also report that those teachers have become more vocal child advocates. Teachers involved in Ohio's Reading Recovery, according to some university teacher leaders, are making sure they are more knowledgeable about child growth and development. They are making more conscious decision about their teaching based on this knowledge.
Talking with teachers at The Literacy Connection meetings, a grass roots organization advocating literature based reading, one hears teachers conversing knowledgeably about recent research in language arts and child development. They actively seek the new research and evaluate it in terms of very stringent criteria. They no longer meekly listen to criticisms of education and educators. They are vocal about their knowledge that is now on the explicit level, rather than tacit knowledge. In visiting their classrooms, education is different from other classrooms, and they can justify everything they are doing.

These teachers have gained much of their knowledge through their own active search, outside any formalized teacher education program. It is time teacher educators caught up with this movement and changed the way traditional methods and education classes are taught. We need to begin to prepare our undergraduates to become decision-makers, not just implementors. We need to help them understand how to move beyond using textbook teaching. Although we have given lip-service for years about the textbook being only a tool and not the curriculum, we have not done a very good job showing undergraduates how to teach in other ways. We have allowed them to fall back on the excuses that the
administration or community expects this and will not let them change. We have allowed them to graduate and talk disparagingly about the theory taught in college versus the reality in their own classroom. We have not bridged the gap between the two very well when they are in our college classes. We teacher educators need to catch up, or we will be run over in the teacher empowerment movement.

Traditionally, curriculum courses are not taught until educators start graduate school. At this time, they are on their way to becoming part of the elite group of academic experts. We must begin to find ways of helping our undergraduate students understand curriculum in its many facets. We must present them with the varieties of alternate curriculum development models available, not just the Tyler model.

We must do the same thing for administrators. There was much talk in the last decade about the administrator as instructional leader. But our educational programs still stress the managerial role. We must help future and practicing administrators understand the broader picture of what curriculum is and can be. They must know about the alternatives to the Tyler model also. If they are going to lead local curriculum
change, they must have a greater understanding of the possibilities and paradigms that exist.

Schwab, Walker, Reid, and others have shown that curriculum change can include a variety of constituencies working together to make education better than it has ever been. They did not narrow the field of talented change agents to those "experts" in the field. In their work, they realized that the quality of change could be improved if people weren't excluded because of the lack of academic letters after their names. Their writings, especially Schwab's commonplaces, reflect the expansion of the field of curriculum. Their work provides a basis for further study and exploration of their ideals. The last section of this chapter will suggest some further study as logical next steps from this study.

Implications for Future Study

My study was actually a single case study of three incidents of curriculum change under a specific state mandate. Other public school districts in other states need to be studied in the same way and comparisons made among the studies. One thing all public schools in the United States have in common is that they are under constant scrutiny and criticism from the
general public. Legislators, who are ultimately charged with the responsibility of providing an education to all, find various ways to control what occurs in schools and how change happens. Ohio responded with one set of new standards. Other states are also responding in some way. Are there some similarities and differences of which we need to be aware. In any case, change should be researched and documented in some way so that it can be improved.

Although each of the districts in this study were under a mandate to change that was heavily influenced by the Tyler Rationale, one school district created a document with objectives that did not look like the typical Tyler objectives. How did this happen? Each district had to write objectives. Walker’s group found that they did not start with objectives or produce objectives in the Tyler sense. But the three districts in this study had no choice; they were required to come up with a list of objectives as their final product. They all did. But more study is needed to understand why St. Michael’s committee ended up with a product so unlike the others, with process-oriented objectives, that it set the ODE in an uproar.

Deliberation is a much more complicated process than described in this study. There are many more ele-
ments that need to be analyzed in data gathered from local school districts before any judgments can begin to be formed about the feasibility of the deliberative model in these contexts.

All of the elements in the deliberative model intersect one another. They are not separate entities as artificially analyzed for purposes of this study. This study only began to hint at the influence the elements have on one another. When all the elements of deliberation have been analyzed in a setting, a creative way must be found to show this intersection and influence of elements on one another.

In conclusion, this study poses more questions than it answers. That is what makes research interesting and worthwhile. Studies that supply simple and complete answers to all questions and become an ending point are not worth doing. Research should lead us in many new directions, posing new research questions. This study, then is not an ending, but a beginning.
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