The launching of a new journal invites reconsideration of the field that the journal represents. The thoughtful planning that must go into a new professional endeavor invites re-searching or investigating anew issues and topics critical to the field. Certain of such topics may be receiving attention, others may be concealed. The task of those concerned about future direction is to uncover and bring to light the concealed as well as to deal with the obvious. The task also is to communicate in such a way that the various publics concerned about curricular matters can enter into the dialogue.

I have one foot in the camp of curriculum visionaries concerned about what curriculum might become. The other foot is in the real world where teachers and principals deal with day-by-day problems, where school boards and curriculum committees frequently are concerned more about similarities than differences in curriculum. Trying to live in both worlds presents problems with language. When I talk with curriculum visionaries, I can use language that evokes fresh and perhaps more poignant images. What is said does not have to be implemented in the near future. When I talk in the real world of children and youth, classrooms, materials, and teachers, I am aware of trying to evoke shared meanings—of dealing with the stuff of curriculum and education as it is.

In order to speak to future directions, I am briefly stating certain concerns in the form of overlapping recommendations. These recommendations grow out of experiences with the dailiness of education and my own reading of what needs to be given greater significance.

1 Rethink the goals and purposes of education. In her study of good high schools, Lightfoot noted that such schools have clearly delineated purposes. Lay persons and professional persons together need to rethink the purposes of the schools in which all are involved. In a democracy, attention needs to be given to possibilities for persons leading fully integrated personal lives while simultaneously contributing in creative ways to public discourse.

In the dialogue about goals and purposes, consideration might be given to such matters as the relation of the local community to the larger world, the development of a rich inner life in a world of much dailiness, the purposes of knowing, and the place of compassion in a suffering world.

2. In order to establish goals, consider the values that must be central in today’s world. To determine such values will not be easy, but dialogue needs to take place among the various groups concerned about the place of education in a just society. Dealing with values in a democracy ordinarily necessitates the juggling of two or more goods: freedom and control, the private good and the public vision, present enjoyment and future plans, self-criticalness and maintenance of a healthy self-concept, citizen of the world and citizen of the local community.

The day is past when a unidimensional approach to values is adequate. The years ahead need to see a resurgence of interest in the value-laden dilemmas facing humankind. Facing value situations as problematic, being aware of the many possible responses to dilemmas, and learning to make value decisions in light of contextual cues might be considered as possible learnings for those engaged in the educational process.

3. Focus on birth-to-death curriculum designs. Substantial thinking and research have been carried out on various aspects of the curriculum among differing groups. Yet little considered research and development have been conducted in the area of alternative curriculum designs that foster a learning society at all ages. What kinds of settings best foster opportunities for persons at all ages to grow in their knowing, being, and acting? What opportunities might be provided for persons of various ages, with diverse interests and backgrounds, to be enriched by each other’s presence? What knowledges and skills do persons at various stages in their development need to lead full and satisfying lives? How shall curriculum be designed so that individuals learn adaptive, dilemma-posing, and action-taking skills necessary at any stage of life? These questions and related ones need alternative responses as the arena expands to include opportunities for growth, change, and enhancement of being throughout the lifetime.

4. Deal with significant ideas even if the encountering and shaping of them cannot be easily measured. Many educational goals worthy of critical thought are given little attention because they do not easily lend themselves to testing. Consider the meaning of justice in a variety of contexts. Consider the essence of planning, the ability to appreciate the creations of others and to be able to create one’s own. Consider the ability to feel discontent with a situation, to sharpen the components of a dilemma, and to work on problem resolution. Consider the ability to establish goals and to drop them if they do not seem fruitful. These are some of the skills and ideas necessary for today’s
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and tomorrow's world. That students have the opportunity to get into situations in which these significant understandings can take place is more important than that such learnings be easily quantified.

5. Develop conditions that invite intense encounters with reality. Good lad's study indicates that, in many instances, students evidence lack of passion and involvement. Instead, boredom reigns. For many reasons—peer group instead of classroom identification, lack of interest in the topics at hand, or irrelevancy of content—students frequently fail to become immersed in the curriculum. A need exists to investigate and develop settings that are intriguing, invigorating, and challenging to students.

Avenues that merit further investigation for classroom practice include the application of interpretive inquiry as propounded by Darroch and Silvers, Aok, and Hultgren, the utilization of student-communications and student teacher interaction as a basis for curriculum as discussed by Barnes and others, the concept of service as explicated by Boyer and others, the concept of responsiveness, caring, and responsibility as considered by Gilligan, and the concept of cooperative learning as researched by Johnson and others and Slavin.

6. Spend increased time and effort on issues of what to teach and why. This relates to the first recommendation relative to renewing attention to goals. In recent years, it appears that disproportionate amounts of time and energy have gone into consideration of matters of instruction and evaluation. These areas have been studied without accounting for the substance (knowledge and skills), purposes, or goals of the curriculum. In addition to the lack of concerned attention to the what and why of the curriculum, curriculum development has not been treated as a total process in which congruency, balance, and consistency among the parts are considered. Numerical scores on matters that may or may not be of substantive concern override attention to the significant.

opment (ASCD) and the American Educational Research Association (AERA) reveals the following. Excluding job-alike groups, untitled sessions, business meetings, and repeat sessions, ASCD held approximately 350 sessions each year. Of that number, in 1984 about 14 percent dealt with topics primarily concerned with goals, knowledge, and skills. In 1985 the percentage arose to about 29 percent because of a large number of sessions dealing with thinking skills and computer skills. However, in both years less than 3 percent of the sessions focused on goals and purposes of education, and under 10 percent of the sessions dealt with knowledge and the curriculum. Skill development was given slightly more attention. At least two-thirds to three-fourths of the sessions at ASCD are devoted to instructional procedures, inservice education, and supervision. Little attention is given to values, ethics, or alternative ways of conceptualizing total curriculum designs.

Division B (Curriculum Studies) of the AERA held approximately 50 sessions at the 1984 and 1985 national conferences. Approximately a quarter of those sessions dealt with educational goals and purposes and knowledge and skills in school programs. Only one session in 1984 and two in 1985 seemed to deal with purposes and goals in the curriculum. The skill area that received most attention was reading. The major portion of AERA's Division B sessions focused on philosophical issues and matters pertaining to theory and research. Although the primary function of these organizations may not be to deal with the goals and content of education, if neither ASCD nor Division B of AERA, which hold among the largest of the general professional conferences, do not deal with such matters, which other organizations will? On neither of the programs does much attention seem to be given to the idea of a match between the various components aspects of the curriculum, such as purpose, knowledge skills, and evaluation.

The above recommendations apply basically to the form the curriculum might take. Next are a few recommendations relative to the process of curriculum change.

7. Reconsider the most appropriate tasks for the various units involved in curriculum development. In many school systems, the county or the town is the unit with major responsibility for development. The individual school is primarily responsible for implementation. Yet in Lightfoot's research on good schools and in much of the research on effective schools, the individual school is the significant unit. If the individual school becomes the unit, creative planning is necessary so that central offices might serve functions of coordinating efforts, sharing resources, sparking vivid thinking, and bringing to the surface community values. Realizing that institutional "invigoration and restoration"\textsuperscript{12} is a slow process, central offices might help provide support so that those at the firing line might have patience with the jagged states of development.

\textsuperscript{12}Sara L. Lightfoot, \textit{The Good High School} (New York, Basic Books, 1983), p 313
Plan and implement collaborative approaches to curriculum development involving state departments of education, local school districts, and institutions of higher education. Currently, increasing numbers of states are exercising their constitution-given right of being responsible for education within the state by mandating minimum school requirements, which in many instances fill a good portion of the school curriculum.

Such mandating of requirements defines the responsibility of schools in very minimal ways. The initiative and creativity so essential for handling the perplexing dilemmas faced by schools are stifled as energy and attention are devoted to dealing with observable and measurable but possibly superficial learnings. The heritage of state responsibility for education has been redirected from educating citizens able and willing to interact with the uncertainties of a democracy to technically educated persons treating in a nonchalant manner the gift of democracy.

An alternative approach might be for schools and school systems to spell out a system of accountability cooperatively developed by the three parties mentioned above. These plans of accountability might differ, however, from school system to school system and from school to school. Such plans might emanate from shared visions, will, intentions, and knowledge. Those who must implement will share in development. Consistency will not be more important than courage, nor tradition more significant than involvement.

Consider the impact of the insignificant upon the significant. How frequently is scheduling seen as the issue that determines what is taught and the context in which teaching takes place? What cannot be scheduled is not encountered by students.

Likewise, if a subject is not easily susceptible to being translated into behavioral terms, it frequently does not become part of the curriculum. What is significant and important may be lost because of the constraints educational institutions place upon themselves.

The years ahead need to see an emphasis upon the significant even if certain amounts of consistency of structure need to be sacrificed. Likewise, a greater emphasis needs to be placed upon important learnings even if such learnings are better observed in the twilight of the mind rather than in the glare of the sun.

Move as rapidly as possible to prepare teachers and administrators to deal with conceptions of curriculum development that build upon the personal knowledge of teachers and students. Basically, most curriculum development has assumed bodies of knowledge developed by “experts” to be learned by someone—the teacher or the student. The task of administration is to see that those in their charge receive the body of knowledge. The result of this stance has been the indictments by Apple\(^1\) and others interested in emancipation—that the curriculum has a controlling function.
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The viewpoint that builds upon the personal knowledge of teachers is derived from a faith that teachers are sense-makers and that their knowledge is of worth. Likewise the knowledge students bring to the classroom is what makes sense to them. Their knowing is their being. Knowing and being can become as one when the inner workings and strivings of persons are shared, enhanced, and enlarged. Indeed knowing and being become infinite possibilities never realized when curriculum is seen as the text that is out there rather than within the person.

Dealing with the inner knowledge of students and teachers allows not only for the realization of more possibilities. It is also more in keeping with the underlying tenets of democracy—the inviolable dignity of each person, maximum freedom within a system that protects all, and care for the least as well as the more advantaged. Application of techniques derived from hermeneutic inquiry and ethnographic procedures gives opportunity to move from education as technical enterprise to education as a valuing of the persons including their inner knowledge and being.

Many proposals are rampant for the extension of the school day and year. Care needs to be exercised so that elongated curriculums are liberating rather than oppressing and that the creative abilities of teachers and students are reinforced rather than sabotaged.

I began by indicating that these points and recommendations are ones growing out of personal concern. They are matters inviting re-searching, rethinking, and reordering of priorities. Who will take the necessary action? What is the role of our major curriculum-oriented professional organizations? Do we need to rethink our roots and some of the basic assumptions upon which our educational system is built? Do we need to formulate new ways to conceptualize and implement curricular practice? If so, how shall such dialogue and ultimately action take place?
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