8 Curriculum Implementation

LEARNING OUTCOMES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to

1. Explain in sufficient depth the nature of implementation as a change process
2. Describe the various modernist implementation models such that you and fellow readers can role-play their enactment
3. Discuss postmodernist implementation models articulating why and how such models could be activated in school settings
4. Articulate the different assumptions of modernism and postmodernism
5. Explain your affective responses to modernism and postmodernism and how your responses might influence your engagements in curricular activities

Once a curriculum is developed, it must be implemented within the shortest time frame if it is to address the current needs of students and society in an increasingly changing world. Take too long to put into practice a new curriculum, and you run the risk of delivering a curriculum that lacks relevance or misses a new evolving intellectual target. Speed of delivery and enlisting all educators and the public are essential before what is new has missed its educational mark. Yet, many planned and developed curricula are not implemented or implemented quickly enough because a plan to incorporate them into the school's educational program does not exist. In 2007, Jon Wiles and Joseph Bondi noted that more than 90 percent of new curricula fail to be implemented; in their view, educators lacked the managerial skills and knowledge necessary to deliver a new curriculum.[1]

However, it may not be that educators are deficient in managerial skills and knowledge; rather, it may be that they are rigid in their thinking strategies regarding how to approach curriculum implementation. Also, educators may be overwhelmed by the ever-increasing rate of change. Or, as John P. Kotter notes, educators, like many individuals, "don't feel the full rush going on around them, which is a part of the problem."[2] We sense that most people do feel the brisk winds of change but are attempting to "sail" into safe harbor rather than test their skills in the maelstroms ever present in this new century.

THE NATURE OF IMPLEMENTATION

Leslie Bishop stated many years ago that implementation requires restructuring and replacement.[3] It requires adjusting personal habits, ways of behaving, program emphases, learning spaces, and existing curricula and schedules. Stated tersely, in these rapidly changing and expanding times, many educators at all levels of schooling will have to change not only their knowledge sets regarding curricula and their creation and delivery, but also their mindsets, and perhaps even their personalities. They will have to become comfortable with risks, even thrive in pushing social as well as educational boundaries. These individuals will have to thirst for action recognizing, as Kotter declared, that "action is opportunity seeking and risk taking, all guided by a vision that people buy into."[4] Certainly, the readiness with which teachers and others accept a new curriculum depends partly on the quality of the initial planning and the precision with which the steps of curriculum development have been carried out.[5] But, in this second decade of the 21st century, we need a playfulness with the steps and new considerations of what precision really means in fluid times.

Implementation became a major educational concern beginning around 1980. Millions of dollars were being spent to develop curriculum projects, especially for reading and mathematics; yet many of the projects did not succeed. Seymour Sarason suggests that much educational reform has failed because those in charge of the efforts had little or a distorted understanding of the culture of schools.[6]

Sarason notes two kinds of basic understanding essential to implementation. The first is an understanding of organizational change and how information and ideas fit into a real-world context. The second is an understanding of the relationship between curricula and the social-institutional contexts into which they are to be introduced. Educators must comprehend the structure of the school, its traditions, and its power relationships as well as how members see themselves and their roles.[7] Successful implementers of curriculum realize that implementation must appeal to participants not only logically, but also emotionally and morally. Indeed, Fullan notes that most teachers are motivated to action primarily by moral considerations.[8]

One's view of the social-institutional context is influenced by whether one perceives the world of education as technical (modern) or nontechnical (postmodern). Those with a technical, modern, view believe that implementation can be planned down to specifics; those with a nontechnical, postmodern, view hold that implementation is fluid and emergent. We believe that the most productive stance regarding implementation is to view it as a combination of technical (modern) and nontechnical (postmodern) aspects.

How might we persuade educators to accept and implement a curriculum? First, we could assure them that implementing the new curriculum will bring some reward. Second, we could indicate the negative consequences of inaction—for example, the school will not be in compliance with state mandates, or students will fail to pass a standardized test. Third, we could point out ways in which the particular curriculum we wish to have implemented is similar to the one already in place. However, we might wish to tout the new program as nothing like—and even superior to—the existing one.[9]

Successful curriculum implementation results from careful planning, which focuses on three factors: people, programs, and processes. To implement a curriculum change, educators must get people to change some of their habits and, possibly, views. Many school districts failed to implement their programs because they ignored the people factor and spent time and money modifying only the program or process. However, focusing on the new program provides people with new ways to meet the objectives of the school's programs. Organizational processes, too, are important. Reorganizing departments can move people in the directions necessary for successful implementation.[10]

Kotter asserts that in today's fast-paced, dynamic world, we need to consider reorganizing departments and ways in which we engage in decision making and action. Although Kotter is referring to the business world, his comments and insights have relevance to educational

organization and especially to curriculum implementation. He notes that the key question facing business leaders, in our case educational leaders, is how to function effectively in this century characterized by "turbulence and disruption."[11]

Most school systems and specific schools are organized as hierarchies; decision making is initiated at the upper levels of the pyramid. At the individual school level, the administrative organization mirrors this hierarchical organization. For most of the 20th century, this decision-making structure worked well. Curriculum development and implementation were coordinated by the curriculum director and carried out by "layers" of line and staff personnel: principal, department chairpersons, teachers, and supervisors.

Curriculum development and implementation delivered via a hierarchy in this century have limitations that must be recognized and modified. Kotter denotes that hierarchies "live" by policies, rules, and procedures that actually impede speedy strategic decision making. Additionally, such an organization fosters an environment in which the educational players at the various levels are reticent to engage in thinking and actions without gaining the permission of their superiors.[12] This is evident when school boards usurp the authorities of curriculum leaders, decide what the curriculum to be implemented will be, and demand that those lower in the hierarchy fall in line. This results in complacency and marginal acceptance of the program to be implemented. In some cases, it results in resistance to the new curricular program.[13]

Kotter denotes that to address challenges "birthed" in the "mounting complexity and rapid change" of this century, we need a new organization.[14] He suggests a system of individuals organized as a network—"more like a . . . solar system." He purports that such a system, somewhat also like a spider's web, can generate and deliver innovation, in our case, new curricula with "agility and speed."[15] The network does not eliminate the hierarchies; it complements them with more dynamic strategies of thinking outside of boxes and producing innovations with maximum efficiencies.

As with spider webs, each spider species has its own web design, so it is that each school must tailor its organization of curriculum implementation to its school's unique culture within an equally unique social community.[16]

Incrementalism

Many educators, as well as members of the general public, think primarily of change when contemplating implementation. They view implementation as procedures for managing change. Yet, as Richard E. Elmore advises, implementers must query themselves as to the actual purposes of the change being considered. Focusing just on changing the curriculum and the school culture gives emphasis to the management of change. Just introducing a new curriculum or even a new textbook series can be documented when all teachers are using the educational program or material. In addition, if educators do not use the material, it is rather easy to indicate noncompliance. However, in both the curriculum development and implementation stages, the central question is, what is the value of the change for teachers and students?[17]

Although we consider implementation to be a change process, we are constantly querying: Does the change have purpose and value? Will it improve teachers' pedagogical and curricular actions and students' learnings? Simply put, change must result in improvement, and improvement in students' learnings and teachers' actions requires time. As Elmore notes, "Improvement equals increased quality and performance over time."[18]

Implementation of a curriculum designed to improve and not just change students' accomplishments requires some agreement regarding what constitutes improvement. How do we define *quality*? In the various efforts at school reform writ large and the purchasing of textbooks to support curricular change, many assume that the latest program, the newest textbooks, or the latest computer programs signal improvement. Yet this is false simplification.

Whether some new program spells improvement depends on our personal and educational philosophies. It also is contingent on our grasping in some depth the rapid changes occurring in all

realms of the world community and our dispositions to decipher emerging trends and to forecast possible events. When considering what educational programs to create and introduce, we must be futuristic dreamers. We must also realize that in many ways, we are the creators of our futures. We are or can be active players in shaping futures. Educators must accept one point: The increasing cultural and ethnic diversity of our country within a world community experiencing chaotic changes will make it more challenging to define improvement, let alone deliver improved curricula.

The implementation process exhibits a control mentality.[19] Various power groups strive to direct diverse avenues of change to serve their particular purposes. Power groups range from politicians, to parents, to community members, to business groups, to religious groups, and to educators. In the last century, we deluded ourselves into thinking there was cooperation among these various communities. In this century, it appears that while individual groups demand that the curriculum and schools improve, they have little consensus as to what improvement looks like. Most groups in this new century have policies that create or try to introduce policies and programs that serve their own narrow views on what it means to be educated. Many business groups, and some particular individuals, only want new curricula that will enable students to become skilled workers within the world economic system. Certainly today, these various groups are generating controversy and flux in the educational dialogue and program implementation.[20]

Impacting curricula implementation is often "gaming the system." Politicians game the system when they advocate policy changes to make schools accountable, knowing full well they have no idea of how to measure accountability of a new curriculum. They have played the game to please their constituents, raise standards, and make the tests more difficult; then they threaten to withdraw financial support for the schools. Educators often play the game of advocating a new curriculum program that addresses the policy of higher standards. However, often the public has not given the schools the funding capacity to implement the recommended curricula or to use pedagogical approaches based on the latest brain research.

Improvement takes time, but improvement is in the eye of the beholder. What we might consider improvement designed to foster school creativity and inquisitiveness, others might view as a negative, fostering students' questioning of authority or challenging their place in society. Although it appears everyone is into the latest technological gadgets, many "modern" 21st century people are fearful of rapid change, especially if they believe they have little control over it, or if the change occurring challenges their values and world views—their power positions.

Communication

To ensure adequate communication, a curriculum specialist must understand a school's (or school system's) communication channels. Communication channels are vertical (between people at different levels of the school hierarchy) or horizontal (between people at the same level of the hierarchy). For example, communication between a principal and a teacher is vertical; communication between two teachers is horizontal.

Horizontal networking among peers is being encouraged in many school-restructuring efforts. Communication flows more easily among persons who consider themselves equals and who are equally involved in some curriculum change. Many curricular activities that combine subject areas or integrate major segments of the curriculum presuppose effective horizontal communication.

Although formal channels of horizontal communication may exist in schools, much horizontal communication is informal. Effective curriculum leaders encourage an abundance of communication channels. They work to establish cohesive school communities composed of teachers, administrators, students, and even community members.[21] Effective communication actually requires a delicate balance, a synchronizing, of both formal and informal collaboration.[22]

As Andy Hargreaves and Michael Fullan assert, individuals involved in collaborative cultures embrace the risk of failure and living with uncertainty, essentially accepting some of the postmodern stances of risk taking and embracing the unforeseeable in hopes of creating and

implementing curricular programs of relevance and educational value.[23] And involving students in program discussions allows students to sense the complexity of defining what knowledge is of most worth and also to feel comfortable with the unpredictability of their program choices. They get to appreciate that a curriculum is not made and then just implemented, but is always in a state of being made. The curriculum is not static; it is dynamic, evolving at many levels.[24]

Communication these days is spoken, written, and seen. The World Wide Web enables collaboration among educators regardless of distance. Time disappears with computers, iPods, and smartphones. Educators may in the near future, if not now, communicate with "colleagues" in the virtual world. Ideally, such facilitation of communication should modify the cultures of schools. Teachers really do not need to work in isolation. In fact, if educational change is going to bring educational improvement in all realms of human growth, we must communicate effectively and more frequently. Technology is not going to be the death knell of face-to-face communication. Technology will likely serve to alter the educational environment in which teachers and students work.

Support

To facilitate implementation, curriculum designers must provide the necessary support for their recommended curricular innovations or modifications. They and the entire school community must facilitate capacity or capability. Elmore defines *capacity* or *capability* as those resources, knowledge, and skills brought by both teacher and students to the instructional core and the skilled actions of the total school organization to support and maximize the delivery and engagement of teachers and students with the implemented curriculum.[25]

If the new curriculum is to enable improvement in students' learnings, it must be maintained and supported over time. As Michael Fullan and others note, building a cadre of competent implementers requires the school district's sustained support.[26] Teachers must become highly knowledgeable about the new curriculum content; they must perfect new instructional approaches; they must know how to manipulate the educational environment, taking into consideration the backgrounds and learning styles of their students. Such support often takes the form of in-service training or staff development.[27]

In-service training or staff development is necessary for teachers who lack a deep understanding of curriculum and its creation. Even many educational administrators lack "curriculum literacy."[28] People who engage in teacher-education programs primarily take courses that focus on instructional methods in various subject areas. These courses lead many teachers to assume that the curriculum will be handed to them and their only responsibility will be to teach it. Teachers must have knowledge of curriculum development, even if they opt out of active involvement in it.

Research has revealed the characteristics of effective professional in-service programs. Such programs must fit into the schools that provide them. Effective in-service programs result from collaborative efforts and address the needs of those who will be affected by the new curricula. They are flexible enough to respond to the staff's changing needs. They spread knowledge of the new curriculum and increase people's commitment to it. For example, teachers in one school might learn about the curriculum from teachers at other schools, or even from schools in other countries. The Internet can help.[29] In-service programs should be scheduled at convenient times for curriculum implementers. Open discussions on new curricula should be scheduled throughout the implementation process. Such discussions allow implementers to express objections or concerns and consequently to reduce opposition. Effective in-service programs must also evaluate whether curricula are achieving their objectives and whether they are in harmony with the school district's philosophy and approach.

We purport that while in-service sessions can and do have merit, in some ways they fracture the flow of curriculum development and implementation. If, as we believe, curriculum is always

in the making, we need to have educational professionals in a constant flow of curriculum development, curriculum adjustment, and varied avenues of implementation.[30] We need school professionals in constant communion with their colleagues. As Hargreaves and Fullan denote, "It's not a good thing when teachers work alone."[31] We need professional learning communities.

Hargreaves and Fullan define professional learning communities as follows:

> Where collaborative improvements and decisions are informed by but not dependent on scientific and statistical evidence, where they are guided by experienced collective judgment, and where they are pushed forward by grownup, challenging conversations about effective and ineffective practice.[32]

We note that professional learning communities are always "on call," not just activated when a new program is being created and implemented. As we have indicated, all curricula developed and implemented are constantly being monitored and modified as information explodes, new pedagogies are developed, and new "players"—teachers and students—are engaged in schooling.

Without adequate financial support, new curricula fail. When federal funds were flowing, many school districts adopted innovations but failed to allocate funding to these innovations in their regular school budgets. When the federal funds (essentially intended as start-up funding) ran out, the districts discontinued their new curricula, citing lack of necessary funds. If school districts implement new curricula using federal or state grant money, they must devise ways to support these curricula with money allocated in the school budget.

Money is required for new materials and equipment and to pay people who help implement a new curriculum. At the local level, five steps are involved in budgeting for new programs: preparation, submission, adoption, execution, and evaluation. When a new program is adopted, the school board allocates funds for specific educational materials. The other four budgeting steps involve the superintendent at the district level and the principal (or chair) at the school level.[33]

A trusting relationship must exist among all parties in the school, especially between administrators and teachers. Effective implementation can and should utilize the services of lead teachers who are released from classroom teaching so that they can serve as salespeople for the new curricular program and as mentors or coaches so that teachers gain the knowledge and competency requisite for enacting the created curriculum.[34]

In addition, the trusting relationship among all parties in the school also involves the total community: political players, community advocates, community associations, particular foundations, and even church groups—and of course, school professionals in every capacity. As Joseph P. McDonald asserts, these members comprise both civic and professional capacities, in our case to curriculum development and implementation.[35]

McDonald denotes that when you combine civic and professional capacities with the resource money, you create what he defines as action space. Action space upsets the status quo; action space introduces challenges and productive chaos in ways that educators, working alone, are unable to achieve. Such space does not hackle educators. Rather, it inspires them to innovate; it provides them with exemplars and notes of caution that enable the creation and delivery of meaningful curricula.[36] Action space engages the professional realm not only with new skills for educators, but also the expertise of professionals in noneducational fields such as information technology, nanotechnology, gaming, and even brain research. As with any innovation, these three sources of action space will vary in contributions at particular times. The strength of influence of money, civic capacity, and professional capacity will be impacted to varying degrees by the dynamics of the times, the cultural forces in play, the economic health of the community, and the political theater present. Educational professionals must recognize action space and that they must engage with others in this space.[37]

8.1 Using Professional Learning Communities
Teachers typically use professional learning communities (PLCs) to collaborate with colleagues and improve their students' learning. How might PLCs be used when school administrators implement a new curriculum? Would PLCs help? Explain.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_7YX40bWrCs

IMPLEMENTATION AS A CHANGE PROCESS

The purpose of curriculum development, regardless of level, is to make a difference—to enable students to attain the school's, the society's, and, perhaps most importantly, their own aims and goals. Implementation, an essential part of curriculum development, brings into reality anticipated changes. Simply put, curriculum activity is change activity.

Yet what happens when change occurs? Of greater importance, what are the value and role of change? What is the source of change? What really motivates people to change? Can people predict the consequences of change? Are all the consequences of change beneficial to students and the general society? Can educators control changes that directly affect them? Do different educators—for instance, administrators and teachers—engage in change for the same or similar reasons? Do schools that make the most major changes actually become the most innovative and effective? Indeed, people can exert control, to varying degrees, over the process of change, but to do so requires that they understand change. Comprehending the concept of change and the various types of change allows individuals to determine sources of change. It also assists them in determining whether demands for change have educational value or just political expediency.

Even if we do have our values in place regarding educational change, we must appreciate that we cannot predict, even with limited precision, how successful the change activities will be for those involved and for those who experience the changed curriculum—the students. There is no denying that change can occur in several ways. The two most obvious ways are slow change (as when minor adjustments are made in the course schedule, when some books are added to the library, or when the unit or lesson plan is updated by the teacher) and rapid change (say, as the result of new knowledge or social trends affecting schools, such as computers being introduced into classrooms).

Currently, schools are being affected more by rapid change than slow change. We are experiencing rapid change not only in our knowledge bases of how the brain functions and how learning occurs, but also in changes in the demography of the country and the increasing diversity of groups within the general society. Rapid change is occurring in family backgrounds and structure, subcultures, and community groups. Cultural pluralism is exploding and competing voices are gaining agency. Additionally, educational technology also is exploding, having a greater impact on curricula and their implementations.

According to the research, for curriculum change to be successfully implemented, five guidelines should be followed:

1. *Innovations designed to improve student achievement must be technically sound.* Changes should reflect research findings regarding what does and does not work, not designs that simply are popular.
2. *Successful innovation requires change in the structure of a traditional school.* The way students and teachers are assigned to classes and interact with one another must be significantly modified.
3. *Innovation must be manageable and feasible for the average teacher.* For example, one cannot innovate ideas concerning critical thinking or problem solving when students cannot read or write basic English.
4. *Implementation of successful change efforts must be organic rather than bureaucratic.* A bureaucratic approach of strict rules and monitoring is not conducive to change. Such an approach should be replaced with an organic and adaptive approach that permits some deviation from the original plan and recognizes grassroots problems and the school's conditions.
5. *Avoid the "do something, anything" syndrome.* A definite curriculum plan is needed to focus efforts, time, and money on sound, rational content and activities.[38]

The data indicate that the guidelines "are systematically interrelated, and that with the possible exception of the guideline regarding structural change, they apply equally well to all levels

of education." Curricularists benefit by "considering their applicability in the particular context of their own schools and school districts."[39]

Types of Change

Curriculum implementers who do not understand the complexities of change are likely to initiate actions that will result in discord within the school, school district, or both. Curricularists also need to ascertain whether they are approaching curriculum implementation, change, within a modern or postmodern framework or a combination of both configurations. These two approaches to curriculum study, which includes development and implementation, add to the dynamics of bringing curricula to life. We have attempted to present various types of change with consideration of both modernism and postmodernism.

MODERNIST APPROACHES TO CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION. Individuals who adhere to modernist approaches to curriculum implementation accept that there are various defined rules and procedures for creating change and developing and implementing new curricula. The ground rules furnish guidelines as to how to define what new curricula are needed and denote the reasons such curricula will address identified needs. Ground rules provide diagnostic data to the curriculum developers and implementers, as well as guidance as to the steps needed for curricular development and action. These rules also guide how individuals in various groups engage in various actions and activities.[40]

These rules are more or less relevant regardless of the dynamic changes occurring in the general society. However, adhering to these rules alone will not produce meaningful educational programs. As Kotter purports, we need not just good management, but leadership to entice people to generate "something that did not previously exist."[41] Leadership is necessary to stimulate risk taking, novel thinking, new contents that will enable students to experience a curriculum that morphs with the times present, and times forecast.[42]

Ideally, leadership follows an avenue of *planned change.* In such change, those involved have equal power; they identify and follow precise procedures for dealing with the activity at hand. Planned change is the ideal. While individuals with a modernist persuasion will seek precise actions for addressing their curriculum development and implementation goal, planned change can exist in a postmodern stance of curriculum development. More will be discussed later.

While planned change is the ideal type, Warren Bennis denotes two more types of change: *coercive change* and *interaction change*. In coercive change, one group determines the goals, retains control, and excludes other people from participating. Those who lead such change are often defined as rigid managers. They value stability and efficiency in dealing with our volatile environment. Needless to say, coercion fosters discord, distrust, and outright anger in whatever product the group produces. In interaction change, there is a fairly equal distribution of power among groups who mutually set goals and strategies of action. However, strategies of action are not carefully developed. Rather, they are conceived as needed in the process of change. In interaction change, participants often lack deliberateness and are uncertain as to how they should implement the desired changes.[43]

We would add a fourth type of change to the list: *random change*. Such change occurs with no apparent thought and no goal setting. Random change is common in schools, as when curricula are modified in response to unanticipated events such as new legislation or pressure from special-interest groups.

We can also consider change in terms of its complexity. John McNeil listed increasingly complex types of change:

1. *Substitution.* This depicts alteration in which one element may be substituted for another. A teacher can, for example, substitute one textbook for another. By far, this is the easiest and most common type of change.

2. *Alteration.* This type of change exists when someone introduces, into existing materials and programs, new content, items, materials, or procedures that appear to be only minor and thus are likely to be adopted readily.
3. *Perturbations.* These changes could at first disrupt a program but can then be adjusted purposefully by the curriculum leader to the ongoing program within a short time span. An example of a perturbation is the principal's adjusting class schedules, which would affect the time allowed for teaching a particular subject.
4. *Restructuring.* These changes lead to modification of the system itself; that is, of the school or school district. New concepts of teaching roles, such as differentiated staffing or team teaching, would be a restructuring type of change.
5. *Value-orientation changes.* These are shifts in the participants' fundamental philosophies or curriculum orientations. Major power brokers of the school or participants in the curriculum must accept and strive for this level of change for it to occur. However, if teachers do not adjust their value domains, any changes enacted are most likely going to be short-lived.[44]

Although change that occurs in the schools cannot be fit into precise categories, curriculists must realize that types do exist and that planned change is the ideal. However, change is not synonymous with improvement.[45] Education is a normative activity. A person's advocating and then managing change means, in effect, making a statement about what he or she thinks is valuable.

POSTMODERNIST APPROACHES TO CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION. Modernist approaches to curriculum implementation are identified as following various precise steps to produce programs that are conceived with exactitude and can be confirmed with a high degree of accuracy. In contrast, postmodernist approaches are most challenging to identify, for there are no firm definitions of this approach due to its continuing evolution. And, there may never be a time when postmodernism will essentially achieve stasis. It is a dynamic movement and cluster of attitudes in constant flux, continuously operating within chaos and complexity accompanied by uncertainty.[46]

Also, adding to the challenge of comprehending postmodernism is that it is not just an orientation to education, curriculum development, and implementation in particular. Postmodernism is a world view that addresses myriad aspects of our culture or cultures: "politics, art, science, theology, economics, psychology, literature, philosophy, architecture, and modern technology." Postmodernism nurtures an ecological and ecumenical world view that challenges the modernist positions of dominance and control.[47]

It is beneficial to think that postmodern approaches to curriculum development and curriculum implementation are somewhat like improvisational theater. One has the general idea of the play or a particular scene with a particular act. But, the person entering the situation does not have precise dialogue mastered; he or she senses the situation, and with playfulness, reacts, improvises responses, and engages in spontaneous, unplanned actions to advance the "theatrical event."

After "playing" in improvisational theater, individuals engage in interpretive analyses of their "playful" theatrical actions to assess meanings and also impacts on the various other actors and audience members. This interpretative analysis is a cluster of processes that accompanies both curriculum development and curriculum implementation. Educators so engaged analyze the value and meaning of information organized into courses and then scrutinize the procedures employed in implementing the specific curriculum. While so occupied, they realize that their critique and analyses are fluid, with surprises and unexpected consequences. Even their judgment as to effectiveness is not blessed with certainty.

Postmodernists define this activation of analyses to better comprehend the curricular content and pedagogies selected and arranged and the procedures by which the curriculum "package" is implemented as hermeneutics. Hermeneutics has been defined by schools as "the art of interpretation."[48] The term is not unique to education. Nor is it the sole possession of

postmodernists; it goes back to classical Greek times. As Slattery purports, the Greek word *hermeneuenin* means to interpret. The word draws its root from Hermes, who was the courier of the Greek gods; his task was to elucidate the edicts of the gods to other gods and mortals.[49]

Modernists and postmodernists both engage in hermeneutic activities. Perhaps the main difference is that modernists engage in such inquiry so as to attain a significant degree of precision in their understandings, while postmodernists use such analyses to challenge the views and assumptions of the modernists. Modernists state with a high degree of confidence that their methods of inquiry and actions are intellectually, politically, socially, and in our cases, educationally sound. Postmodernists challenge such a posture and, more importantly, strive to "expose the internal contradictions of metanarratives by deconstructing modern notions of truth, language, knowledge, and power."[50]

Resistance to Change

> When an institution of great complexity and importance, such as the school, becomes intricately bound up with nearly all other social institutions, attempting to bring about significant changes will meet a multitude of resistances. Some initial reforms may be allowed and even encouraged, but if they expand and threaten to cause deep and wide-scale changes, the institution will then inexorably, link by link, tighten into an adamantine obstacle preventing any major reforms.[51]

Adding complexity to the current social and educational scene are the "face-offs" between and among the various factions of modernists and postmodernists. There are individuals and groups in both "camps" who are rigid in their views and approaches to current realities of educational needs and what particular actions or dispositions are required.

Many modernists staunchly defend and demand highly defined standards that all students must attain. They advocate making America first in the world in all things. They sing the praises of the American Dream, and only lament that the schools are not being effective in delivering curricula so that that objective is attained.

Many postmodernists are resisting actions of modernists to maintain and even strengthen the existing social and school structures. Many postmodernists urge schools and their curricula to nurture students to become willing to live with nature rather than separate from nature. Students should develop a cooperative rather than a competitive posture with fellow students in the country and the world. Postmodernists advocate creating curricula that inform students that a Eurocentric view that values and views Western world culture as at a higher level than other traditions and cultures must be corrected. A postmodern curriculum, while respecting the scientific approach, stresses that there are other avenues of investigation, with moral, religious, and aesthetic traditions that can reveal "truths" that can assist students in developing new world views. As Slattery declares, postmodernists want the curriculum and its implementation to present to students and to have them accept that "the world is an organism rather than a machine, the earth is a home rather than a resource to exploit or a possession to horde, and persons are interdependent and not isolated and independent."[52]

A curriculum leader, whether a modernist, a postmodernist, or a meld of these two postures, must accept that people are the key to successful curriculum activity. He or she must also be cognizant of the barriers people place between themselves and efforts to change. Unlearning values, positions, beliefs, and behaviors is much more challenging than learning new ones. In today's diverse society, groups react differently to suggested change, primarily because they do not perceive the change as leading to improvement. We live in a hierarchical society containing many social classes. Yet, to many educational change agents, the school and its curriculum are to contain content and be taught so that all children have an equal chance at success. However, many argue that in reality, schools do not furnish curricula that provide all students an equal chance at success.

Certainly schools should offer students opportunities to gain the competence and knowledge requisite for success in life. Yet the challenge is that students come to school with different

backgrounds, capabilities, interests, and talents. Thus, the curricula introduced must cater to a multilayered student body. However, to do this, we must engage the total community to get them on board. This is the challenge in this century. For parents whose children are successful, there may be resistance to change. As Ellen Brantlinger notes, if influential people's desires are being met by the existing structures, curricula, and practices, there is no perceived need to alter them. Rather, there is a desire to retain and even strengthen them.[53]

Even parents whose children are not attaining success in schools may not wish to have the curricula dramatically changed. Often these parents are quite conservative and wish their children to experience the traditional curricula that has enabled the more privileged children to succeed. Give my children basic mathematics so they can take advanced mathematics like they do in "affluent" schools. Direct teaching makes sense. Let us not bring in a program that engages students in inquiry, in creative problem-solving. They will not pass the standardized tests, required for successful school advancement. These parents demand their students experience the standard curriculum to attain their personal interests.[54]

With regard to education, some educators strive for a classless society in which all attain that which they desire. However, in reality we do have classes. We do have communities that mold the curricula. Often these communities want only changes that work to their advantages. Communities with less power seek to gain power to influence the schools to serve their interests. Educators are ethically responsible for attempting to address all interests and aspirations of diverse communities. Yet, as noted in the first quote in this section, when an institution of great complexity and importance becomes intricately bound up with nearly all other social institutions, attempting to bring about change will meet with great resistance. Major change may eventually help all, but it initially pleases few.

Educators are being pulled in many directions. Everyone, including educators, possesses diverse thoughts. People's ruminations about education are complex, ever changing, and at times contradictory. Some want progressive, brain-friendly curricula and pedagogies. Others want more direct teaching and more conservative curricula addressing "standard" contents.

Faced with such diverse and ever-changing demands, educators often stall regarding implementing a new curriculum. Inertia shackles the staff, the administration, and even the community. Individuals are not even aware that they are resisting change. Their cognitive systems are overloaded. They have lost their ability to recognize a problem that requires attention. Even if they do recognize a problem or an unacceptable situation, they choose to ignore it for various reasons. Perhaps they realize that the problem demands efforts they are unwilling to make. Other times, people acknowledge problems that require educational change but explain the problem by blaming the community or a particular culture. There are times—especially when people attack the schools and insist on change—that educators become defensive, counterattacking those requesting the change rather than attempting to address what may well be legitimate demands.[55]

Perhaps the key reason for people's inertia is that they believe that it is simply easier to keep things as they are. It is more comfortable to stay with what is known than to attempt change and trigger the unknown. We like maintaining steady states, adhering to our cherished traditions and institutions. As humans, we tend to evade those problems and processes of change that we consider too complex.

The status quo is supported in schools when there is not a clear mission stated for a new program. At the phase of implementation, however, we must return to the mission—to the intent of the curriculum—to sell it to others in the educational organization. However, many schools phrase their mission statements as essentially bland general proclamations that do not really distinguish one new curriculum from another.

Often, teachers have not been able or willing to keep up with scholarly developments. They have not stayed abreast of the knowledge explosion, which would allow them to feel committed to curriculum change and the implementation of new programs. Teachers frequently view change as simply signaling more work—something else to add on to an already overloaded schedule for which little or no time is allotted. As Elmore denotes, "turning a school around"

requires that teachers increase their knowledge base of the new curricular content, develop new expertise in pedagogical approaches, improve their knowledge of instructional design and theory, and become expert in the latest theories of how students learn. In other words, they must increase their capacities to deliver the new programs. Increasing teachers' and administrators' capacities, essentially the schools' capacities, requires not only extra effort but, usually, extra monies. Currently, many educators are overwhelmed by changes being proposed and their implications.

Despite teachers having tremendous demands on their time, many do a remarkable job of keeping up with the literature. Even so, many of these teachers tend to disregard available evidence regarding new curricular or pedagogical practice if it challenges their current understandings and outlook. They reject altering their programs and instructional strategies if this requires a change in outlook or practice.

Can educators cope with the demands for more change for new roles? Uncertainty fosters insecurity. Often, educators who feel comfortable with the present are reluctant to change for a future they cannot comprehend or see clearly. People often prefer to stay with certain known deficiencies than to venture forth to uncertain futures, even if the changes would most likely be improvements. Bringing new students or parents or content into the curriculum realm or organizing the program in new ways makes many teachers uneasy. However, this may change as we bring new people into education who consider education as a second career. Many of these people are coming from professions in industry, and especially from high-tech fields, where change is embraced and recognized as essential for the continued well-being of any institution. These people come into education with résumés noting high involvement in reconceptualizing the business organizations they have left. Another effort to bring in people who might otherwise not consider a career in education is the Teach for America program. This program recruits individuals with content-degree specialties such as mathematics, chemistry, or languages to become teachers after taking a four- to six-week educational program. Individuals accepting the offer must commit to at least three years in the classroom. This program maintains that a great change in education can come from individuals who possess greater in-depth knowledge of a content area. Although this is change, it remains to be seen if the program translates into improvement. Many professors of education take umbrage at the notion that a person can become a competent teacher with only minimal education content.

Another factor that causes people to resist change is the rapidity of change. Many people believe that if something is implemented this year, it will most likely be abandoned when another innovation appears and will thus make all their efforts useless. Teachers are unwilling to support changes perceived as short lived. They will not commit energies to curricular changes or school reorganizations with little chance of lasting. Certainly, there have been enough "bandwagons" in education to make educators shy away from innovation.

Another key reason why some teachers resist getting involved in curricular change is that, although they may know about the planned school innovation, they do not know about the latest research, or if they know about it, they refuse to use it in guiding their actions.[56] An explanation for not knowing about the latest research is that teachers lack opportunities within their regular school day or week to read research studies. Few schools possess complete research libraries. Also, in most schools, teachers are classroom-bound and, therefore, lack opportunities to discuss the latest research with colleagues.

Even if teachers do have time to discuss research with fellow teachers, they frequently find that the research often furnishes contradictory results or does not really apply to the local school community in which the teachers work. Educational researchers often wish to obtain results that are generalizable. Teachers usually want research that essentially addresses their situations. As Shazia Miller, Karen Drill, and Ellen Behrstock submit, teachers utilize different criteria for judging quality research. Teachers classify high-quality research as that which has high potential to lead to change in curricula or instruction. If not, teachers tend to consider the research not worth their time or attention.[57]

One might think that if teachers really are knowledgeable about current research, they would engage in change, implementing new curriculum or pedagogical approaches. However, it

appears that teachers tend to discount research that does not support what they are already doing. Research that supports their current practices actually increases teachers' resistance to change.[58]

People often resist change, too, if no financial or time support is given to the effort. A project for which no monies are budgeted is rarely destined to be implemented. Often, school districts budget monies for materials but fail to allocate funds for the creation of the curriculum plan, its delivery within the classroom, or necessary in-service training.

Several years ago, Thomas Harvey, writing on the nature of change, provided an analysis of the obstacles to getting people involved in change—and why they resist it. The list is still useful.

1. *Lack of ownership.* Individuals may not accept change if they think it is coming from outside their organization; interestingly, much of the current demand for school reform and restructuring is coming from national commissions or state legislatures.
2. *Lack of benefits.* Teachers are likely to resist a new program if they are unconvinced that it will benefit students (in terms of learning) or themselves (e.g., by bringing them greater recognition and respect).
3. *Increased burdens.* Often, change means more work. Many teachers are hostile to changes that will add work to their already-heavy schedules.
4. *Lack of administrative support.* People will not embrace change unless those officially responsible for the program have shown their support for the change.
5. *Loneliness.* Few people desire to innovate alone. Collaborative action is necessary to implement new programs successfully.
6. *Insecurity.* People resist what appears to threaten their security. Few will venture into programs with obvious threat to either job or reputation.
7. *Norm incongruence.* The assumptions underlying a new program must accord with those of the staff. Sometimes new programs represent philosophical orientations to education that are at odds with the staff's orientations.
8. *Boredom.* Successful innovations must be presented as interesting, enjoyable, and thought-provoking.
9. *Chaos.* If a change is perceived as lessening control and order, it is likely to be opposed. We desire changes that make things more manageable and enable us to function more effectively.
10. *Differential knowledge.* If we perceive those who advocate change as being considerably better-informed than we are, we may see them as having excessive power.
11. *Sudden wholesale change.* People tend to resist major changes, especially changes requiring complete redirection.
12. *Unique points of resistance.* Unexpected circumstances and events can retard change. Not everything can be planned in advance; people or events outside the organization can impede our innovative spirit.[59]

Consideration of the points in the preceding list and sensitivity to the needs of people involved in curriculum change ease implementation. Also, resistance to change can benefit change agents by requiring them to think carefully about proposed innovations, consider the human dynamics involved in implementing programs, and avoid advocating change for its own sake or in order to allow some educational fad.

Leaders of curriculum activities must give primary attention to what Thomas Sergiovanni describes as a *lifeworld*. The lifeworld of a school refers to the culture of the school with its attendant meanings that hold significance to the key players in that lifeworld—the teachers and the students.[60]

Sensitive curriculum leaders realize that for successful implementation to occur, they must promote in teachers and in students their voice, their agency. They must foster in these key players opportunities to participate in and identify with the curriculum being implemented from cognitive, emotional, and spiritual orientations.[61] Essentially, for there to be successful implementation of the curriculum, there must be established, at least unofficially, a curriculum for the

teacher implementers so they can develop their human agency. Teachers must have opportunities to ruminate their behaviors through meditations that allow them to self-fashion their identities. They must have quiet time and sharing time to give dimension and description about who they are. In a very real way, teachers—and later, we hope, students—have opportunities to actually develop several identities with various and particular voices. Teachers nurtured to be receptive to change take on identities of curriculum implementer, innovative teacher, nurturer of creative and reflective students, and spokesperson of educational change. The list of persons and the variety of voices are limited only by the imaginations, dedications, and deep personalities of the individuals involved. Those who have gained some degree of expertise over their varied persons and resultant voices have attained agency to some degree. They are major players in school worlds. They have come to truly work cooperatively to create and strengthen community.[62]

Individuals must understand how the curriculum change will affect them personally. They must clearly grasp the platform on which they are to build the curriculum. They must possess a clear sense of mission and confidence that the curriculum envisioned has the potential to enrich students and teachers.

Stages of Change

Curriculum change has essentially three stages: initiation, implementation, and maintenance. *Initiation* sets the stage for implementation. It gets the school and the community receptive to the planned innovation. Planners raise essential questions about who will be involved in the school and in the surrounding community, what level of support is expected from school and community "actors," and how ready both educators and citizens in the school district are for the innovation. Also, how much money is the school and community willing to commit to the conceptualized new curricula and its introduction into the educational system? Essentially, at the initiation stage, educators must create what McDonald has identified as a specified "action space" involving civic capacity, professional capacity, and money.[63] Ideally, action space is considered and implemented not at the initiation of implementation, but at the commencement of conceptualizing the curriculum and its development process.

Implementation of change involves presenting innovation and getting people to question, and perhaps rethink, their perceptions of the purposes of education within a complex and chaotic world community. Also, at this stage, the players need to get a sense of the "fit" of the new program to be implemented and whether, with sufficient effort and adequate funding, the likelihood of success is quite high. Here, curriculum developers and implementers working with outside community members will be challenged to convince naysayers, holders of beliefs that the program is not relevant to the times or that, at this time, the innovation will not be accepted by the community or will demand too high of a financial cost. McDonald denotes that the interaction of encouraging and discouraging beliefs "feed . . . the capital market of school reform."[64] "A capital market is an 'informal aggregation' of potential investors and investment advisors and their collective spin."[65]

At this stage, all players, educators and community members, are assuming somewhat different roles for themselves. Most educators do not consider themselves as investors in education, but they are. Most community members, especially individuals from the business communities, do not consider themselves primarily as school reformers, but they can be. The various players expanding their primary views of who they are will facilitate opportunities for "reframing encouraging beliefs more often than discouraging ones."[66] There will be a melding of beliefs and views such that consensus will be achieved that the new curriculum will be "on target" for a particular school, or for certain students, or for the entire school system. Implementation does not mean acceptance without questioning what the new program presents. Teachers and other educators must put their own stamp on the innovation; they must personalize the suggested curriculum so that they can optimize the learning experiences for their unique students. This adaptation actually must be done every year to cater to the newly entered class.

Mike Schmoker stresses that for effective school programs to be implemented, schools must establish learning communities. Such communities furnish teachers with support staff and with scheduled opportunities to discuss issues that arise as a result of innovation.[67] Successful implementation requires teamwork. Fullan notes that in successful implementation, teacher-collegial relationships are central to the activity. Interaction "flavors" the relationships and teachers' thinking regarding the innovation. Implementation requires teacher collaboration; it demands teachers exchange ideas, support new actions, rearrange thinking, and assess feelings about the new program. Fullan asserts that "collegiality, open communication, trust, support and help, learning on the job, getting results and job satisfaction and morale are closely interrelated."[68] Implementation strives to make schools "learning enriched" for all the players: administrators, teachers, and students.

Maintenance is the monitoring of the innovation after it has been introduced. Maintenance refers to those actions required for the continuation of the innovation. Unless maintenance is planned for, innovations often fade or are altered to such a degree that they cease to exist. As Fullan articulates, the problem of maintenance—or, as he states it, continuation—shadows all forms of educational innovation. This challenge to continue a new educational program is endemic regardless of whether the push for the new program was external or internal.[69]

Maintenance must be planned for, but such planning is not just solving technical problems or introducing flow charts. To maintain an innovation, we must address or even ignite the affective domain of teachers and others. We must excite the senses. We must spark passion. Commitment requires emotional attachment to the innovation adventure. The positive emotional response to a change of curriculum is what fosters success. Teachers must experience positive emotional attachment to all dimensions of the curriculum. They must be excited by its aims and goals. They must respond affectively to the contents and pedagogies to be implemented. Educators must see the morality of the curricular innovation. Also, of course, students should have their emotional and moral selves activated for the innovation to take root.[70]

CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION MODELS

In today's world, choice—including choice regarding curricular change—can be overwhelming. Educators, especially in this new century, function within the construct of diversity in approaches to curricular innovation, purposes of education, organization of school spaces, creation of diverse curricula, means of engaging students in such curricula, and approaches to measure successes in student learnings. The complexity of choices is increased in this century with the debates among modernists, postmodernists, and those at the confluence of these two major views of forms of myriad realities: educational, social, political, philosophical, economic, environmental, and theological.

Postmodernists urge members of society to discard modernity, to move beyond it. They recommend a postmodern stance that celebrates uncertainty and that encourages educating students and the general society to live in compatibility with nature, to work cooperatively with fellow citizens rather than as competitors, to strive for both national and world peace through peaceful negotiation, and to recognize and utilize the wisdom of the world community, not just be led by a Eurocentric view of the evolving world. But, as previously noted, the approach of this "movement" to all phases of life is short on stating precisely how to attain results. In fact, exactness is not really viewed as attainable. There is much confusion within this "cloud" of postmodernism, both among academics and the general public.[71]

In contrast, modernists believe in varying degrees in "precise" approaches to implementing new curricula that have been created through careful reasoning. While they realize that even following well-tested procedures of development and implementation, there will still be serendipitous happenings among both educators and students. They do realize that the best-laid plans do not guarantee hoped-for results. A well-written play does not guarantee, nor should it, that all audience members will leave the theater with the same knowledge, the same affects, and the

same psychological effects. The move toward adherence to standards is in the modernist camp. Individuals of this persuasion seem to ignore the planned surprises that would occur in a postmodernist curriculum development and implementation.

We the authors exist in a middle universe between modernism and postmodernism. We realize that when people are involved in curricular activities, they are not robots, programmed for specific actions. We cannot ignore teacher intuition, which can have an impact on the evolution of the educational experience. In truth, educators responsible for curricular change should embrace the notion that the "personal and tangential can stimulate a routine venture to a novel educative venture."[72] Also, educators need to realize that learning is multidimensional in cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. And, learning continues after a lesson is completed and the student leaves the school arena. Students learn many things in school that have not been triggered by teachers' instructions. Teaching–learning is not a simple cause-effect relationship.

As previously stated, postmodernism is still in evolution, thus we are challenged in presenting precise postmodern implementation models. For this reason, we start with modernistic models.

As noted previously, Leslie Bishop stated that implementation requires restructuring and replacement. Primary in this restructuring is fostering and molding changes in people. Implementation, to be successful, actually requires the shaping of the school culture; that is, shaping the norms and behaviors extant in the school or school district.[73] However, enabling change in people's beliefs and behaviors is not easily or quickly accomplished.[74] Also, those engaged in new curricula or educational procedures must realize that the program being implemented deals with numerous changes—new curricular contents, new pedagogical approaches, new educational materials, new technologies, and perhaps even new educational environments. Of course, the major challenge is having an implementation procedure that allows educators time to try out different beliefs or to sample novel understandings about the innovation.

Although the models of implementation to be discussed appear to have distinct steps and stages, we must remember that implementation occurs in specific and individual settings with varying histories, unique competencies among staff, particular expectations among community members, and various capacities with regard to materials and monetary resources. Even though learning the various steps of implementation strategies appears easy, actually carrying them out is highly complex.[75] As Fullan contends, a person skilled in implementing an innovation juggles and fuses various factors that at first might appear at odds with each other: "simultaneous simplicity-complexity, looseness-tightness, strong leadership–user participation, bottom-up/top-down, fidelity-adaptivity, and evaluation–non-evaluation."[76] As Fullan submits, effective implementation—actually, any strategy for improvement—requires a nuanced apprehension of the process, a way of thinking that does not become apparent in a rigid following of a list of steps or phases to be enacted.[77]

We encourage our readers to read and consider the following implementation models with this mindset.

Modernist Models

OVERCOMING-RESISTANCE-TO-CHANGE MODEL. The *overcoming-resistance-to-change (ORC) model* of curriculum implementation has been employed for many years. According to Neal Gross, it rests in the assumption that the success or failure of planned organizational change basically depends on leaders' ability to overcome staff resistance to change.[78] To implement a new program, we must gain advocates for it by addressing people's fears and doubts. We must convince individuals involved that the new program takes their values and perspective into account.[79]

One strategy for overcoming resistance to change is to give school administrators and teachers equal power. Subordinates should be involved in discussions and decisions about program change. When leaders adopt this strategy, staff members tend to view the innovation as self-created and, therefore, feel committed to it.

Curriculum leaders using the ORC model identify and deal with staff's concerns. They understand that individuals must change before organizations can be altered. Also, change must allow for the individuality and personal needs of those involved. Based on their research on curriculum innovations in schools and colleges, Gene Hall and Susan Loucks divided implementation into four stages:

Stage 1: Unrelated concerns. At this stage, teachers do not see a relationship between themselves and the suggested change, which they therefore do not resist. For example, a teacher might be aware of the school's efforts to create a new science program but not feel personally or professionally affected.

Stage 2: Personal concerns. At this stage, individuals react to the innovation in terms of their personal situation. They are concerned with how the new program will affect what they are doing. For example, biology teachers consider their involvement in a new science program and its effects on their teaching.

Stage 3: Task-related concerns. These concerns relate to the actual use of the innovation in the classroom. For example, an English teacher would be concerned about how to implement a new language arts program. How much time will be required to teach this new program? Will adequate materials be provided? What are the best strategies for teaching the new program?

Stage 4: Impact-related concerns. At this stage, a teacher is concerned with how the innovation will affect students, colleagues, and the community. The teacher might also want to determine the program's impact on his or her own subject area. For example, will a new mathematics program influence a teacher's teaching methods and content topics in ways that help students better understand mathematics?[80]

Educators who employ the ORC model must deal with people's personal, task-related, and impact-related concerns. Otherwise, people will not accept the innovation or will deal with it in unintended ways. Educational leaders engaged in curriculum development and implementation must develop in the school or school district a strong culture of professionals. They must create a safe environment in which those involved in development and implementation feel comfortable in thinking outside the box and secure to take calculated risks. Also, to get the curriculum players to change from resistance to eager acceptance, the educational leader must create in collaboration with all involved an acceptance of the mantra; the curriculum developed and now to be implemented is to be managed with an experimental mindset. With such a mental approach to implementation, all participants will realize that mistakes will certainly happen, but with an analytical eye, one can deduce significant learnings. Dare to take risks; dare to fail, distill data from mistakes.[81] Engage in creative problem-solving. Be students of the processes in which you are immersed. Realize that curriculum development and implementation are not solo work; they require teamwork among the primary players.

8.2 Resistance to Increased High-Stakes Testing
This news clip reports that teachers and parents are resisting the increased high-stakes testing that narrow the curriculum and turn students into stressed-out test takers. If you were a school administrator, what can you do to ensure that teachers support curriculum changes?

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TK3Uv4zSN7c

Of course, curriculum leaders and the primary players must keep those educators not directly involved with the development or implementation informed of the innovation. And when the players' actions will impact directly others in the school, those affected players should be involved in the early decisions regarding the innovation. Often, faculty can be called together to share concerns and map strategies to deal with those concerns. Teachers may find that they have to change their strategies and teach different content. By sharing concerns, they gain confidence that they can make the necessary changes.

ORGANIZATIONAL-DEVELOPMENT MODEL. In the 1970s, Richard Schmuck and Matthew Miles developed the position that many approaches to educational improvement fail because the leaders assume that adoption is a rational process and rely too heavily on innovation's technical aspects. Such leaders assume that systematic properties (e.g., class size, school organization) of

local school districts are constants.[82] Schmuck and Miles's views are postmodern to the extent that they suggest doubts about individual rationality, objective measures, universal truths, and the scientific method.[83]

Schmuck and Miles suggested an approach called *organizational development (OD)*. It is a long-range effort to improve an organization's problem-solving and renewal processes, particularly through collaborative diagnosis and management. The emphasis is on teamwork and organizational culture.

Wendell French and Cecil Bell list seven characteristics that separate OD from more traditional ways of intervening in organizations:

1. Emphasis on teamwork for addressing issues
2. Emphasis on group and intergroup processes
3. Use of action research
4. Emphasis on collaboration within the organization
5. Realization that the organization's culture must be perceived as part of the total system
6. Realization that those in charge of the organization serve as consultants/facilitators
7. Appreciation of the organization's ongoing dynamics within a continually changing environment[84]

OD treats implementation as an ongoing, interactive process. The approach rests on the assumption that individuals care about the future and desire to be actively engaged in designing, developing, implementing, and evaluating the educational system.[85]

OD treats implementation as never finished. There are always new ideas to bring to the new program, new materials and methods to try out, and new students to excite. Enacting the curriculum continually engages teachers and students in growth by providing enriched learning that benefits the total person.

CONCERNS-BASED ADOPTION MODEL. The *concerns-based adoption (CBA) model* is related to the OD model. However, those who use a CBA approach believe that all change originates with individuals. Individuals change, and through their changed behaviors, institutions change. Change occurs when individuals' concerns are made known. For individuals to favor change, they must view the change as at least partly of their own making. They must also view it as directly relevant to their personal and professional lives. Because the change process involves so many individuals, it needs time to take shape. Individuals need time to learn new skills and formulate new attitudes.[86]

Also, unlike the OD model of change, the CBA model addresses only adoption (implementation) of curriculum, not development and design. It assumes that teachers and other educational workers have already analyzed the needs of the school and have created or selected a curriculum for the school or school district that meets those needs. It certainly functions with the belief that in addition to the needs of the students, the innovation also addresses the teachers' concerns. Because we are discussing curriculum implementation, this model of implementation addresses teachers' concerns regarding content, materials, pedagogies, technologies, and educational experiences. These factors should be thought about in their varying relationships; they exist as an educational universe of variables that hopefully interact to furnish students a rich and productive learning experience.[87]

F. F. Fuller's research regarding the way in which preservice teachers evolve into experienced teachers provided the model's conceptual underpinnings. Fuller found that preservice teachers generally moved from concerns about self to concerns about teaching, and then to concerns about students.[88] Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller found a similar sequence of teachers' concerns.[89] Others have reported two stages of concern before concern for self: (1) awareness of the innovation; and (2) interest in learning about the innovation, but no realization that the innovation may directly affect them. At stage 3, teachers wonder whether they have the skills and knowledge to implement the innovation. At stage 4, they have reservations about how to manage

1. Awareness of innovation
2. Awareness of information level
3. Concern for self
4. Concern for teaching
5. Concern for students

FIGURE 8.1 Concern Stages Relating to Implementing an Innovation

Source: Adapted from Collin J. Marsh and George Willis, *Curriculum: Alternative Approaches, Ongoing Issues*, 4th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2007).

their time and resources to implement the program successfully, and how to actually teach it. At stage 5, teachers focus on how the new curriculum influences students' learning. Figure 8.1 depicts the concerns.

In the CBA model, the curriculum is implemented once teachers' concerns have been adequately addressed. Teachers are expected to be creative with the curriculum, modify it where necessary, and tailor it to their students. Additionally, teachers should work with their colleagues in fine-tuning the curriculum for the benefit of the total school program.

SYSTEMS MODEL. The OD and CBA models draw on systems thinking. Both consider people's actions as performed within an organization defined by a system of relations among people and structures. People in schools and school districts have overlapping responsibilities. Also, the work of higher-level administrative or curricular teams affects that of lower-level professional teams. If people responsible for a major portion of an innovation respect, support, and trust one another, they are also likely to interact in a positive way with others throughout the organization.

The school is an organization of loosely coupled units: departments, classrooms, and individuals. These parts have flexible rather than rigidly defined relationships. Although a central administration is defined, most schools have little centralized control, especially over what occurs in the classroom. For this reason, it is difficult for curricular change to be implemented as an edict from the central office.

Planned change within the school should be perceived as "win-win." Also, we must recognize that the process never finishes: Every aspect of the implemented curriculum is unique, requiring that educators realize that even when some aspect of the program is implemented, it is not static. The implemented curriculum essentially has a life of its own. It interacts continually with the people teaching and learning it. Every encounter that students have with the new curriculum is unique; every learning is personalized. And educators must realize that even when a curriculum is fully introduced, it is taught and experienced differently each year. Although the teacher may be the same, his or her behaviors in engaging students with the implemented curriculum are unique. Different students, different times, and different demands on all the players in the educational theater are unique. Great teaching is always striving for better teaching and better curricula; each year is a new beginning.[90]

Accepting the systems model to curriculum implementation means realizing that curriculum change resembles an evolving solar system. Although it has rules, there is variation. Like the solar system, competing forces do enable order. Planets do stay in their orbits. Likewise, in implementation, conflict must be managed so that everyone can win: students, teachers, chairs, and principals. However, successful implementation requires energy, time, and patience. It demands recognizing that implementation is more than a set of techniques or disconnected approaches. In a systems approach, there must be engagement; there must be the drawing of energy among the participants; there must be the formulation of rationales for the innovation suggested. However, there must also be the recognition that there is no complete attainment of final results. Curriculum implementation, regardless of approach, is like sailing to the horizon. We can direct

our craft to the horizon, but it can never be attained. Thus with curriculum implementation, we realize we can never complete the task of introducing the new program. Curriculum innovators must be cognizant that their task is not to arrive at the perfect curriculum, but to comprehend that innovative curriculum development and implementation are continual pursuits of the next engagement of students in their learning. Implementation of novel curricula can never be finalized. Educators can never rest on their laurels. Time does not stand still, nor do the demands on curriculum developers and implementers. Educators are always called to consider something new, something that enables students to participate competently in an evolving world dynamic.

Postmodernist Models

The previous discussion of systems models suggests a dynamic—ever changing, ever expanding, resembling an evolving solar system. In a real sense, the systems model seems to occupy the "thought space" between modernism and postmodernism. We mention that in a systems model, the curriculum is never complete; it is constantly expanding, contracting, in a somewhat chaotic cosmos. Roth's book *Curriculum-in-the-Making*, while developing a case for a postconstructivist perspective, certainly informs the reader that curriculum is always in the making. Only after it has been taught can one state with any precision what the curriculum was. One cannot state what it is because it will be somewhat different and have divergent learning results the next time it is activated with new students.[91] Roth presents his perspective that the curriculum is living because it is unfinished and changing, "that takes the figure of the event-in-the-making as its fundamental motive."[92]

Postmodernists, and persons who identify themselves as postconstructivists, argue that modernists work under a mythical assumption that precise plans, curricular plans in our case, are the cause that results in the effect of students' specific learnings. Postmodernists reject this conception between precise plans and ensuing action results. They argue that there are gaps between plans and strategies and resulting actions. The plans, curricula, are essentially general and the actions suggested within the curricula are structurally unique. Modernists who believe their plans will result in specific planned learnings are misguided. As Roth posits, such plans cannot deal with all the possible contingencies, all the myriad learnings cognitively, affectively, and psychomotor related. Infinite results can arise from students dealing with plans. And most of these results cannot be determined with certitude. Too many other factors are at play: the students' abilities, their interests, their social situations, and their cultural backgrounds, among other factors. Also, we must consider the teacher's competence, interest in the subject matter, even the teacher's social and cultural background.[93]

However, while we agree with Roth that there will be many unanticipated and even unknown varied learnings and emotions that students will grasp after experiencing a curriculum according to some specific plan, at least we can identify in general terms that what was planned to occur did in some ways occur, and that students did exhibit at least minimum understanding of the curricular content presented or experienced. In the future, we may devise more precise measures to assess the depth and varieties of understanding. But, we acknowledge we will never achieve absolute *exactness* in identifying all the "layers" of understanding and emotions. Certainly, we will not be able to peer into the souls of students to assess their spirituality. However, we do hope that students will have been motivated to various degrees to continue their learning journeys.

While this section is titled "Postmodernist Models," we have found none with any degree of specificity. Indeed, we believe that postmodernists would find precise "recipes" for creating curricula anathema to their postmodern dispositions. Postmodernism is more of a philosophy that is still in a dynamic state of emergence. It is more of a critique of modernism and its influence on various realms of being and doing than a "guide" for specific actions. As Slattery states, this new posture of thinking and action addresses "the autobiographical, historical, political, theological, ecological, and social context of the learning experience."[94] This philosophy nurtures "reflective understanding, heightened sensitivity, historical grounding, contextual meaning, and a liberating praxis."[95]

Slattery posits that postmodernism does not advocate any single method or approach to educational thinking, including curriculum development and implementation. Each individual must accept the challenge of generating his or her path of curricular activity. Slattery does note that he can teach you his steps in dealing with postmodern activities, but each individual must generate his own music.[96]

While he does not actually reveal his particular steps for creating postmodern curricula, he does suggest dispositions and approaches that will foster individuals engaging in postmodernism related to schooling and to life in general. He advocates that teachers of this persuasion foster in their classrooms "reflective dialogue, autobiographical journals, nonconfrontational debate, cooperative investigations, and probing questions."[97] We assert that all effective programs and pedagogical approaches of the modernist disposition would not recoil from what Slattery recommends. Slattery notes that postmodern teaching stresses the interconnectedness of knowledge, the melding of learning experiences, international communities, the world of nature, and life itself.[98] We would counter that educators in the modernist camp also stress these intellectual dispositions. Dewey, long before postmodernism, advocated similar emphases in education.

As Doll purports, "the person having the experience must do the experiencing for him/herself." Doll cites Dewey, denoting that "The beholder must create his own experience."[99] Doll further asserts that this experiencing has an "aesthetic, qualitative, intuitive, felt, creative, even spiritual—side to it."[100] We agree. We assert that students must be the creators of their own knowledge and also their own affective stands toward it. But, as Doll recommends, teachers are there to assist students in this challenge of crafting their unique experiences and the resulting understandings and affective stances.[101]

However, it is naïve to assume that meaningful curricula that engage students in active in-depth learning results out of an ether of process. Certainly students can participate in curriculum development and implementation, but they should not be charged with creating their educational programs and bringing them to life. No modernist believes that one size fits all. No modernist believes that plans made will achieve 100 percent predictable results. No modernist is advocating means of implementation that will deny students critical inquiry, will retard free thinking, or will attempt to brainwash students so as to control them. Modernists, as is true of postmodernists, realize that information- and program-producing strategies always require further exploration and inquiry. We suggest that both thought camps, which cannot be precisely classified and interpreted, really need to meld rather than repel. Citizens of both camps should raise questions that stimulate vision about excellent curricula and their implementation rather than just generating questions that are an end in themselves.[102]

Factors Affecting Implementation

Fullan discusses key factors that affect implementation.[103] People who wish to implement a new curriculum must understand the characteristics of the change being considered. Even postmodernists need to realize that some process must be defined that will address educational concerns. Certainly, at the commencement of development and implementation, there will be rough spots in the process. Often people at the beginning of implementation will resist the innovation if they do not see the need for change. Tina Rosenberg notes that successful innovation results by persuading the players to latch onto a common cause, to buy into the program being implemented.[104] When change acts with people's values, people are more willing to accept it.

People must know the purpose or purposes of an innovation and what that involves. *Clarity* about goals and means is important. But, individuals involved must realize that goals are not endpoints; rather they are directions, pathways of actions, that hopefully will result in more enlightened and motivated student scholars. Often, people are not clear as to how a particular innovation differs from what they are already doing. *Complexity* refers to the difficulty of change. For staff experienced in curriculum development, extensive change can be rather easy. For inexperienced staff, the same change can be quite challenging. Implementers must recognize

the level of difficulty and take adequate measures.[105] However, if the curriculum is totally different from the one being replaced, even experienced teachers need time to learn about the innovation and to experiment with varying ways of engaging students. Geoffrey Canada, president and chief executive officer of the Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy charter schools in New York, indicates that successful schools are those where teachers are enabled to experiment. To gain new knowledge and skills, teachers are afforded opportunities for professional development.[106] Often, in regular schools, teachers receive only a two-day workshop to "get up to speed" regarding a new curriculum.

To accept an innovation, people need to perceive its *quality, worth,* and *practicality.* In many cases, teachers simply do not have the time to carry out the suggestions. Sometimes curricula are haphazardly implemented that could have been well implemented if those in charge had ensured that the necessary materials were available to teachers. Often teachers in new programs soon realize that technical or support staff are unavailable to answer questions.

Table 8.1 provides an overview of curriculum implementation models.

KEY PLAYERS

People involved in curriculum implementation can include students, teachers, administrators, consultants, state employees, university professors, parents, lay citizens, and political officials interested in education. Depending on their skills, such people may play different roles at different times in the change process. Often, the same people are involved in both development and implementation of a new curriculum. At other times, the individuals differ, but the roles of the players remain the same. Certainly, principals and curriculum directors are involved in both development and implementation. However, implementation requires different knowledge and strategies from those of development.

Almost anyone in the educational community can initiate the change process. However, initiatives usually begin in the administrative hierarchy. Sometimes school districts pay one or more people to be internal initiators of change. These people are charged with discerning problems, demands, or deficiencies that require attention. They may get others to consider change by writing papers, forming ad hoc committees to analyze particular issues, submitting proposals, or simply sending memos to staff recommending concern for some action.

In some cases, an initiator participates in the entire change process. This is especially likely when the initiator is an insider. In other cases, an initiator can just serve as a catalyst, with no active involvement in any stage of curriculum change.

Students

Before the late 1980s and 1990s, educators rarely thought of students as agents of change. However, since then, more and more educators have realized that students, even elementary students, can contribute to meaningful education change. The degree of student involvement depends on students' maturity and on the complexity and scope of the change being considered. As Dennis Thiessen notes, "student voice" has become the clarion call for change in the way we understand, respond to, and work with students in elementary and secondary schools.[107]

Increasingly, educational practitioners and researchers realize that students possess unique perspectives on their own learning and on the nature and purpose of their schooling.[108] As Alison Cook-Sather suggests, students "should be afforded opportunities to actively shape their education."[109] Students must be included in discussions about the organization of curricular programs. Educators must form partnerships with students in designing and implementing the curriculum.[110] That way students claim some ownership of the new curriculum. They also learn valuable approaches for organizing their own learning inside and outside of school.

For students to become involved in implementation, they must see the relevance of the new program and feel they truly have influence. As active participants, they are likely to greet the implemented curriculum with interest and enthusiasm.

Table 8.1 | Overview of Curriculum Implementation Models

Model	Author-Originator	Assumptions	Key Players	Type of Change Process Engaged
Modernist Models				
Overcoming resistance to change (ORC)	Neal Gross	Resistance to change is natural. Need to overcome resistance at outset of innovation activities Must address concerns of staff	Administrators, directors, teachers, supervisors	Empirical change strategy Planned change strategy
Organizational development (OD)	Richard Schmuck and Matthew Miles	Top-down approach (vertical organization) Stress on organizational culture Implementation is an ongoing interactive process	Administrators, directors, supervisors	Empirical, rational change strategy Planned change strategy
Concerns-based adoption (CBA)	F. F. Fuller	Change is personal. Stress on school culture	Teachers	Empirical change strategy Planned change strategy
Systems model	Rensis Likert and Chris Argyris	The organization is composed of parts, units, and departments. Linkages between people and groups. Implementations consist of corrective actions.	Administrators, directors, teachers, supervisors	Normative, rational change strategies Planned change strategy
Educational change	Michael Fullan	Successful change involves need, clarity, some complexity, and quality of programs.	Administrators, teachers, students, school board, community members, and government	Rational change strategies
Postmodernist Models				
Curriculum-in-the-making	Wolff-Michael Roth	Curriculum is always in the making, never completed. The curriculum is "living." Infinite results are always present from curricula implemented.	Curriculum directors, teachers, students, community members	Chaos theory basis Quantum change theory basis
Myriad approach models Individual conceptualized implementation processes stressing liberating praxis	Patrick Slattery	Each individual challenged to generate own unique approach to curriculum development and implementation.	Individual teachers, students, community members	Idiosyncratic procedural process Complexity change theory
Complexity theory influenced approaches	William E. Doll Jr.	Complex relations cannot be distilled into simple incidents. Complexity deals with interactive dynamic systems.	Teachers, students, community members	Interactive change Networks in increasing complexity

Teachers

Teachers must be central to any curricular improvement. Henry Giroux has posited that teachers are integral to the thinking that drives program creation and implementation. Teachers are directly involved with the implementation in the classroom. They possess clinical expertise.[111] As Elizabeth Campbell indicates, curriculum expectations emerge from teachers' capacities to enact curricular and pedagogic actions "with discretion, judgment, and proficiency."[112] Teachers modify and fine-tune the design work of their colleagues and outside professionals.

The key to getting teachers committed to an innovation is involvement. In addition to being members of the curriculum advisory committee, teachers should have opportunities to participate in curriculum learning communities in which they can develop identities as curriculum innovators.

Teachers need more than one- or two-day skill-training workshops. They need time to make sense of new curricula slated for implementation, time to gain competence in new instructional practices that engage students,[113] and time for frequent dialogue on the curriculum's educational purposes and the conditions necessary to implement and maintain the curriculum.[114]

Teachers must adhere to the essence of the innovation while adapting it to their students. Teachers must be viewed as full participants in curriculum implementation, not passive recipients of the curriculum. As Corey Drake and Miriam Gamoran Sherin note, teachers put their own spin on the new curriculum. Teachers bring their own knowledge, experiences, and dispositions to the curriculum and modify it to fit (see Curriculum Tips 8.1).[115]

Supervisors

Curriculum implementation must be supervised and monitored. Both the manner of teaching and the content being addressed need oversight. The supervisor provides direction and guidance and makes sure teachers have the skills to carry out the change.

Effective supervisors realize that they must adjust their tactics to the situation and participants. Supervisors can give experienced teachers much responsibility. However, they might have to give beginning teachers more structure; they might need to schedule more supervisor-teacher conferences and more in-service training for such staff members to deliver the new curriculum.

Supervisors can carry out their responsibilities in numerous ways. A few popular ways are classroom observation, demonstration teaching, supervisor-teacher conferences, staff-development meetings, and grant funding. If supervisors are effective, teachers are likely to commit to, and feel comfortable with, the new program being implemented.

CURRICULUM TIPS 8.1 Priming Teachers and Students for Curriculum Implementation

1. Conduct informal sessions to assess teachers' thinking and emotions regarding the new curriculum that has been developed. Obtain input from students.
2. Indicate how the new curriculum to be implemented addresses teachers' and students' needs that have been previously expressed.
3. Note how the new curriculum focuses on the overall aims and goals of the school and school system.
4. Emphasize that teachers and students will have freedoms to contribute their own knowledge and pedagogical skills to the new curriculum.
5. Inform teachers they will have opportunities to collaborate with colleagues in "fine-tuning" the implemented curriculum.
6. Stress that the new curriculum is not a static document, carved in stone. Rather, it is an educational document always in flux, in the making. Create an atmosphere of joy and excitement.

Principals

The principal's leadership is critical to the success of curriculum implementation. Principals determine organizational climate and support the people involved in change. If a principal creates an atmosphere in which good working relationships exist among teachers and between teachers and support staff, program changes are more likely to be implemented. Effective principals foster enthusiasm for the new program.

Today, principals must not only be administrators with an in-depth understanding of curriculum and implementation, but also what Catherine Marshall and Maricela Oliva have called *boundary crossers.*[116] In addition to being a school leader, a principal must be a community activist. Principals must speak and act for teachers, students, *and* the community. Principals must listen to what these individuals have to say. Principals must facilitate meaningful action among all parties involved in curriculum implementation.[117]

Curriculum Directors

Curriculum directors concentrate on the overall process of curriculum development, including implementation and evaluation. Large school districts have full-time directors who oversee curriculum activities. In some school districts, directors oversee the entire K–12 program; other districts have a director of elementary education and a separate director of secondary education. In small school districts, the superintendent or associate (assistant) superintendent assumes responsibility over curriculum matters.

Ideally, the curriculum director or assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum inspires trust and confidence and is knowledgeable, articulate, and charismatic.[118] The curriculum director or assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum should help teachers and principals gain the pedagogic and curricular knowledge requisite for curriculum implementation. They should be familiar with the latest research and theorizing about innovation and should have the skills to communicate their knowledge to the school's staff.

Curriculum Consultants

At times, a school district may wish to bring in an external facilitator or coordinator. Often, small school districts have no internal experts to consult regarding innovation. Even large districts may find they need an outside facilitator. School districts do not usually employ curriculum consultants over extended periods. Rather, schools bring in consultants to do one- or two-day workshops. However, such workshops are ineffective because curriculum implementation requires a much longer time frame. Consultants also help schools analyze programs, assess them, and obtain grant funding. Most such consultants are based at colleges and universities.

Many educational consultants are employed by state departments of education and sent to various schools and school districts to assist in curriculum development and implementation. Many consultants are on the staff of intermediate school districts and work closely with school districts served by such organizations. Private national consultants also assist in curricular activities.

Successful consultants cooperate with teachers in addressing some development or implementation issue. They assist rather than judge. Sometimes, but not usually, consultants are hired to work with teachers throughout the curriculum development and implementation process. Consultants can provide guidance, analysis, and critique without being in a district on a daily or weekly basis. Consultants can establish peer support systems, peer coaching, and networks for working with internal facilitators. They also can guide teachers to information that helps them become comfortable with, and knowledgeable about, the innovation.

Parents and Community Members

Schools exist within communities, frequently in increasingly diverse communities. Educators must realize that students actually spend more time in their communities than in school.

Educators must also apprehend that curricula exist outside school walls; student learning does occur when students exit the school. In the development and implementation of curricula, educators must strive to focus on communities and develop means of engaging parents and community members in school activities, including implementation.

The work of Geoffrey Canada with the Harlem Children's Zone Academy charter schools has shown what academic success can be achieved by considering the communities within which students live and schools exist. He engaged the community block by block. Today, that community is almost 100 blocks in area. Children who lacked many resources and were underachieving are now achieving academic success. Canada's accomplishments impressed President Barack Obama; he urged the creation of 20 "Promise Neighborhoods" nationwide.[119]

Canada views community with a wide lens. He views innovation as requiring educators and community members not only to make the school innovative, but also to work to make the community innovative. Canada posits, "We need to improve schools at the same time we address the barriers to academic success outside of schools from health problems to misguided parenting practices to lack of physical safety."[120] He urges us to broaden our definition of education and to realize that the educational experience commences at birth and continues in all environments within which students interact.

Although communities differ with regard to specific issues, the community should participate in varying degrees with the creation, implementation, and maintenance of curricula. This does not mean that parents and community members are going to do the teachers' jobs, but a partnership should exist. As Fullan communicates, "The closer the parent is to the education of the children, the greater the impact on child development and educational achievement."[121]

Educators must take the lead in engaging the community in educational actions. Fullan suggests that while both educators and community members want only the best for children, they often differ in what they consider the best. In many communities, parents do not trust teachers. Community members often believe that teachers, especially those who do not actually live in their communities, frequently "don't get it" when it comes to understanding their children and the environment in which they live. Teachers, and certainly the principal, must extend a welcoming hand to parents and community members.

However, building trust in schools, as Bryk and Schneider point out, is a major challenge.[122] It requires modifying a community culture or cultures with school or school cultures. It requires teachers actually leaving their classrooms and entering the community. Teachers can no longer stay in the comfort of their schools; professors of education must leave their "towers" and mix with the "people." It means that educators must realize that what is or should be occurring in the communities and schools is a rearrangement of power and influence. Educators should view community members as partners. Teachers cannot educate students alone in the isolation of the classroom.[123] Even with home schooling gaining in popularity, parents cannot educate their children alone. Adding to the complexity of working with parents and community members is the realization that although school and homes do have visible and measurable curricula, schools, homes, and the larger communities all possess various hidden curricula that can serve to advance or retard students' total academic learning. Moreover, we do not mean just the learning of disciplined knowledge; rather, we also consider the impact the community and its members have on students' attitudes, values, and belief systems. And what of the null curricula—that curricula that students know exist but to which we attempt to deny them access, the taboo topics we do not teach or from which we tend to shield their eyes?

Bringing in the total community to work with educators in developing and implementing curricula is not always going to be smooth. As Michelle Rhee, former chancellor of the Washington, D.C., public school system, articulates, there will be conflict, but we should not shy away from it. Rearranging power and influence, shaking up the politics of the special interests, will ruffle feathers. However, as Rhee notes, we must mount various fights, but we can do it respectfully: "[T]his is the time to stand up and say what you believe, not sweep the issues under the rug so that we can feel good about getting along."[124] However, in dealing with the community,

we must strive for a win-win result. We are not striving for anyone to lose. And educators must realize that this dynamic with parents and community members will be an ongoing drama. Educators and community members cannot wait for Superman; we must realize that challenges will be addressed by our efforts, cooperatively taken. We are superman and superwoman!

Conclusion

Curriculum implementation is much more than handing out new materials and courses of study. For implementation to succeed, those involved must understand the program's purpose, the roles people play within the system, and the types of individuals who are to be affected by interaction with the new curriculum. For successful implementation, schools essentially must establish learning communities. A major emphasis is to make the school, as a result of curriculum implementation, learning enriched for everyone involved, certainly for teachers and students.

Effective implementation does not occur without serious planning. The change process demands planning, but planning with flexibility so as to address unintended circumstances and events. As events arise, procedures must be fine-tuned.

People who create a new curriculum or course are eager to see the school or school district enthusiastically implement it. Yet implementation does not demand that educators accept the curriculum without question. School players need time to "try out" the new curriculum or course and to put their own stamp on it. Teachers need opportunities to engage their colleagues in conversations about the curriculum or course being presented. Interaction "flavors" teachers' relationships regarding the curriculum to be implemented.

Curricularists can and do bring various perspectives to implementation and employ numerous strategies. Even postmodernists have some idea of strategies to employ in creating and implementing curricula that address their concerns. Successful implementation requires a community of trust. Trust takes time as well as collaboration among the curriculum players. It takes educators developing a shared ethic of responsibility. It requires creating an environment in which various educational stands and approaches to curriculum development and implementation can be honestly discussed with respect for all participating parties.[125]

Those in charge of change must comprehend the dynamics of change strategies and the dynamics of group processes. They must be cognizant of the complexities within schools and communities. They must realize that educational postures are being analyzed, critiqued, refined, and challenged. Instigators of change, curriculum implementation, must realize that the turmoil extant in the local and national communities is reflected within the school and school district communities. We are living in a complex and chaotic time. We need to be excited and motivated to be active change agents.

Discussion Questions

1. How would you argue for "capacity building" to facilitate curriculum implementation?
2. How would you argue for the engagement of a modernist approach to curriculum implementation in the complexities and chaos of the 21st century?
3. How would you argue for a postmodernist approach to curriculum implementation in this century?
4. What defenses would you employ to convince others to use students and community members in curriculum implementation?
5. What are your affective responses to this chapter's content?

Notes

1. Jon Wiles and Joseph Bondi, *Curriculum Development: A Guide to Practice*, 7th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2007).
2. John P. Kotter, *Accelerate* (Boston: Harvard Business Review Press, 2014), p. 5.
3. Leslie J. Bishop, *Staff Development and Instructional Improvement: Plans and Procedures* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976).
4. Kotter, *Accelerate*, p. 5.

5. Michael Fullan, Peter Hill, and Carmel Crevola, *Breakthrough* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2006).
6. Seymour B. Sarason, *The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990).
7. Ibid.
8. Fullan, Hill, and Crevola, *Breakthrough*.
9. Roger Soder, *The Language of Leadership* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001).
10. Michael Fullan, *The New Meaning of Educational Change*, 4th ed. (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007).
11. Kotter, *Accelerate*, p. 1.
12. Ibid., p. 9.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid., p. 11.
15. Ibid.
16. John I. Goodlad, *In Praise of Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1997).
17. Richard E. Elmore, *School Reform from the Inside Out*, 4th printing (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2007).
18. Ibid., p. 211.
19. Ellen Brantlinger, *Dividing Classes* (New York: Routledge, 2003).
20. Elmore, *School Reform from the Inside Out*.
21. Valerie Truesdale, Claire Thompson, and Michael Lucas, "Use of Curriculum Mapping to Build a Learning Community," in Heidi Hayes Jacobs, ed., *Getting Results with Curriculum Mapping* (Alexandria, VA, ASCD, 2004), pp. 10–24.
22. Andy Hargreaves and Michael Fullan, *Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2012), p. 112.
23. Ibid., p. 113.
24. Wolff-Michael Roth, *Curriculum-in-the-Making: A Post-Constructivist Perspective* (New York: Peter Lang, 2014).
25. Elmore, *School Reform from the Inside Out*.
26. Fullan, *The New Meaning of Educational Change*; and Elmore, *School Reform from the Inside Out*.
27. Fullan, Hill, and Crevola, *Breakthrough*.
28. Colin M. J. Marsh and George Willis, *Curriculum: Alternative Approaches, Ongoing Issues*, 4th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2007).
29. Fullan, Hill, and Crevola, *Breakthrough*.
30. Roth, *Curriculum-in-the-Making: A Post-Constructivist Perspective*.
31. Hargreaves and Fullan, *Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School*, p. 136.
32. Ibid., p. 128.
33. Harry J. Hartley, "Budgeting," in R. A. Gorton, ed., *Encyclopedia of School Administration and Supervision* (New York: Oryx Press, 1988), pp. 40–41.
34. Fullan, Hill, and Crevola, *Breakthrough*.
35. Joseph P. McDonald, *American School Reform* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014), pp. 22–23.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid., p. 27.
38. Daniel U. Levine, Rayna F. Levine, and Allan C. Ornstein, "Guidelines for Change and Innovation in the Secondary School Curriculum," *NASSP Bulletin* (May 1985), pp. 9–14.
39. Ibid., p. 14.
40. Roger Schwarz, *The Skilled Facilitator*, New and Revised (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002), pp. 96–97.
41. Kotter, *Accelerate*, p. 62.
42. Roth, *Curriculum-in-the-Making: A Post-Constructivist Perspective*.
43. Warren Bennis, *Changing Organizations* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966); and Warren Bennis, *On Becoming a Leader* (Reading, MA: Addison Wesley, 1989).
44. John D. McNeil, *Curriculum: A Comprehensive Introduction*, 6th ed. (Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman, 2000).
45. Elmore, *School Reform from the Inside Out*.
46. Charles Jencks, *What Is Post-Modernism?* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988), cited in Patrick Slattery, *Curriculum Development in the Postmodern Era: Teaching and Learning in an Age of Accountability*, 3rd ed. (New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2013), p. 23.
47. Slattery, *Curriculum Development in the Postmodern Era*, pp. 18–19.
48. Ibid., p. 119.
49. Ibid., p. 135.
50. Ibid., p. 17.
51. Kieran Egan, *The Future of Education* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), p. 88.
52. Slattery, *Curriculum Development in the Postmodern Era*, p. 20.
53. Brantlinger, *Dividing Classes*.
54. Ibid.
55. Soder, *The Language of Leadership*.
56. Kenneth T. Henson, *Curriculum Planning: Integrating Multiculturalism, Constructivism, and Educational Reform*, 2nd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2001); and Elmore, *School Reform from the Inside Out*.
57. Shazia Rafiullah Miller, Karen Drill, and Ellen Behrstock, "Meeting Teachers Half Way: Making Educational Research Relevant to Teachers," *Phi Delta Kappan* (April 2010), pp. 31–34.
58. Ibid.
59. Thomas R. Harvey, *Checklist for Change* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1990).
60. Thomas Sergiovanni et al., *Educational Governance and Administration*, 3rd ed. (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1992).
61. Kris Sloan, "Teacher Identity and Agency in School Worlds: Beyond the All-Good/All-Bad Discourse on Accountability-Explicit Curriculum Policies," *Curriculum Inquiry* (Summer 2006), pp. 119–152.
62. Ibid.
63. McDonald, *American School Reform*.
64. Ibid., p. 16.

65. W. Warner Burke, *Organizational Change: Theory and Practice*, 2nd ed. (Los Angeles: Sage, 2008), cited in McDonald, *American School Reform*, p. 16.
66. Ibid.
67. Mike Schmoker, *Results Now* (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2006).
68. Fullan, *The New Meaning of Educational Change*, p. 97.
69. Ibid.
70. Ibid.
71. Slattery, *Curriculum Development in the Postmodern Era*, pp. 20–24.
72. Peter Hlebowitsh, "Centripetal Thinking in Curriculum Studies," *Curriculum Inquiry* (September 2010), pp. 503–513.
73. Stacey Childress, Richard E. Elmore, Allen Grossman, and Susan Moore Johnson, "The PELP Coherence Framework," in Michael Fullan, ed., *The Challenge of Change*, 2nd ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2009), pp. 179–184.
74. Ibid.
75. Fullan, *The New Meaning of Educational Change*.
76. Ibid., p. 86.
77. Ibid.
78. Neal Gross, "Basic Issues in the Management of Educational Change Efforts," in R. E. Herriott and N. Gross, eds., *The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change* (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1979), pp. 20–46.
79. Parker J. Palmer, *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998).
80. Gene E. Hall and Susan Loucks, "Teacher Concerns as a Basis for Facilitating and Personalizing Staff Development," *Teachers College Record* (September 1978), pp. 36–53; and Gene E. Hall and Susan Loucks, "The Concept of Innovation Configurations: An Approach to Addressing Program Adaptation." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.
81. Mary Moss Brown and Alisa Berger, *How to Innovate: The Essential Guide for Fearless School Leaders* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2014), pp. 46–47.
82. Richard S. Schmuck and Matthew Miles, eds., *Organizational Development in Schools* (Palo Alto, CA: National Press Books, 1971); and Richard S. Schmuck et al., *The Second Handbook of Organizational Development in Schools* (Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield, 1977).
83. M. Jayne Fleener, "Introduction: Chaos, Complexity, Curriculum and Cultures: Setting Up the Conversation," in William C. Doll Jr., M. Jayne Fleener, Donna Trueit, and John S. Julien, eds., *Chaos, Complexity, Curriculum, and Culture* (New York: Peter Lang, 2005), pp. 1–17.
84. Wendell L. French and Cecil H. Bell, *Organization Development*, 4th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990).
85. Roger Kaufman and L. W. Harrell, "Types of Functional Educational Planning Models," *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 2,* 1 (1989), pp. 4–13, cited in Robert V. Carlson and Gary Awkerman, eds., *Educational Planning* (New York: Longman, 1991).
86. Marsh and Willis, *Curriculum: Alternative Approaches, Ongoing Issues*.
87. Fullan, *The New Meaning of Educational Change*.
88. F. F. Fuller, "Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization," *American Educational Research Journal, 6,* 2 (1969), pp. 207–226, cited in Marsh and Willis, *Curriculum: Alternative Approaches, Ongoing Issues*.
89. Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller, *Teachers, Their World and Their Work* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1991).
90. William Ayers, *To Teach: The Journey of a Teacher*, 3rd ed. (New York: Teachers College Press, 2010).
91. Roth, *Curriculum-in-the-Making: A Post-Constructivist Perspective*.
92. Ibid., p. 3.
93. Ibid.
94. Slattery, *Curriculum Development in the Postmodern Era*, p. 206.
95. Ibid.
96. Ibid., p. 209.
97. Ibid., p. 217.
98. Ibid., p. 218.
99. John Dewey, *Art as Experience* (New York: Capricorn, 1958, original publication, 1934), p. 54, cited in William E. Doll Jr., "Crafting an Experience," in Donna Trueit, ed., *Pragmatism, Post-Modernism, and Complexity Theory, The "Fascinating Imaginative Realm" of William E. Doll, Jr.* (New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2012), p. 98.
100. Doll, "Crafting an Experience," p. 99.
101. Ibid.
102. Stanley Fish, *Versions of Academic Freedom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014), p. 123.
103. Fullan, *The New Meaning of Educational Change*.
104. Tina Rosenberg, *Join the Club: How Peer Pressure Can Transform the World* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2011), p. xix, cited in Hargreaves and Fullan, *Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School*, p. 151.
105. French and Bell, *Organizational Development*.
106. Geoffrey Canada, "Bringing Change to Scale: The Next Big Reform Challenge," in Karl Weber, ed., *Waiting for "Superman"* (New York: Public Affairs, 2010), pp. 189–200.
107. Dennis Thiessen, "Student Knowledge, Engagement, and Voice in Educational Reform," *Curriculum Inquiry* (Winter 2006), pp. 345–358.
108. Alison Cook-Sather, "Sound, Presence, and Power: 'Student Voice' in Educational Research and Reform," *Curriculum Inquiry* (Winter 2006), pp. 359–390.
109. Ibid., p. 359.
110. Ibid.
111. Henry A. Giroux, *Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life*, 2nd ed. (Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2005).
112. Elizabeth Campbell, "Curricular and Professional Authority in Schools," *Curriculum Inquiry* (Summer 2006), pp. 111–118.
113. Corey Drake and Miriam Gamoran Sherin, "Practicing Change: Curriculum Adaptation and Teacher Narrative

in the Context of Mathematics Education Reform," *Curriculum Inquiry* (Summer 2006), pp. 153–187.
114. John R. Wiens, "Educational Leadership as Civic Humanism," in Paul Kelleher and Rebecca Van Der Bogert, *Voices for Democracy: Struggles and Celebrations of Transformational Leaders, 105th Yearbook, Part I* (Malden, MA: National Society for the Study of Education/Blackwell, 2006), pp. 199–225.
115. Drake and Sherin, "Practicing Change: Curriculum Adaptation and Teacher Narrative in the Context of Mathematics Education Reform."
116. Catherine Marshall and Maricela Oliva, *Leadership for Social Justice* (Boston: Pearson, 2006).
117. Soder, *The Language of Leadership*.
118. Paul Kelleher and Rebecca Van Der Bogert, "Introduction: The Landscape of the Superintendency: From Despair to Hope," in Kelleher and Van Der Bogert, *Voice for Democracy: Struggles and Celebrations of Transformational Leaders*, pp. 10–28.
119. Canada, "Bringing Change to Scale: The Next Big Reform Challenge."
120. Ibid., p. 196.
121. Fullan, *The New Meaning of Educational Change*, p. 189.
122. A. Bryk and B. Schneider. *Trust in Schools* (New York: Russell Sage, 2002), cited in Fullan, *The New Meaning of Educational Change*, p. 193.
123. Fullan, *The New Meaning of Educational Change*.
124. Michelle Rhee, "What I've Learned," *Newsweek* (December 13, 2010), pp. 36–41.
125. Hargreaves and Fullan, *Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School*, pp. 113–114.