Editorials

values to society, to the school system, and to educators of increasing holding power.

• The April issue will be "non-theme" in the sense that the articles will be selected solely on the basis of timeliness and significance. Such an approach tried experimentally in the May 1976 issue seemed to meet with considerable success.

• "Instructional Supervision: Trends and Issues" is the theme for May. Modernization of the role and function of instructional supervision is a most timely subject for investigation by professional educators. Concerns related to instructional supervision abound. In some situations, supervisors are being bypassed by boards of education who are intent on enforcing their views of accountability simplistically measured by standardized test scores. Other examples can be given of supervisors being bypassed because of various expressions of teacher power that concentrate on increased benefits for teachers as the first priority. Professionally, many teachers are developing their own skills for peer supervision through team approaches and sophisticated modes of professional growth.

Concerns can be alleviated if instructional supervision can meet the challenge of present issues in education and can demonstrate that it has an indispensable role in helping to find solutions to daily and long-range problems in the schools. Competent instructional supervision has never been more sorely needed, as schools find themselves fully staffed with tenured teachers, not all of whom are committed to lifelong learning in the area of professional growth in teaching.

The content of the journal continues to reflect our efforts to make the articles, features, and editorials both timely and relevant. New sources, more "involved" writers, carefully selected unsolicited materials, use of longer, more "in-depth" papers, interviews with important personages—these are some of the innovations that will make these pages more helpful, meaningful, and significant for readers in the coming days.

With this issue, too, *Educational Leadership* appears in new format and design. This grows out of the work of the artist, with the suggestions and guidance of the editorial and production staff members.

We look forward, with you, to another year of hope and accomplishment, in a spirit of rededication to the field of the high endeavor that is ours.

Who Should Be Involved in Curriculum Development?

Ronald Brandt

A good many Americans are losing confidence in their schools. And some of us educators are not so sure of ourselves, either. Oh, we're trying. We have a little of everything: some district or state curriculum guides, some commercial materials, some products of federal research and development, some school-planned mini-courses, some special projects. In short, a hodgepodge. Pressures on teachers are overwhelming; effects on students are not completely understood.

Surrounded by people who are deciding, or who want to decide what should be taught, we are reminded that "too many cooks spoil the broth." We need an understanding among all the cooks about what each can best contribute to the recipe.

Bits and pieces may make good soup, but a comprehensive curriculum takes more than that. Curriculum development is the planning of programs designed to enable people to learn.

Of course, some learning occurs without any planning, and much learning results from planning by individual teachers. But efficient use of resources requires planning on a broader scale—planning that consciously builds interrelationships among the parts.

"Comprehensive curriculum planning takes time and money. . . . the involvement of people in appropriate ways does not happen naturally; it must be provided for."

Comprehensive curriculum planning takes time and money. It cannot be undertaken by individual teachers or schools. Even most school districts lack resources to do the whole job. Agencies with sufficient resources to attempt it may include states, intermediate agencies, voluntary consortia, or regional laboratories. At these levels, the involvement of people in appropriate ways does not happen naturally; it must be provided for.

A role of the general public in such planning is to help determine the goals: what students should know and be able to do as a result of their schooling. Most educators would probably agree with this idea, but they seldom practice it, because trying to communicate with large numbers of people is difficult and time consuming.

Goals for students describe two kinds of outcomes: what all students are *expected* to learn, and what individual students may *choose* to learn. Members of the public should perhaps have more to say about the first than the second, although the range and extent of choices depend partly on what the public is willing to provide.

Professional educators have primary responsibility for planning programs which enable students to accomplish the goals. Of course, planning takes place at different levels, and different people are involved at each level. Those who define the broad scope and sequence of curriculum need a set of skills different from the skills of teaching. They must be able to clarify aims, analyze content, select teaching and learning strategies, and arrange lessons in an appropriate sequence. They cannot work independently; they need advice from teachers—and from others, including people who know about use of subject matter in life situations.

An important stage in the development of curriculum is "tryout" in classrooms and continuing revision to assure that the curriculum does enable students to learn. This is the point at which feedback can and should be gathered from parents, students, and teachers who were not included earlier.

Members of local boards of education have an especially difficult job. Charged by the state and by their constituents with being responsible for the schools in their community, they often do not have enough information or technical knowledge to govern the system. One of their roles in curriculum development is to expect from administrators evidence that the curriculum is in accord with local goals, and that it enables students to meet the goals efficiently.

Almost everything I have said needs to be qualified with a lot of "if's." I may have implied that a monolithic curriculum can serve all students—that diverse interests have to compromise on a single plan. Instead, it is likely that schools will create more and more alternatives so that students and their parents can make curricular choices in matters that affect them personally.

If so, each alternative must be planned in relation to the others and to the broad goals of education. Otherwise, we will still have a hodgepodge. EL

Ronald Brandt is Associate Superintendent for Instruction, Lincoln Public Schools, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Copyright © 1976 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.