CHAPTER 3

MANAGING THE CURRICULUM

3.1   Introduction

The new curriculum (cf. 2.6.1.3) with its multi-faceted nature is a theoretical substructure within the OBE approach and its implementation requires particular management skills.   This chapter (cf. 1.3.2) examines aspects of the management process at micro level that will ensure the effective implementation of the new curriculum.   It focusses on those skills and practices seen to be appropriate for district officials, principals and teachers attempting to meet the challenges of the rapidly changing curriculum (cf. 2.4).   It is against this back-drop that issues pertaining to the management of the curriculum will be addressed.   There is an ever increasing emphasis on the management roles of district officials, principals and teachers.   Firstly the chapter deals with managing the change, the training of principals and teachers in the new curriculum and the monitoring and support of principals and teachers at district level. Secondly it ranges from co-ordinating the curriculum, ensuring the implementation of policy, staff development and resource management to curriculum evaluation, all at school level and finally it covers curriculum development at the class room level.   The roles of those charged with the overall responsibility of the curriculum process, have undergone some evolution.   As a result, the required skill and knowledge base for curriculum managers has to change accordingly.

Curriculum problems, as listed below, are unique to provinces and each province has varying levels of curriculum proficiency.   In the provinces there is a greater awareness of curriculum issues – but the question arises as to whether there are sufficient knowledgeable curriculum specialists who are acquainted with both theory and practice (cf. 2.6.1; 2.6.2) in an attempt to find a synergy between them and to ensure relevant curriculum implementation.   In South Africa several factors influence effective curriculation detrimentally, namely:

- teachers and principals who are often sceptical towards curriculum evaluation (cf. 3.4.6) and experimentation

80

- an apparent rigidity in the procedure for the revision of curricula (cf. 2.6.1.2)

- a limited amount of meaningful contributions by teachers to curriculum development (cf. 3.5.1) at meso- and macro level

- a shortage of curriculum specialists (cf. 2.8; 3.3)

- many teachers are ill-informed regarding curriculum theory and practice (cf. 2.6.1- 2.6.2) and

- a tendency towards bureaucracy (Human Sciences Research Council [HRSC] 1981:116-124; Carl, Volschenk, Franken, Ehlers, Kotze, Louw & Van der Merwe 1988:1-3).

To be able to implement a curriculum effectively, requires a great deal more than a few actions or skills on the part of district officials, principals and teachers. It is of paramount importance that the curriculum process be *managed* effectively.

Although the latest resources on managing the curriculum have been consulted, earlier resources dating from the eighties have also been introduced. These resources were found to be extremely useful since they contain information based on sound curriculum management practices. This information is generic by nature and spans the entire spectrum of curriculum management – be it a new or an existing curriculum. As the chapter unfolded, a careful and ongoing check was made to ensure that any 'old' resources remained relevant to this study.

Clarity on the concept of management and the concept of curriculum, as discussed in the next section, should bring the reader to an understanding of all that curriculum management entails.

3.2 The Field of Curriculum Management

3.2.1 Defining Management and Curriculum

Since definitions of curriculum management are infrequent, the two concepts are dealt with separately but together they provide a perspective on the broad character of curriculum management.

Pretorius (1998:54) defines management as the "process of working with and through individuals and groups and other resources to accomplish organised goals". He further explains that the achievement of a school's objectives through leadership, is a result of the management in the school in which each staff member has a role to play.

Johnson and Scholes (2002:44) explain that effective management is possible when managers have the cognitive capacity to make sense of problems or issues in their experiences.

Grobler (1998:i) speaks in a school context and is quoted as saying that the quality of management will contribute to the quality of life and the standard of work of both teachers and learners. Marsh (1992:391) regards management as the ability of the principal to carry out developmental supervision and provide curriculum leadership in the school. Likewise, Hoberg (1994:44) argues that instructional leadership implies that the principal as the manager of the school should provide a clear vision and direction and be able to delegate certain responsibilities to competent staff. Teachers can only perform their task of teaching successfully in a school which is effectively managed at every level. Van der Westhuizen (1991:41) states equally that guidance should be given so that all efforts in the school can be channelled correctly.

When an attempt is made to define the concept 'curriculum', it is clear that writers have different opinions. In addition, a writer may use this notion within different contexts.

A recent definition of curriculum is offered by Walker (1990:5) in which he regards curriculum as the content and purpose of an educational programme in a school. He continues his definition by including subjects, learning activities, learning experiences and learning outcomes. Curriculum 2005 (C2005): 1997:10) states that a curriculum is everything planned by teachers which will assist in developing the learner.

Carl (1986:17) is of the opinion that the notion of curriculum may have a narrower, as well as a broader, meaning. The narrower curriculum would imply a set of subjects, whereas the broader curriculum would include all the learning experiences offered by a school during, and after, school. Pratt (1994:5) echoes the idea of the narrower meaning by saying that curriculum means "a plan for a sustained process of teaching and learning". He continues to say that curriculum does not include teaching and learning. It is only a *plan* for instructional acts.

Barrow (1984:11) provides a clear definition in describing the curriculum as a programme of activities by teachers and learners – so designed that learners will, as far as possible, achieve specific educational and other school objectives.

The concept curriculum can also be regarded as a school curriculum which is further divided into the relevant school phases. A relevant school curriculum is developed according to the needs of the relevant community and the learners. The school curriculum must be thoroughly planned and should make provision for compulsory and optional learning activities in the form of examination and non-examination subjects and for suitable after-school activities. The ultimate aim would be to lead the child to adulthood. Oliva (1988:9-10) confirms this point of view by pointing out that a curriculum "… may be a unit, a course, a sequence of courses, the school's entire programme of study – and may take place outside of class or school".

It appears that curriculum is a broad concept which includes all planned activities and therefore also subject courses which take place during the normal school day. It also includes after-school planned activities such as societies and sport. This all takes place within a specific system it is continuously subject to evaluation and aims to lead and to accompany the child to adulthood so that he/she can be a useful citizen within the community. Other education systems may consider a curriculum from a

different point of view. In this case the manifestation of the curriculum may be somewhat different. This is also an indication of the complexity of the curriculum. It has a variety of possibilities for interpretation which must be taken into account at all times.

From the above definitions on management and curriculum, a single perspective can be obtained on the notions and concepts of **curriculum management** which the curriculum manager must understand. The school is responsible for executing the primary function of the education system, which is managing, teaching and learning. However, for the school to carry out this function effectively, the school principal must fulfill his/her curricular role. Donmoyer and Wagstaff (1990:20) mention that principals are increasingly tasked with being curriculum managers. Boyd (1996:63) maintains that there has recently been a demand for principals to be instructional leaders as well as curriculum managers.

Since curriculum management is about curriculum improvement and effective implementation, principals need to spend most of their time performing this important function. Morphet, Johns and Reller (1982:300) reiterate that surveys show that principals typically regard curriculum management as their primary function and one on which they would like to spend a large amount of their time. Duke (1987:57) agrees, but adds that principals, spend relatively little time observing in classrooms and working with the teachers to improve instruction. Murphy, Hallinger, Weil and Milman (1983:141) assure readers that one of the most important reasons for the lack of curriculum management activities on the part of many principals is their lack of a sound knowledge base of instruction and curriculum. This has a negative impact, not only on the achievement of the school's objectives, but also on the individuals associated with the school. This confirms Ngcongo's (1995:31) word of caution. Without supporting effective teaching, principals are robbed of the core business of the school, namely teaching and learning.

Squelch and Lemmer (1994:1) maintain that the performance of the school, its staff and its learners, are deeply affected by the principal's leadership role. The principal as curriculum manager should play a positive role – particularly if the entire approach to teaching is changing. This implies that all principals should ensure that

their roles as curriculum managers are always given priority since it is about curriculum improvement and learner development.

3.2.2   Classifying Curriculum

Oliva (1988:8-9) makes a meaningful contribution by classifying curriculum as one of the following:

- a set of objectives, its intentions or its purpose, e.g. the development of thinking skills

- context, i.e. the particular context or perspective within which the curriculum develops, for example a philosophy which may serve as a starting point and which eventually determines the nature of the curriculum and

- strategies used in the process. In the teaching and learning process for example, a problem-solving strategy may be followed.

Walters (1985:1-3) alleges that the word curriculum, in education and in practical teaching, has undergone a change in meaning and therefore it has become necessary to differentiate at least amongst the following curricula:

- the school curriculum – courses and their subjects that are offered by the school

- the course curriculum (for example human and social sciences for the Intermediate Phase which would include a number of subjects like history and geography) and

- the subject curriculum (for example the history curriculum), which includes a description of the subject and the systematic organising of the aims, objectives, content, teaching methods, learning activities, curriculum material and learner assessment procedures for that subject.

3.2.3   The Features of a Curriculum

Schubert (1986:26-34) prefers to spell it out as characteristics of a curriculum since these characteristics provide a wider conceptualisation and offers a broad perspective of what a curriculum should be. He says the curriculum is:

- a learning programme of planned activities

- content

- the cultural reproduction of a community reflecting its relevant culture

- specific learning results

- specific activities and experiences that lead to learning

- an instrument for social reconstruction where values and skills are acquired which may help to improve the community

- designed to set out tasks and concepts which must be achieved, or a predetermined purpose, e.g. the mastery of a new task or an improvement of a previous task and

- *curere*. The focus is on the person so that self-discovery may take place through activities and the person may get to know himself/herself – 'who', 'how' and 'why' he/she has developed in the way he/she did. A greater understanding of oneself is an important aspect in this regard.

This contribution by Schubert provides multiple views and not merely one aspect of the curriculum. The curriculum therefore is seen in its totality. One cannot concentrate on a single facet since an understanding of the broader perspective may be overlooked.

Oliva (1988:5-6) agrees by stating that the amorphous use of the term 'curriculum' has given rise to different interpretations. Depending on the writer's philosophies, a number of interpretations have arisen. A curriculum is:

- what an individual learner experiences as a result of the school's involvement

- that which is taught in a school

- the learning experiences of the learners in a school

- a set of subjects which are followed

- everything planned by the staff

- content

- everything which takes place within a school, including co-curricular activities, guidance and inter-personal relationships

- a study programme followed by a learner

- a set of behavioural objectives

- a package of material and

- a number of courses following on each other.

3.2.4 The Characteristics of a Curriculum Manager

According to Smith and Andrews (1989:23), the principal as curriculum leader means that the principal is perceived as:

- providing the necessary resources (cf. 3.4.5) so that the school's academic goals can be achieved

- possessing policy knowledge and management skills in curriculum matters which lead to improved teaching practices

- being a skilled communicator in one-on-one small groups and large-group settings

- to be future-focussed and creating a visible presence for the staff, learners and parents at both the physical- and philosophical levels of what the school is all about.

However, both experience and training are needed (cf. 3.3.2) to assist the principal in gaining and mastering these qualities. As Everard and Morris (1996:216) contend, true proficiency comes only from practical experience coupled with reflective learning.

Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1989:155) identify the following three requirements for curriculum management:

- curriculum managers work with other principals to develop a shared commitment to a common vision of excellence in teaching

- the leader has a vision for excellence in teaching. Snowden and Gordon (1998:66) agree, adding that the leader must have the organisational vision necessary to guide the school into the future and an ability to articulate this vision. The principal should therefore not only be clear on where he/she is heading to with the school, but should also be able to clarify this to the staff and

- curriculum managers and their teaching colleagues have the knowledge and skills to ensure that the vision becomes a reality.

These requirements can be fulfilled in a situation where there is a healthy and objective relationship between the principal and his/her staff (cf. 3.4.4.1). Lezotte (1992:1) warns that the vision of the school cannot be attained unless the principal creates support for it among those implementing the curriculum. Hoy and Miskel

(1991:277) maintain that the quality of the principal-teacher relationship is the most important factor in determining the leader's influence on the group members.

The question then arises: 'Who would be the people responsible for taking the management of this curriculum forward?' The answer necessitates a description of the roles of the relevant people in managing the curriculum namely district officials, the principal and the teacher.

3.3   The Role of District Officials in Managing the Curriculum

In addition to what has been stated in Chapter 2 (cf. 2.8), I, in my capacity as curriculum manager in the provincial office of the EC DOE, discovered that the role of district officials in managing the curriculum, is fourfold. Firstly, they have to deal with the changes that principals and teachers experience in the form of a mindshift (cf. 2.4), when a new curriculum is introduced (cf. 3.3.1). Secondly, they have to train principals in the new curriculum (cf. 3.3.2) and thirdly they have to monitor and support them (cf. 3.3.3). Finally, district officials are also responsible for evaluating the curriculum. Evaluating the curriculum is, however, dealt with in the next section (cf. 3.4.6.) since it is seen by authors as also being part of the role of the principal.

3.3.1   Managing Change

Prior to the training of principals and teachers in the new curriculum, district officials first have to manage the change that takes place in the *minds* of principals and teachers when a new curriculum is being introduced (cf. 2.4). Much has been written about managing change. First the various attitudes of principals and teachers towards change are outlined. A discussion then follows on how district officials have to prepare principals and teachers for curriculum change by getting them involved to ensure a sense of commitment towards the new curriculum.

3.3.1.1   Attitudes of Principals and Teachers towards Change

Pratt (1980:433) describes a disposition which often exists in any form of management. He contends that "there is nothing more difficult to carry out, nor more doubtful of success, nor more dangerous to handle, than to initiate a new

order of things. For the reformer has enemies in all who profit by the older order, and only lukewarm defenders in all those who would profit by the new order". This tepidness arises partly from a fear of the critics who have policy in their favour and partly from the scepticism of those who do not truly believe in anything new until they have actually experienced it.

Renewal or change is often unsuccessful because teachers lose sight of certain critical factors and views on development. A critical factor for successful change is, according to Czajkowski and Patterson (1980:160), the level of readiness for such a change on the part of those involved. Gultig and Stielau (2002:11) seem to offer a suggestion by saying that the first step in dealing intelligently with change is to reflect upon the past to see how it shapes thoughts and practices which result in people being 'blind' to new possibilities.

Principals and teachers normally have different attitudes towards change. The manner in which district officials disseminate curriculum information often determines how acceptable a new curriculum will be for principals and teachers (Pratt 1980:427). The information may be perceived in many ways and district officials as the trainers in this curriculum should take this into account when planning their training. The variety of attitudes that district officials have to deal with, are categorised as follows (Pratt 1980: 427):

- The *enthusiasts* are characterised by being energetic, accepting challenges and having high ambitions. They are adapted to progress and will participate in meaningful innovation. They will also enthusiastically receive and implement a new curriculum.

- The *supporters* are less radical, but also involved in professional associations and aspects of in-service training. They are well-informed regarding curriculum issues and may easily be persuaded to accept innovation provided the design is thoroughly planned, well-founded and tested.

- The *acquiescers* are purposeful. Although they also adapt to improvement or development, they will not initiate it. They usually only make contact with their equals and follow the path of least resistance.

- The *laggards* maintain a low profile and are usually sceptical towards any change. They are inclined to act dogmatically, are very rigid in their actions and will not consider any change unless the majority of their colleagues have already accepted it.

- The *antagonists* are usually loners and will resist any change, any new curriculum or revised curriculum – even if it is aimed at development or improvement.

Each of these respective attitudes may vary in depth. When district officials train principals and teachers, they should address the abovementioned attitudes of principals and teachers by identifying some of the *causes* of these attitudes. This is necessary since negative attitudes may eventually impact on the success or failure of the planning and implementation of the curriculum (Pratt 1980:426 – 432). Pratt further identifies some of these causes or factors which often lead to a resistance to change:

- vulnerability resulting from an uncertainty as to what the new curriculum contains

- a lack of motivation

- scepticism regarding the credibility of the new curriculum resulting from problems experienced in the above four factors

- a lack of sufficient resources such as material, administrative support and specialised knowledge and

- a lack of clarity regarding the development of the curriculum.

Czajkowski and Patterson (1980:160) render their views as being:

- a fear of the unknown

- a fear for new ideas

- a sense of security for that which is in place

- a lack of self-knowledge in terms of own abilities

- a lack of motivation

- a fear of criticism

- insufficient support by education leaders (cf. 3.4.3)

- indistinct and faulty teacher training (cf. 3.3.2)

- ambiguity and

- a lack of understanding of the nature and extent of the envisaged change (cf. 2.6.1.2).

The causes of resistance do not always lie with teachers as consumers, although they must often bear the brunt for failures. The reasons for resisting change can probably not be generalised, but contain a clear warning by the two writers Czajkowski and Patterson (1980:160), stating quite aptly that failure is most often attributed to teachers, not innovators and success to innovators, rarely to teachers.

Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin and Hall (1987:31 – 32) however, refer to these attitudes as 'stages of concern'. They state that principals and teachers may be at seven different levels of adapting to curriculum change and a level may be determined by a teacher her/himself. District officials should take note of these stages of concern when preparing teachers for curriculum renewal:

Level 0: 'I am not concerned about the innovation' (awareness).

Level 1: 'I would like to know more about the change' (informational).

Level 2: 'How the change will affect me' (personal).

Level 3: 'I spend a lot of time getting material ready' (management).

Level 4: 'How the change is affecting the learners' (consequence).

Level 5: 'I work with other teachers' (collaboration).

Level 6: 'I have ideas that would work even better' (refocussing) (Hord *et al*. 1987:32).

The levels are distinguishable but not divisible. Levels 0-2 pertain to the teacher, level 3 to the task at hand and levels 4-6 to the impact that the change has on teaching. A teacher may be at a certain level of adapting to change and may have concerns at most levels, but as the teacher adapts to renewal, he or she will become more prepared and motivated. The level of growth and development of teachers may reduce according to their success in moving through the levels (Hord *et al.* 1987:32).

Hord *et al*. (1987:31-32) further explain how teachers, when they adapt to change, may develop from an attitude of no concern (level 0) to an attitude where they refocus (level 6) and then their own initiative begins to develop. The pace and quality of development varies from person to person but it is in fact the preparation by district officials which may bring about the ascent and rapidness of teachers moving through the levels to level six. The role of district officials in preparing teachers for change through training is therefore a much needed part of managing the curriculum.

So, to determine the readiness of principals and teachers for the change to a new curriculum, it is necessary to identify the level of their attitudes towards the change during their training and to make them aware of the causes that may contribute to negative attitudes. These negative attitudes would impact on the successful planning and implementation of the new curriculum.

3.3.1.2   Commitment as a Prerequisite to Curriculum Change

Meaningful curriculum renewal is only possible if teachers are committed and there is dynamic leadership from district officials. Georgiades (1980:74) says the following of getting teachers committed: "Significant change in curriculum will not occur through wishful thinking but through hard work and diligent application.   Meaningful curriculum change demands a deep sense of understanding and, beyond all, a commitment to improve education". McNeill (1996:241-242) is more specific. He says that district officials often feel helpless in initiating a new curriculum since they find it difficult to persuade principals and teachers to respond enthusiastically and to carry out envisaged changes.

Czajkowski and Patterson (1980:174) allege that the actual contribution of district officials does not only lie in 'how to do it', but rather in giving moral support to principals and teachers by creating a climate which makes the envisaged changes possible. It is within a sense of commitment that a team spirit arises and a sense of 'ownership' develops. Commitment is therefore not only essential for the successful implementation of the curriculum, but also for breaking down resistance to change and turning limited powers into enabling powers.

The preceding discussion emphasises that curriculum change can only be successful if all principals and teachers are committed to the change. Therefore, district officials have, as one of their prime functions, the task of preparing teachers for the change to a new curriculum.

Workshops, seminars and information-sharing sessions on managing change should be conducted by district officials prior to the training of principals and teachers on the new curriculum in order to overcome the resistance to change. This will hopefully lead to maximum input in the implementation of the new curriculum.

Commitment to change therefore appears to be of cardinal importance – not only in eliminating resistance, orientating and motivating those involved, but also possibly in determining the viability of the implementation of the curriculum.

Change, and therefore also curriculum change, endeavours to make provision for, and satisfy the needs, of specific groups. This may include the needs of the country, community, learners and also teachers. District officials must therefore seek, by means of training, to motivate teachers with a view to satisfying these needs. Training is provided by district officials on managing change and there are opportunities for input – which may later lead to a positive attitude, acceptance and support of the envisaged curriculum.

After managing change, district officials need to embark on the training of principals and teachers on issues pertaining to the curriculum itself. This is discussed in the next section.

3.3.2 The Training of Principals and Teachers in the Curriculum

In my capacity as a provincial curriculum co-ordinator, I have found that various curriculum initiatives have failed because adequate teacher training by district officials has not been carried out. For the purpose of this discussion, the term 'teacher training' must be seen as *including* principals.

Basson, et al (1991:646) maintain that the school principal plays a key role in any change that takes place in the school – be it as initiator or supporter. However, the principal cannot play a key role without being trained in order to become more efficient in his/her task.

It is of cardinal importance that district officials keep schools fully informed on new developments in the curriculum, thereby ensuring optimal curriculum implementation (Hattingh 1989:17). It is necessary for district officials to train teachers *thoroughly* in the new curriculum because Gultig and Stielau (2002:372) say that, at a local level, teachers are challenged to develop a democratic curriculum which is entirely different from the one in which they grew up. At a global level, they are also challenged in developing citizens and workers suitable to be internationally competitive and adaptable.

Once the design of the curriculum has been finalised (cf. 2.6.1.3), the training of teachers normally follows (cf. 3.3.2) – undertaken by a number of district officials

who, in turn, were trained at national level. Teacher training comprises the preparation of teachers through the distribution of information, thoughts and concepts in order to make them aware of the envisaged curriculum. According to the HSRC Report of the Working Committee for Curriculum Development (1981:110-112), the training of principals and teachers is one of the key activities in a curriculum management process. It is a prerequisite for meaningful and successful implementation of the curriculum at classroom level and it is an important strategy when implementing a new curriculum. The implementation of a new curriculum has often failed as a result of defective or injudicious training.

The successful implementation of a new curriculum and high quality learning, mainly depends on the capabilities of the teachers and the effectiveness of the school system. Should teachers not be well-trained in the curriculum and the implementation at classroom level is not constantly supported, there will be little achievement regarding the high expectations of the reform. Brady (1996:13) emphasises that OBE will be unsuccessful if there is not appropriate, good quality training of teachers and sufficient support. Principals and teachers must therefore be monitored and supported by district officials as is alluded to in the forthcoming section.

MacLaughlin (2002:187) in turn, remarks that the training of principals and teachers in a new curriculum is deemed to be ineffective if it is concentrated and scheduled to take place prior to implementation only, like in the form of a once-off training. The advantage of such training is however, lower cost, but it does not address the critical fact that teachers cannot know what they ought to know, until the curriculum is being developed and implemented.

New innovations like a new curriculum, can fail when their planners overlook the 're-socialization' of teachers. Even willing teachers, writes MacLaughlin (2002:187), have to go through a learning and un-learning process in order to develop new attitudes, behaviours and skills for a radically new role. Concrete, inquiry-based activities, scheduled regularly during curriculum implementation, provide a means for this developmental process to take place.

Effective training by district officials is not only a requirement for the effective implementation of a curriculum, but also for the institutionalisation thereof. In other words, it is also for the establishment and consolidation of effective curriculum implementation into an accepted and inherent part of curriculum practice.

3.3.3   The Monitoring and Support of Principals and Teachers

As a provincial curriculum specialist, I believe that challenging factors experienced by district officials during the training of teachers, must constantly be borne in mind during the monitoring and support of teachers in the classroom since resistance also manifests itself in different ways during curriculum implementation. The challenge is therefore to identify the causes of this resistance (cf. 3.3.1.1) on a continuous basis by means of a survey, evaluation, baseline study or interview and to endeavour to break resistance down.

The real success of curriculum implementation is largely determined by the quality of the planning, design and teacher training done beforehand and the support provided by district officials during the implementation. The following four guidelines developed by Pratt (1980:435-442) provide district officials with strategies for monitoring and supporting teachers.

- Continuous contact with teachers to provide advice and assistance, to encourage mutual contact between teachers as well as effecting contact with learners and parents.

- Clear communication to illustrate roles, to explain terminology, illustration of possible means of evaluation and to supply answers to the frequently asked questions.

- Provision of a support service, for example, explaining time-tabling, support by supplying material, setting an example, creating a climate within which trust and security features and also through encouraging teachers.

- Compensation such as praise and acknowledgement, but also intrinsic aspects of compensation where successful implementation is regarded as sufficient

compensation. This creates an opportunity for professional growth by way of improved perspectives and increased responsibilities. A further advantage of intrinsic compensation is that it is the actual development which is rewarded and not its symptoms. Teachers often find their rewards merely in their acceptance of a new curriculum and not so much in the implementation of it.

Jordaan (1989:386-391) mentions that the way in which district officials monitor and support teachers will ultimately pay off for successful curriculum implementation. They should not only offer support during implementation, but problems must be addressed continuously, practice-oriented in-service training must be provided and supporters must be available on a continuous basis to offer assistance and encouragement. Many curriculum initiatives have failed because district officials have underestimated the importance of monitoring and support of teachers during curriculum implementation. It is dangerous to take the view that the most important work has been done once the teacher training by district officials has been finalised.

Lagana (1989:53-55) puts it clearly that managers must realise that teachers are able to determine their own requirements for professional development and that they are able to grow in this development – if scope to do so, is allowed. Sufficient support, time and scope by district officials must therefore be allowed for this purpose. Access to resources to stimulate development, must also be created. There must also be a climate in which there are shared values in terms of the vision. The school could then have a corps of informed teachers who accept responsibility for what takes place in the school.

It is therefore necessary for district officials to plan effectively for monitoring and support with a view to identify facilitating and inhibiting factors and to follow a suitable strategy which will ensure success. Dynamic curriculation is often determined by the achievability of a curriculum in practice and in this regard the monitoring and support come strongly to the fore. It is also during the implementation process that empowered teachers have to apply the appropriate curriculum skills like developing the three levels of planning, to ensure the correct interpretation and coverage of policy (cf. 3.4.2) and to include the key elements of the curriculum (cf. 2.6.1.3). The success may very much depend on the degree and level of teacher training by district officials. If this section provided the information

on the role of district officials, what is it then that is expected of the principal in managing the curriculum? The next section therefore offers an extensive outline on the role of the principal in managing the curriculum.

3.4   The Role of the Principal in Managing the Curriculum

Change in education around the world presents a number of challenges and places huge demands on schools. How schools respond to these challenges and demands, depends mainly on the role played by their school principals. Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:161) say that principals themselves, are the best or worst instruments in facilitating change. An outcomes-based approach has been implemented in a number of developed countries such as Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, New Zealand and in a couple of states in the United States of America (Malcolm 1999:80; Vakalisa 2000:21). Because of this new approach, the way in which schools are managed, needs to be re-organised. This places the role of the principal as curriculum manager, in the spotlight. Therefore, this section looks at the role of the principal in managing the curriculum.

Raywid (1990:153) notes that those who consider themselves to be agents of change are proposing two broad strategies for attaining their goals. The first is to return authority for decision-making to the school site and to democratise the process of decision-making. The other is to give teachers the right to develop the curriculum (cf. 3.5.1) for which they are responsible.

A principal is someone who has a significant impact on learners' opportunities to learn in the classroom. Donmoyer and Wagstaff (1990:20) emphasize the fact that principals influence teaching and learning whether it is intentional or not. Principals should therefore ensure that learners receive quality teaching both inside- and outside the classroom. This is their main function and all other responsibilities are secondary to this.

Sergiovani and Starratt (1988:2) argue that a few states in the United States of America have instructed all principals and supervisors to go through state-approved and sponsored management programmes as a prerequisite for their continued employment and as part of a licensing system to certify them as evaluators of teachers (cf. 3.4.6). Meanwhile, Van der Westhuizen (1991:4) says that, if teachers are expected to be

academically and professionally equipped before they can teach, the same requirements should be set for a promotion position – at least in terms of the post of a principal. This emphasises the need for educational leaders to acquire academic and professional training and skills in curriculum management.

As a curriculum leader, the principal has the responsibility of co-ordinating the curriculum and ensuring the implementation of policy.

3.4.1   Co-ordinating the Curriculum

Hallinger and Murphy (1987:57) maintain that principals co-ordinate the curriculum by ensuring that learners receive appropriate teaching in areas identified by the school district through policy. Principals should assist teachers in interpreting curriculum policy (cf. 3.4.2) as instructed by the DOE whilst implementing the curriculum (cf. 2.6.1). Drake and Roe (1986:152) also allude to the fact that improved teaching and learning should be the primary focus of the principal and Stoll and Fink (1996:105) agree by saying that the principal should work with teachers to promote learning.

Murphy *et al.* (1983:141) believe that principals co-ordinate the curriculum in the following three ways:

- they ensure that the curriculum content (cf. 2.6.1.3) is consistent with both learning outcomes and with the assessments used to measure the attainment of those outcomes

- they work to ensure that learning and teaching support materials used in their schools (cf. 3.4.5) are consistent and mutually reinforcing and

- they establish curriculum evaluation procedures and ensure that these evaluations occur on a regular basis (cf. 3.4.6).

Planning and staff meetings are also essential in the process of curriculum co-ordination. Planning is a continuous process that provides a forum for reassessing curriculum outcomes and activities, monitoring curriculum activities and modifying

practices in the light of curriculum demands. Curriculum issues can be identified and solutions determined before problems become crises – since problems often arise unexpectedly during curriculum implementation. Planning that is continuous, adaptive and congruent with the curriculum are better able to respond to these factors. Frequent staff meetings ensure less serious curriculum implementation problems and greater staff cohesiveness (cf. 3.4.4). Staff meetings not only provide a vehicle for articulating and working out problems; but they also give staff an opportunity to communicate curriculum information, share ideas and support each other (MacLaughlin 2002:188).

In terms of curriculum reforms in South Africa, the principal must ensure that the curriculum is implemented in their schools according to the time specifications prescribed by the RNCS policy (cf. 4.5.2.1). The timeframe is set out as follows:

2004:	Foundation Phase:	Grades R – 3
2005:	Intermediate Phase:	Grades 4 – 6
2006:	Senior Phase:	Grade 7
2007:		Grade 8
2008:		Grade 9 (EC DOE & MIET 2003:12)

The Imbewu Programme and the EC DOE (2003:10-11) state that the five principles of the RNCS (cf. 2.6.1.3) form the backdrop to the curriculum and are intended to guide teachers in curriculum development (cf. 3.5.1). Principals should, however, ensure that the first principle sets the scene for co-ordinating the curriculum as this is what makes the curriculum uniquely South African. This principle consists of four parts:

- Social Justice: Social justice refers to the responsibility of caring for learners and that everyone should have equal opportunities to improve their lives.

- Human Rights: the rights of learners are grounded in the day-to-day experiences of learners in their local environment and the violation thereof must be guarded against.

- A Healthy Environment: A healthy environment is necessary for learners to live and work in.

- Inclusivity: It is expected of schools to accommodate all learners – irrespective of their culture, race, language, economic background, gender or ability.

Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan and Lee (1982:41-42) elaborate further by maintaining that effective curriculum co-ordination also aims at effective teaching which includes elements such as the following:

- *Teaching time:* The effective use of teaching time can be ensured by:

  - allocating the correct time and period according to departmental prescriptions

  - introducing fixed test periods and

  - avoiding unnecessary encroachment upon lesson periods.

- *Class size and composition:* When drawing up the school time-table, the principal and the management team must ensure that classes have been put together as fairly as possible.

- *Distribution of work:* The work distribution of teachers must be as balanced and fair as possible so that staff can proceed with their teaching task uninterruptedly.

The effective use of teaching time, as indicated above, can be ensured by allocating the correct time according to departmental prescriptions. It stipulates that the formal school day for teachers will be seven hours and the formal teaching time per school week is 35 hours. This should be allocated as follows:

- Foundation Phase: Grades Reception (R) – 2: 22 hours 30 minutes and Grade 3: 25 hours 0 minutes.

- Intermediate Phase: Grades 4 – 6: 26 hours 30 minutes and

- Senior Phase: Grade 7: 26 hours 30 minutes and Grades 8 – 9: 27 hours 30 minutes (RNCS Overview 2002:17; DOE 2003:31).

In summary, it can be said that the success of the school should not depend on the principal alone. It should depend on the joint effort of the management team and the teachers – in other words, shared responsibilities (cf. 3.4.4.1) should be the order of the day. Glickman (1991:7-8) maintains that the principal of a successful school is not only the instructional leader, but rather the co-ordinator of staff. The principal can therefore use the staff in assisting him/her in curriculum issues. This suggests that deputy heads, heads of departments and senior teachers need to assist the principal in the running of the school.

Hallinger and Murphy (1987:61) warn, however, that inadequate knowledge in curriculum and instruction, fragmented district expectations, territorial treaties negotiated with teachers and the diverse roles played by principals, can prevent them from performing their role as curriculum co-ordinator effectively. Principals therefore need to be supported (cf. 3.3.3) in order to be able to fulfill their responsibilities more effectively. The principal has a number of facets that have to be co-ordinated but in the line of duty in managing the curriculum, he/she will also have to ensure the implementation of policy.

3.4.2   Ensuring the Implementation of Policy

According to Christie (2002:173), members of the government admit that South Africa has excellent policies but do not know how they are to be implemented. This generalisation might prove to be dangerous since it dodges the question of whether or not policies may be seen as 'good' while issues of importance in the implementation thereof, are ignored.

Christie (2002:174) also writes that policies formulated at national and provincial levels, pass through education bureaucracies to the complex contexts of schools. In order to sustain a thrust of 'change' through these levels, is often impossible since there are many officials in education who shape 'policy as a practice'. It is not

simply a matter of planning for policies to be able to reach schools through cohorts of implementers.

It is highly improbable that principals will participate in the formulation of curriculum policy but the principal plays an important role in translating departmental policies into practice. Carson (1984:19) says that the function of policy formulation should ideally be carried out by departmental officials since they have access to a variety of sources which may act in a consultative capacity. Specialists from universities and other government organizations could also be included. The principal's responsibility however, will only be limited to ensuring that both he/she and the staff:

- are familiar with the content of policy

- interpret policy correctly and

- base the implementation of the curriculum on departmental policy and guidelines.

Sergiovani and Starratt (1988:263) agree that the curriculum is *designed and produced outside* the classroom and *developed inside* the classroom as teachers prepare materials for classroom teaching. The principal as curriculum leader should assist teachers in contextualising curriculum policy and guidelines by altering-, rearranging- and reinterpreting them.

There are a number of policies that inform the development (cf. 3.5.1) and implementation (cf. 2.6.1.) of the curriculum (cf. 2.6.1.1 & 2.6.1.3). Principals should find these policies an essential and useful source of reference to support them when they and their teachers plan, teach and assess. The following policies are relevant (Education Labour Relations Council [ELRC] 2003:A2 – A98, B2 – B70, H42 – H53; Teacher's Resource Book 2004:15-17):

3.4.2.1   The Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS) Policy

The RNCS policy (Teacher's Resource Book 2004:15) provides the policy for the development and implementation of the revised curriculum for schools for Grades R-9. It promotes a learner-centred approach where learners' knowledge, skills and values are demonstrated in order to attain the prescribed outcomes that are rooted in South Africa's constitution.

The proponents of curriculum policy see the revised curriculum as a key factor in setting the scene and providing coherence for teaching and learning. The RNCS sets out the intentions of the policy makers. It guides and informs:

- district officials in the development of RNCS training materials

- teachers in developing the curriculum like Learning Programmes, Work Schedules and Lesson Plans (cf. 3.5.1.1 – 3.5.1.3)

- publishers in the writing of textbooks to support teachers and learners and

- evaluators in the selection of evaluation objects (cf. 3.4.6) and the setting up of criteria for evaluation at classroom, district, provincial or national levels.

Although stated implicitly, the RNCS describes the kinds of teachers required to operationalise its intentions. It therefore indirectly sets the agenda for the selection, training (cf. 3.3.2), management (cf. 3.4.4) and support (cf. 3.4.3) of teachers.

3.4.2.2   The Language in Education Policy

The Language in Education Policy (Teacher's Resource Book 2004:16) promotes additive multi-lingualism, respect and equity for all languages and full access and participation in the community. It also maintains the learner's home language and it provides access to additional languages.

3.4.2.3   The 'Norms and Standards for Language Policy in Public Schools'

The Norms and Standards for Language Policy in Public Schools (Teacher's Resource Book 2004:16) promotes the development of all official languages. It counteracts the disadvantages from mismatches between home languages and the Language of Learning and Teaching (LOLT) and it develops programmes for the redress of previously disadvantaged learners' languages.

3.4.2.4   The National Policy on HIV/Aids for Learners and Educators in Public Schools and Students and Educators in Further Education and Training Institutions

The National Policy on HIV/Aids (ELRC 2003:A2) recognizes the severity of HIV/Aids, its existence in schools and the need for intervention programmes. All stakeholders should be consulted and basic principles must be agreed upon. This policy promotes:

- prevention and care

- a school strategy on how to cope with HIV/Aids

- non-discrimination and equality for all and

- a code of conduct and responsibility.

The policy also suggests that a Representative Health Advisory Committee be established.

3.4.2.5   The Norms and Standards for Educators Policy

The Norms and Standards for Educators policy (Teacher's Resource Book 2004:15) policy, developed in 1998, promotes the seven roles of teachers namely: mediator, interpreter and designer, leader/administrator/manager, researcher, life-long learner, pastor, assessor and specialist. All of these must be developed to appropriate levels in teacher training. Teaching practice is the mode of delivery

through which all roles are to be developed and assessed. The policy also promotes teacher proficiency in more than one official language.

3.4.2.6 The Education White Paper 6: Special Needs Education Policy

Education White Paper 6 (Teacher's Resource Book 2004:17) promotes educational opportunities in an enabling environment for all, especially those with barriers to learning. It acknowledges and respects all differences, e.g. gender, race, ability, culture and it acknowledges that all learners can learn if a broad range of teaching styles are used.

3.4.2.7 The Religion and Education Policy

The Religion and Education Policy (ELRC 2003:H42) promotes knowledge, understanding, appreciation and respect for all religious traditions and equity between religion and education. It also promotes a broad base of religious activities at school within the framework of a school policy and enhanced constitutional rights and responsibilities.

3.4.2.8 The Assessment in the General Education and Training Band Policy

The Assessment policy (ELRC 2003:H48) promotes an assessment practice which is learner-centred and criteria-referenced. Its assessment enhances developmental growth, offers multiple opportunities and is based on outcomes. It is transparent, continuous, varied, flexible, valid and an integral part of teaching and learning.

The above brings about a certainty that the development and implementation of the new and revised curriculum at school level will have to be guided by the RNCS and other related policies. The principal therefore needs to ensure the implementation of policy in his/her school by aligning practice with it. Although the implementation of policy is vital for curriculation, the principal will also have a role to play in the monitoring and support of his/her teachers. This is why the following discussion on the monitoring and support of teachers is necessary.

3.4.3 The Monitoring and Support of Teachers

Sergiovani and Starratt (1988:357) regard monitoring and support as an in-class support system designed to provide assistance directly to the teacher. Donmoyer and Wagstaff (1990:25) suggest that, for this to work, it must be frequent and continuous. Principals should have time set aside for assisting teachers who experience problems in- and outside the classroom.

Sergiovani and Starratt (1988:350) see the principal's role of monitoring and support as a leadership function which involves professional observation of teaching and learning events and ensures improvement of the teacher's teaching abilities with the view to professional development. Sergiovani and Starratt (1988:306) also suggest that the improvement of curriculum implementation must start with the teacher. Teachers should therefore not feel threatened when the principal shows an interest in what they are doing in the classroom. The principal should also make teachers understand that the intention is to assist them where possible.

Krug (1992:432) declares that the primary service that schools offer, is instruction. The school principal should therefore ensure that, through a monitoring and support process, quality curriculum development is offered so that high quality teaching and learning can take place. Squelch and Lemmer (1994:11) regard the principal as the most important leader in the school – but not as the only person responsible for school improvement. This is why they maintain that an efficient team, comprising senior staff and the parent community, should support the principal in the monitoring and support of teachers. The principal's continued presence will also ensure that effective teaching and learning takes place – but for this to happen, meaningful staff development is necessary.

3.4.4 The Development of Teaching Staff

3.4.4.1 Good Leadership

In the past, decisions were made by the DOE or the principal and then passed down through a clearly defined hierarchy. It followed the route from principal to

Head of Department to teacher to learner. The problems associated with this style of management are the following:

- It is undemocratic and does not fit in with the new dispensation in South Africa.

- Decisions that are filtered down often get lost or are misinterpreted in the structure.

- It creates a negative attitude among teachers and learners since they have no power to shape the school as they wish. This makes it difficult for 'change' to take place (Management of the RNCS s.a.:10).

OBE schools should try to reduce the levels of the hierarchy to produce flatter, more open, participatory structures. This will improve the flow of information and create a sense of 'ownership'. This will also make it easier for managers to lead, rather than instruct (Management of RNCS s.a.:10).

Sergiovani (1990:24) and Loock (1998:11-12) regard leadership as *transactional* and *transformational*. The first type is characterized by a stage referred to as *bartering*. This is the stage during which negotiation takes place between the principal and the teacher. Reciprocal needs are addressed and needs for improvement of the school enjoy preference. Attention is given to both physical- and social needs. The principal and the teacher both know what is expected of each other. Once this negotiation stage has been completed, participation is consciously effected.

The second type, i.e. the 'transformational' type, is characterized by three stages. Leadership is now, after 'bartering', followed by *'building'*. This support stage is often characterized by uncertainty as it is the stage during which potential problems are identified, expectations created and specific needs of different groups addressed. It is also the stage of symbolic leadership since the leader begins to withdraw slightly and, as facilitator, begins to pave the way for intrinsic participation. It is also the stage during which teacher development (cf. 3.4.5) comes strongly to the fore. The aim is for a *commitment to change* to be made.

The third phase is the *'bonding'* stage during which greater clarity occurs and during which one rises above the ordinary routine tasks. More is done than is expected because a specific value system has begun to develop and persons now identify with these values. Objectives and the vision of the school are now shared and leader and follower are now 'bonded' together. This stage is therefore characterized by the existence of a shared value system which strengthens the bond.

The last stage is *'banking',* during which stage a routine is followed and institutionalization takes place. There is reciprocal confidence and the teachers have freedom – but in the process, values are maintained. The school principal remains the facilitator, but the teachers are now, in effect, all leaders and everyone's needs are also now met.

The Teacher's Resource Book (2004:72) points out, in terms of the revised curriculum (cf. 2.6.1.3), that the management style of the principal should also reflect the principles of the RNCS (cf. 3.4.1).

The move towards a more flexible structure means that responsibilities are shared. Effective teamwork is the hallmark of successful schools. If a culture of teamwork has been developed at a school then it is highly likely that the creativity of staff will improve (Management of the RNCS s.a.:11).

From these points of view it appears that, to develop teachers can be a huge challenge. The above illustrates how external powers do not decide what teachers need, but that it is a team process. The emphasis now falls on excellence, focus and enabling teachers. Accountability features strongly, intrinsic motivation is present, good group relationships prevail as well as shared leadership – all become part of the routine. Good leadership (cf. 3.4.4.1) is of cardinal importance to ensure that staff development comes to its full right. There is a clear connection between the standard of leadership and the standard of teacher development. Research conducted by Martin (1990) confirms this connection. This does not only apply to the principal as a leader, but also to the teacher – whether he or she is prepared to fulfill a leadership function or not. The principal

will, in any event, have to make an informed commitment to the development of staff. This then leads to a discussion on the principal's role in the development of teachers.

3.4.4.2   Teacher Development

Lagana (1989:54) says that innovative principals realise the need, not only to develop themselves, but also their staff. They would of course also have to undergo a process of development themselves to be able to function as educational leaders.

Dunlop (1995:147) writes that the key to improving the teaching- and learning process in school is the professional development of teachers. The school cannot change or improve from what it is, without the development of staff and changing their approach to teaching. Du Four and Berkey (1995:2-3) believe that people are the key source to school improvement. They argue that schools do not change, only individuals change. They therefore maintain that the fundamental role of the principal is to assist in creating the conditions that enable staff to develop – so that the school can achieve its goals more effectively.

The principal should therefore, identify the strengths and weaknesses of the teachers in order to provide support and find practical ways of overcoming the limitations of each teacher. Likewise, the principal should always be vigilant and consider all issues affecting the staff's productivity, effectiveness and job satisfaction. The principal should support the teachers and play a critical role in assisting them in understanding the school's needs and requirements. By doing so, the principal is able to contribute positively to the professional development of the staff.

Sergiovani and Starratt (1988:39) caution however, that the principal should bear in mind that staff development does not assume a deficiency in the teacher but instead, a need for people at work to grow and develop on the job. As curriculum manager, the principal should discuss the changes taking place with his/her staff and should persuade them to change their traditional teaching methods. The principal should also encourage the staff to attend in-service training and

workshops organized by the school, the Department of Education and/or the Non-Governmental Organisations in order to familiarize themselves with new developments.

The principal should see to it that teachers are developed according to their skills and capabilities. Bondesio and De Witt (1991:273) maintain that when the principal has the right attitude to personnel development and training, chances are much greater that teaching in each classroom will have maximum output and take place in the interest of all learners. The principal should therefore create internal in-service training for the staff. Such programmes should be conducted within the school context.

According to Hattingh (1989:10), staff development, just like the school in which it must serve, extends over a wide variety of fields which vary from mere organisational structures and channels, through elements such as the nature of the message and development, to social aspects such as resistance by the receiver, the characteristics of the trainer, social systems and individuals.

The social system makes provision for all elements which have to do with a school. It therefore refers specifically to line and staff networks, the network of authority structures in the school, the individual's receipt and use of new knowledge, the nature of the renewal or change and the impact of it on teachers, personal roles, character qualities and therefore actually any aspect which is connected to the staff who make up the school (Hattingh 1989:20). It seems as though teacher development is primarily related to attitudes, roles and responsibilities of teachers making up the school.

Rogers (1983:5-6) regards teacher development as a process of communication which takes place via certain channels for a period between members of the social system. Communication in this context is seen as a two-way process in which information-sharing takes place in order to come to a clearer understanding. Rogers also regards staff development as a type of social change through which the school's structures and functions should be adapted to the nature of the change or renewal.

Staff development is not always strictly planned and structured. 'Chance' training or diffusion may also take place. It is, however, clear that the possibility of successful implementation of the curriculum decreases in the case of intermittend planning and 'chance' training. Kelly (1980:67-69) distinguishes between these planned and unplanned activities, by using the terms *dissemination* and *diffusion*. Curriculum dissemination is regarded as a part of systematic administration where meetings, plans of action, timetables, circulars and organized in-service professional development programmes are responsible for the distribution of information – making the dissemination of information a structured- and planned process.

A very important aspect is also that, should principals be prepared to play a role in the development of teachers, it does not mean that they forfeit authority – in other words that "…teacher empowerment implies disempowering principals… we view teacher empowerment as a more intensive professionalisation of the teacher's role" (Kavina & Tanaka 1991:115).

What this in fact implies, is that there should be encouragement for teacher development which will require a particular leadership style other than the traditional ones. It would require a participative leadership style to provide opportunities for development and to encourage teachers in joint decision-making. Bernd (1992:64) puts it very strongly by saying that teacher empowerment loses its effectiveness if the teachers do not have a principal to keep them on track, well-informed and involved – so the principal must fulfil this role.

This requires that principals adopt new perceptions and attitudes. They will no longer be able to uphold traditions, but will have to break with them. Houston (1993:11-12) refers to this as 'transformational leadership' (cf. 3.4.4.1). He says: "The idea of taking one thing and making something else from it is a basic precept for the transformational leader. The leaders of the new world will be those who see a different world and realize they must also change to help others to get there".

There will have to be particular aims as to what must be achieved and there must be a joint effort in achieving these aims. The goal should be, according to Cunard

(1990:34), to prepare learners more effectively for the society in which they live. The principal therefore has the task of developing teachers in such a way that they will be able to make a contribution in this regard. In this way, not only is learner potential developed, but teachers are also empowered. Cunard (1990:33) says: "The principal who shares power with teachers is still a leader. I believe this principal is a more effective instructional leader because empowered teachers are more likely to maximize their potential".

The management team's idea which stems from participatory leadership, is described by Grafft (1993:18) as 'Teaming for excellence'. According to him, a great amount of success depends on the quality of interaction between principals and their staff. He suggests various steps which may be followed to promote this process and which will encourage the development of teachers:

- maintaining healthy working relationships

- building confidence

- developing and attaining clear objectives

- promoting social interaction

- carrying out effective conflict resolutions

- maintaining and promoting good personnel relationships and

- maintaining good communication skills.

Huddlestone, Claspell and Killion (1991:80-88) motivate why it is desirable to promote teacher participation in decision-making. They suggest a procedure to implement it. Their preparation phase includes the following:

- developing good communication channels

- conviction of the principle of 'participating in decision-making'

114

- developing the expertise of personnel

- evaluating the staff to see how receptive they will be to it

- building a base of knowledge in order to be able to take informed decisions

- showing confidence and support

- beginning on a small scale

- being on a small scale and

- being patient and realistic.

The phases that follow are those of experimentation, refinement and rounding off and institutionalisation. The message which comes through strongly from this, is that development does not take place overnight, but that it is a process which takes place over a long period of time.

The preceding discussion emphasises that teacher development must be based on good, effective and purposeful decision-making since these events must progress in a methodical and structured way. Within this development structure, communication figures strongly. Without good planning, goal-oriented and meaningful professional development cannot take place. Initial planning must be flexible since continuous adjustments must be made. Effective decision-making and problem-solving skills are also essential.

From the aforegoing in this sub-section it can be concluded that teacher development is not only a multi-faceted and complex process, but also critical in ensuring dynamic curriculation. There are a number of aspects to be considered, for example, what the nature, the essence and the objectives of professional development are, how those involved may be prepared for change, how resistance to change may be eliminated, what existing procedures may be utilized and what

the facilitating powers and the inhibiting factors are which may influence professional development and the institutionalisation of a curriculum.

Teacher development is therefore a highly complex and sophisticated process which must be carried out cautiously and purposefully to ensure success. A haphazard way of dealing with it, may seriously harm effective curriculation. South Africa is characterised by its rapid changes and the curriculum is no exception in the field of education. School curricula are amended and implemented without effective training for schools and parent communities. This situation creates a climate of dissatisfaction and resistance since all stakeholders have not been thoroughly prepared for the envisaged changes. Changes in the education system should be characterised by effective development to prevent a scenario of this nature. The success of the implementation of the curriculum will be determined by this development.

Teacher development therefore has a key role to play in the process of enriching teachers as curriculum agents. It appears that thorough development has not yet come into its own in practice. This will require dynamic leadership on the part of the principal. The more purposefully the teacher is guided, the more effectively the process can progress. Only then can there be talk of a dynamic and relevant curriculum process – but not without the skill of managing the resources in the school which is the topic of the next section.

3.4.5   Managing the Resources in the School

Duke (1987:204) maintains that resource management starts with a needs assessment and an assessment to determine what budget is needed to purchase the resources necessary for meeting those needs. Principals should not only ensure that there are sufficient teaching materials, supplies and other resources, but they should also ensure that these are passed on to the relevant teachers. Accordingly, Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:116-117) maintain that while the principal has a major role to play, teachers too, should be responsible for managing resources.

Learning and Teaching Support Materials (LTSM) and other resources, should be viewed as an integral part of curriculum implementation for the purpose of assuring

quality in education. Teachers need to be creative and resourceful in sourcing, designing and adapting materials for use in the classroom like newspapers, magazines and textbooks (Teacher's Resource Book 2004:36). All the different Learning Areas – and in turn different Learning Programmes – will rely on different resources for their success. Teachers will have to familiarize themselves with the resources needed and those available as they develop their Learning Programmes. Care should be taken not to develop Learning Programmes where a lack of access to resources will discriminate against learners. Teachers must also be sensitive to the limitations of learners who experience barriers to learning and how their progress may be affected by the availability of resources (DOE 2003:7).

The effective management of the school's resources will assist in creating an environment conducive to effective teaching and learning. Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:116-117) suggest that identifying the need for resources, obtaining the resources, creating an effective stock-taking system, securing the resources, distributing resources effectively and fairly and maintaining the resources, are central to the successful management of resources in a school. Pratt (1994:258) concurs with this. He says that, when planning a curriculum, six main areas of resources need to be considered namely materials, equipment, facilities, personnel, time and cost. When it comes to implementing the curriculum (cf. 2.6.1), clear specifications of the required resources can make the difference between success and failure.

Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:114) also remark that problems associated with the poor management of resources, can affect and undermine the morale of teachers. This in turn can lead to frustration, despair and failure. Likewise, it can minimise personnel effectiveness and job satisfaction. The results of this can have a negative effect on both the individuals and the achievement of the school's objectives. This then leads to another very important role of the principal, namely to evaluate the curriculum.

3.4.6   Evaluating the Curriculum

Many curriculum initiatives have failed because of the lack of ongoing evaluation practices. It is a poor reflection on the curriculum that, at times, the inadequacies of an educational innovation (cf. 2.5) are only discovered years after implementation. Implementation can only succeed through ongoing evaluation which should not only

be carried out at the end of a process, but be part of the process. The principal needs to take cognisance of the context in which the school operates and the evaluation should ideally be conducted by principals who have a sound knowledge of the current educational approach.

According to Workman (1998:14), it can be argued that principals – who, by implication, are involved in the learning environment – would be the most suitable evaluators. This does, however, raise the concern that such principals may lack knowledge in the field of evaluation. Yet, someone who may be deemed an expert in evaluation may also not be suitable, since the person may not be familiar with the curriculum and its context and therefore many vital issues could be overlooked or misinterpreted. What is necessary, is for principals to become more knowledgeable on evaluation. In this way, those directly involved in a school can be active participants in their own curriculum evaluations.

Ornstein and Hunkins (1998:324-325) argue that evaluation is a process performed to gather data enabling evaluators to decide whether to accept, change or eliminate something. Information is obtained to make statements of worth regarding the focus of the evaluation. Evaluators therefore need to determine whether the expected outcomes have been attained and to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum before implementation, as well as the effectiveness of its delivery.

Eisner (1985:195-196) states that curriculum evaluation comprises the evaluation or value determination of the effectiveness or functionality of all curriculation actions and the curricula which emanate from them. The aspects of a curriculum which must be evaluated are by their very nature comprehensive and it may happen that the available resources are insufficient to gather all the necessary information. Mosterd (1986:38) agrees by saying that a curriculum evaluation may determine the effectiveness of a curriculum by establishing whether the learning outcomes have been reached. She adds however, that an evaluation may also determine whether a curriculum is acceptable to teachers and learners or not.

Nevo (1986:15) states that evaluation should be conducted by individuals or teams who:

- display competencies in research methodology and other data-analysis techniques

- have an understanding of the social context and the unique substance of evaluation objects

- have the ability to maintain correct human relations with evaluees and to develop a rapport with them and

- provide a conceptual framework which integrates all the above competencies.

Although principals would be the most suitable evaluators, it is also common knowledge that an individual cannot take on the task of being 'the player and the referee'. Having considered the views of these two authors on the topic, it becomes clear that the ideal evaluator would be the evaluation expert – but one who has made a concerted effort in becoming familiar with the context in which the duties are to be performed.

Asprinwall, Simkins, Wilkenson, and McAuley (1992:14) state that *evaluation needs to be seen as an integral part of the management process*. It is not good enough to think of it simply as something which is a stage in the planning process, let alone something which is 'bolted on' as an afterthought. It must be a continuous subject of contention and must be soundly embedded in the curriculum process (cf. 2.6.1.3). If it is merely a *stage* in the implementation process, it can be postponed. If it is integral to the process, it cannot. Pratt (1994:339) echoes this statement by saying that the task of curriculum- and programme evaluation does not end when the curriculum is implemented (cf. 2.6.1). There should be dialogue between stakeholders of the curriculum. This constitutes evidence of true commitment to feedback and renewal.

Ongoing evaluation is therefore one of the most crucial aspects in managing the curriculum. The reasons for this is not only to prevent disasters, but also to be able to carry out the implementation of the curriculum effectively. These are elaborated on in the next section.

3.4.6.1 The Reasons for Principals to Undertake an Evaluation

Stakeholders in education often expect that evaluation will solve many pressing problems. The reasons may be:

- the public who demands accountability

- the curriculum developer (cf. 3.5.1) who needs to be acquainted with improving curriculum materials (cf. 3.4.5) and

- the teacher who is concerned about the effect of learning opportunities (cf. 2.5.5.2b) on individual learners (McNeill 1996:263).

The purpose of evaluation therefore, is not to inspect for defects, but to magnify existing conditions in such a way so as to improve on them. Evaluation has the implicit capacity to build and to improve situations and for this reason it should form an integral part of the curriculum process. Through evaluation, changes occur continuously and possible weaknesses are not left to degenerate. A curriculum initiative may therefore change considerably from its origin (cf. 2.6.1.2) since information gathered through the process of evaluation, is applied (Workman 1998:14). Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (1985:184) share these views by elaborating further. Programmes cannot be improved unless there is an awareness of their strengths and weaknesses and unless curriculum planners, curriculum developers, curriculum implementers and principals become aware of better ways of improving them. Goals must be matched with the needs of people, planning effectively requires an awareness of options and relative merits and convictions of good work need to be supported by evidence. It is therefore necessary for public servants to subject their work to competent evaluation.

Ornstein and Hunkins (1998:324) reckon that the purpose of evaluation is to illuminate on all the variables within a learning environment so that adaptations can be made to a learning process. It therefore requires that principals have an in-depth understanding of the nature and purpose of evaluation which is, broadly speaking, categorised as follows:

- We evaluate to gain information about the nature or characteristics of a learning programme.

- We evaluate to gain information about the quality or merit of a learning programme.

The first one of these reasons may involve working with processes, implying that a reason to evaluation, is to improve processes. The second may relate more to the judgements that are a part of accountability needs. The purpose of evaluation then, can be summarised as "…to provide information on the effectiveness of projects so as to optimize the outcomes, efficiency and quality of the curriculum" (Fink 1995:2).

Rogers and Badham (1992:3) brave another two major purposes for evaluation of performance:

- accountability to *prove* quality: for example to demonstrate that funding is being properly deployed to maintain and improve implementation standards and

- development to *improve* quality: for example to assist in the process of improving curriculum implementation.

McGaw (1995:7) further states in this regard that where the purpose of evaluating is accountability, the focus is on *outcomes*. Where the purpose of evaluating is improvement or development, the focus is on *process*.

The rationale for the performance of schools, according to these two writers, is twofold:

- to *prove* to society and government that quality exists by evaluating *outcomes* for *accountability* and

- to continuously *improve* implementation performance by evaluating *processes* for *improvement and development*.

Hopkins (1989:14-15) lists three types of decisions to be made when planning an evaluation – the first two being in congruence with the purposes set out by the previous two writers:

- Curriculum *improvement*: deciding what teaching materials (cf 3.4.5) and teaching methods (cf 2.6.2.6) are suitable and where change is needed.

- Decisions about learners and their *outcomes* (cf 2.6.1.3b): identifying learner needs in order to plan the teaching, judging learner merit for purposes of selection and grouping, acquainting the learner with his own progress and challenges toward attaining the curriculum objectives.

- Management practice: judging how sound the entire curriculum process is (termed systemic evaluation) and how good individual principals are (cf 3.4.4.1).

He also emphasises that curriculum *improvement* is probably the major focus for a curriculum evaluation. Evaluating to judge the effectiveness of the whole curriculum (cf. 2.6.1.3), is here also seen as an important function of the principal as evaluator.

Nevo (1995:17) relates the terms, the 'nature and quality' of the curriculum, to well-used approaches to evaluation like 'formative and summative' evaluation or with the similar distinction between 'pro-active evaluation' which informs decision-making, and 'retro-active evaluation' which informs accountability.

These terms clearly reflect the purposes of the evaluation and are often used to describe the approach to be used for the evaluation. It could, however, be a rather theoretical explanation for the principal who is not considered to be a professional evaluator.

On a more practical note, Marsh and Willis (1995:257) report the following reasons for principals to undertake evaluations:

- an interest in improving teaching and making a better job of meeting the needs of learners (cf. 2.6.1.3a)

- a desire to examine the effects of, or problems introduced by, new curricula (cf. 2.6.1.3) or curricula changes (cf. 2.6.1.2)

- a concern to justify or give a 'stamp of approval' to implementation practices (cf. 2.6.1) in the face of criticism from parents or the public

- a response to teacher dissatisfaction with implementation procedures conveyed through colleagues or professional associations

- a desire to settle conflict in the school in terms of personalities, power or roles and

- an opportunity for individuals to increase personal status (to 'build an empire'), gain promotion, change the balance of power or gain higher qualifications.

The array of reasons offered by these writers should provide principals with a clear understanding of the vast area in which evaluation operates.

Nevo (1986:15) expresses similar sentiments to the aforementioned writers and is of the opinion that curriculum evaluation can serve four different functions:

- for improvement (formative)

- for selection and accountability (summative)

- to motivate and gain public support (socio-political) and

- to exercise authority (management).

From the above it seems that the literature on the purpose of evaluation is comprehensive. A great deal of repetition occurs between authors but new perspectives on the matter are also visible. It is, however, necessary to obtain all these views so that a workable practice may be established.

In summary, it can be said that the purpose of an evaluation is to allow curriculators to revise, compare and maintain or discontinue their implementation actions. Evaluation enables them to make decisions, draw conclusions and to furnish data that will support their decisions. Not all evaluation efforts are aimed at securing data and making judgements regarding learners' successes. It often centres on establishing the staff's capabilities or attitudes towards the curriculum.

Attention needs to be given to issues in the curriculum that need to be evaluated but how are these issues (often referred to by writers as 'evaluation objects') selected? Since the selection of evaluation objects are so central to evaluation, it is the focus of the next section.

3.4.6.2 The Selection of Evaluation Objects

The question may be asked: "What is it in the curriculum that should be evaluated?" There are a number of ways to approach this question, but in each case it basically involves the key elements of the curriculum (cf. 2.6.1.3a - 2.6.1.3e).

In the Nevo (1995:11) definition he refers to the 'what' of evaluation as the 'educational objects'. Nevo (1986:15) also lists educational objects as projects, learning programmes (cf. 3.5.1.1) and learning and teaching support materials (cf. 3.4.5).

Ideally, everything that is performed in the name of education should be evaluated to determine its worth and how improvements can be made. Some form of evaluation may be expected at every level in the curriculum process e.g. national, provincial, district, school and classroom level. Typical evaluation objects in curriculum implementation are outcomes (cf. 2.6.1.3b), learning content (cf.

2.6.1.3c), teaching methods (cf. 2.6.2.6) and learner assessment (cf. 2.6.2) (Nevo 1986:15).

Marsh and Willis (1995:258-259) suggest that principals, when evaluating for curriculum, should use four curriculum 'commonplaces'– teacher, learner, content and milieu. All four of these commonplaces may well be addressed in any evaluation, but each may receive different degrees of emphasis depending on the purpose of the evaluation.

Another useful classification of what should be evaluated, is the commonly accepted key elements of the curriculum – purposes and principles (cf. 2.6.1.3), outcomes, content, teaching methods and learner assessment. Again the purposes of the evaluation will determine which of the objects may receive emphasis within the evaluation. If *accountability* (cf. 3.4.7.1) is a major focus, then measuring *outcomes* should give useful information. While it may seem that measures of outcomes will only give data required, it is usually desirable to obtain information about the teaching and learning *processes* that contribute to attaining the outcomes (Brady 1995:250-251).

Curriculum anticipations and particularly the anticipations with long-term effects, usually arise from a rationale for the Learning Area (cf. 2.6.1.3d). Human (1986:25-26) also elevates the importance of focus areas for each Learning Area, illustrating that it may include examples like 'responsible citizenship' for Human- and Social Sciences or 'more logical thought' for Mathematics.

The *value* of a curriculum then, does not exclusively lie locked up in the immediate outcomes thereof, but also in the consequences which the curriculum has for individuals and the community in the long term. What these viewpoints are actually saying, is that the Learning Outcomes must not be regarded as an *ends* (result) in itself, but rather as a *means* (process) in achieving the broader outcomes. It means that the Learning Outcomes – only in terms of the long-term effects thereof – are subject to evaluation.

Human, Taylor and Steyn (1986:30) write that the term *resources* refers to curriculum resources such as study material (text books), teaching- and learning

aids, curriculum equipment and other facilities (cf. 3.4.5). Such resources can, by their very nature, also be evaluated. The term *learners* however, includes the dispositions, background and circumstances of learners which may have an effect on curriculum events and outcomes.

Rodgers (1983:144-145) mentions that there are specific main categories in terms of which curriculum evaluation should be addressed. These categories are:

- content of the specific Learning Areas

- resources for teaching

- organisation and structure of the implementation

- teaching methods

- classroom management and

- teachers' functions.

Here too, the multi-faceted nature of curriculum evaluation is apparent.

Drake and Roe (1986:274) contend that the principal cannot exercise leadership (cf. 3.4.4.1) to improve learning without evaluating the results of the teaching process. Evaluation is also essential for the continuous improvement of each individual in the school – including learners and teachers. Bondesio and De Witt (1991:265) regard the following as some of the opportunities that the principal can make use of, when carrying out an evaluation:

- class visits

- staff meetings

- extra-mural activities and

- social occasions.

To evaluate the staff, the school principal should decide on 'when', 'why' and 'how' this task will be performed. The principal as curriculum manager (cf. 3.4) should have a background knowledge of the activity or object to be evaluated. Without this knowledge, evaluation will be meaningless to the teacher.

Duke (1987:82) maintains that the evaluation of a teacher should be in accordance with the policies of the school. This generally implies that once evaluation has been undertaken, a written report should be compiled and the teacher concerned should be issued with a copy. Moreover, it is necessary that the strengths and weaknesses of the teacher be discussed constructively and the report kept for official purposes. As Drake and Roe (1986:274) sum it up, evaluation is a continuous process, which focusses on improving the effectiveness of teaching and attaining the goals and objectives of the school. Evaluation should therefore be used as an aid to improve work performance. However, Drake and Roe (1986:274) maintain that improvement cannot result from evaluation unless changes are also implemented.

It can be concluded that almost anything in the curriculum process can be an object of evaluation and that evaluation should not be limited to the evaluation of learners or teachers only. A clear identification of the evaluation object is an important part of any evaluation process. It is also evident that it is the purpose of the evaluation that informs the selection of evaluation objects. If the purpose is *accountability*, the *product* (outcomes) will be the evaluation object – if the purpose is *improvement or development*, then the *process* (method) becomes the evaluation object.

From the preceding discussion on the role of the principal in managing the curriculum, it seems that principals have long been considered to be the curriculum leaders in the school. However, this may be more the ideal than the reality since many principals are still the link between the district office, teachers and parents. Currently it appears that the roles of principals, along with the roles of teachers in managing the curriculum, are certainly changing. This is due to an effort in restructuring the curriculum. Principals as curriculum managers therefore have a number of functions to perform but since this

does not exclude the teacher from playing an important role in managing the curriculum, the focus then turns to the role of the teacher in managing the curriculum.

3.5   The Role of the Teacher in Managing the Curriculum

Apart from the main function of the teacher which is implementing the curriculum at classroom level, or more commonly referred to as the teaching process, the teacher also has a management function to perform which precedes curriculum implementation. This management function is mainly to develop the curriculum which is to be implemented. The teacher's involvement may vary from curriculum development at classroom level to school, district, or even provincial level.

Developing a curriculum involves a large number of stakeholders – both school-based and community-based. It also involves different levels of planning (cf. 2.6.1.3f; 3.5.1.1 – 3.5.1.3) like the school level and the classroom level and at times, even the national level.   Concern among people, for certain types of curricula, is that curriculum development largely is a political activity in which there is competition for authority and control, for scarce resources and for the importance of certain values.

The teacher occupies a central position in curriculum decision-making. The teacher decides what aspects of the curriculum, newly developed or ongoing, to implement in a particular class. The teacher also determines whether to spend time, and how much of it, on developing basic skills or crucial thinking skills. Observers point out that when teachers close the classroom door, they determine the details of the curriculum – regardless of the curriculum plans of others. Teachers are clearly the most powerful implementers of the curriculum (Klein 1991:34)

In addition to being curriculum implementers at the classroom level, teachers are also involved in curriculum committees. Some of these committees are established at grade level, others according to the learning area and others according to the type of learner under consideration. A committee may be for the gifted or the learning-impaired learner. The formation of a committee is the standard way of involving teachers in curriculum activities beyond the classroom (Kimpston & Anderson 1986:109).

Effectively teachers should be involved in every stage at every level of curriculum development. Although not all teachers wish to be involved in all stages, all teachers, by the very nature of their role, are involved in the implementation of the curriculum. Teaching is implementing the curriculum at classroom level. Teachers also need to be part of broad curriculum development from the formulation of aims and goals to the evaluation and review of the curriculum (Reynolds 1992:14).

Teachers should, by the very nature of their work, be practising intellectuals. Giroux (1988:125) argues that the teacher should be viewed as an intellectual, engaged in some form of thinking. Teachers should not be viewed as performers, professionally equipped to attain any goals set for them, but rather as professionals with a special dedication to the values of the intellect and the encouragement of critical thinking in learners.

3.5.1 Developing the Curriculum

Developing the curriculum, is to a large extent determined by the teacher's role at classroom level. The extent to which the teacher accepts and executes the role of curriculum developer, determines the effectiveness of the implementation process thereafter. Therefore, whenever there is talk of curriculum development, the teacher's role and involvement in it, comes to the fore. The three levels of curriculum development within a phase, referred to as levels of planning, have already been discussed (cf. 2.6.1.3f). It explains that these levels are the three-year phase plan which is referred to as the Learning Programme, the one-year plan for each of the grades in the phase termed the Work Schedule and the short-term plan for the weeks, months or term within a year – referred to as the Lesson Plan.

The nature of teacher involvement may not always be to play an active role in the development of the curriculum. It may take the form of consultation and feedback before, during and after the development. While there will be far greater participation during implementation, it still remains of prime importance, that the teacher is the central figure who cannot, and may not, be entirely ignored during development (Oliva 1988:55). The teacher plays an important role in the development of the curriculum since he or she will be the implementer of the relevant curriculum (cf. 2.6.1). Human *et al.* (1984:19-20) reflect the statement of

Oliva above by regarding the teacher as the person who will eventually implement the curriculum and who may gather valuable insights into defects in the curriculum. West, Farmer and Wolff (1991:1) sum it up succinctly by saying that "all teachers design instruction … and all instructional designers teach".

The RNCS Teacher's Guide for Foundation Phase (DOE 2003:1-2) agrees with the above writers, stating that curriculum development theories and practices in recent times have focussed on the role of teachers in developing effective teaching-, learning- and assessment strategies. The guide states that the RNCS curriculum is to be implemented in schools by means of Learning Programmes (cf. 2.6.1.3e). Teachers are encouraged to develop their own Learning Programmes and this should be carried out in line with the prescribed RNCS policy.

Beauchamp (1983:90) motivates the teacher's involvement by indicating that the curriculum development process is an educational process. Through his or her active involvement in the development of the curriculum, the teaching- and learning situation (implementation) may take place more effectively. Loucks and Lieberman (1983:131) link up with this by ascribing poor implementation to a lack of teacher participation: "Without adequate participation, the chance of successful implementation greatly diminishes". Saylor *et al.* (1981:100) support this idea and mention that a lack of participation may lead to a misconception of what is expected of the teacher in curriculum implementation (cf. 2.6.1).

Currently it appears that the roles of principals, along with the roles of teachers in curriculum activities, are changing. Part of this is due to an effort in restructuring schools. Raywid (1990:153) notes that those who consider themselves to be agents of change are proposing two broad strategies for attaining their goals. The first is to return authority for decision-making to the school site and to democratise the process of decision-making (cf. 3.4.4.2). The other is to give teachers the right to develop the curriculum for which they are responsible (cf. 3.5.1).

Czajkowski and Patterson (1980:172-173) say that it is the teacher who often has the best specialist knowledge of the curriculum and that the utilisation thereof may lead to greater development in the school as well as in the classroom. Levy (1991:366-367) however warns that a few reasons may prevent teacher participation from

coming into its own, i.e. limited training, limited time, rigid prescriptive syllabi and bureaucracy.

The preceding discussion emphasises that a very high value is placed on teacher involvement in the development of the curriculum. How it will appear in practice, is determined by the teaching approach.

From the above paragraphs the following points become clear:

- Teacher participation in – and involvement with – curriculum development are essential for the whole process of curriculum implementation.

- A lack of involvement may have negative implications for the school and the teacher.

- The promotion of teacher participation in curriculum development may lead to greater professionalism and self-empowerment.

- Attempts to limit teacher participation are unrealistic and unproductive.

- Teacher involvement in curriculum development varies at the various curriculum levels.

Relevant curriculum development is not only assured at a broad district level, but also through curriculum actions of those involved at other levels of planning such as the school, subject or classroom level (cf. 2.6.1.3f).

3.5.1.1   The Development of Learning Programmes

The RNCS Teacher's Guide for Foundation Phase (DOE 2003:2) explains clearly that the Learning Programme (cf. 2.6.1.3f) is a phase-long plan that provides a framework for planning, organising and managing classroom practice in each phase. It specifies the scope for teaching, learning and assessment for the phase and is a structured, systematic arrangement of activities that promote the

attainment of Learning Outcomes and Assessment Standards for the phase (DOE 2002:15-16).

Teachers may act as facilitators and initiators in the broad school curriculum which is aimed at the development of Learning Programmes. Teacher involvement is therefore not only limited to the development of Work Schedules (cf. 3.5.1.2) and Lesson Plans (cf. 3.5.1.3), but has broader implications for the school curriculum. The extent of support that the teacher receives, will determine the success of the development process and the initiative of the teacher (Weiss 1980:178).

The extent of teacher participation in the development of the school curriculum will be determined to a great extent by the particular school atmosphere, opportunities for participation and the level of teacher training. It would then be the responsibility of the teacher to take up these opportunities and to participate fully. This may have positive spin offs in the classroom since the teaching may then also seek to attain school objectives (Beauchamp 1983:96).

It may not always be possible for teachers to contribute to Learning Programme development but it is desirable that they should have some input in it. This would largely depend on the extent to which principals create opportunities for it. Teacher initiative is, however, also of importance in that teachers, either individually or collectively in their Learning Area (cf. 2.6.1.3d) groups, should initiate change.

3.5.1.2 The Development of Work Schedules

A Work Schedule (cf. 2.6.1.3f) is a year-long programme that indicates how teaching, learning and assessment will be sequenced and paced in a particular grade. It is a delivery tool – a means of working towards the achievement of Learning Outcomes specified in the Learning Programme and includes the Assessment Standards that will be achieved in a particular grade (DOE 2003:2).

Cawood, Muller and Swartz (1982:68-69), already in the eighties, expressed this view by saying that a subject curriculum includes more than just the objectives

and selected core content. The subject curriculum includes all the details for a school year which the teacher may require in order to teach effectively in the subject. Principals should encourage flexibility so that they do not dampen the teacher's spirit for personalizing the teaching and experimenting with it.

A similar view, also from the eighties, is that the subject curriculum comprises a description of systematically selected and classified aims, content teaching, learning activities and experiences, teaching methods and learner assessment procedures for a subject. However, this does not necessarily mean that all components should always be present (Human Sciences Research Council [HSRC] 1984:2).

The development of Work Schedules should take place with input from Learning Area meetings, societies, study groups at teacher centers, Learning Area committees and teachers' unions. Active participation of the teacher in Work Schedule development can lead to a more effective teaching and learning situation.

The subject curriculum is therefore an overarching facet which consists of *various components* including the syllabus.

3.5.1.3 The Development of Lesson Plans

A Lesson Plan (cf. 2.6.1.3f) is the third level of planning and is drawn directly from the Work Schedule. It describes the teaching, learning and assessment activities in detail that have to be implemented in a certain time (DOE 2002:15). A lesson plan could range from a single activity to a term's teaching, learning and assessment and may last from a day to a week or a month. It includes 'how' teaching, learning and assessment activities are managed in the classroom in terms of teaching style, approach and methodology (DOE 2003:2-3).

It appears that the classroom is probably that level at which the teacher will become more actively engaged in curriculum development since it is the level at which the actual implementation of the curriculum (cf. 2.6.1) takes place. Weiss

(1980:176) is of the opinion that teachers should have the primary responsibility for what takes place in their classrooms.

Writers, such as Beauchamp (1983:96), emphasise that teachers will probably conceptualise the curriculum arising from their experiences in the classroom. Other factors which may also influence the conceptualisation of the curriculum are teacher training (cf. 3.3.2), sizes of classes, school- and education policies (cf. 3.4.2) and a great emphasis on cognitive development (Weiss 1980:176-177).

In the classroom the teacher plays a significant role – particularly in terms of developing the classroom curriculum. To be able to do this, the teacher must be able to identify objectives, analyse content, plan activities and learning experiences, select training methods and sequence learning events. Thereafter it is equally important to be able to assess the learner (Carl 1986:219).

To summarise issues around curriculum development, it can be said that teacher engagement is essential for successful and meaningful curriculum development since teachers will be the eventual implementers thereof and will experience the problems first hand. If teachers 'own' the process, more improved professional development (cf. 3.4.4.2) may occur and this may result in a higher standard of curriculum development. When teacher participation is encouraged, there should also be sufficient support from district officials (cf. 3.3.3), since it is unrealistic to expect that teachers themselves will have the necessary competence and knowledge to develop the curriculum.

Teachers should not be passive receivers of the curriculum but as empowered curriculum agents they should also show initiative and act as agents for renewal. Through utilising existing mechanisms, as well as creating new input mechanisms, teachers may make a valuable contribution to curriculum development. The value of teacher involvement in curriculum development in order to ensure effective curriculum implementation, cannot be over-emphasized.

At school level, in the development of Learning Programmes, the teacher also has a role to play although the climate in the school and the leadership approach of the principal, will determine this input. Teachers may assist in enriching and

extending Learning Programmes by displaying a critical adaptation and by liaising with the school's educational leaders. A team approach is essential in order to interrupt and review the *status quo*, but for this physical and moral support are necessary. Teachers may therefore also act as initiators and facilitators at school level. It is however often the case that if initiative is suppressed, teachers may show resistance to any form of change or renewal. Within the development of Learning Programmes, the teacher may contribute to more comprehensive Work Schedule development. Even more detailed curriculum development follows in the form of Lesson Plan development.

It appears from the literature that it is particularly at micro-level in the classroom where the teacher would show the greatest degree of participation in curriculum development. Teachers conceptualise the curriculum in a unique way in the classroom – perhaps differently to what is envisaged by the developer at a broader level. Co-operation and involvement in the first level of development is therefore of cardinal importance. The roles that teachers play here, may be more specific or more general in nature but the successful execution of these functions implies active contributions and can only mean positive results for the particular curriculum.

The core of the matter therefore appears to be active teacher involvement in developing the curriculum. Barrow (1984:269) even alleges that teachers must be able to act autonomously and that education must be given back to teachers. Flexibility will encourage teachers to participate.

It is clear that the teacher may well have responsibilities in curriculum development at even broader levels like the district, but the greatest responsibility will probably lie at school and classroom level where Learning Programmes, Work Schedules and Lesson Plans are developed. This should be the point of departure for curriculum development since, from this point, a greater contribution at the broader level may be brought about.

It would be an ideal situation if all individuals had a role in developing the curriculum and in sharing accountability for its effective implementation. The

results will enhance the educational process and lead to the ultimate goal of quality education for all learners.

In summary it appears that, from the role of the teacher in managing the curriculum, curriculum development may take place at various curriculum levels – the development of Learning Programmes at school level and the development of Work Schedules and Lesson Plans at classroom level.

In this chapter the management of a curriculum was discussed. Local- and international literature have been reviewed to determine how the roles of district officials, principals and teachers in managing the curriculum, are viewed. Many of the tasks they have to perform were alluded to, which brings the writer to concluding this chapter with a number of implications that curriculum management may have for district officials, principals and teachers.

3.6   Conclusion

In conclusion it can be said that departmental officials, school principals and teachers should carry out the above tasks as well as other responsibilities in a manner that is in line with the objectives of the curriculum. However, they cannot perform these tasks effectively without the relevant training and support from stakeholders. A look into the implications that curriculum management might have for district officials, principals and teachers, may reveal the vastness of the tasks envisaged for them.

3.6.1   Implications for District Officials in Managing the Curriculum

The whole issue of district officials having to train principals and teachers, is not a simple matter. The district official must ensure that the teacher will have specific curriculum skills and knowledge after the training which will enable him/her to be effectively involved in the classroom and outside of it. The teacher must ultimately not only be able to do micro-curriculation in the classroom, but also at school or even district level.

The process of teacher training by district officials includes Learning Programme development, Work Schedule development and Lesson Plan development. The

teacher must be encouraged to even take part in the development of the broader curriculum at district-level. Here however, participation may be of a more indirect nature. To participate at this level, district officials would have to ensure that teachers develop a certain amount of aptitude, knowledge and skills. The important issue which arises here, is that the teacher must not be a mere implementer of the curriculum at classroom level, but must be trained by district officials to be an agent for change who is able to develop and implement the relevant curriculum dynamically and creatively. Only then can it safely be assumed that the teacher can make a valuable contribution to developing the curriculum and implementing it.

A further question may arise: 'What must district officials train teachers on?' Specific areas in which teachers may be trained are:

- the development of Learning Programmes, Work Schedules and Lesson Plans

- the selection of content (cf. 2.6.1.3c)

- determining teaching strategies   and

- assessing the learner (cf. 2.6.2) (Du Four & Eaker 1987:85-87).

It is most desirable that district officials, in the process of teacher training, will also encourage a self-empowerment process and that it will not only be conducted by them as external agents (Carl 1994:192). The teacher will therefore have to be pro-active and engage in some self-study. District officials must ensure that teachers have a broad knowledge and understanding of educational views, a sound knowledge of the learner, a positive teaching attitude, good educational relationships and also a knowledge of, and expertise in, the general field of curriculum including Learning Areas (cf. 2.6.1.3d). The teacher will then not only be trained to be a Learning Area specialist, but also to be involved in general curriculum aspects at school level. Aspects such as the place and value of a particular Learning Area within the broad curriculum framework then becomes relevant for teaching and learning.

According to Nihlen (1992), teacher involvement may come to the fore when teachers also begin to function as researchers. In this way they no longer are civil

servants, but are rather seen as trained teachers. District officials should put mechanisms in place to realise this function.

Fullan (1993:16-17) maintains that beginner teachers should not only be trained by district officials to teach well, but also in bringing about changes if necessary. This requires that teachers will always remain 'students' so that they may develop in this area of expertise. District officials must include teachers to contribute to a better teaching environment in the classroom by becoming involved beyond the classroom.

From the above it is obvious that teacher training involves a reasonable amount of time and effort by district officials. The debate is most certainly not over. In future, high demands will be made on teachers to play a greater role as curriculum agents, than was the case in the past. To be able to do this, requires that they be *trained* by district officials to do so with a view to enabling them to make a contribution to the transformation of their teaching environment. If this then is required of district officials, what then are the implications for principals in managing the curriculum?

3.6.2   Implications for Principals in Managing the Curriculum

In his presentation, Martin (1990) says that principals must be able to maintain good human relations, be able to identify people's potential and maintain good interpersonal communication skills. Principals must also show their teachers that they have enough confidence in them to give them the freedom to plan their own Learning Programmes and to take independent decisions. Following this view, Ornstein and Hunkins (1988:69) say " …teachers are virtually an untapped source of energy and insight, capable of profoundly changing the schools …". Levine (1987:43) confirms this point of view by saying that one of the school principal's main objectives should be to democratise schools. This involves respecting every individual and treating them with dignity so that growth and development of the people on whom he relies, will take place. The principal must ensure that there are opportunities for consultation in decision-making, that every teacher's expertise will be utilized and that, if necessary, even restructuring of systems will take place. He further says that, to be part of a democratic society, would require the development of teachers' skills, attitudes and responsibilities. This will make particular demands

on the school principal. According to Mc Coy and Shreve (1983:102-103), these tasks require such school principals to:

- be self-actualized

- make provision for maximal growth and development on the part of both the staff and themselves

- be accessible to their staff

- build on the strengths and energies of their staff and utilize them

- be prepared to take risks and

- have good communication skills.

For this to happen, facilitation workshops will be required. If all the above can be acquired, it will also promote a sense of 'ownership'. Ownership is only possible within a climate of shared decision-making, according to Cherry (1991:33). No restructuring is possible without it. Teachers should not feel threatened by school principals, but should see the development of the school as a team. This will mean, therefore, that school principals will have to 'share power' in order to attain the common goal.

Rowley (1991:28-31) gives an example of how schools may be restructured. This requires a particular skill on the part of the principal. Change may include the development of a climate for participation and the redefinition of roles, experimentation and risk-taking. Reep and Grier (1992:90-96) confirm this strategy and emphasise the willingness to take risks. They say: "If you are dedicated to risk-taking efforts, you must provide a safety net for those testing new waters and communicate to your staff that failure is acceptable". A new management philosophy is necessary, characterized by good communication, a suitable climate, the development of interpersonal relationships, participation in decision-making and acknowledgement of the professionalism of teachers. Foster (1990:38-40) also describes a similar procedure to operationalise staff development (cf. 3.4.4.2).

An essential duty of the principal has been described as 'ensuring the implementation of policy' (cf. 3.4.2). This has several implications for principals managing the curriculum:

- **The RNCS Policy**

    - principals need to interpret the national/provincial guidelines

    - ensure that the development of Learning Programmes (cf. 3.5.1.1) is based on this policy

    - ensure that the implementation of the RNCS at classroom level (cf. 2.6.1.3) is based on this policy and

    - the development of LTSM (cf. 3.4.5) must also take the content of this policy into account.

- **The Language in Education Policy**

    - There should be support for learners whose Language of Learning and Teaching (LOLT) and Home Language (HL) are different.

    - The school language policy must be derived from the Language in Education Policy.

    - A composition of learners and staff must determine school language policy.

    - The weighting of language teaching must be taken into account.

    - The methods used, must include code switching and teacher assistance.

- **The Norms and Standards for Language Policy**

  - must support general conceptual growth amongst learners and

  - must promote full participation in society and in the economy.

- **The National Policy on HIV/Aids**

  - Schools should develop an HIV/Aids policy.

  - There must be Life Skills and HIV/Aids programmes in schools.

  - Health care partners in the community must be identified.

  - Learners must be provided with information on HIV/Aids prevention.

  - Schools must develop a policy on First Aid.

  - There must be an individual Learning Programme for an ill learner at home.

  - Parents and families of sick learners must be supported.

  - The stigma and discrimination against learners and teachers must be addressed.

  - Teaching and learning for learners who are infected or affected by HIV/Aids must be adapted.

- **The Norms and Standards for Educators**

  - Teachers should be provided with training to improve their proficiency in more than one official language.

- Prospective teachers should be given opportunities to do practice teaching in schools – during their Pre-service Education and Training (PRESET).

- Teachers should teach in the phase for which they were trained.

- **Education White Paper 6: Special Needs Education**

  - Schools must develop a school-based Support Team.

  - Teachers should be provided with training to assist learners with disabilities and barriers to learning like In-service Education and Training [INSET], professional and staff development.

  - Schools must develop networks and support mechanisms.

  - Principals must ensure that the curriculum is flexible in terms of adaptations, pace, learning styles and groupings to accommodate a range of learning needs.

  - Teachers must demonstrate sympathy, sensitivity and tolerance to promote the principles of Inclusive Education.

- **The Religion and Education Policy**

  - Teachers should be provided with training (INSET, professional- and staff development) in Religion and Education.

  - Diverse belief systems, values, festivals, rituals and customs should be catered for in the school.

  - Religion must be dealt with objectively.

  - Religion, although dealt with in Life Orientation, must also be built in across Learning Areas.

- Parent information sessions must be arranged.

- **Assessment in the GET Band**

  - Teachers should be provided with training (INSET, professional- and staff development) in assessment strategies.

  - The school must follow the assessment policy framework for teaching and learning.

  - Principals must ensure that teachers plan before, during and after assessment – it promotes reflection and re-planning.

  - Learner activities (cf. 2.6.2.6) must be relevant to Learning Outcomes (cf. 2.6.1.3b) and Assessment Standards (cf. 2.6.1.3c).

  - Assessment must be transparent (cf. 2.6.2).

  - Assessment strategies (cf. 2.6.2.5) must be adapted for different learning styles and for learners with disabilities.

From the above it can be deduced that good leadership (cf. 3.4.4.1) is essential for the development of teachers (cf. 3.4.4.2). It is a particular view which will lead to either purposeful development – or the absence thereof.

Evaluation, also one of the functions of the principal (cf. 3.4.6), is a complex stage in the curriculum process. From the descriptions of evaluation, the complexity and multi-faceted nature of the field of evaluation becomes evident. The implications that curriculum evaluation has for principals, are numerous. They would be expected to make a significant contribution at school level and to be very involved in evaluations in the school.

The entire nature and purpose of evaluation is associated with making decisions about curriculum matters. A number of ideas dealing with the reasons for an

evaluation were examined along with several definitions to prove that evaluation is an essential part of curriculum process. It requires the expertise of principals as well as resources, as is the case with other major stages of the curriculum process. Evaluation as an integral part of the management process was dealt with and the competencies required by principals in order to become good evaluators, were emphasised. As managers they have an important role to play in evaluation and should not see evaluation as being detached from this role.

Competence in selecting evaluation objects were dealt with proving that clarity and discretion are essential requirements in dealing with the selection of evaluation objects.

After recognising the listed implications, principals should form a picture of the completeness, comprehensiveness and meaningfulness of their role as evaluator. An evaluation plan may probably not comply with all these requirements, but the value of these implications lies in the fact that the role of the principal as evaluator is identified. The utilisation thereof may therefore make a valuable contribution to evaluating the implementation of the curriculum.

Evaluation is a necessary component for improvement. Curriculum structures and functions cannot be improved unless it is evident where their strengths or weaknesses lie and unless educators become aware of better means. There is no certainty that outcomes are of any worth unless they can be matched to the needs of the learners. Planning effectively is impossible if options and their relative merits are not clear. Constituents can also not be convinced that good work has been done and continued support deserved – unless evidence shows that promises were kept and beneficial results have been produced. For these and other reasons, teachers must subject their work to competent evaluation. Evaluation results must assist teachers in sorting out the good from the bad and point the way to much needed implementation improvements. Principals are accountable to the department, learners and other stakeholders and should therefore gain a better understanding of evaluation issues.

However, teachers are also implicated in matters pertaining to the management of the curriculum. This is captured in the next section.

3.6.3   Implications for Teachers in Managing the Curriculum

Teacher involvement is essential for successful and meaningful curriculum development since teachers will eventually be the implementers thereof and experience any problems first-hand. If teachers contribute to it, professional growth is ensured and this may lead to a higher standard of curriculum development. When teacher involvement is encouraged, there should, however, be sufficient support for them since it is unrealistic to expect that teachers themselves will have the necessary competence and knowledge to develop the curriculum.

Teachers should not be passive receivers of the curriculum. As curriculum agents they should also show initiative and act as agents for renewal. Through utilising existing and creating new input mechanisms, teachers may make a valuable contribution to curriculum development.

In the development of Learning Programmes, the teacher has a role to play – although the climate within the school and the leadership approach of the principal, will be determining factors of this involvement. Teachers may assist in developing the school curriculum and by liaising with the school's educational leaders. A team approach is essential and physical and moral support for teachers are necessary. Teachers may act as initiators and facilitators at school level. It is however often the case that when initiative is muted, teachers may show resistance to any form of change and renewal. Within this broad school curriculum, the teacher may in turn contribute to more comprehensive year long Work Schedule development and Lesson Plan development.

In a changing and developing country such as South Africa, it is necessary that all stumbling blocks in the curriculum process be removed. South Africa has a need for dynamic curriculum management so that relevant education may prepare learners for the world of work.   Relevance is therefore essential.   Curriculation must be purposeful in order to produce an informed workforce and provide for other needs. This is only possible if the curriculum is well grounded from the Learning Programme to the Lesson Plan.

It appears from the above implications that it is particularly at classroom level where the teacher should show the greatest degree of involvement – that is in terms of lesson plan development. Teachers interpret the curriculum in a unique way in the classroom – perhaps different to the way it was intended by the developers of the broad curriculum. Therefore co-operation and involvement in the initial development is also of cardinal importance. The roles that teachers may play in Lesson Plan development, may therefore be more specific or more general in nature. The successful execution of these functions implies active involvement and can only mean positive results for teaching and learning.

The core of the matter therefore appears to be active teacher contribution. Barrow (1984:269) even alleges that teachers must be able to act autonomously and that education must be given back to teachers. Principals must be flexible in order to make teacher participation possible and to develop them.

From the above, a perception can also be acquired of the broad and the narrow nature of the field of curriculum management that curriculum agents such as district officials, principals and teachers must take into account. It is a field which is clearly difficult to capture in a single definition since there are so many variations of, approaches to, and views on, the curriculum. Van Rensburg (1992:5) mentions: "For South Africa to have any hope of competing in the same league as the global economic society, education will have to be more relevant to employment and the quality of both education and the work force will have to improve". Focus must be placed on the development of relevant skills to meet the needs of the country. The challenge for good curriculation is the emphasis on effective curriculum management. Having dealt with the way in which a curriculum should be managed, it would be appropriate at this point to turn the focus to what is actually happening in the field regarding the implementation of OBE perceived from a management point of view.