

## **Implementation and Management of a Curriculum**

### **Contents**

Introduction

- 6.1 Curriculum Implementation
- 6.2 Approaches / Perspectives of Implementation
- 6.3 Components of Implementation
- 6.4 Five Dimensions of Curriculum Change
- 6.5 Factors affecting Curriculum Implementation
- 6.6 Levels or Stages of Curriculum observed during Implementation
- 6.7 Implementation Analysis or Project Monitoring
- 6.8 Curriculum Management
- 6.9 Sri Lankan Experiences of recent Curriculum Reforms

## **Introduction**

This Essential Reading Six is the last Reading of the Course on ‘Teacher Educator as a Curriculum Developer’. This Reading deals with the Implementation and Management of a Curriculum. A curriculum becomes a reality only when teachers implement it with real students in real classrooms. The Reading commences with a discussion on two approaches or perspectives of implementation. Then components of implementation and five dimensions of curriculum change are presented and discussed. Under the section on factors affecting curriculum implementation six factors including teacher involvement are discussed. The levels or stages of curriculum that can be observed during implementation are discussed next. The importance of implementation analysis or project management, and its principles are highlighted in the next section. The Reading concludes with a brief discussion on the different aspects and stages of curriculum management and Sri Lanka Experiences of recent Curriculum Reforms.

### **6.1 Curriculum Implementation**

We shall commence this Reading with the following extract from a report of the National Education Commission, Sri Lanka (1992) which describes in a nutshell some important tasks and aspects pertaining to curriculum implementation:

‘The CURRICULUM prescribes and determines the methods and practices adopted in a given course. It serves as the PLAN for the teaching and learning activities not only for the teachers and learners but also guides the supervisors, managers and others having monitoring and executive functions in relation to it. During implementation specific methods and practices need modifications and fine-tuning in the light of observed outcomes. Such adjustments are likely to be localized ones and intended to improve the implementation of the curriculum in particular contexts. The persons who implement a plan should be given the freedom and the resources for making any necessary adjustments.

All those who are involved in planning and implementation should work with the clear idea that a plan has a limited duration. Hence while a plan is being implemented there should be concomitant analysis of its shortcomings, a study of changes that are taking place both as result of implementation of the plan and other causes, and exploration of alternate strategies that are better suited to meet future needs, in addition to ongoing monitoring and mid-course corrections. These tasks should be pursued actively.”

Colin J. Marsh (1992) has highlighted another important aspect of curriculum implementation when he observed that:

“Curriculum (which) starts as a plan .... only becomes a reality when teachers implement it with real students in a real classroom. Careful planning and development are obviously important, but they count for nothing unless teachers are aware of the product and have the skills to implement the curriculum in their classrooms.”

It follows from the two quotations given above that curriculum implementation refers to the actual use of a curriculum or what it consists of in practice. In other words, it is the process of putting a change into practice and the means of accomplishing desired educational objectives. The amount and quality of change which occurs or fails to occur at implementation will significantly affect what outcomes are achieved in any given change effort.

Thus, implementation consists of putting into practice something which is new to the person who is attempting to bring about a change. Changes can be in the form of externally developed innovation or ones which are locally or self-developed. In either case individual implementers are involved in a process of change (Fullan, 1991).

Taken as a whole, implementation is a process over time by which people, events, and resources determine whether or not practice is altered when something new is attempted. In implementation the focus is on the extent to which actual change in practice occurs and on those factors which influence the extent of change.

## **6.2 Approaches / Perspectives of Implementation**

There are two distinct approaches or perspectives of implementation in research literature: (1) Fidelity of Implementation or Programmed Orientation Approach, and (2) Mutually Adaptive / Adaptation or Process Orientation Approach.

### **6.2.1 The Fidelity of Implementation or Programmed Orientation Approach**

This approach to implementation assumes that the change has certain programme requirements established by its developers. It emphasizes clearly that practice should conform to the developer's intentions. Here a structured approach to implementation is recommended whereby teachers are given explicit instructions about how to teach a unit or course. This implies that the classroom teacher must be thoroughly trained to use the new curriculum package and once having received this training, will teach it at a high level of technical proficiency.

This approach is suitable for curriculum packages where the content is complex and difficult to master and thereby requires careful sequencing. It can also be used in subjects where teachers may lack the necessary knowledge or skills; and in subjects or units where appropriate diagnostic and achievement tests can be incorporated. Many of the nationally produced curricula come under this category.

### **6.2.2 The Adaptation or Process Orientation Approach**

This approach to implementation assumes that the exact nature of implementation cannot and / or should not be prespecified, but rather should evolve as different groups of users decide what is best and most appropriate for their situation. Adherents of this approach maintain that differing organizational contexts and teacher needs will require on-site modifications. They suggest that all innovations become modified during the process of implementation and this is vital, if it is to achieve the outcomes desired by the users.

Programmed (Fidelity) approaches to implementation are appropriate under situations having clear and consensual goals, well worked out innovations, and minor focused

changes. Programmed changes have the advantages of being more clear, more specific, and easier to assess.

Adaptive approaches are more effective under situations having conflict over goals, incomplete development, and major changes. These changes have the advantage of allowing for more individual choice, and development suited to a variety of situations. However, they frequently create confusion about what should be done. As the change is continually evolving, and varies across situations this is extremely difficult to assess.

### **6.3 Components of Implementation**

Components of implementation refer to the components of existing practice which are altered as a result of implementing something new. Thus change in practice is multidimensional. We have already discussed in Reading Five the eight distinct dimensions of curriculum spelled out by Leithwood (1981). These are really the components of curriculum implementation:

1. Describing changes in global conceptions;
2. Objectives;
3. Student entry behaviours;
4. Content;
5. Instructional material;
6. Teaching strategies;
7. Learning experiences; and
8. Assessment tools and procedures.

Curriculum changes, whether they are externally or locally developed, involve a number of changes in what teachers (and others) think and do. Altering aspects of one's beliefs, using new curricular materials and technologies, employing new teaching strategies and learning diagnoses are all aspects of components of implementation (Fullan, 1991).

## **6.4 Five Dimensions of Curriculum Change**

Several studies on the implementation of curriculum innovation have been made. Fullan and Pomfret (1977) who reviewed this research identified the following **five dimensions of curriculum change**:

Changes in:

- i. Subject matter and materials;
- ii. Organizational structure;
- iii. Role / behaviour;
- iv. Knowledge and understanding; and
- v. Value internalization.

Most curriculum innovations require changes in all five dimensions. Failure to recognize the need for change in one or more dimensions may result in adopting the form but not the substance of an innovation. One example for this situation is the failure which occurs in inductive approaches to science when teachers do not change their classroom behaviour and continue to lecture.

## **6.5 Factors affecting Curriculum Implementation**

### **6.5.1 Teacher Involvement**

Ultimate success or failure of a curriculum depends on the quality of the teacher's own planning and implementation. The teacher is the final decision maker concerning the actual learning opportunities provided to students, although students have the final choice regarding their response to experiences provided.

Research on curriculum implementation shows that the extent to which a curriculum is implemented in the classroom is associated with teacher involvement in the process. However, it cannot be assumed that teacher involvement in curriculum development assures implementation. It is important that teachers should understand what is wanted in the curriculum and they should make a genuine commitment to ensure its success.

Taba (1962), Fullan and Pomfret (1977), and Fullan (1991) have identified several other categories of factors that influence implementation of a curriculum innovation. Of these factors the following six factors are discussed below:

1. Characteristics of the Innovation / Change;
2. Strategies and Tactics;
3. Characteristics of Adopting Units;
4. Sociopolitical Factors;
5. Factors external to the School System;
6. Organization of the School / Institution and its Institutional Facilities.

### **6.5.2 Characteristics of the Innovation / Change**

Four major characteristics of innovation identified in research literature are:

- Need and Compatibility;
- Explicitness or Clarity;
- Complexity; and
- Quality and Practicality.

Curriculum changes are not always based on an assessment of need, especially as perceived by those responsible for working with the change. Research suggests that the question of need and compatibility makes a difference in terms of whether something happens.

Clarity (about goals and means) is another perennial problem in the curriculum change process. Problems related to clarity have been found in virtually every study of significant change. The degree of clarity on the part of those attempting something new is related to the degree of change in practice which occurs. Innovations which are described in abstract, global, or ambiguous terms lead to user confusion, lack of clarity, and frustration.

Complexity refers to the difficulty and extent of change required of the individual involved in implementation. The actual amount of complexity depends on the starting point for any given individual or group. Many changes involve an array of activities, diagnostic skills, teacher strategies and pedagogical understandings if effective

implementation is to be achieved. The ease of implementation declines as complexity increases.

The quality and practicality of the learning materials being used are directly associated with the nature of the change. Many curriculum changes fail to get implemented because the learning materials are insufficiently developed. Research has found that several large scale curriculum development efforts have suffered because of inadequate attention to the quality, usability, and appropriateness of materials (Lewis, 1991).

### **6.5.3 Strategies and Tactics**

The methods used in introducing and implementing innovations should support the process of resocialization of teachers and administrators. This is a basic condition for the success of implementation. Four important methods or strategies which support this process have been suggested in research as follows:

- i. In-Service training;
- ii. Resource support;
- iii. Feedback mechanisms; and
- iv. Participation in decision making.

Intensive and ongoing in-service training of teachers linked to problems of implementation is an important factor for the successful implementation of a curriculum. In-service training should provide demonstration lessons, models and experiences to teachers. It should also provide psychological reinforcement conducive to resocialization. Research has demonstrated that significant changes in practice occur when staff development activities are conducted prior to and during curriculum implementation.

Provision of necessary materials and resources required for implementing the curriculum well in advance of the launching of curriculum in school is very essential for its success of implementation.

A successful strategy for curriculum change is the provision of a feedback mechanism to identify problems encountered in implementation, and suggest solutions to such problems, and provide support for addressing such problems. Sometimes high



expectations for success of a curriculum on the part of sponsors and administrators can create unrealistic pressures on teachers. This may distort feedback if teachers resort to hide their problems and failures and make a pretense of success.

The strategy of getting curriculum implementers or users (teachers) to participate in decision making is very complex and controversial. However, several psychological and sociological studies have found that those involved in implementing a decision should participate in making the decision if it is to be effectively implemented. Fullan and Pomfret (1977) conclude from research that “active involvement in the development process appears to be the critical factor, rather than participation in decisions per se.”

They recommended that users be codecidors with authorities on invitation and adoption of innovations; be co-planners of training experience in planning for implementation stage; and be problem solvers and evaluators during implementation.

#### **6.5.4 Characteristics of Adopting Units**

##### **i. Adoption Process of Adopting Units**

The selection of the approaches used in the adoption and decision process plays a pervasive role in the implementation.

Two types of adoption processes, namely, opportunism and problem solving have been identified in the research literature.

Opportunism is responding to the availability of funds with little local commitment.

Problem Solving addresses itself to locally identified needs. It has been found that problem solving process has led to greater changes.

##### **ii. Organizational Climate of Adopting Units**

Several studies have found that organizational climate of adopting units plays a crucial role in whether and how implementation occurs.

In the case of a school-based change such as a curriculum implementation, the principal of the school is a key factor. His or her support to the staff through provision of materials and time, involvement of staff in decision making, and enthusiasm for the innovation are essential for implementation to be effective. High morale of teachers and interaction among them are contributory factors for effective innovation.

### **iii. Basic teacher preparation and development**

Teacher preparation and development is basically another critical factor in the implementation, non-implementation, or mis-implementation of a new curriculum. Intensive and ongoing in-service teacher training and adequate resource support to teachers are essential for this preparation and development.

### **iv. Country / Provincial / District / Zonal level leadership**

The leadership at different levels encompasses a number of variables which influence implementation. Broad conditions for change in the province / district / zone are set by the nature of its leadership. Central Ministry / Office staff who show an active interest in determining the type of changes needed, in supporting adopted changes during the initial implementation period, and in assessing their impact have an influence on the quality of implementation. The central administration can influence the climate for change in the province / district as a whole through leadership in planning, through communication, and through decisions about resources, and selection and development of other leaders in the province / district.

## **6.5.5 Sociopolitical Factors**

### **i. Adequacy of implementation of political decisions, and the need for avoiding haste**

It is the usual practice in many situations to make efforts to obtain as many adoptions as possible in the shortest time once a political decision is made to implement an innovation. This approach has a negative effect on implementation. Because of the urgency of introducing new programmes inadequate time is spent in planning and specifying implementation strategies. As a result of this haste, and because of the desire to avoid a risk of rejection or delay, the most important process of obtaining or determining acceptance by users is ignored.

## **ii. Recognition of the importance of Teacher Incentives**

The personal costs for teachers in trying new innovations are high in terms of energy, time, and sometimes trauma involved in learning new skills. Generally, teachers are expected to bear these costs at their own expense. With little or no incentives and high personal costs, teachers may resist the innovation.

### **6.5.6 Factors external to the school system**

Three factors which may facilitate or inhibit curriculum implementation are given below:

- i. Policy change;
- ii. Financial or Material resources;
- iii. Technical Assistance.

A certain amount of pressure for changes to be implemented will be exerted once government policy decisions regarding a new or revised curriculum are made. However, the mere existence of the policy does not result in much implementation unless other factors mentioned in this Section (6.4) are also conducive to change.

Regarding financial and material resources, Berman and Mc Laughlin (1977) observe that the availability of financial or material resources does not guarantee curriculum change as there are a variety of opportunistic reasons why school systems seek additional resources.

External assistance given only at the orientation stage does not result in much change in practice, unless the local conditions and strategies reinforce the external assistance.

### **6.5.7 Organization of the School / Institution and its Institutional Facilities**

The organization of the school and its institutional facilities need to be shaped to implement the curriculum. However, what usually happens is the reverse. The functioning curriculum is fitted into the existing arrangements and shaped by the limitations in these conditions. When the conditions necessary for implementing a curriculum design are not fulfilled, a discrepancy between the intended and the actual curriculum is naturally created (Taba, 1962).

## 6.6 Levels or Stages of Curriculum observed during Implementation

John Goodlad (1978) after visiting hundreds of classrooms in the United States of America observed and identified four levels of curriculum in its implementation as follows:

1. Formal Curriculum - as set forth by the state and local schools;
2. Perceived Curriculum - what teachers say they are trying to do;
3. Observed Curriculum - what observers see when present in the classroom;
4. Experiential Curriculum- what students are perceiving and reacting to.

When means (that is, responses to the question: “How shall it be taught?”) are separated from ends (that is, responses to the question: “What shall be taught?”) the curriculum experienced may vary from the curriculum planned. Means and Ends become consistent when the curriculum is based on the consideration of all elements in the experience of the learner.

Because of this discrepancy observed in a curriculum during implementation the Second International Science and Mathematics Studies of the 1980s regarded curriculum as having three sequential stages (Rosier, 1987; Garden, 1987) as follows:

1. Intended Curriculum: In most systems this is defined at the level of the authority in charge of education, which may be the country as a whole in a highly centralized system or an individual school board in a decentralized system. At some stages of education in some system the curriculum may be defined at the level of the individual school or even of the individual teacher.
2. Implemented Curriculum: this has its locus at the level of the individual classroom. It is the task of the individual teacher to interpret the intended curriculum, translating it into a set of learning experiences that the teacher deems to be appropriate for the particular group of students in the class.
3. Achieved / Attained Curriculum: This refers to the extent to which individual students have internalized the experiences that were planned and organized for them. This is the part of the intended curriculum delivered to students and which is manifested in their achievements and attitudes.

The curriculum at each of these levels / stages is influenced by the context in which it occurs, and the contexts themselves are determined by antecedent conditions and factors. It is the responsibility of teachers and others involved in implementation to take every effort to identify and reduce the discrepancies between these curriculum levels / stages.

## **6.7 Implementation Analysis or Project Monitoring**

When embarking upon an innovative project such as the implementation of a new curriculum we know that adaptation, adjustment and flexibility will be required to try to cope with all the unforeseen disincentives, difficulties, disagreements and unintended consequences or side-effects that are very likely to crop up. Yet because we do not know in advance what they are, we cannot plan in detail how to deal with them. What we can do is to design into the project a capacity to monitor the continuing implementation of the project in order to detect such divergences and discrepancies, to analyse their provenance or causation, and to take whatever remedial or corrective action is appropriate and feasible (Hurst, 1981).

Trial, and Adaptation are two principles which lie behind the notion of implementation analysis. Innovations are, to their potential adopters, fraught with unknown hazards and uncertainties. However, hesitations, skepticism and reluctance that arise as a result of such hazards and uncertainties can be reduced by adopting the innovation initially on an experimental basis on a reduced scale or for a reduced time. This is why increased provision is made for 'first-phase' projects of a trial nature. It is very important that 'pilot' projects are followed up.

The principle of adaptation requires that the new idea can be modified so as to adjust it to fit the requirements and capabilities of those who are supposed to implement it, if this is at all possible. In addition, they may have to make adjustments themselves in order to incorporate and institutionalize or routinise the new idea. In schools this often means adjustments to the timetable, to superior-subordinate relationships, information flows, decision making procedures, and relationships with parents and other members of the school community. Adjustments may also be needed in more mundane but very practical matters such as the organization of physical space,

buildings and equipment, cleaning and janitorial staff, provision of textbooks and other consumables, and the like (Hurst, 1981). These requirements will need to be addressed by the Managers responsible for the implementation of the curriculum.

## **6.8 Curriculum Management**

Paul Hurst (1981) referring to the ‘administrative inflexibility’ pertaining to curriculum implementation observes that:

“The concept of implementation analysis or project monitoring and remedial or corrective action as the required style for successful innovation, puts a heavy premium on managerial flexibility – on being able to analyze and deal with the unforeseeable problems of change as and when they occur. I need hardly dwell on the fact that few ministries are organized to function in this way, being (at their best) more intended to manage steady –state or expanding systems rather than changing ones”.

Hurst further says that a recent common trend has been to try to cope with this problem by decentralization. Although it is widely believed that decentralization and increased participation in decision making favor innovation, the empirical evidence does not confirm this view (Hurst, 1979).

The transition from pilot curriculum projects to large scale national adoption of a curriculum is often made without adequate provision of necessary facilities such as teachers, textbooks, and physical resources. Many curriculum projects do not include monitoring and evaluation procedures to enable necessary revisions to be made. Curriculum Management is the process of making arrangements for the implementation of a curriculum efficiently and effectively by providing the necessary facilities and developing an ongoing monitoring and feedback system.

The curriculum is not merely a set of documents but a particular combination of formal, informal and non-formal learning experiences that occur within a school. The collegial interaction of staff of a school and their interaction with students are of major importance. All teachers are involved to a certain extent in managing the Curriculum. However some have a greater impact than others such as the Principal, Deputy / Vice Principal, Sectional Heads and Grade Coordinators of the school.

However much impressive a curriculum is, if it is not implemented efficiently in school, the quality and the amount of learning experiences acquired through it by students and its impact to the society will be minimal. Therefore a curriculum has to be managed effectively in school if it is to be a success.

Successful management of the school curriculum depends upon the Principal's capacity to maintain a purposeful concentration on the tasks in hand while at the same time providing sensitive and encouraging support to individuals.

#### **6.8.1 Stages of Curriculum Management**

There are five stages in the Curriculum Management Process, namely, (1) Planning; (2) Organizing; (3) Staffing; (4) Direction; and (5) Control.

Planning involves setting goals for implementing the curriculum and following strategies to achieve the goals.

Organizing is the systematic arrangement of human and physical resources in order to implement the plan efficiently.

Staffing involves the selection and appointment of suitable personnel to perform the tasks involved effectively and efficiently.

Direction comprises two aspects: motivation and leadership.

Control is the guidance for performing the intended tasks as planned.

Most curriculum writers agree that there are four basic phases in the process of curriculum change:

- Orientation / Needs Phase
- Initiation / Adoption Phase;
- Implementation / Initial use Phase; and
- Institutionalization / Continuation Phase.

We have already discussed the first three phases. Institutionalization occurs when a curriculum innovation is supported in schools after an initial period of use. The real test for the continuance or disappearance of an innovation comes after external funds have been terminated or after consultant assistance has stopped.

It is appropriate to conclude this Reading on Implementation and Management of a Curriculum with the following observations of Paul Hurst (1981):

“The story of educational innovation so far is a story of people who assume that their ideas are correct and fruitful, and that when they do not work, it is someone else’s fault. But the right approach assumes that the idea itself is always capable of development, and that any innovative project is essentially experimental. Thus the principles for design and management of such projects are those of the scientific experiment. .... Unfortunately most trained educational administrators are trained to be planners rather than experimenters. Their training predisposes them to assume that, if only sufficient careful forethought can be taken, error can be avoided. .... The experimenter, by contrast to the planner, is concerned not to avoid error but to seek it out.”

## **6.9 Sri Lankan experiences of recent Curriculum Reforms**

### **6.9.1 Primary Education Curriculum Reforms**

The 1997 Primary Education Reforms of Sri Lanka were implemented first as a pilot project in all Grade 1 classes of schools in one of the twenty five districts of the country, namely, Gampaha District in 1998. The Grade 1 curriculum was introduced island wide in around 10000 schools in 1999. The reforms reached Grade 5, the final year in the primary school, in 2003.



This child – centred, activity – based curriculum was an integrated curriculum encompassing four subject areas the First Language (Sinhala / Tamil), Mathematics, Religion and Environment Related Activities. Oral English was introduced in grades 1 and 2 for communication and formal English from grade 3. Primary Education was organized in three stages, namely, key stage 1 (grades 1 and 2), Key stage 2 (Grades 3 and 4), and Key Stage 3 (Grade 5). Guided play, activity and desk work with more play in key stage 1 and more desk work in Grade 5 formed the three elements of the learning teaching process. Entry competencies of students were identified to enable the learning – teaching process to be planned according individual needs. Essential Learning Competencies were developed for all three Key Stages to be tested to assess mastery of competencies at the end of each Key Stage.

The quality and effectiveness of the reforms have been evaluated by several studies. Major findings of these evaluations have been highlighted in the chapter on ‘Review of Education Reforms (1997-2003)’ of the publication titled ‘Envisioning Education for Human Development ...’ of the National Education Commission, Sri Lanka (2003). There was consensus that the reforms were well designed and implemented systematically and that all stakeholders – students, teachers, officers and parents – had responded positively. Although there was agreement that the curriculum materials and books were relevant and of high quality, it has been pointed out that these materials tended to be uniform as a result of centralization of the reform process and ‘too much teacher directed’, thereby stifling the creativity and initiative of teachers and students. The needs of more able children too did not appear to have received adequate consideration.

Most teachers had participated in training programmes but there were doubts regarding the adequacy of these programmes and the capabilities of many teachers to implement the curriculum reforms. Researchers found in their classroom observations that the expected transformation in the learning – teaching process had not taken place in many schools. Many classroom activities were seen to be desk, blackboard, book and teacher centred with few opportunities for creative activities and flexibility in movement. Teachers

complained of lack of resources, large classes and time consuming record keeping and evaluation tasks. One major concern highlighted was that the wide disparities between the different Types of schools (Type 1 AB, 2 and 3) in infrastructure facilities, learning – teaching processes and student performance reflected the socio – economic disparities that existed among schools and students. The reforms have not been able to bridge this gap and could have unwittingly widened it in the absence of a strong programme of positive discrimination. Lack of effective monitoring and supervision at local level is another weak point in the reform scenario.

### **6.9.2 Junior Secondary Curriculum Reforms**

Junior Secondary Curriculum reforms were introduced in Grade 6 and Grade 9 in 1999, in Grade 7 in 2000 and in Grade 8 in 2001 without any pilot testing. Environmental Studies, conceptualized as an integrated introduction to science and social studies in grades 7-9 replaced General Science and Social Studies in the ‘transition’ year grade 6. Science in Grades 7-9 was changed to Science and Technology’ with the objective of making it more relevant to needs. Not only was there a new and welcome emphasis on practical work, activity based projects and student centred learning – teaching experiences but an Activity Room was to be provided in each school, where students would have the opportunity of ‘hands on’ experience in handling simple tools and ‘learn by doing’. In the absence of resources for Activity Rooms, the concept was transformed partially into a subject ‘Practical and Technical Skills’.

The evaluations provide some feed back regarding the implementation and degree of acceptance of the reforms by different stakeholders. There have been, for instance, strong views regarding the new subjects in the curriculum, the adequacy of human and material resources available for implementation, the learning – teaching process and supervision and monitoring system.

Environmental Studies was seen to be a student centred subject but it was criticized for lack of clear objectives and failure to achieve the integration of Science and Social Studies. There were no teachers competent to teach an

integrated subject, so that science teachers (usually) or other subject teachers taught only units within their subject areas.

The change from Science to Science and Technology was questioned by both curriculum developers and teachers. The former felt that the two components had been hastily and artificially integrated, and teachers were not clear as to why or how technology was included.

The inclusion of Practical and Technical Skills in the curriculum has been seen widely as a positive change, particularly in the potential it offers for the development of aptitudes and preparation for the world of work. Both teachers and students are reported to have enjoyed their freedom from a rigid curriculum. There were on the other hand, strong criticism of the inclusion of the new curriculum area 'Life Competencies' to replace the earlier subject 'Life Skills'. Teachers found both concepts and content abstract, 'loosely presented' and confusing.

Overall, evaluation studies indicated that the Junior Secondary Curriculum content tended to be heavy, the learning – teaching process teacher dominated and limited largely to conventional techniques such as dependence on blackboards, with minimal effort to promote activity based learning experiences as envisaged in the reforms.

Chapter 2 of the publication of the National Education Commission (2003) referred to above also reviews Senior Secondary (grades 10-12) Curricular Reform introduced during the period 1997-2003 and reports the findings of the evaluation studies.

## **Summary**

The important aspects and tasks of curriculum implementation highlighted in the first Section of the Reading led to a discussion on two distinct approaches or perspectives of implementation. Eight dimensions of a curriculum referred to in Reading Five form the components of curriculum implementation. The five dimensions of curriculum change identified through a review of research on curriculum implementation were also discussed. Eight factors affecting curriculum implementation were presented and discussed in detail. An awareness of the levels or stages of curriculum observed during implementation emphasized the need for implementation analysis or project monitoring related to curriculum implementation. Finally, important aspects and stages of curriculum management and Sri Lankan experiences of recent Curriculum Reforms were briefly discussed.

## **Objectives**

You are now able to

- i. Understand the important aspects, tasks, and approaches or perspectives of curriculum implementation,
- ii. Explain the components of implementation and dimensions of curriculum change,
- iii. Understand the factors influencing curriculum implementation,
- iv. Analyze and monitor implementation of curriculum,
- v. Explain significant aspects and stages of curriculum management.

## References

- Berman P. and McLaughlin M.W. (1977) Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. 7: Factors Affecting Implementation and Continuation, Santa Monica, California: Rand in Lewis (ed.), 1991
- Fullan M. (1991) 'Curriculum Implementation' in Lewis Arie (ed.) (1991) International Encyclopedia of Curriculum, Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Fullan Michael and Pomfret Alan (1977) 'Research on Curriculum and Instruction Implementation' Review of Educational Research, 47 (Spring 1977): 335-397.
- Garden R.A. (1987) 'The Second IEA Mathematics Study', Comparative Education Review, Vol. 31, No. 1, February 1987.
- Goodlad J. (1978) 'A Preview of Schooling in America', Phi Delta Kappa, 60 (September 1978): 48, in Saylor et al., 1981.
- Hurst Paul (1979) 'Appraisal Criteria and the Acceptance of Innovations', Educational Studies, 5, 135-150.
- Hurst Paul (1981) 'Some Issues in Improving the Quality of Education', Comparative Education, Vol. 17, No. 2, June 1981.
- Leithwood K.A. (1981) 'The Dimensions of Curriculum Innovation', Journal of Curriculum Studies 13: 25-26, in Fullan, 1991.
- Leithwood K.A. and Montgomery D.J. (1980) 'Evaluating Program Implementation', Evaluation Review, Vol.4, No. 2, April 1980.
- Lewis Arie (ed.) (1991) International Encyclopedia of Curriculum, Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Marsh Colin J. (1992) Key Concepts for Understanding Curriculum, London: The Falmer Press.
- National Education Commission, Sri Lanka (1992) The First Report, National Education Commission, Sri Lanka.
- National Educational Commission, Sri Lanka (2003) Envisioning Education for Human Development... Proposals for a National Framework on General Education in Sri Lanka.
- Rosier Malcolm J. (1987) 'The Second International Science Study' in Comparative Education Review, Vol. 31, No. 1, February 1987.
- Saylor J. Galen, Alexander William M. and Lewis Arthur J. (1981) Curriculum Planning for Better Teaching and Learning, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Taba Hilda (1962) Curriculum Development – Theory and Practice, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.