Curriculum Management and Instructional Development:

WHAT is curriculum management? It is not a lockstep method for dealing with educational problems by the strict application of systems from other fields. It is not a little bit of everything—leftovers that assistant superintendents and education specialists neglect. Nor is it a plan for action that *guarantees* results.

Curriculum management is a process that is based on four major points. First, it involves the identification and establishment of goals. Second, it requires the formulation of a process to guide educational and instructional specialists, including teachers, toward the attainment of these goals. Third, it is the establishment of managerial techniques to assist in the implementation of the identified process. And last, it includes constant evaluation and reevaluation of the validity of the identified goals, processes, and managerial techniques.

Because of the complementary functions of curriculum and instruction, there is necessarily an overlap between curriculum management and instructional development. Instructional development involves:

1. Identification and analysis of instructional needs

2. Formulation of specific objectives

3. Development and testing of viable alternatives

4. Revision and retesting of alternatives

5. Evaluation of the system as well as of individual learner achievement.

The major difference in the two approaches concerns emphasis. Curriculum management stresses the identification of purpose and content involving essentially "what" questions; instructional development deals with strategies and techniques of teaching that attend basically to questions of "how." One method for dealing effectively with both sets of crucial questions is to utilize an instructional development system in curriculum management. This article will deal with a description of an appropriate instructional development system.

Instructional Development Institute

A nine-step model for instructional development forms the basis for the Instructional Development Institute (IDI), a seven-day workshop [1] designed to train key school personnel in a system for dealing with problems of curriculum and instruction. The IDI was developed by a consortium of National Special Media Institutes (NSMI) which includes the following institutions: Michigan State University, Syracuse University, the

---

[1] The institute is currently being revised into a five-day workshop.

A Cooperative Venture

GEORGE W. STANSBURY*
DOROTHY HUENECKE

Teaching Research Division of the Oregon System of Higher Education, and the University of Southern California. The IDI, produced under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology, Division of Educational Technology, Media Specialist Program, was designed, developed, and validated by the consortium in a period of nearly 18 months.

Participants in the Institute should include teachers, administrators, policy makers, and specialists (TAPS). These participants form TAPS teams to work on instructional problems specific to their schools and school systems; if one of these roles is missing, the potential effectiveness of IDI is diminished.

The Institute is constructed around a three-stage, nine-function system as indicated in Figure 1. The following is a description of each stage and function of the system.

Stage I: Define		
Function 1: Identify problem	Function 2: Analyze setting	Function 3: Organize management
Stage II: Develop		
Function 4: Identify objectives	Function 5: Specify methods	Function 6: Construct prototypes
Stage III: Evaluate		
Function 7: Test prototypes	Function 8: Analyze results	Function 9: Implement/recycle

Figure 1. A Schematic of an Instructional Development Institute (IDI)

Stage I: Define

Function 1: *Identify the Problem.* The first step in the instructional development process is critical, for it involves the identification of the problem. It provides structure that enables the TAPS teams to separate symptoms, the cause of problems, from the actual problems themselves. It focuses attention upon the status quo or "what is" while allowing for a description of the ideal or "what ought to be."

Function 2: *Analyze the Setting.* This is basically a data-gathering stage. Activities of the Institute guide the TAPS teams toward the assessment of learner characteristics against the background of present school practices, community resources, and other related conditions which may have bearing on the identified problem.

Function 3: *Organize Management.* Decisions at this point will result in the assignment of TAPS team responsibilities, the establishment of communication lines, and the definition of project planning and control procedures.

* *George W. Stansbury, Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, and Dorothy Huenecke, Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction; both at Georgia State University, Atlanta*

Stage I deals directly with those processes that are primarily the responsibility of curriculum management. The second stage and Functions 4, 5, and 6 deal primarily with those decisions typically regarded as the domain of instructional development. Thus, IDI bridges the gap between curriculum management and instructional development.

Stage II: Develop

After the problem has been clearly defined, relevant situational factors have been identified, and managerial tasks have been assigned, alternative solutions to the problem are developed in Stage II.

Function 4: *Identify Objectives*. This function involves the specification of behavioral objectives. Institute participants are trained in ways to write objectives so they can translate broadly stated problems into precise statements that describe desired learner behavior.

Function 5: *Specify Methods*. Methods and materials are outlined which have the potential to aid in the attainment of the specified behaviors. This function treats these factors in more than a superficial fashion: the relation among such elements as objectives—cognitive, affective, and psychomotor; the size of instructional groups; and the materials available are all considered in reaching decisions about methods.

Function 6: *Construct Prototypes*. An opportunity is provided here for TAPS teams to review and/or design strategies and materials to implement Functions 4 and 5. The actual construction of a prototype for testing is a task that may take a period of weeks, but a framework and direction for doing this are provided within the Institute.

The first five functions in particular that have thus far been described can be handled in some detail within the confines of the Institute; the last three functions can only be hypothesized during the Institute, since they depend largely on information which must be obtained "on site."

Stage III: Evaluate

Function 7: *Test Prototypes*. After the TAPS prototypes have been developed, they must be tested in the appropriate educational setting with a representative group of students and teachers. It is essential to evaluate the prototype and process the evaluation data. Until this is accomplished, the prototype should not be utilized for a large population.

Function 8: *Analyze Results*. The primary task of this function is to determine the relationships among objectives, methods, and results.

Function 9. *Implement/Recycle*. Evaluators will indicate what kinds of revisions (if any) should be suggested, according to the interpretation of the results of Function 8. If the prototype was satisfactory it can be implemented on a larger scale. If revisions are necessary, the process must be recycled back to an appropriate function.

Stage III is the field trial stage tying the theoretical concepts of curriculum management and instructional development to real life situations, thus committing two major components of an educational system to a joint effort toward educational change.

In conclusion, curriculum management can be a vital part of a total educational system, a system whose responsibilities and boundaries are becoming ever more precisely defined. For maximal effectiveness, each segment of the system should work cooperatively with the other segments.

The Instructional Development Institute described here is one instructional development system that can be used in cooperation with curriculum management. Like all systems, it cannot guarantee results; but used with the commitment of resources and personnel, it can become a much needed delivery system of curriculum management. Thus, when curriculum management and instructional development are implemented jointly in a harmonious venture, the likely outcome is improved educational services for students. What more could be asked of curriculum management? □