School-based curriculum development: principles, processes, and practices

Annotated bibliography

Rachel Bolstad

This annotated bibliography summarises a selection of books and papers referred to in:

Bolstad, R. (2004). *School-based curriculum development: principles, processes, and practices.* Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research. (Available for purchase at: www.nzcer.org.nz)

The references are indexed in two ways: by theme; and alphabetically (by author).

Annotated Bibliography (indexed by theme)

Annotated Bibliography (listed alphabetically)

Bezzina, M. (1991). Teachers' perceptions of their participation in school based curriculum development: a case study. *Curriculum perspectives, 11* (2), 39–47.   4

Brady, L. (1992). *Curriculum development: fourth edition.* Sydney: Prentice Hall.   6

Brady, L. (1995). School based curriculum development and the national curriculum: can they coexist? *Curriculum and teaching, 10* (1), 47–54.   9

Brooker, R., & Macdonald, D. (1999). Did we hear you?: issues of student voice in a curriculum innovation. *Journal of curriculum studies, 31* (1), 83–97.   10

Cocklin, B., Simpson, N., & Stacey, M. (1995). *School planning to achieve student outcomes: processes of change in a secondary school.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Hobart, November 26–30.   12

Day, C. (1990). United Kingdom: Managing Curriculum Development at Branston School and Community College. In C. Marsh, C. Day, L. Hannay, & G. McCutcheon (Eds.), *Reconceptualising school-based curriculum development* (pp. 140–172). London: The Falmer Press.   13

Elliot, J. (1997). School-based curriculum development and action research in the United Kingdom. In S. Hollingsworth (Ed.), *International action research: a casebook for educational reform* (pp. 17–28). London: The Falmer Press.   15

Hannay, L. (1990). Canada: School-based curriculum deliberation. In C. Marsh, C. Day, L. Hannay, & G. McCutcheon (Eds.), *Reconceptualising school-based curriculum development* (pp. 140–172). London: The Falmer Press.   17

Howells, H. (2003). Teacher professionalism and curriculum power: a cautionary tale. *English in Australia, 136*, 27–39.   20

Keys, P. (2000). *Developing a good science syllabus for an optimistic future: a classroom teacher's perspective.* Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education conference, The University of Sydney, 4 December.   22

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1992). Student perspectives on curriculum innovation and change in an English secondary school: an empirical study. *British Educational Research Journal, 18* (3), 221–234.   24

Marsh, C., Day, C., Hannay, L., & McCutcheon, G. (1990). *Reconceptualising school-based curriculum development.* London: The Falmer Press.   26

Marsh, C. (1990). Australia: establishing a Unit Curriculum for Years 8–10 at River Valley Senior High School. In C. Marsh, C. Day, L. Hannay, & G. McCutcheon (Eds.), *Reconceptualising school-based curriculum development* (pp. 73–97). London: The Falmer Press.   28

May, S. (1992). The relational school: fostering pluralism and empowerment through a 'language policy across the curriculum'. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 27* (1), 35–51.   29

McCutcheon, G. (1990). United States of America: school-based curriculum development in Chester: revising a curriculum. In C. Marsh, C. Day, L. Hannay, & G. McCutcheon (Eds.), *Reconceptualising school-based curriculum development* (pp. 99–121). London: The Falmer Press.   30

Prideaux, D. (1993). School-based curriculum development: partial, paradoxical and piecemeal. *Journal of curriculum studies, 25* (2), 169–178.   31

Ramsay, P., Hawk, K., Harold, B., Marriot, R., & Poskitt, J. (1993). *Developing partnerships: collaboration between teachers and parents*. Wellington: Learning Media.   33

Ramsay, P., Harold, B., Hill, D., Lang, C., Yates, R., with Patara, L., & Jeffs, C. (1995). *Final report of the SBCD project.* Hamilton: University of Waikato.   36

Reid, W. (1987a). Where is the habit of deliberation? In N. Sabar, J. Rudduck, & W. Reid (Eds.), *Partnership and autonomy in school-based curriculum development* (pp. 110–114). University of Sheffield: Division of Education.   38

Reid, W. (1987b). The functions of SBCD: a cautionary note. In N. Sabar, J. Rudduck, & W. Reid (Eds.), *Partnership and autonomy in school-based curriculum development* (pp. 115–124). University of Sheffield: Division of Education.   38

Sabar, N., Rudduck, J., & Reid, W. (1987). *Partnership and autonomy in school-based curriculum development.* University of Sheffield: Division of Education.   40

Shoham, E. (1995). Teacher autonomy in school-based curricula in Israel: its significance for teacher education. *Westminster studies in education, 18*, 35–45.   42

Willis, M. (1997). The national agenda in the national capital. In J. Lokan (Ed.), *Describing learning: implementation of Curriculum Profiles in Australian schools 1986–1996* (pp. 27-53). Melbourne: ACER Press.   44

Willis, S., & Kissane, B. (1995). *Outcome-based education: a review of the literature.* Murdoch, Western Australia: Prepared for the Education Department of Western Australia.   46

Key theme	Teacher role in SBCD
Reference	Bezzina, M. (1991). Teachers' perceptions of their participation in school based curriculum development: a case study. *Curriculum perspectives, 11* (2), 39–47.
Type of document	Journal article
Nature of document	Research article: case study
Short abstract	This paper reports on a case study of SBCD in a small Catholic primary school in Sydney in 1986/1987. Bezzina suggests that teachers' participation in SBCD is (or should) comprise five groups of behaviours: (1) gathering background information; (2) planning, (3) implementing; (4) evaluating; and (5) working with others. Bezzina investigated teachers' perceptions of their involvement in SBCD, in relation to the theoretical perspective described above. Bezzina found that teachers had a somewhat limited view of what participation in SBCD involves.
Research context, design, methodology	The school had a full-time staff of seven and a roll of 220. Over a 30–week observation period, data for the case study was gathered through interviews, observations, and questionnaires with all or some of the seven teachers.
Key findings or points discussed	**Defining SBCD** Bezzina defines SBCD as "a process in which some or all of the members of a school community plan, implement and/or evaluate an aspect or aspects of the curriculum offering of the school. This may involve adapting an existing curriculum, adopting it unchanged or creating a new curriculum. SBCD is a collaborative effort which should not be confused with the individual efforts of teachers or administrators operating outside the boundaries of a collaboratively accepted framework" (p. 40). **Structures for curriculum development within the school** The structures to support SBCD at the school included: the staff's establishment of a school set of priorities for curriculum development (in a staff consultation at the beginning of the year); regular staff meetings, the provision of time for SBCD activities, the link made between SBCD and staff development; and the use of expertise of outside personnel. During the 30 weeks of observation, Bezzina identified 16 "SBCD" initiatives within the school, covering a range of subjects. (However, not all were fully and systematically implemented: some did not survive the planning stage or initial discussions.) The case study shows the importance of the principal and external influences on SBCD initiatives within the school. Of the 16 initiatives identified, 5 were the result of the principal reacting to external influences such as system priorities, and the availability of in-service training. Religious education was also important for the school. **Teachers' perceptions of SBCD** Bezzina asked teachers to identify the behaviours in which they might be involved during SBCD. Teachers mentioned: gathering background information, planning, evaluating, and working with others, but did not appear to identify "implementation" as an aspect of SBCD. Perceived advantages of SBCD included: an ability to better respond to [class] needs/situation, and a better awareness of curriculum among staff. However, the benefits of SBCD were seen as largely related to improved curriculum rather than to personal benefits for the teachers. Teachers also identified aids and barriers to participation. The principal was viewed as an important aid, as was the provision of time and school climate. Time was also perceived as a barrier, as were perceptions of competing priorities and staff burnout.

	Bezzina suggests that teachers may have treated the production of curriculum documents or policies as an end in itself, somehow unrelated to the act of teaching. Interestingly, where teachers perceived collaboratively devised school policies not to be in the best interest of their students, they chose to depart from this in their *implementation* (i.e. classroom practice), rather than seeking to address the policy itself. That is, they had "a desire to implement what was best, appropriate and relevant for their own classes....where the collaboratively designed curriculum was seen as inappropriate, teachers chose to change practice rather than change policy" (p. 46).
Related references	Bezzina, M. (1989). Does our reach exceed our grasp? A case study of school based curriculum development. Paper presented at the AARE conference, Adelaide, Nov–Dec.

Key theme	General overviews of SBCD
Reference	Brady, L. (1992). *Curriculum development: fourth edition.* Sydney: Prentice Hall.
Type of document	Book
Short abstract	This book is written for teachers and others involved in curriculum development. It discusses curriculum context, curriculum process, curriculum evaluation, the translation of curriculum into programmes, curriculum management, and the place of curriculum planning within the operation of full school management plans. The book is structured in five parts, 16 chapters, with concise summaries and reading/reference lists at the end of each chapter. Although this book is now 12 years old, it covers the issues well, with a good deal of "how-to" information for schools on the processes of curriculum development. Throughout the book Brady seeks to provide teachers with a good background understanding of the contexts, principles, and educational theories that sit underneath the processes of SBCD. Key points from the first two parts of the book are annotated in detail below.
Key findings or points discussed	**Part 1: Curriculum context**
	This section examines what teachers need to know about the system and school context in which curriculum planning operates. There is a brief history of SBCD in Australia and elsewhere up to the 1990s. Brady then looks at the theoretical position of curriculum development within schools, with particular reference to principles of collaborative school management, and teachers' "decision-making space".
	Collaborative school management
	Brady first locates SBCD within a general framework of planning and decision-making within schools, and cites Caldwell and Spinks' (1988) collaborative school management cycle. This cycle has six phases: (1) goal setting and needs identification; (2) policy making, with policies consisting of statements of purpose and broad guidelines; (3) planning of programmes; (4) preparation and approval of programme budgets; (5) implementing; and (6) evaluating. Brady discusses how curriculum development can occur within this cycle.
	Teachers' curriculum decision-making space
	Having identified school management planning as one influence on teachers' degree of decision-making, Brady next considers other factors that influence teachers' decisions about curriculum. Brady discusses Smith and Lovat's (1990) notion of teachers' "curriculum decision-making space", i.e. Smith and Lovat contend the decision options that are available to teachers are determined by five overlapping frames: the system frame, the school/institution frame; the faculty frame; the learners' frame; and the teacher self-frame.
	1. The system frame: these are the decisions that teachers perceive have already been made by policy statements, curriculum documents, or other system directives. Smith (1983) claims the factors in this frame restrict teachers' decisions about content selection, sequencing of content, methods to impart content, etc.
	2. The school/institution frame: these are the restrictions the teacher perceives to have been placed on them within the school, including timetabling, access to resources, and class organisation.
	3. Faculty frame: these are decisions teachers perceive to have been made by faculty heads (e.g. teachers' allocation to classes, coordination of topics to be taught from one year to another to avoid repetition and ensure development, and faculty

policies about student assessment, resource allocation, etc.).

4. Learners' frame: these are teachers' expectations regarding students, e.g. about students' abilities, interests, likely behaviour and teacher-student relationships, the products of experience with particular classes/students, information from other teachers, etc.

5. Teacher self-frame: this frame relates to teachers' professional self-concept, the ideals that teachers possess, etc: "A teacher's self-concept is likely to be stronger if he [sic] believes his classroom practice is consistent with his educational ideals (p. 23).

Definitions and practice of SBCD

Brady discusses different meanings that have been attached to SBCD: i.e. in one sense it is viewed as the opposite to a top-down imposed curriculum. But he notes that "school-based" does not mean "school-limited".

Brady further suggests that SBCD needs to be viewed as a continuum of practices, depending on who is involved (e.g. individuals, individual in parameters, groups, or whole staff) and whether those people are "selecting", "adapting", or "creating" curriculum.

Part 2: Curriculum process

This section "examines what teachers need to consider before and during the process of curriculum and program development". Brady first discusses what teachers should know about their school and community context (via a situational analysis), and second, what they should know about the contributions of the philosophy, psychology, and sociology theory to SBCD.

The need for a situational analysis

Brady says that SBCD forces teachers "to reappraise the context within which objectives or learning experiences are determined….Curriculum objectives have to be rewritten to meet local variations. They are no longer issued as standard for every school…. Instead, curriculum development begins with a critical examination of the situation at the school level and, because every school is different, situational analyses cannot be transferred from one school to another." (p. 37)

The contributing disciplines – philosophy, psychology, sociology

Brady contends that "questions concerning the nature of learning, the nature of society, teaching methods, desired outcomes and the nature of the learner are ones that must be answered at every stage of development" (p. 52). Brady discusses the contributions of philosophy, psychology, and sociology theory to SBCD, e.g. for aiding teachers to determine objectives consistent with educational principles based in these disciplines. Brady notes teachers do not have to be scholars of these disciplines to develop effective curricula but "...when teachers plan a curriculum, they make philosophical, psychological and sociological assumptions, however informed or however conscious those assumptions might be" (p. 65). A conscious attention to the contributions of philosophy, psychology, and sociology can help to inform teachers' decision-making in SBCD. For example, *philosophy* provides insight into the nature of knowledge, the nature of mental qualities (philosophy of mind), the nature of aims and objectives, the clarity of terms, the priority among objectives, the

	interrelatedness of objectives, the curriculum activities, the curriculum structure, the nature of a "good life", the function of school. *Psychology* theory raises questions about the nature of students, the process of thought, the selection of learning experiences, learning theory, etc. *Sociology* theory attends to future trends, social background, the role of teacher and school, etc.
	The remaining chapters in Section 2 consider the theoretical and practical SBCD issues of: models for curriculum development; stating objectives; selection of content; selection of method; and election of student evaluation procedures.
Related references	Brady, L. (1995). School based curriculum development and the national curriculum: can they coexist? *Curriculum and teaching, 10* (1), 47-54.

Key theme	Critical perspectives on SBCD
Reference	Brady, L. (1995). School based curriculum development and the national curriculum: can they coexist? *Curriculum and teaching, 10* (1), 47–54.
Type of document	Journal article
Nature of document	Commentary
Short abstract	Brady looks at SBCD in Australia in the context of simultaneous movements towards centralisation (the development of "national profiles" for curriculum), and structural decentralisation (the shift towards self-managing schools), from the 1970s to the mid-1990s. A brief history of SBCD in Australia is given, in the context of various educational policy developments during this period. Brady considers whether SBCD can co-exist with the imminent introduction (in the mid-1990s) of national curriculum statements and profiles in Australia, and concludes that it will, albeit of a more constrained nature than SBCD of the past.
Key points discussed	The 1970s are described as the "heyday" of SBCD in Australia. In the 1980s there was a move towards centralisation of curriculum, and a perceived slowing in the impetus of SBCD. Through the late 1980s and early 1990s there were concerted moves towards the development of a national curriculum. In 1990, the Curriculum Corporation was established. In 1991 the Australian Education Council identified eight learning areas and began working on the development of "statements" (or agreed national position) and "profiles" (description of progress in learning outcomes at eight levels) for each learning area. At the same time there was a trend towards decentralisation in the form of self-managing schools.
	At the time of writing (1995) Brady suggests that the degree of prescription in the national profiles will be the factor which will determine the future of SBCD. Brady discusses the impacts of a greater degree of curriculum prescription on SBCD with reference to the idea of teachers' "decision-making space" (*see* Brady (1992) also annotated in this bibliography). Brady suggests that with the advent of the national profiles, SBCD will change in form from whole staff involvement in the "creation" of curriculum, to a process of curriculum "adaptation" by groups or teachers operating within specified parameters. (*see* Brady's Figure 1).
Author's implications	Brady's view is that the advent of national curriculum will not remove schools' ability to engage in SBCD, but that the prescriptive nature of the profiles will create a more limited space for teacher "decision-making" on curriculum matters than was the case in the past. "Within the framework of self-managing schools, the impact of greater community involvement and accountability, will require schools to consistently respond to local needs. Even with the most stringent prescription, teachers will continue to adapt and modify the curricula to achieve an operational curriculum to suit their respective classrooms."

Key theme	Student role in SBCD
Reference	Brooker, R., & Macdonald, D. (1999). Did we hear you?: issues of student voice in a curriculum innovation. *Journal of curriculum studies, 31* (1), 83–97.
Type of document	Journal article
Nature of document	A critical commentary, which draws on the findings of a research project.
Short abstract	This article explores the position of student "voice" in curriculum innovation. The discussion draws from evaluation research of a senior secondary PE curriculum innovation in Queensland. The authors use the evaluation as a context to raise issues about how student voice was positioned during the project, and suggest ways to enable students to contribute in a more meaningful way to curriculum making.
Research context, design, methodology	In Queensland, new curriculum initiatives are formally trialled for up to four years, during which time the "new curriculum is evaluated using data collected from relevant stakeholders in schools...and other interested parties. Upon successful completion of a trial, a curriculum framework is approved for general implementation by the central authority and passed down to all schools within the authority's jurisdiction...although each school is required to remain within the framework's boundaries, it has 'freedom' to interpret a curriculum in its own setting" (p. 84). The authors were contracted by the Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies (BSSS) to evaluate the 4-year trial of a new PE curriculum in 11 schools. The evaluation included interviews with school stakeholders, including teachers and Year 11 and 12 students.
Key findings or points discussed	"Brooker and MacDonald contend that the "linear and structured curriculum making" approach used in Queensland deliberately favours the voices of some stakeholders. In particular, the authors suggest that learners' preferences "if sought at all, are marginalized and their voices are mostly silent in curriculum making" (p. 84). However, they also ask: What does legitimate student 'voice' sound like?

Critics have said that traditional authority structures in schools have "systematically silenced" students' voices in curriculum making. The authors discuss influential theoretical perspectives on student voice. For example, within a liberal framework two main ways of examining the student-experienced curriculum are common: (1) studying student attitudes towards school subjects; and (2) studying student conceptions of subject matter. Because liberal frameworks dominate PE research, the focus of this research is generally on "how children viewed their programmes, rather than how they contributed to the construction of those programmes". The authors suggest that "listening to student voice becomes an end in itself", but ask how is student voice actually incorporated into curriculum? Critical theory alerts educationalists to the danger that schooling renders some students "voiceless". Feminist and post-structuralist theory also raise questions about student voice and its political and social implications.

The authors say that across the traditions (liberal, critical, feminist, post-structuralist) the issue of student voice has been a concern...however there has been "little criticism and few empirical data that attend to student voice within curriculum making. Rather, the emphases have been on the more passive role of student experience and response" (p. 89).

Reflecting on their own evaluation of the Queensland PE curriculum innovation, Brooker and MacDonald ask three questions: How was student voice positioned in the evaluation? Why should students have spoken? What were the outcomes from what the students said? |

	How was student voice positioned?
	"The positioning of student voice in the evaluation was framed by several intersecting factors: existing protocols for such evaluations, researchers (re) interpretations of those protocols, guidelines given to teachers about...students to be interviewed, students chosen../for interview, interview protocols, conduct of the interviews...and interview questions" (p. 90). The authors say that the Queensland protocols for evaluating new school subjects clearly place teachers at the centre. Although the evaluation "included" students in the data collection, the emphasis was on teachers. Also the framing of the interview questions tended to elicit superficial reactions – the questions provided a boundary for student voices and limited the depth and focus of their responses.
	Why should students have spoken?
	With hindsight, the authors suggest that student voice "could have informed the development of the subject in ways that other stakeholders could not". For example, they cite quotes from students that pertain to:
	(1) issues related to the curriculum and youth culture;
	(2) comments about "who can achieve sucess in PE" – i.e. the importance of providing opportunities for a wide range of abilities;
	(3) the relationship between actual and intended student outcomes from PE; and
	(4) what students offer to the PE curriculum.
	What were the outcomes from what the students said?
	Brooker and MacDonald comment on how student comments in the final report "were a distilled version of what the students had said in the course of the evaluation, and individual voices were subsumed into a single reporting "voice" (students were interviewed in groups). For the authors, this manner of reporting "limited students' power in dialogue" and reduced the level of sophistication of their input into the evaluation. This raised post-structuralist questions such as: Who gives voices to whom? For whose benefit? What use will be made of the speech after it is heard?
Authors' implications	Brooker and MacDonald conclude that it is necessary to reconsider how to bring students' voices into curriculum making. They suggest methods, e.g. adding students to curriculum-making committees, and other ways of reformulating practices that give students an active voice in institutional settings. Students could conduct peer interviews or use other methods that elicit student voice in a way not structured by interview schedules or specific data-collection timetables. The authors also feel the practices designed to "hear" student voice need re-thinking – e.g. volunteer students to act as "cases" whose experiences of a new curriculum could be tracked throughout the period of the evaluation. This could help to avoid the homogenisation of student experiences.

Key theme	SBCD processes in practice (case studies)
Reference	Cocklin, B., Simpson, N., & Stacey, M. (1995). *School planning to achieve student outcomes: processes of change in a secondary school.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Hobart, November 26–30.
Type of document	Conference paper
Nature of document	A case study of a "whole-school planning" process in a NSW secondary school, within an "outcomes-based education" context.
Short abstract	In this article, Cocklin et al. describe the processes, challenges, and successes for a NSW secondary school which engaged in school-based planning to reflect an "outcomes-based education" view of schooling. The article provides a useful background description of the meaning of OBE, and how this school got involved in a process of change "directed towards an overall goal of improving the school lives and learning of their students" within an OBE framework. The description of the planning processes within the school is useful and interesting as an example. The article is also interesting from a political point of view. It was written in 1995, shortly after the release of a very significant report in NSW (the "Eltis report") which seems to have pushed for a shift away from OBE, and back towards a "subject content" curriculum orientation. Cocklin et al. conclude with a list of comments about the challenges and benefits that were encountered during the school-based development process. They also note some uncertainty about what consequences the recent political decisions (embodied in the Eltis report) would have for school decision-making in NSW.

Key theme	SBCD processes in practice (case studies)
Reference	Day, C. (1990). United Kingdom: Managing Curriculum Development at Branston School and Community College. In C. Marsh, C. Day, L. Hannay, & G. McCutcheon (Eds.), *Reconceptualising school-based curriculum development* (pp. 140–172). London: The Falmer Press.
Type of document	Book chapter
Nature of document	Case study (UK)
Key points discussed	This case study looks at SBCD activity that was funded through TRIST (Technical Related In-service Training) in one UK school. In 1986/1987 five separate projects were undertaken by different groups of teachers at Branston School on a voluntary basis. Three projects are described in the case study.

First project: Curriculum descriptions

The aim of the *Curriculum Descriptions* group was to produce a summary of the curriculum offered to Branston pupils, such that all staff could gain some insight into the experiences children were receiving in areas other than their own. The project was divided into two areas: (a) discovering what the curriculum is, and how it is delivered; and (b) investigating a means of presenting a description of the school curriculum in a comparatively immediate and accessible form. The group developed a survey and administered it to all teachers who taught Year 11. The group also observed classes of pupils every day for a week to see the curriculum in action, noting the overt curriculum. Pupils were also interviewed.

Second project: Learning about learning

The aim of the *Learning about Learning* group was to stimulate the teacher-as-researcher model. Teachers began by observing their own classrooms and sharing their observations with the group. Through the discussions, the group became interested in looking at teacher questioning as an aspect of teacher/student exchanges. Teachers observed other teachers' classrooms and recorded the number of teacher questions during the lesson. The group was also interested in how best to motivate students and encourage them to take greater control over their own learning. Some teachers followed single students through all their day's classes. Excerpts from the group's reports are given on pp. 152–154. These show how the group started to notice many students' "isolation from their peers and teachers", and also the amount of time students spent listening in class. This stimulated the group's interest in investigating group work as a means of countering students' perceived isolation and passivity.

Third project: Tutor group

Compared with the two projects described above, the aim of the *Tutor* group involved less research on the teachers' part, and was more task-oriented. The group was supposed to review the school's current tutor group and pastoral care system and make recommendations. However, the principal had already signalled an imminent policy decision to move from a vertical to a horizontal pastoral system. Thus "...it became clear during the first term that [the groups'] role was not to conduct research in order to describe or make recommendations for change but rather to plan for the implementation of a policy decision taken by the principal which did not have the unanimous support of staff" (p. 154).

Emerging issues

The author discusses issues that emerged for participants and non-participants in the

	three groups. Issues are raised as pertinent for consideration by managers of SBCD and professional development include:
	1. The climate – contextual constraints:
	"It is important...to remember that [school-based work] occurs within at least three major contexts – national, local (school), and individual (social-psychological) – and that these will affect attitudes of participants and non-participants to learning and change" (p. 156).
	2. Ownership and control – participation in need identification and policy-making
	"The principal's underlying intention was to engage colleagues in collaborative activities for the 'common good' of the school...the assumption was that this would be shared by project members. A related assumption was the expectation that the results of the investigations – whether descriptive or in the form of recommendations – would be disseminated to colleagues in the school and an aspiration that change could result" (p. 158). The author discusses how tensions may arise between "institutional needs" and personal or group needs in the course of SBCD. For example, there were some issues for staff in the *Tutor* group, as they had to conduct research in preparation for a policy they didn't all agree with. However for the *Curriculum Descriptions* group and the *Learning about Learning* group, members' interests, motivations, and prejudices coincided with the "institutional needs" of the school. The author also suggests that the work of these two groups "did not threaten the existing order in the school". The author concludes that SBCD which meets institutional needs is more likely to succeed when these coincide with those of the individuals involved, and are not perceived to affect the structure of the organisation or curriculum of others in the school.
Author's implications	The author concludes the case study by further discussing the role of the Principal (who was a strong driver of SBCD) and the issues around "mandated ownership" of curriculum change through SBCD.

Key theme	Teacher role in SBCD
Reference	Elliot, J. (1997). School-based curriculum development and action research in the United Kingdom. In S. Hollingsworth (Ed.), *International action research: a casebook for educational reform* (pp. 17–28). London: The Falmer Press.
Type of document	Book chapter
Nature of document	Review of the history of action research in the UK
Short abstract	In this chapter Elliot traces the history of action-research in UK education from the 1960s to the 1990s. The theme running through his analysis is a shift in the context/meaning of "action research", and consequences of this for curriculum development approaches.
	In the 1960s action research emerged as a tool for school-based curriculum change. It was closely tied to the goal of creating curricula that were more meaningful and relevant to learners. A proliferation of "bottom-up" curriculum development projects ensued, many involving collaborative action research between teachers and academics. From the 1970s in the UK, there was a shift towards more top-down curriculum development and externally-driven reforms. Action research was reconstructed as a personal professional development process for teachers, rather than as a tool for genuine curriculum development. Elliot concludes by advocating a return to more bottom-up curriculum and pedagogical change, and hopes that collaborative action research between teachers and academics may re-emerge in the UK as an educational change strategy.
Key points discussed	**The 1960s: pedagogically driven curriculum reform**
	In the 1960s, curriculum development was perceived to be a solution to the widespread problem of alienation of secondary students from schooling and education. Action-research emerged in the context of SBCD at this time. Elliot says that those who moved to change the curriculum adopted either a *reformist* or *innovatory* stance. The reformists wanted to make the curriculum less knowledge-based and concentrated on practical skills. The innovatory stand attempted to change the curriculum to make it more relevant to the experience of everyday living in contemporary society. This included: restructuring content around life themes rather than subjects; representing content as resources for thinking about the problems and issues of everyday life rather than simply information to be learned; transforming the teaching-learning process from the systematic transmission of information to discussion-based inquiry; teachers monitoring the ways they select and represent content in classrooms by eliciting student feedback; and collaboration between teachers across subject specialisms.
	Elliot describes this approach to curriculum change as *pedagogically driven*: "...action research took the form of a self-reflexive experimental process in which the teacher monitored his or her interactions with students in determining what constituted educationally worthwhile curriculum experiences" (p. 18).
	Curriculum development approaches of the 1960s and 1970s
	Elliott describes successful and unsuccessful approaches to curriculum development during the 1960s and 1970s. In the mid-1960s the Schools Council for Curriculum Reform (SCCR) was established to provide teachers and schools with support for curriculum development. The SCCR was an educational partnership between teachers, local educational authorities, and central government. It initiated a range of projects, led by academic subject experts but staffed by teachers on secondment. The project teams devised and piloted new content and materials with volunteer schools,

	then tried to disseminate their packages more widely. However this approach generally failed to secure widespread adoption in schools – it rested on the assumption that curriculum innovations were transferable commodities.
	Elliot contrasts this with the different approach used by Stenhouse in the Humanities Curriculum Project (HCP). Stenhouse "reconceptualised the humanities subjects as resources for adolescents to reflect about their experience of becoming adults in society, rather than bodies of abstract knowledge to be acquired through a continuing dependency relation with teachers" (p. 20). The HCP was thus a pedagogically-driven form of curriculum change, highly congruent with the logic that underpinned many more localised SBC initiatives which preceded it. However, "the difference was that Stenhouse and his team articulated and made that logic publicly explicit, and thereby enabled HCP as an innovation to become the focus of significant debates within the teaching profession, amongst educationalists in the academy, and more widely through the media" (p. 21). The idea of action-research was an integral element of the curriculum change theory underpinning the HCP.
	In the 1960s and 1970s Curriculum Studies also emerged as a new field of enquiry in universities and colleges. Two major strands which emerged were a new paradigm of curriculum evaluation (it became the study of *change processes*) and a new paradigm of educational research: action research. Elliot discusses these in some detail.
	Changes in the 1970s
	From the 1970s in the UK, there was a shift towards more top-down curriculum development and externally-driven reforms. Curriculum Studies went into decline, and action research was reconstructed as a personal professional development process, rather than as a tool for genuine curriculum development.
Author's implications	Elliot concludes by advocating a return to more bottom-up curriculum and pedagogical change, and hopes that collaborative action research between teachers and academics may re-emerge in the UK as an educational change strategy.

Key theme	SBCD processes in practice (case studies)
Reference	Hannay, L. (1990). Canada: School-based curriculum deliberation. In C. Marsh, C. Day, L. Hannay, & G. McCutcheon (Eds.), *Reconceptualising school-based curriculum development* (pp. 140–172). London: The Falmer Press.
Type of document	Book chapter
Nature of document	Case study (Canada)
Short abstract	This is the second of four case studies illustrating various instances of SBCD in Marsh et al.'s book *Reconceptualising school-based curriculum development.* This case study provides some interesting insights into SBCD within two senior high school departments in one Canadian high school.
Key points discussed	The case study follows two subject committees in one high school, the geography committee and the history committee, as they developed a SBC to comply with provincial curriculum reforms and a directive from their principal.
	In 1984 the Ontario MOE initiated major reforms of the secondary curriculum. Policies required major shifts in school organisation, SBCD, and student streaming procedures. School principals were legally responsible for ensuring that a course outline for each course in the school was on file in the office and available for inspection. The school course outline was to be derived from a general provincial guideline produced by the MOE for each subject area. Philosophically, these guideline documents represented a major change for secondary schools in Ontario. They emphasised thinking skills, problem-solving approaches to curriculum, rather than a focus on factual content, and reflected an image of the learner as a self-motivated, self-directed problem solver.
	The principal and school administration saw this as an opportunity for school improvement, seeing a reflective curriculum process as an opportunity for teacher growth. In 1984/5 the principal mandated that subject areas had to develop a "curriculum" for each of their courses. There was a budget of release time for this. Several HODs and teachers were sent to professional development courses on curriculum development. The school also enlisted support from staff at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (The author of the chapter was such a staff member.) The author describes the experiences of the history committee, which met once and was unable to develop a common course of study, and the geography committee (of which the author was a member), which met eight times and completed the task of developing a departmental curriculum.
	History committee
	The author suggests that the four-person history committee failed to address the major philosophical changes in the new MOE guideline and were more focused on the content shifts, i.e. whether WWI had been shifted from grade 9 to grade 11. The committee's attitude towards the curriculum development process was quite hostile. It was seen as the imposition of the MOE and the principal. "Perhaps because the committee avoided discussing the pedagogical and philosophical changes apparent in the new guideline, they failed to perceive a problem with their past practice of teaching history. Consequently curriculum development was viewed as a task to be procedurally handled through reissuing past practices without reflection on these practices" (p. 103). The history committee eventually decided to cease joint development of a course of study. Each teacher designed individual courses of study which reflected their individual orientations.

Geography committee

The geography committee members also began with a view of the curriculum development process as necessary to meet the demands of the school administration and the MOE. Initially they did not perceive the process or the product would be useful to their teaching. However, through the development process the committee began to view their existing curriculum and pedagogy as problematic.

The author compares and contrasts the experiences of the two committees and discusses the issues that emerged in two categories: contextual factors and the curriculum development process itself.

Contextual factors

The four contextual factors which seemed to affect the success of the development process were: curriculum orientations, leadership, the initiation source, and resources available.

Curriculum orientations: The author says that SBCD by nature requires teachers to reflect on individual and school philosophies, citing Miller and Seller (1985) who describe three meta-curriculum orientations: transmission, transactional, and transformational. The history committee appeared to have a strong "transmission" orientation and did not engage in a conversation about the philosophical differences between this orientation, and the "transactional" orientation of the new guideline. The geography committee also began with a transmission orientation, but through the SBCD process began to discuss alternative teaching practices (and implicitly, alternative curriculum orientations).

Leadership: The history committee head and the geography committee head had very different leadership styles. The former saw little value in the process and did not engage staff in discussion etc. The latter saw the process as a growth opportunity for staff and invited exploration and respect for alternative ideas.

Initiation source: In this case, external. Both committees initially saw the purpose of the SBCD task as to satisfy the requirements of their school administration. The history committee continued to hold this view but the geography committee began to change their attitude during the process, and the external pressure to develop the common course of study "was replaced with an internal desire to create a curriculum and to reflect on existing practice" (p. 114).

Resources: The school administration made various time and support resources available. The history committee did not take advantage of these, while the geography committee did.

The curriculum development process

The author discusses how "problem formation" for both committees came from an external source (the Ontario curriculum reforms and the subsequent directive from the principal). Therefore, the development process itself (not current practice) was viewed as the problem. This made it hard for the staff to problematise their current/past practice. However, through the SBCD process, the geography staff started to do this, while the history committee never did.

However, even for the geography committee, this was a difficult process. "Problem formation was not an easy task for the geography committee and they struggled with conceptualising alternatives to their past practices. Contrary to some of the traditional curriculum models, the committee did not rationally define the problem and then find ways of addressing the issues through the curriculum document. Rather, the committee gradually formed the problem as they made curricular decisions....members had to deal with their personal orientations in light of the issues arising from their

	curriculum deliberations and the new MOE guideline" (p. 117).
Author's implications	The author concludes the case study by saying that SBCD must be reconceptualised as a professional growth experience for teachers. She notes time is an issue. "The process is time consuming as participants need time to reflect critically, consider alternatives, deal with the cognitive dissonance, and assimilate new ideas into their personal knowledge. Yet schools often demand that curriculum be developed in a very short time.....if that time is not available then the curriculum development process might become a rush for the solution without the existence of a well-defined problem" (p. 120).

Key theme	The political nature of curriculum development
Reference	Howells, H. (2003). Teacher professionalism and curriculum power: a cautionary tale. *English in Australia, 136*, 27–39.
Type of document	Journal article
Nature of document	Critical commentary; case study
Short abstract	Howell argues that having the responsibility to develop and implement curriculum is crucial to the professional identity of teachers. In 1986, teachers across different educational institutions in Victoria (including secondary schools, TAFEs, and technical schools) collaborated to develop a Study Design for the Victorian Certificate of English. The Study Design took four years to develop but was rolled back just two years after reaching its accredited form. Howells, one of the members of the Field of Study Committee (FOSC), charged with the development of the English Study Design, describes the 4-year process and uses this as a "cautionary tale" to highlight the political nature of curriculum development. In particular, Howells suggests that the Victoria example "shows that teachers' professional responsibility for curriculum development can be circumscribed by political forces to the detriment of the teachers' professional identity and worthwhile curriculum innovation".
Key findings or points discussed	Writing in 2003, Howells argues that rather than promoting teachers' professional engagement in curriculum development, the current situation in Victoria places teachers "at a distance from effective decision making" (p. 27) and marginalises them from curriculum development processes. By contrast, she suggests that the VCE English Study Design initiated in 1986 and accredited in 1990 "embodied the best thinking in English curriculum and pedagogy, [and] that it demonstrated what accomplished teachers at that time believed, knew, and practiced".

In the early 1980s, a new government in Victoria committed to a reform agenda for education which included a call for a radical reshaping of post-compulsory (pre-tertiary) education. Of particular concern was to throw aside "the archaic tools of selection and segregation" then in place in the post-compulsory education sector. All sectors involved in providing post-compulsory education were to be brought together into one system, and the 44 versions of English offered throughout the state were to be replaced by a single 2-year course of study, leading to a common credential. A 20-member Field of Studies Committee (FOSC) was convened in 1986 to develop the English Study Design. Fourteen of these were practising classroom teachers, and included representatives from a range of institutions. Howells suggest at the outset of the development process, the FOSC did not foresee the constraints which would ultimately be imposed on the VCE by political and public relations pressures. During the first 18 months the committee engaged in much deliberation about the meaning of terms like "common", "compulsory", "English", and "standards". The committee engaged in widespread consultation with the English teaching community. Issues of assessment were also explored. Howell writes that the FOSC committee had strong opinions about forms of assessment that were appropriate for English. The majority did not advocate external assessment by written examination. However it soon became clear that the FOSC did not have complete autonomy in this aspect of the Study Design, and that political and public pressure demanded particular forms of assessment be visible in the Study Design. Gradually the FOSC realised they did not have the degree of autonomy and decision-making power they had originally thought, and concessions and compromises had to be made as the course approached readiness for accreditation. Despite this, Howells argues that that English Study Design in its final form still represented a good design, and was soundly based on the knowledge and experience of teachers and educators. Why, then, were the changes |

	rolled back only 2 years after it was accredited? Howells identifies some dissatisfaction with the Study Design within the English teaching community, but suggests the real explanation lies in the range of social, political, and academic forces that exert pressure on curriculum development.
Author's implications	Howell concludes by speculating on what teachers can learn from the VCE English Study Design narrative. In her view, education is about change, and "it is hard to imagine that there will not be a time when the curriculum does not need to be changed to meet changing conditions in society. It is also hard to imagine that accomplished teachers will not have valuable professional knowledge arising from the experience of the classroom that would be important in the development of new curriculum initiatives….but….teachers also need to understand the competing forces that influence effective curriculum change, and they may need to develop skill in knowing how to contend with those forces" (p. 38).

Key theme	Teacher role in SBCD
Reference	Keys, P. (2000). *Developing a good science syllabus for an optimistic future: a classroom teacher's perspective.* Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education conference, The University of Sydney, 4 December.
Type of document	Conference paper
Nature of document	Research: case study (Australia)
Short abstract	The Queensland School Curriculum Council recently released the first of the eight new syllabus document: the years 1 to 10 science syllabus. For the first time, teachers were to be involved in writing and developing their own school-based programme. This paper reports on a pilot study that was conducted over a year in one large primary school, during the year of implementation of the new science syllabus. The study provides a perspective of science curriculum change by practising classroom teachers. The study specifically addresses how teachers dealt with two issues in the new syllabus: planning of outcomes-based assessment and constructivist approach to learning.
Research context, design, methodology	The researcher as a participant observer interviewed nine teachers and observed four teachers.
Key findings or points discussed	Previously, science syllabuses in Queensland were written in a form that required little or no school-based curriculum development. The 1999 syllabus asked teachers to achieve three tasks: first, review their own teaching philosophy; second, implement an outcomes-based approach for planning and assessment; and third, be involved in writing and developing their own school-based programme.
	The school in Keys' study had for many years established various curriculum committees and fostered a strong sense of participative decision-making. Professional development directly related to the science syllabus had been provided over a 2-year period. During the year of implementation teachers were provided with a copy of the new science syllabus document together with a school-based developed programme. They were also provided with support from the education advisor.
	Keys found that in planning, the teachers preferred the idea of integration and tended to use language or social studies as their integrating device. There appeared to be no pedagogical reasoning behind the teachers' choice other than their personal preference for a subject. The teachers relied heavily on past lessons and resource material that they had already previously been using. They did not make use of the new science syllabus document and supporting material other than to identify the core learning outcomes. Teachers expressed frustration over the amount of time spent in the preparation of a lesson in meeting these outcome statements of the new syllabus. The teachers' view was that the new syllabus was not user-friendly and did not lend itself readily to classroom use.
	Keys did not observe any change in the teaching approach of the four teachers after having had the new syllabus in their possession for a school year. Much of the teaching approach was a mixture of a process model to a didactic model of teaching science. There was very little indication of a shift towards "constructivist" teaching approaches. Regarding assessment, teachers expressed their concern on four issues: determining if a child had achieved a core-learning outcome; group assessment versus individual assessment; the recording of observations; and effective tools for assessment. Of these four issues the teachers were most concerned about effective tools for assessment.
Author's implications	Keys concludes that if a syllabus document is to be a principal reference for SBCD,

	then there needs to be careful consideration given to the format and presentation of the document. The syllabus document needs to be concise, easily understood, and a workable document so that the teacher can readily use it within the classroom. Secondly, when a new syllabus document is introduced into a school careful planning and consideration needs to be given to its implementation process, including the provision of support and professional development which assists teachers to better understand what is expected of them in the SBCD process, and supports them to make adjustments to their practices or beliefs about curriculum and teaching where needed.

Key theme	Student role in SBCD
Reference	Mac an Ghaill, M. (1992). Student perspectives on curriculum innovation and change in an English secondary school: an empirical study. *British Educational Research Journal*, *18* (3), 221–234.
Type of document	Journal article
Nature of document	Research; case study
Short abstract	This article looks at Year 11 and 12 students' perspectives on curriculum innovation and change in an English secondary school. The curriculum innovations in operation included the National Curriculum, the GCSE, student profiling/Records of Achievement, and various others.
	A key theme of the article is a paradox that emerged between student and teacher perspectives on the curriculum changes. The school's official intention of creating a student-centred innovation unintendedly resulted in students' "exclusion, disorientation, and de-skilling". For teachers, the initiatives were mainly about attending to the technical and administrative aspects of the changes – and consequently overlooking the need to build shared meanings of the curriculum innovation among teachers and students. However, many students felt that the curriculum reform had in some cases actually deteriorated the relationship between teachers and students as "getting things done" became the key focus.
Research context, design, methodology	The school was an inner-city secondary school of mixed ethnicity.
Key findings or points discussed	Mac an Ghaill suggests that in the context of UK curriculum changes in the early 1990s, students appeared "to have disappeared from the educational map...students appear as extras in the narrative of curriculum reform that is acted out each day within schools". Mac an Ghaill suggests that there was never a clear discussion within the school about what a "student-centred" pedagogy actually meant. Student perceptions of the school's move to a more "student-centred curriculum" raised some interesting issues. Students suggested that despite the curriculum/teaching/assessment changes many teachers "had not really changed" or didn't really know how to talk to young people.
	Mac an Ghaill reflected on the contradictory teacher and student data. Teachers were saying the curriculum changes had been successful in developing student-centred pedagogies, while students were saying the opposite. Mac an Ghaill suggests this was because teachers measured the changes by: (a) the production of dept and pastoral policies that "prioritised" student needs; (b) the development of courses that emphasised what students could achieve; (c) the introductions of new forms of assessment that enabled students to be actively involved in negotiating their learning, etc. In contrast, students tended to evaluate the changes based on how they felt teachers'-student interpersonal relationships had deteriorated, with teachers having less direct classroom contact with them. The strategies teachers cited as contributing to the creation of a student-centred classroom were perceived by students to actually cater less to their needs than having more interpersonal time with their teachers.
	Teaching methodology and curriculum change
	Students were asked to describe what made a "good" or "bad" teacher. Mac an Ghaill found that "...compared to the teachers' rather simplistic theories of pedagogic relations, the students' understandings, grounded in their schooling experiences, perceptively and cogently demonstrated an awareness of the complexities of classroom relations, which involved teacher and student histories and biographies.

	Implicitly they acknowledged the difficulties involved in altering existing curriculum practices. In contrast, the management and many of the teachers tended to undertheorise the cultural and contextual complexity of curriculum and pedagogic change" (p. 227).
Author's implications	Mac an Ghaill concludes that "the absence of a student perspective from the official curriculum decision-making processes in secondary schools contributes to a major limitation in the implementation of current innovation" (p. 229).
Related references	Brooker, R., & Macdonald, D. (1999). Did we hear you?: issues of student voice in a curriculum innovation. *Journal of curriculum studies, 31*(1), 83–97.

Key theme	General overviews of SBCD
Reference	Marsh, C., Day, C., Hannay, L., & McCutcheon, G. (1990). *Reconceptualising school-based curriculum development.* London: The Falmer Press.
Type of document	Book
Nature of document	Overview of SBCD theory and principles; case studies
Short abstract	This book discusses theoretical aspects of SBCD, and looks at the role and development of SBCD in four countries: Australia, UK, Canada, and USA. The first part of the book deals with issues of context for SBCD (at national or state levels) and then presents a theoretical framework for SBCD. Note that this annotation refers only to the first section of the book. The second part of the book comprises case studies of SBCD from each of the four countries. The four case studies (Marsh, 1990; Day, 1990; Hannay, 1990; and McCutcheon, 1990) are each annotated separately in this bibliography.
Key points discussed	**The contexts for SBCD in Australia, Canada, United Kingdom, USA** For each country (Australia, Canada, the UK, and the USA) Marsh et al. describe the historical roots of SBCD, the situation up to 1990, key factors contributing to the growth of SBCD, factors limiting the growth of SBCD, and evaluative evidence about SBCD. In all four countries, SBCD emerged in the context of: 1. demands for increased autonomy of the school in curriculum making; 2. dissatisfaction with "top-down" modes of control; 3. schools needing to be responsive to their environment, and requiring the freedom, opportunity, responsibility and resources to determine and direct their affairs; 4. the view that schools are best fitted to plan and design the curriculum, and to construct the teaching and learning of specific programmes; 5. the view that teacher self-actualisation, motivation, and sense of achievement are integrally bound up with curriculum decision-making; and 6. the view that the school is a more stable and enduring institution for curriculum development than regional and national bodies. The authors state that involvement in SBCD requires a redefinition of the teacher's role, and that teachers will need help to prepare them for this role. Implications for teacher education and institutional/organisational changes are also noted. **Towards a reconceptualisation of SBCD** Marsh et al. draw from SBCD literature to analyse the concepts and practices of SBCD. Like Brady (1992), Marsh et al. present SBCD as a continuum of practices/processes. They note that "school-based" does not mean that all decision-making rests with the school, and suggest a preference for the term "school-focused". **Why become involved in SBCD?** Marsh et al. discuss various factors that may sit behind individuals' involvement in SBCD. The two main motives discussed are "current level of job satisfaction" and "educational innovations". It is theorised that teachers who are unsatisfied by various aspects of their job (e.g. wanting promotion, poor student attainments, feeling of inadequate resources, boredom, etc.) may seek to engage in SBCD. Also, educators who are susceptible to educational innovations. Figure 3 on p. 55 diagrams some key "driving forces" and "restraining forces" for using an educational innovation.

	SBCD as an ideal
	Marsh et al. discuss some things that might be expected to feature in SBCD in an ideal situation. Some problems that can arise during SBCD are briefly discussed, as is the issue of evaluating SBCD.

Key theme	SBCD processes in practice (case studies)
Reference	Marsh, C. (1990). Australia: establishing a Unit Curriculum for Years 8–10 at River Valley Senior High School. In C. Marsh, C. Day, L. Hannay, & G. McCutcheon (Eds.), *Reconceptualising school-based curriculum development* (pp. 73–97). London: The Falmer Press.
Type of document	Book chapter
Nature of document	Case study (Australia)
Short abstract	This chapter is the first of four case studies illustrating various instances of SBCD in Marsh et al.'s book *Reconceptualising school-based curriculum development.*
Key points discussed	In this case study, two innovative administrators (principal and deputy principal) in an Australian high school in the early 1980s began to experiment with new structures in their school: notably "vertical timetabling" and daily pastoral care sessions with vertical age groups. These new structures were developed in response to concerns about the need for a more flexible curriculum with subjects that catered for the needs of high- and low-achieving students. In 1986, the state (Western Australia) invited the school to become a pilot school to initiate a new curriculum structure for lower secondary students, the "Unit Curriculum". This required the school to engage in SBCD, since, although some aspects of the new Unit Curriculum structure were prescribed by the state education system, a number of planning decisions still had to be made by staff at the school. They had to plan their own version of the Unit Curriculum, make a number of critical decisions about priorities and schedules, and then follow these through to the implementation stage.

The case study gives a chronology of events for the SBCD and looks at the roles of various parties during the process. An interesting analysis on pp. 83–90 of the chapter looks at the role and activities of various key actors over 3 years. This shows the initial strong drive from the principal and deputy principal, and gradually greater involvement from senior staff, all staff, then students and parents, with gradually less involvement by principal and deputy principal. The case study discusses some of the personal/professional characteristics of the principal and deputy principal that seemed to be important for the development and sustainability of the SBCD, and the processes that were used to enable staff to work together on planning. |

Key theme	Parent/community involvement in SBCD
Reference	May, S. (1992). The relational school: fostering pluralism and empowerment through a 'language policy across the curriculum'. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 27* (1), 35–51.
Type of document	Journal article
Nature of document	??
Short abstract	In this article May draws on the example of Richmond Road School's Language Policy Across the Curriculum (LPAC) to outline the advantages and demands of SBCD. Richmond Road is hailed as an example of a "relational" school (an idea from Skilbeck), that is, one with a democratic decision-making framework among staff, and an established consultation process with the local community. May's key message is that developing an LPAC involves more than identifying the language needs of the school: these need to be realised in organisational and pedagogical changes to the structure of the school, and to be supported by a national educational climate which fosters both the equity considerations that underlie an LPAC, and the autonomy that schools require to develop these intentions at the local level.
Key findings or points discussed	May argues that language policy across the curriculum (LPAC) must be a curriculum policy that arises out of the language needs of particular schools. "They should be cross-curricular in their concerns, breaking down traditional subject boundaries, and they should involve the whole school community in their development and implementation…. The establishment of an LPAC...must be guided by the language expectations that local parents have for their children. An educational climate which allows schools the autonomy to develop these locally tailored language policies will further aid this development" (p. 36). May goes on to discuss the challenges and demands that SBCD places on schools, citing Skilbeck (1984). Richmond Road School is used as an example to illustrate a process of SBCD that included identification of the language needs of the students and community served by the school, community consultation, and structural changes to the way the school operates.
	"Richmond road is a relational school. The pursuit and application of curriculum innovation and development in language policy had led to a fundamental restructuring of the school. This change in school organisational structure and pedagogical practice has been based on collaborative decision-making at a staff level and an open interchange between the school and its community with regard to the language needs of its pupils" (p. 49).
	The role of national educational policy in supporting the development of SBCD is also discussed.
Author's implications	May's key message is that developing an LPAC involves more than identifying the language needs of the school – these need to be realised in organisational and pedagogical changes to the structure of the school – and to be supported by a national educational climate which fosters both the equity considerations that underlie an LPAC, and the autonomy that schools require to develop these intentions at the local level.

Key theme	SBCD processes in practice (case studies)
Reference	McCutcheon, G. (1990). United States of America: school-based curriculum development in Chester: revising a curriculum. In C. Marsh, C. Day, L. Hannay, & G. McCutcheon (Eds.), *Reconceptualising school-based curriculum development* (pp. 99–121). London: The Falmer Press.
Type of document	Book chapter
Nature of document	Case study (United States)
Key points discussed	This case study looks at SBCD at the district level brought about by teachers, administrators and parents: the development of a curriculum for gifted students in the district of Chester (a pseudonym). In the state of Ohio at the time (the 1980s), the mandated policy was primarily a process mandate: each school district had to develop graded courses of study to prescribe what is taught in a given subject or programme in its schools. At that time, the state specified subjects and some requirements, but not content.
	In 1987 Chester developed a Gifted Education curriculum for the district. This included a matrix of skills to be taught, and a set of mandated units about economics, architecture, and other areas. These units were partly compiled and adapted from a list of State Department of Education recommendations and objectives contained in the state's other courses of study, and partly from units already taught by different gifted teachers in the district.
	Issues immediately arose with the new Gifted Education curriculum. For example, teachers had differential knowledge of the different units. Other issues included community relations, a lack of materials, and a lack of articulation of the gifted programme among elementary, middle, and senior high schools. An ad-hoc committee was formed in response to these concerns, and this eventually resulted in a curriculum revision.
	The case study looks at some of the deliberations that occurred in the committee meetings. One of the major themes in the case study is that the deliberations opened up opportunities for those involved to share and clarify their various views and perspectives on gifted education. This led to the development of some agreed principles. For example, "ultimately the team decided that a curriculum that prescribed in depth a reasonable number of essential skills and concepts was preferred over one that covered in a superficial way a wide range of content" (p. 135).
	Because the people who developed the curriculum were those who taught it, by the time they finished the revision, they knew the curriculum (and each other) very well. The author also notes that the people involved each had strong personal views. "The people involved here were polite, but firmly committed to particular ideas. As these ideas were deliberate, people came to understand their own and others' commitments more clearly and a group position resulted" (p. 137).
Author's implications	As a general comment about SBCD in Chester, the author notes a lack of an overall conceptual design of the curriculum because the state mandated development of graded courses of study for each discipline separately. "The absence of such an overall conceptualisation permits courses such as gifted education...to be seen as peripheral, and hence not an integral part of what is to occur in Chester schools" (p. 138).

Key theme	The political nature of curriculum development
Reference	Prideaux, D. (1993). School-based curriculum development: partial, paradoxical and piecemeal. *Journal of curriculum studies, 25* (2), 169–178.
Type of document	Journal article
Nature of document	Critical commentary on the politics of SBCD
Short abstract	This paper draws on case study research findings from South Australian schools, to provide a critique of SBCD, or at least the version of it that was advocated in South Australia in the 1970s and early 1980s. Important lessons/directions for teachers, schools, and curriculum in the changed educational climate of the 1990s are described.
Key findings or points discussed	**SBCD: from bureaucratic to ideological control of curriculum**
	This section considers issues of power and control – via post-structural analyses of curriculum. Prideaux claims SBCD was not a "grass roots" phenomenon in South Australia; rather it had its origins and impetus in official statements from senior levels of the Education Department. He cites Pusey (1979) who claims that Australian education in the 1970s and 1980s moved from a tight bureaucratic mode to a more pervasive form of ideological control. Tight control through external exams and imposed curricula shifted to "indirect control" through official sponsoring of educational research, consultancy, and inservice education. Pusey claimed SBCD represented a way of intervening to regain some control over the curriculum activities of schools and teachers. Schools were given responsibility for the curriculum, but the state was able to make strategic interventions through the support of national curriculum projects by outside agencies, such as Australia's Curriculum Development Centre, and also through involvement in local projects and the development of guidelines for schools.
	SBCD in South Australia: a critique
	Case studies in three South Australian primary schools are used to illustrate three major features of the SBCD of the 1970s and 1980s: the *partial* nature of the devolution of authority; some *paradoxical* effects of the emphasis on consensus; and the *piecemeal* basis of curriculum changes associated with SBCD.
	Prideaux claims SBCD was p*artial* because authority for curriculum development was devolved to Principals and not to schools and their communities. It was *paradoxical* because SBCD put an emphasis on consensus at whole-school level. But the case studies show this was sometimes very difficult. For example, in a school where there were at least two competing approaches to language teaching, some teachers felt the SBCD restricted their individual teaching freedom, and felt they would have had more within-school consensus with an externally-imposed curriculum. Prideaux says although it is important for teachers to achieve a shared purpose and understanding in their curriculum programmes, the South Australian SBCD proposals "tended to ignore the conflict and struggle that underlies curriculum. The emphasis was on achieving a consensus and not on the political processes of addressing conflicts, debating them and negotiating agreements" (p. 174).
	Finally, Prideaux says the South Australian SBCD was *piecemeal.* Prideaux locates the conceptual basis of SBCD within an "innovations" view of curriculum, which assumes that curriculum change at a local level can make programmes more relevant, more enjoyable or more useful for the students for whom they are designed. Prideaux discusses crtiticisms of this assumption. For example:
	• that it ignores the central role of curriculum in the selection and reproduction

	functions of education;
	• that by concentrating on small isolated changes, this approach does little to change the overall structure of curriculum and to challenge its reproduction of divisions in society; and
	• that SBCD can be seen as an "alternative" curriculum which excludes some groups from access to "mainstream and powerful" curriculum programmes.
Author's implications	Prideaux concludes that teachers and other curriculum workers cannot afford to ignore the relationship between curriculum development, and curriculum control and power. Prideaux suggests poststructuralism can make a contribution to these parties' understanding of the politics of curriculum. He suggests that teachers and others should deconstruct curriculum development, for example, as a staff working together, and that teachers should "carry the deconstruction of curricula into the classroom to their students". Furthermore, Prideaux argues there is a need to bring into focus the issues of *conflict* inherent in curriculum, and that "this conflict is not resolved by attempting to put a veneer of consensual decision making in place" (p. 176).

Key theme	Parent/community involvement in SBCD
Reference	Ramsay, P., Hawk, K., Harold, B., Marriot, R., & Poskitt, J. (1993). *Developing partnerships: collaboration between teachers and parents.* Wellington: Learning Media.
Type of document	Book
Nature of document	Research; summary of a NZ Ministry of Education research project
Short abstract	This book provides a comprehensive view of the 1987 Department of Education project: the Curriculum Review Exploratory Study. The project had three main aims: (1) to trial materials for enhancing collaborative decision-making between teachers and parents on curriculum matters; (2) to trial materials, including a national draft curriculum statement, relevant to the collaborative decision-making process; (3) to document the process of change from non-collaborative to collaborative forms of decision-making. The project was set up by the DoE as a consequence of the National Curriculum Review, and was given greater impetus and direction by the Picot report, and the 1989 "Tomorrows Schools" reforms.
Research context, design, methodology	The 2-year project involved 28 schools (primary, intermediate, secondary) in four clusters in Southern Auckland, the Waikato, Kapiti Coast, Palmerston North, and Southwest Christchurch. Each cluster had a "developer", a person who worked with schools to facilitate community involvement in SBCD, and a researcher who recorded and provided ongoing evaluative information on the change processes of school-community relationships. Using a grounded-theory methodology, the research group developed and tested over 700 propositions about the processes involved in school-community collaboration in curriculum development.
Key findings or points discussed	**Phases of the project** The authors describe the unfolding of the project in terms of six phases. *Phase 1: Pre-development and preparatory work* In this phase, a baseline study was conducted to identify the existing level of parent consultation in place in the schools. Most were operating with a fairly superficial level of consultation. *Phase 2: Getting started* In this phase, developers met with schools, and principals, staff, and parents were informed of the intent and mechanics of the project. The developers gained an idea of what curriculum development plans the school already had in place and how these could be incorporated into the project. *Phase 3: Laying the groundwork* This phase involved "getting people on board" the project. Although parents and other community members were involved, the key focus of this phase was on teachers, as the researchers and developers believed that teachers had to be secure in their own classroom practice, and their techniques for interacting with parents, before they could successfully share decision-making with them. In one cluster, staff development included workshops on the advantages/disadvantages/meaning of "consultation". The developer in that cluster also found that the schools had varying and contradictory perceptions of the learning needs of their school's particular students, and that scant attention was paid to the unique characteristics of their school/community/students in teaching programmes. The developer proposed that each school in the cluster prepare "pupil profiles". Working parties in each school collected and collated information about

	their students' personal details, family background, educational experience, and learning and behaviour characteristics. Several schools sent questionnaires to parents or interviewed students.
	In most schools a curriculum review committee (CRC) of teachers, parents, and others, was established as a steering or leadership group. While some CRCs worked well, others did not. Many parents involved in this phase of the project felt their involvement was peripheral, and that teachers were making the real decisions. Progress was "painstakingly slow", but after several months schools seemed to have reached a point where they were prepared to work in earnest with parents.
	Phase 4: Encounters with parents
	In this phase, the developers asked teachers and principals to choose an issue they saw as important, and use this as a focal point for involving parents. The initiatives that schools adopted to involve parents were many and various, and the issues focused on ranged from difficult issues relating to the health syllabus or Mäori knowledge and values, to simpler matters such as school reports. Three general categories of approach to parent involvement were identified: (1) social activities which opened opportunities for parents to participate in a range of social and educational activities (e.g. a multicultural dinner, or school sports days; (2) pupil-centred activities, focused on drawing parents' attention or involvement in some specific pupil learning or behaviour consideration; and (3) issues-centred activities, concentrating on a concern specific to the school district (e.g. racial or health issues). During this phase, teachers and parents continued to alter their attitudes. Generally, teachers underestimated the high level of parent support, and the myth that many parents did not want to be involved was put to rest. Although there were some instances of entrenched patterns of resistance to collaboration, by the end of this phase, "…many schools had seen their teachers, developers, and parents working together to devise, implement, and evaluate, and where necessary, modify courses of action designed to promote collaborative decision making on curriculum matters" (p. 93).
	Phase 5: Reconsideration, regrouping, andreplanning
	Having made the first deliberate attempts to involve parents in decision-making, most schools paused to evaluate what had happened, to reflect on which strategies had worked and which had not, and to develop new initiatives. Evaluation proved to be a vital part of the process of involving parents in decision-making and the role of the developer to help guide staff through the evaluation process proved critical. "Evaluation proved particularly valuable for some of the schools which had been struggling with the concept of collaborative decision-making, as it allowed them to gain not only a clearer understanding of the value of parental involvement but also of the means of achieving this aim" (p. 101).
	Phase six: Developing the charter
	In this final phase, "the trialling and preparation work of the earlier phases was put to the test through the writing of school charters". As general patterns, Ramsay et al. noted the conversion of more and more people to the value of collaborative decision-making and partnership in education, and a movement away from curriculum policies based on the *Draft National Curriculum Statement,* towards those arising from the consultative process mandated by the consultative process. However, the rate at which different schools worked towards or achieved the highest level of consultation was variable, and depended on factors including the school's traditional way of doing things, the availability of appropriate resources and systems, and the beliefs, attitudes, and actions of people involved in the charter-writing process.
Authors' implications	In the second and third parts of the book, Ramsay et al. use their research findings to seek to discuss the role of people, resources, and systems in supporting partnership.

	The authors speculate on the ultimate impact of the study on the 28 schools involved, and identify what they believe is needed to enable successful shared decision-making between parents and schools. These include:
	• For teachers: communication skills, critical analysis skills, knowledge of the school and its community, and pre- an in-service education.
	• For parents: confidence in their role, information, and practice in making contributions.
	• For schools and communities: professional leadership amongst principals, open-minded innovative people, change facilitators, inclusive approaches, adequate resources, appropriate consultation systems, a secure platform from which to launch change, and time.
	The implications of these needs for policymakers are also discussed.
Related references	Ramsay, P., Harold, B., Hawk, K., Marriot, R., & Poskitt, J. (1992). Sharing curriculum decisions with parents: an overview of findings of project C.R.R.I.S.P. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 27* (2), 167–182. Ramsay, P., Harold, B., Hill, D., Lang, C., Yates, R., with Patara, L., & Jeffs, C. (1995). *Final report of the SBCD project.* Hamilton: University of Waikato.

Key theme	SBCD processes in practice (case studies)
Reference	Ramsay, P., Harold, B., Hill, D., Lang, C., Yates, R., with Patara, L., & Jeffs, C. (1995). *Final report of the SBCD project*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
Type of document	Research report
Nature of document	Research (New Zealand)
Short abstract	This is the final report of an 18-month project which trialled a model of SBCD in 18 schools, based in two geographical clusters. The project followed on from Ramsay et al.'s earlier Curriculum Review Research in Schools Project (*see* Ramsay et al., 1993, also annotated in this bibliography). After the CRRISP project, two new requirements and expectations were placed on New Zealand schools: the New Zealand Curriculum Framework (NZCF) and the National Educational Guidelines (NEGS). The purposes for the SBCD project were to assist schools and boards of trustees to:

• explore and identify the requirements and expectations of the NZCF and theNEGs;

• review their current curriculum and audit it against the requirements of these documents, in consultation with stakeholders; and

• plan their curriculum development and delivery, including the monitoring of curriculum delivery.

The research aimed to document the approaches taken by schools, to provide an informed basis for other schools undertaking curriculum development. |
| **Key points discussed** | In the first 12 months of the project, facilitators worked in depth with the 18 schools. For the next 6 months facilitators withdrew from the schools and work carried on under the direction of school staff.

A baseline study provided some insight into where each of the 18 schools was starting from. For example, the researchers found that schools began the project with very different levels of familiarity with the NZCF and the NEGs. In some schools teachers were very familiar with the documents, while in other schools teachers had very little familiarity with them. The baseline study also revealed that while BOT chairpeople recognised their legal responsibility for curriculum delivery, and wished to be consulted about curriculum matters, most were reluctant to get too involved with curriculum development because they saw this as the professional domain of school staff.

According to Ramsay et al., key features of the SBCD model in this project were:

• outside consultants provided external facilitation support, and principals, teams of staff, and a school-appointed "implementor" provided internal support for SBCD;

• school-wide reviews were developed to enable teachers and boards of trustees to establish goals based on their own needs;

• staff were allowed to audit their existing curriculum against the New Zealand Curriculum Framework and the National Educational Guidelines;

• boards of trustees were sensitised to their responsibility under the National Administrative Guidelines (NAGs) especially in the curriculum area; and

• this resulted in the development of meaningful and workable strategic plans.

In the first few months of the project, facilitators spent time visiting schools, and leading seminars to familiarise teachers and BOTs with the NZCF and NEGs. The project team (the facilitator, principal, implementor, and teams of staff) looked at the school's existing planning procedures, and endeavoured to establish a self-review process in |

	each school which would lead towards the development of a strategic plan. Typically, four questions were used for the self review: Where are we at? Where do we want to be? How are we going to get there? How do we know when we are there?
	"This approach proved to be very effective, and midway through the phase we were able to report that almost all of the schools had set realistic goals and were beginning to work towards achieving them. Moreover we noted that considerable progress was being made on preparing a three year strategic plan for the implementation of aspects of the NZCF" (p. 26). By the end of the year (1994), the facilitators "had helped schools to a position where an adequate curriculum development model was in place and schools were poised to commence work in 1995 without the facilitator" (p. 33).
	In 1995, the facilitators had withdrawn from the schools. The researchers continued to gather information about curriculum development and planning within the schools. All but two of the schools continued their SBCD project work. "All of the schools noted that they missed the facilitator's involvement but most claimed that the model developed in 1994 was so strong that it continued to work well." However some problems were noted. For example, the "pace of change" was often cited as a problem. In many schools, it took a long time for staff and BOTs to become familiar enough with the NZCF and NEGs that they could work with these documents according to the needs of pupils in the schools, rather than "accept[ing] them in an uncritical fashion for uniform implementation in each school" (p. vi). Similarly, it took a long time for many schools to develop processes for strategic planning. Top-down models were still favoured by many. "Those principals and implementors, however, who chose to involve as wide a range of people as possible in curriculum decision making made the greatest advances" (p. vi).
Authors' implications	Ramsay et al. conclude that the SBCD model trialled in this project "remains the most flexible and powerful approach yet" (p. vii). They assert that one of their most important findings was the desirability of school-wide reviews and school-wide curriculum development, noting that "the teacher development model currently being utilised by the Ministry of Education was not supported as much as the school wide curriculum development system used in the present project" (p. vi).

Key theme	Critical perspectives on SBCD
Reference	Reid, W. (1987a). Where is the habit of deliberation? In N. Sabar, J. Rudduck, & W. Reid (Eds.), *Partnership and autonomy in school-based curriculum development* (pp. 110–114). University of Sheffield: Division of Education.
	Reid, W. (1987b). The functions of SBCD: a cautionary note. In N. Sabar, J. Rudduck, & W. Reid (Eds.), *Partnership and autonomy in school-based curriculum development* (pp. 115–124). University of Sheffield: Division of Education.
Type of document	Chapters in an edited book
Nature of document	Critical commentaries
Short abstract	These two chapters, both from the same edited book, explore key questions around decision-making, and the meaning of "curriculum", in SBCD.
Key findings or points discussed	In "Where is the habit of deliberation?" (pp. 110–114) Reid says that SBCD is not about giving schools complete and total decision-making about what and how to teach, but that it does involve giving schools greater responsibility for curriculum decision-making than they customarily have had. Thus a habit of *deliberation* is a necessary precondition for SBCD. "SBCD should be fostered rather than implemented; it should grow as a helpful way of solving problems that are already apparent or becoming apparent to schools and teachers. Deliberation begins with the identification of problems. Thus ideally, it should operate in the school *before* any formal introduction of SBCD" (p. 111). Reid suggests that "if SBCD is brought in as a 'solution' before the problems are to which it is a solution have been understood", teachers and schools will become preoccupied with questions around resources: i.e. how can schools find time and money to do yet more work? "If, on the other hand, SBCD is seen as something teachers have had a hand in building in response to problems that they, through their own deliberations, have recognised and delineated, then the further work of resolving these problems through curriculum development will be more willingly undertaken. Purposeful activity, based in ideas to which teachers have a personal commitment, will encounter fewer difficulties from perceived shortage of resources." The remainder of the chapter discusses ways in which the habit of deliberation can be fostered within schools, with a particular focus on the role of leadership.

In "The functions of SBCD: a cautionary note" (pp. 115–124) Reid asserts a preference for the term "school-focused" rather than "school-based" curriculum development. This chapter focuses on the meaning of "curriculum", and how this might be reshaped (or not) by a shift towards school-focused curriculum development. Reid says that the advent of national education systems and centralised curriculum-making was an important step in the development of modern nationhood. Over time, there was a shift away from such centralisation, and "educators had to look for new conceptions of how schooling can be provided. It is this challenge which lies behind the invitation to engage in SBCD" (p. 115). Reid argues however that "the opportunity to be grasped in the movement towards SBCD is not that of determining how central functions can be delegated or transferred, but in the more fundamental one of moving from a notion of curriculum which sees it as embodying choices made through formalised, hierarchical structures, to one which understands it as the outcome of less formal, communal deliberation on wants, resources, and possibilities."

Reid says "the means by which the curriculum is planned affects the conception we have of what curriculum is". Bureaucratic models of curriculum decision-making cast the curriculum as an information-transmitting device, that is, the curriculum, as things-to-be-learned. Thus decision-making about curriculum is instrumental and is directed |

towards deciding "what knowledge is of most worth". This of course raises questions about who has authority to determine which knowledge should or should not be included in curriculum. Traditionally, access to centralised curriculum development organisations has only been possible through regulatory rights or through pressure-group activity. Reid argues that if this model of curriculum is held, then SBCD will result in nothing more than transferring the same kind of bureaucratic process into schools. "To say that development is 'school-based' implies a good deal for the location of the function but little for its reconceptualisation...to say, however, that development is to be 'school-focused' suggests that it is not confined to an identifiable organisational base. It is to embrace wider publics for which the school acts as a focal point. But this in turn raises important questions: How are such publics to be defined? How are their desires, preferences, and aspirations to be focused in a process of decision?" (p. 117). Reid makes the point that "these 'publics' may have to be made as much as found, and...in the nature of things, they will not emerge speaking a common language" (p. 118).

Reid argues that the fundamental shift in conception of curriculum is away from curriculum as *"things-to-be-learned"*, to a view of curriculum as *a vehicle for the shaping of group and individual identity*. In other words, "the point of teaching [the curriculum] is that we have some further end-in-view... that students shall better know who they are, what they are capable of doing and what it is good to be doing" (p. 118). The implications of this shift in conception of curriculum are very important for thinking about how publics should be involved in the determination of curriculum. In the first case, which sees curriculum as things-to-be-learned, certain groups will have more status in decision-making than others (e.g. employers, teachers, academics), and the different grounds of interest, authority, or expertise among different groups with different views will need to be managed (most likely through the bureaucratic model of curriculum development). In the latter case, where the curriculum is seen as a tool for shaping identity, the curriculum becomes a project to which many people with many different interests can contribute with some equality of status, since none has an expert or instrumental engagement in such questions.

Author's implications	The essence of Reid's argument in these two chapters is that successful SBCD requires an *a priori* habit within schools of continuously identifying changing educational needs and priorities, and deliberating how these are to be addressed through curriculum and pedagogy. However, it is equally vital to recognise that the kind of deliberation about curriculum we can have depends on what we conceive to be the nature and function of curriculum. (P. 121) "A design for curriculum, as opposed to a specification for what items shall be included in a curriculum, has to emerge from a set of common understandings. These in turn will be achieved through discussion. If we enter that discussion with the idea that a curriculum is indeed a collection of things-to-be-learned, a 'selection from the culture', a set of 'learning experience'...we shall have set up a context for bids and bargains, for expert testimony or majority power, but not for purposing in common. That comes from consideration of issues relating to the curriculum thought of as a voyage, narrative, or saga. Such issues...preoccupy people of all sectional interests and all manner of talent...What kind of people do we want to be? What kind of community would we like to live in? What sort of schooling could help us to be those kinds of people and have that kind of community? These are the kinds of questions that matter if we think that knowledge should be a means as much as an ends in curriculum" (p.121).

Key theme	General overviews of SBCD
Reference	Sabar, N., Rudduck, J., & Reid, W. (1987). *Partnership and autonomy in school-based curriculum development.* University of Sheffield: Division of Education.
Type of document	Edited book
Short abstract	This book is a collection of edited chapters that emerged from an international working seminar in Israel in 1985. Participants from three countries (England, Israel, and Canada) explored issues and problems relating to various aspects of SBCD. The editors note that "despite devoting a lengthy session to exploring meanings of SBCD, a definition that was acceptable to all participants did not emerge. It became clear that meanings differ within and across countries and are significantly affected by political, social and cultural factors." An interesting point about different national interpretations of SBCD is made on p. 2: "While the English with their supposed tradition of autonomy see SBCD as being about *whole* school curriculum planning, in Israel SBCD is about planning *part* of a school curriculum in relation to one or more school subjects."
	The themes of "partnership" and "autonomy" in SBCD thread throughout the chapters.
Key findings or points discussed	The book is structured in three main sections.
	Section 1 National Contexts
	The three chapters in this section give historical/contextual histories for the growth and development of SBCD in Israel and England, up to the mid-1980s.
	Section 2 Partnership and autonomy - degrees of freedom
	The two chapters in this section explore the themes of partnership and autonomy as important theoretical framings for SBCD. In "Autonomy is more than just the absence of external constraints" (pp. 29–36), David Gordon makes the point that for SBCD to occur, not only do school personnel need to be in an environment which promotes SBCD (or removes constraints to it), they also need to *believe/perceive* that they are free to develop (and have the ability to develop) their own curricula. Gordon cites examples from his own experience where teachers have not believed this to be the case, and thus have backed away from SBCD. Gordon argues that teachers who haven't the knowledge and training to develop worthwhile curricula on their own need help. "In other words, productive curriculum development which is *solely* school-based is extremely unlikely to 'happen'. We must content ourselves with an interpretation of the term 'SBCD' which allows for some collaboration with an external agency" (p. 34). Gordon goes on to suggest two possibilities – either collaboration with a curriculum development centre that is part of the central or local educational authority, or collaboration with independent centres, e.g. research institutes or universities. The drawbacks of each possibility are discussed.
	Section 3 Partnership in practice
	The four chapters in this section give accounts of SBCD in different settings. For example, in "Environmental education: A: the special case of environmental education", (pp. 51–55), Abraham Blum makes the case that the interdisciplinarity, relevance and "local/global" features of EE demand SBCD as a process for creating meaningful student learning experiences in EE. In the next chapter, "B: School-based curriculum development in environmental education: a teacher's perspective", (pp. 56–61), Shoshana Keiny and Tzila Weiss describe the IEEP (Israeli EE project) which was founded in 1983 to enhance the implementation of EE in secondary schools. Teachers from various schools throughout the country were recruited and presented with a conceptual model for EE curriculum development. Teachers were organised in local

	teams of 2–4 teachers and worked with a curriculum consultant to develop EE curricula. One teacher's experience (Weiss) is described in a first-person account.
	Section 4: Confronting some key questions Key questions are indicated by the titles of the chapters in this section: "Can school-based curriculum development be other than conservative?" "Can teachers produce high quality curriculum material?" "Can we train teachers to improve the quality of curriculum materials?" "Do we pay enough attention to pupils' understanding and experience of change?". "Are schools capable of making critical decisions about their curriculum?". The two final chapters in this section, both by William Reid, are annotated separately in this bibliography (*see* Reid 1987a; 1987b).

Key theme	Teacher role in SBCD
Reference	Shoham, E. (1995). Teacher autonomy in school-based curricula in Israel: its significance for teacher education. *Westminster studies in education, 18*, 35–45.
Type of document	Journal article
Nature of document	Research article; case study
Short abstract	Teacher autonomy is part of the educational ideology of kibbutzim (collective farms or settlements in modern Israel, owned by the community members, and operating under collectivist principles). This article deals with the concept of teacher autonomy in school-based curricula in the kibbutz secondary schools in Israel.
	Based on a review of literature, Shoham suggests four ways in which teacher autonomy is likely to find expression in SBCD:
	1. in selecting areas of study (contents, teaching, and evaluation methods) to be taught in the curriculum;
	2. in developing areas of study within the curriculum;
	3. in nurturing the teacher's professional skills; and
	4. in nurturing a democratic ambience through teacher-student interaction.
	The research involved an analysis of the written content of school-based curricula in kibbutz secondary schools in 1990, and questionnaires and interviews with teachers involved in teaching the SBC programmes. These data were compared against the four theorized components of teacher autonomy described above. Shoham found that the written curricula did not actually allow the teacher much autonomy, but that teachers believed the curricula afforded freedom to express professional autonomy and personal-professional needs. These feelings seemed to be what determined their attitudes to these curricula, and their preference for these over externally-imposed curricula. Both the written curricula, and the teacher's comments, suggested minimal involvement of students in curriculum development. Implications of the research findings for the training of the teacher as a curriculum planner and developer are described.
Research context, design, methodology	The research analysed the content of all 35 school-based curricula in existence in kibbutz secondary schools in 1990. Eighty-five teachers who were implementing special programmes responded to a questionnaire, and 53 teachers were interviewed.
Key findings or points discussed	**Analysis of written school-based curricula**
	In the analysis of the written curricula there was virtually no reference to components in which the teacher could be autonomous. While 25 percent of the written curricula suggested teachers could select the content, teaching, and evaluation methods from the SBC, only 11 percent positioned teachers as developers of the area of study – that is, encouraging teachers to develop new subject matter and teaching materials further to the SBC. Seventeen percent of the curricula alluded to teacher professional development (either a need for professional development to help teach the curriculum, or professional development as a result of using the curriculum). As regards students, 14 percent of the curricula mentioned developing a climate of trust between teachers and students, but only 3 percent mentioned involving students in operationalising the curriculum.
	Teacher interviews and questionnaires
	In interviews and questionnaires, teachers felt SBC gave them leeway in content

	selection (92 percent), and provided them with choices in terms of teaching and evaluation methods (66 percent). More than half the teachers implementing the particular SBC had taken part in developing it, either on their own, or as part of teams.
	Regarding student involvement in curriculum development, 55 percent of teachers did not enlist student cooperation in SBC, and those who did so did it to a limited extent. Shoham compares her findings to those of Be-Peretz and Lavi (1983), who found that teachers believe themselves to be better judges of content, teaching methods, and evaluation than their students. However "mutual student-teacher trust" was seen as important, and some teachers mentioned the importance of students' "individual projects" in SBC as a means of developing a personal relationship with students.
Author's implications	Shoham concludes that curriculum planners (i.e. those in schools who are involved in the development and writing of the SBC) see the teacher who will use the SBC as a "consumer". They concentrate on the choice and adaptation of existing subject matter and teaching materials, which limit the autonomy expected of the teacher. However, teachers who use the curriculum perceive the teacher as a selector, choosing and adapting material to their needs. Teachers view professionalism, teamwork, and teacher-student trust as important goals, but place less emphasis on teacher involvement in developing areas of study or student participation in curriculum development.
	Shoham suggests the SBC developers are "autonomous innovators", but the SBC users (other teachers) are not necessarily such. Shoham suggests that teacher training should emphasise that it is not enough for the developer to be autonomous, the users have to have autonomy too.
	But she also raises the questions:
	• Can the teacher be trained to function as an autonomous creative individual, even if s/he is not by nature creative?
	• Is it a good idea for every teacher to draw up a SBC even without the necessary talent to do so?
	• Are the demands placed by teacher autonomy not in fact a hurdle too high for some teachers now active in schools, a hurdle that will in the end prove to be a stumbling block?
Related references	Sabar, N., Rudduck, J., & Reid, W. (1987). *Partnership and autonomy in school-based curriculum development.* University of Sheffield: Division of Education.

Key theme	SBCD processes in practice (case studies)
Reference	Willis, M. (1997). The national agenda in the national capital. In J. Lokan (Ed.), *Describing learning: implementation of Curriculum Profiles in Australian schools 1986–1996* (pp. 27-53). Melbourne: ACER Press.
Type of document	Book chapter
Nature of document	A comprehensive history of SBCD in the Australian Capital Territory from 1974–1997
Short abstract	This chapter describes the history and development of SBCD in the ACT, and gives a clear account of the curriculum and policy developments which have shaped curriculum and teaching practice in ACT schools from 1974–1997. SBCD has been an "enshrined" principle in the ACT since 1974.
Key findings or points discussed	In many ways the ACT represents a unique example for looking at the processes and policy contexts which can support SBCD. In 1974 the territory gained autonomy in terms of teacher supply, curricula, inspection services, and examinations, and was no longer under the auspices of the NSW DET (which was perceived as too large, highly centralised, and removed from the needs of the ACT community). SBCD was inherent in the direction taken by the newly-established Interim ACT Schools Authority, and "…the expectation that each school, in conjunction with its school board, would determine its own philosophy, emphasis and curriculum resulted in two principles being enshrined in the ACT system: school-based curriculum development (or as it has been interpreted in practice, school-based decision making) and curriculum autonomy" (p. 28).
	In the 1970s implementation of this new direction varied from school to school, and learning area to learning area. Then in 1989 the federal government handed over responsibility of government to the people of the ACT. The Schools Authority became the Department of Education. However, the principles of SBCD remained embedded in the philosophy of the ACT system. Eventually, accountability in school-based curriculum development became important and a "Program Review" was established, followed by a 5-year cycle of whole school review. "This included review of the school-based curriculum by central office staff. The main impact of this curriculum review was to remind schools of their obligation to complete documentation of their curriculum" (p. 28).
	In 1984, development of the ACT secondary school Curriculum Frameworks commenced. Until 1989 the design of each framework varied. In 1990 a decision was made to rewrite all the frameworks in the same format and style, and a "Cross Curriculum Perspectives Statement" was added to all frameworks.
	The interaction between the ACT curriculum frameworks, and the national statements and profiles
	In the early 1990s, work began on national curriculum statements and national profiles in Australia. There was significant interaction between this, and the development of the ACT frameworks (e.g. via national collaborations). Sitting underneath the developments of the 1990s was a shift towards OBE.
	In 1994 the ACT Curriculum Frameworks were published as companion documents to the national profiles, and teachers were encouraged "to think of the ACT frameworks and the national profiles as documents to be used together in planning the learning and teaching process" (p. 30). In 1994–5 there was to be a 2-year trial of the implementation of the curriculum frameworks and profiles in ACT schools.
	"HUB documents" for SBCD

	An important part of the curriculum review and renewal strategy was the idea that the ACT frameworks would be the "hub" for the generation of school-based curriculum documents. This incorporated a whole-school view of curriculum planning. "The whole school HUB document outlines the following features of the school, either in a single document or in a portfolio of documents:
	• School vision statement;
	• School policies impacting on curriculum;
	• School strategic plan;
	• Description of the nature of the student population;
	• Identified needs of particular student groups;
	• Additional broad generic outcomes unique to the school;
	• Identification of teaching and learning strategies valued by the school, for example an integrated program, cooperative learning;
	• Curriculum organisation and implementation within the school;
	• Mapping how and where the Across Curriculum Perspectives are to be addressed;
	• Description of generic assessment and reporting strategies;
	• Description of generic evaluation strategies;
	• Description of the monitoring processes to ensure all students can access outcomes which are equally balanced across learning areas; and
	• Description of how the school curriculum articulates with other education stages" (p. 32).
Related references	*Introduction to the ACT curriculum frameworks* Retrieved 15 June 2004 from http://www.decs.act.gov.au/publicat/acpframeworks.htm
	Every chance to learn: curriculum renewal discussion paper. (no date). ACT. Retrieved 15 June 2004 from http://activated.decs.act.gov.au/learning/currenewal/EveryChanceToLearn-DiscussionPaper.pdf

Key theme	Outcomes-based education
Reference	Willis, S., & Kissane, B. (1995). *Outcome-based education: a review of the literature.* Murdoch, Western Australia: Prepared for the Education Department of Western Australia.
Type of document	Report
Nature of document	Literature review
Short abstract	This literature review outlines the premises and principles of outcome-based education (OBE). It includes a section called "OBE and curriculum" which explains how the two things relate to one another. This section in particular highlights the relationship between the two notions of OBE, and SBCD.
Key findings or points discussed	**What is meant by student outcomes?** Willis and Kissane note that the term "student outcomes" is used in two senses in education. The first is to refer to a desired state in individuals, (i.e. the actual capabilities they should develop as a result of their school education). The second refers to performance indicators, which either provide evidence of what has happened with respect to a group of students, or define a desired state (or target) with respect to a group of students. Willis and Kissane state that in their literature review, the former definition is intended. Authors note considerable confusion about what "OBE" means and the various forms it can take (p. 1). **Premises and principles of OBE** (pp. 2–4) Some of the key premises and principles of OBE are explored. For example: *Curriculum content and pedagogy* - The focus is on what students have learned rather than on what systems and schools have provided and teachers have taught. - Curriculum content and pedagogy are determined by what we would like students to exhibit at the end of their educational experience. "A key claim of OBE is that teaching and learning will be enhanced by the clear articulation of the desired outcomes of learning and a commitment by the whole school community to align teaching and assessment towards these outcomes" (p. 2). *High quality outcomes for all students* - OBE is built on the premise that all students can achieve learning outcomes of significance so long as the conditions necessary for their success are met, i.e. it has equity and social justice concerns (*see* p. 3). - Accountability and the professionalism of teachers. **The description of expected student outcomes** (pp. 5–21) This section of the literature review defines "outcomes", as distinct from goals and objectives. It describes three alternative ways of conceptualising and structuring outcomes, e.g. "Traditional OBE" – not really OBE? Because the objectives are derived from the components of existing curriculum and structures, these structures themselves are not really put under scrutiny. "Transformational OBE" – this form of OBE starts with exit outcomes which focus on

	"adult life roles", i.e. "big" exit outcomes. These are used to identify the knowledge, competence, and orientations that then become the basis for curriculum design. This is Spady's favoured form of OBE.
	"Transitional OBE" – this form of OBE starts with exit outcomes which all students are required to demonstrate, and which guide curriculum programme decisions. These outcomes have some similarities to "goals", except they are outcomes because students are required to demonstrate these. Not quite "adult life roles" but at least give a clear conception of what we want students to be able to do in later life. **The same outcomes for all** (pp. 13–16) In this section Willis and Kissane present arguments for and against the notion that all students can achieve high-level outcomes. **OBE and Curriculum** "Proponents of OBE believe that the curriculum process should begin with the explicit statement of the outcomes expected of schooling and curriculum content and structures should be planned to expand students' opportunities to achieve the outcomes. There are two related but different aspects to expanding students' 'opportunities to learn'. The first is provision for all students of a curriculum consistent with the outcomes. The second is the provision of the time, learning opportunities, and environment that individual students need in order to attain the outcomes. Each of these make quite considerable demands on teachers, individually and collectively" (p. 21).