Foreword:

In Praise of *Historical Windows on Curriculum*

William H. Schubert

I am pleased to be invited to comment on this volume, and I praise Tom Poetter and his colleague-students for providing this marvelous set of windows into the relevant history available in curriculum books. Their work is praiseworthy because it recognizes a legacy of ideas and practices that are too often forgotten, and need to be remembered in educational thought and in action.

We live in a time that is both depressingly ignorant and insightfully filled with relevant perspectives. The marketplace sadly controls educational policy with an unawareness that ideas of the past are at our finger tips in cyber-readiness if we will only perceive and reflect. The authors of this book help us to tune in to the great legacy of curriculum studies at our disposal. Each chapter shows how a practicing educator-scholar of today has benefited from study of scholars who devoted a lifetime to consideration of curriculum theory and practice.

In addition, each chapter made me reflect on my acquaintance with the works and authors discussed here, so I want to draw upon my 40-some years as an educator to personalize the historical windows that emerge in this book to illuminate tomorrow. I hope this book can be a clarion call to educators to read and ponder the insights herein.

As I read Tom Poetter's introductory chapter and came to know this project and inspirations for it, I moved into a state of reverie. Historically, I am located between Tom and his doctoral mentor, Norman Overly. When Norm completed his Ph.D. at Ohio State under the direction of renowned mentor, Paul Klohr, I had just finished my Bachelor's Degree at

Manchester College and had immediately enrolled in the Department of History and Philosophy of Education at Indiana University (I. U.), where Norm would later live out most of his professorial career. I vividly recall sitting in the reserve reading room at the College of Education at I. U., poring over two curriculum books that dominated the 1960s: *Fundamentals of Curriculum Development* by Smith, Stanley, and Shores (1957) and *The Process of Education* by Jerome Bruner (1960). They were only recommended, not required for the first course I took on curriculum. I was amazed at how this reading experience was new to me. I sailed through the books as if they were written by kindred spirits, and I had not heard of the authors before. In undergraduate school I had been a deliberate reader, and suddenly I was a speed reader -- comprehending without missing a beat. In undergraduate school I had debated what major to take. Adolescent rebellion made me want to explore other fields than education, the profession of my parents, whose work as educators were deeply respected by many, including myself. But I wanted to be different. When I took stimulating courses in literature, philosophy, history, psychology, anthropology, biology, and more I wanted to major in each, because I thought that each helped me figure out more about who I was and wanted to be, what I wanted to do, how, where, and why. When, as a senior, I took a course in Philosophy of Education, I was introduced through the teaching of Russell Bollinger to perennial questions of metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology. Writing papers on each of these topics helped me realize that the central question that brought my diverse interests together was: What is worthwhile?

The quest for this question which is both unanswerable and worth pursuing should be a beacon light for every human life. The desire to chase that question led me to study history and philosophy of education and its practical instantiation in curriculum development. As I *conversed* with B. Othanel Smith, William O. Stanley, J. Harlan Shores, and Jerome Bruner in

the library at I. U., I also conversed in person with Professors Philip G. Smith, Stanley E. Ballinger, Malcolm Skilbeck, and A. Stafford Clayton in classes. Clayton introduced me to John Dewey through a whole course on *Democracy and Education* (Dewey, 1916). From study of Dewey, I become more convinced that my new-found dedication to educational study derived from my interest in what is worthwhile. It took a new turn, however, one that helped me see the value of making this quest with others, not merely as an individual. This insight greatly affected an event that happened at the conclusion of my Master's Degree. Professor Smith who chaired the Department of History and Philosophy of Education asked if I was interested in one of the (then) new NDEA fellowships to give me a full ride in the Ph.D. Program in Philosophy of Education. I was deeply honored, and after anguished pondering, at the mere age of 22, I declined the offer, saying that if I were to one day teach educators, I should first gain experience as a teacher myself. Deeply within me, I somehow knew that Dewey, other philosophers of education, and curriculum theorists had so enthralled me with the curriculum question (what's worthwhile?) that I could not just pursue it alone; I needed to share it with children and youth. So, I became an elementary school teacher in Downers Grove, Illinois for the next eight years. As a teacher, I continued to read and used the vast resources of the Chicago area to inquire more about what is worthwhile. My students taught me a great deal about such matters as well, and I ultimately learned to listen to them, as my recent former student Brian Schultz has portrayed so well (Schultz, 2008 & 2011).

As I learned and listened, I decided that I wanted to be able to share with other educators and therefore looked into the possibility of doctoral study. After considering a number of great universities, I settled on the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and my adviser was J. Harlan Shores. When I had sped through that Smith, Stanley, and Shores (1957) curriculum

book, little did I realize that I would one day pursue a tailor-made program with J. Harlan Shores. On day one of my doctoral studies Shores advised me to keep a record of everything I read, because later I would need easy access to the sources. There were no personal computers in 1973, so I began to fill a large valise with index cards – to the point that students and faculty would know that they could stop me in the hall to ask for a reference. I used many of the cards as references for my dissertation which was about the interaction of what I deemed my two most important tools of teaching: my emergent philosophy and my evolving imagination. When I landed a professorial job at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), I decided to write the most complete guide to the books of the curriculum field that I could muster, so that subsequent students and scholars could find their way around the literature more efficiently that I had been able to do. The project resulted in *Curriculum Books: The First Eighty Years* (Schubert & Lopez Schubert, 1980), and later was expanded into *Curriculum Books: The First Hundred Years* (Schubert, Lopez Schubert, Thomas, and Carroll, 2002).

I am elated that Tom Poetter and the authors of *Curriculum Windows to Tomorrow* have found these books helpful as they have embarked on the study of the relevance of ideas in key books of the 1960s. I came of age in the 1960s and now have retired – hopefully, still going strong for some time. I see the "what's worthwhile" question addressed many ways in each of the chapters of this book. Over the years I have expanded the question through many sources: in the lives of teachers and students (Schubert & Lopez Schubert, 1982; through a synoptic text (Schubert, 1986/1997) inspired by the Smith, Stanley, & Shores (1950 & 1957) model; though insights from literature and the arts (Willis & Schubert, 1991), from the understandings of teachers and the lore of their experience (Schubert & Ayers, 1992), through the distant and recent history of curriculum discourse (e.g., Willis, Schubert, Bullough, Kridel, & Holton, 1993;

and Marshall, Sears, Allen Anderson, Roberts, & Schubert, 2007), and in a quest for a more just world through education infused by loving relationships (Schubert, 2009a). Throughout these books and myriad other projects my image of what's worthwhile morphed from the Spencerian (Spencer, 1861) question of "what knowledge is of most worth" (pp. 5-95) to a more complex question (that goes beyond traditional knowledge and does not become entangled in a search for the One best form): What is worth knowing, needing, experiencing, doing, being, becoming, overcoming, sharing, contributing, and just plain wondering? (Schubert, 2009b)

Tom Poetter tells the story of his mentor, Norm Overly, bestowing upon him some 200 curriculum books and entreating him to do something worthwhile with them for students. Reading about this in the Introduction to this book, I recalled that Harlan Shores invited me to select some two hundred of his books when he retired, which I hope I have used well. Surely, they were a basis for writing *Curriculum Books*. I now am passing many of them and thousands more that I acquired over the years to a wonderful library at Georgia Southern University due to the initial efforts of Ming Fang He, Professor of Curriculum Studies there. I thank Dean W. Bede Mitchell and his colleagues at the Zack S. Henderson Library, where they are developing a special collection of historical books and documents in the history of curriculum studies. Thus far, the collection includes my collection and that of Edmund C. Short.

Through this book, Tom Poetter has provided a project that honors Norman Overly and helps the field become more aware of its past. The past is always within us and it is important to acknowledge and build upon it imaginatively. I am glad that this volume which focuses of the 1960s will be followed by volumes on the relevance of curriculum literature of the 1970s and 1980s. I would encourage a volume on the 1990s which is increasingly becoming historical, and

others going back to the 1950s, 1940s, 1930s, 1920s, and earlier. Each decade or era still has much to offer for the future.

For now, as I reflect on this volume my thoughts return to the 1960s. I finished high school, went through college, got a master's degree and a principal's certificate, and started a teaching career in the 1960s. I worked for Indiana senators in Washington, when the landmark legislation was passed on civil rights during the summer of 1964. I wandered around the 1964 World's Fair in New York, pondered the American isolation from much of the world and the heightened fear of the Cold War epitomized by "duck-and-cover" drills in schools wherein children would hide under desks and in hallways, being taught that they could avoid being demolished by nuclear warfare. I participated in a world of complexities – counter-cultures, free schools, freedom schools, anti-war, corporate power wielding, and behavioral objectives. I lived in rural, college town, suburban, and urban environs. I saw schools try to implement comprehensive high schools, post-Sputnik curriculum reform in packages of new math, inquiry science, *Man: A Course of Study* (MACOS), and language labs. I saw the American high school and teacher education vastly altered by the reports of Harvard President James Bryant Conant (1959 & 1964) funded by Frank Keppel and the Carnegie Corporation. I witnessed the resilient continued practice of curriculum recipes that bastardized the call of Ralph Tyler (1949) to think seriously about educational purposes, learning experiences, organizational patterns, and evaluation. I saw the beginnings of a curriculum theory of critique in the works of Paul Goodman, Jules Henry, Alice Miel Maxine Greene, James B. Macdonald, Philip Phenix, Lawrence Cremin, Louise Berman, Maxine Dunfee, Elliot Eisner, Dwayne Huebner, Nelson Haggerson, Ted Aoki, O. L. Davis, Joseph Schwab, Herbert Thelen, John Goodlad, Paul Klohr, and many more. Then, as now, I dreaded policy made by governmental and corporate pundits

who could not say a sentence about any curriculum theorists if their lives depended upon it, and the bold fact is that OUR LIVES DO DEPEND UPON IT! I saw policy makers who only viewed the purpose of schooling through the lens of shifting the balance of power to U. S. advantage and making U. S. corporate domination more competitive. I see the same today, which reiterates the crucial need for perspectives in this book.

The power of this book is that the authors help us see how our lives depend upon educational relationships that enable and encourage us to ask what is worthwhile and to embody and enact our continuously evolving responses to this question – a question that rightly shimmers in uncertainty. Each of the chapters helps us reflect on what a key curriculum scholar of the 1960s offers us today and for the future. Each encourages us to turn to the original text. The insights of each author this book's chapters can be seen as heuristic devices that cultivate the interest and will to look more deeply into matters of worth that help grow our next generations. My point, then, in the paragraphs that follow is not to summarize or even comment directly the insights offered about a given theorist of the past. The authors make their interpretive points clearly. My comments, instead, are about memories evoked about the main curriculum scholar emphasized in each chapter, and the kinds of mindfulness (to turn to a term with Buddhist origins) invoked for today and tomorrow.

Kelly Waldrop tells us to remember Philip Jackson, and immediately I return in memory to a year-opening professional development day in Downers Grove in 1969, as a third year sixth grade teacher. A huge auditorium was filled with hundreds of teachers, and a young University of Chicago professor named Philip Jackson approached the stage to give a spell-binding lecture in his deep oratorical voice about his new book, *Life in Classrooms* (Jackson, 1968). I came face-to-face with initial images of what would from then on be known as *the hidden curriculum*.

Today and tomorrow, educational policy makers, leaders, and teachers need to reflect much more on the *hidden curriculum* that students experience by living under schooling, and the moral and political messages that the structures behind schooling teach. Thank you, Kelly.

I am so pleased to see Kyra T. Shahid remind us of the lesser known, pioneering work of Sidney Walton Jr.'s *The Black Curriculum* (1969). It reminded me of a great absence. When I was in doctoral studies, it was rare to non-existent to find an African-American or any person of color in the curriculum literature. Even as I began attending major conferences of AERA or ASCD, one simply did not encounter such major contributors as W.E.B. DuBois, Horace Mann Bond, or Carter G. Woodson, and certainly not Julie Anna Julia Cooper, Ella Baker, Septema Clark, among others. Thus, Shahid's reminders of Walton spur us to augment education that enacts Martin Luther King's (1963) *strength to love* in the quest for racial justice today and tomorrow. Thank you, Kyra.

So many curriculum books have words in the title such as "new" or "modern" and are anything but new or modern today. Louise Berman's (1968) *New Priorities in Curriculum* is a grand exception; her book is as new today as it was in the 1960s, perhaps newer today with the immense traditionalism that dominates educational policy and practice. Leigh Ann Fish helps us see anew Berman's message that we could be teaching perceiving, communicating, loving, knowing, decision-making, patterning, creating, and valuing instead traditional subject areas or as core processes to enliven any subject area. Berman provides a truly exemplary curriculum proposal from one of the few women who emerged to prominence in the curriculum field of the 1960s. Thank you, Leigh Ann.

Candi Pierce Garry makes John Holt come alive. As an elementary school teacher in the late-1960s, I read Holt's *How Children Fail* (1964) and other works, and in 1968 I wrote to him

from school on a large key, manual, primary typewriter. Holt actually responded as if he was my friend and colleague. Why did curriculum theorists rarely acknowledge his work, often degrading it with the term *romantic*, and writing him off as was often done with other teacher-authors who wrote about the children with whom they learned and grew: Sylvia Ashton-Warner, Herb Kohl, Jonathan Kozol, James Herndon, George Dennison, Bel Kaufman, and others. The point is that practitioners, leaders of practice, and policy makers need to listen to teachers and to children themselves as John Holt brilliantly modeled. Thank you, Candi.

John Goodlad never lost touch with schools and never wanted to do so, as Precious Gawanani shows us clearly through lenses of his early work (Goodlad, 1966). Long time dean at UCLA, Goodlad began his career as an advocate of non-graded schools, meaning that individual needs and interests should supersede arbitrary placement in same-age groupings. His significance holds special meaning for me from the time I was a second year elementary school teacher, when a principal in the district who taught an introduction to education course at a nearby community college asked me to substitute for him. He said that I did not have to worry about what to teach, because he had a filmed lecture by John Goodlad for me to show. I did not know Goodlad's work, and as I showed it, I suddenly hoped to do that kind of work some day. During the discussion of the film, I felt like I was doing what I was meant to do. Goodlad was one of the rare deans who kept his research alive while deaning. Thank you, Precious.

Mark O'Hara's rendition of behavioral objectives pioneered by Robert Mager (1962) brought back the queasy uneasiness or maybe I should say dis-ease bestowed on education by the intrusion of business. Speaking of business, Mager was from the corporate *training* world and garnered millions from this small programmed learning book on behavioral objectives. I recall a workshop on behavioral objectives, in which the instructor said we should write a behavioral

objective for each thing we do as teachers. I remember thinking that if I did that I would have to stop teaching, write continuously, and then I would not be doing anything. There were legends about house trailers and attacks at the state capital overflowing with behavioral objectives. I guiltily recollect that in desperate need of summer employment, I accepted a job writing for a corporation that created a computerized bank of behavioral objectives and concomitant test items Bloom, et al's (1956) and Krathwohl, et al's (1964) higher levels of cognitive and affective functioning for works of literature. As a teacher, I tried so hard to keep meaning alive that behavior objectives threatened to destroy. I remember the relief I found in Elliot Eisner's (1969) call for expressive objectives. The point is to view with many caveats the intrusion of corporate control in teaching, texts, and tests. Thank you, Mark.

I am grateful to Rachel Radina for selecting Joseph Schwab's (1969a) treatise on curriculum and student protest. I remember getting to know Schwab at conferences and through correspondence, after I had published pieces in the 1980s about his advocacy of practical inquiry and eclectic arts, based on his landmark article on practical inquiry in *School Review* (Schwab, 1969b). The point I derive from his *College Curriculum and Student Protest* (Schwab, 1969a) is captured well in Rachel Radina's concluding paragraph. She emphasizes that listening to the wisdom of students is essential to the great educational and democratic projects of our present and future, and the listening must be infused with love. If education is to be meaningful, caring, edifying, and democratic today and tomorrow we must listen to students who live daily under the autocratic ethos of standardization, testing, and more testing – pushing us toward privatization of education. Thank you, Rachel.

Returning to the American Educational Research Association (AERA) Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation (1967 and 1969), a focus selected by Scott Sander, re-opens the

window of evaluation, broadly conceived. When one combines perspectives on evaluation of Ralph Tyler, Robert Gagne, and Michael Scriven from the 1967 volume and Elliot Eisner, James Popham, H. J. Sullivan, and Louise Tyler in the 1969 volume, one is exposed to a much broader and deeper perspective on evaluation that touted by policy makers then or now. It is incredible to me that perspectives of half a century ago are so far more advanced than the pseudo-theory that guides educational evaluation and accountability policy today. I am increasingly convinced that educators of tomorrow must demand these and other expansive perspectives, and not ones that reduce education to trivialities of one form of linearity. Testing is no where near to evaluation writ large, and the purpose of evaluation should be feedback for the improvement of curriculum and teaching, not for invidious comparisons of teachers, students, schools, communities, races and ethnic groups, or nations. Thank you, Scott.

I commend Susan Smith for realizing the import of Hilda Taba's (1962) synoptic text that dominated the preparation of curriculum leaders throughout the 1960s and much of the 1970s. Her work which showed more of the interdisciplinary character of curriculum development augmented contributions Ralph Tyler, who told me a story about the two of them at meeting of the major committees of the Eight Year Study in the 1930s. Tyler was evaluation director and Taba was his associate. After the curriculum committee presented at a meeting, someone said that they needed a rationale like the evaluation team had, and Tyler said something like, "Well, shucks Hilda, if they want a rationale for curriculum, we can provide one," so they sketched on a napkin what became the outline for Tyler's renowned *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (Tyler, 1949), which has dominated curriculum practice and policy from the 1950s to today. Although we may think of limitations and criticisms of the Tyler Rationale, it is only a small part of contributions from this scholar whose mark on the 1960s is indelible and who was

an educational adviser to six U.S. Presidents, including those of the 1960s. We ought to reflect on how many curriculum scholars have been known by U. S. Presidents, Secretaries of Education, and other governmental or private sector policy makers, and try to figure out why Tyler reached them. As well, we need to study the mutual influence of Tyler and Taba to reflect on Hilda Taba's substantial influence. Thank you, Susan.

Today it is the rage to look for alternatives to the schooling by edict and servitude, and in this regard the choice of Jocelyn Weeda to reconsider Britain's Summerhill by A. S. Neill (1960) is valuable. Magnet and charter schools, some private and progressive schools, and posh suburban schools move in the Summerhillian direction. Nonetheless, there is immense reluctance to give students choice and to let their imaginative spontaneity surge forward. That such freedom is mostly for the upper classes is captured by the story of a member of the House of Lords who heard about freedom for the children of working and middle class at Summerhill, so he had his limo driver take him there for a visit. After a day of interaction at Summerhill, he returned to the limo astounded, saying something like, "That was amazing. Why, they have almost as much freedom at this Summerhill place as they do at Westminster!" We need to wonder with utmost seriousness if middle and lower socio-economic class schools in the U.S. really need scripts, a steady barrage of tests, standardized products, and more stringent rules or if they need experience akin to the freedom of Summerhill. Thank you, Jocelyn.

There is a very real connection between this last point and the way James Herndon (1968) thought it was *spozed* to be as he learned from teaching in schools of the urban poor as Mary Webb shows well. Herndon represents a coterie of counter-culture educators, often trained by liberal arts and grassroots experience, such as John Holt, Herb Kohl, George Dennison, and Jonathan Kozol. They discovered new ways, somewhat similar to their progressive predecessors,

and their books were among the best sellers, rare indeed for books on education. Often books by these revolutionary teachers were books were discounted by educators in the academy who pejoratively labeled them *romantics*. Nevertheless, they were acknowledged by Paul Klohr (1971) as *greening the curriculum* in much the same way as Charles Reich (1970) called for *The Greening of America* and reflected the spirit of Theodore Roszack's (1969) urging to make counter-culture. Clearly, from those who dare to challenge the system on the ground, we are in dire need of a new *greening* that counters the dominant, dominating, and be-draggled milieu of schooling and brings about a plurality of *ways it spozed to be*. I recall how these books spoke to me in my during the summer of 1972, after my fifth year of teaching, when I took a summer course in alternative forms of education taught by Donald Erickson and Bruce Cooper at the University of Chicago, and came to know the work of Joseph Schwab at the same time. Thank you, Mary.

Realizing that Ryan Gamm selected *Teaching as a Subversive Activity* by Postman and Weingartner (1969) immediately drew me back to my third year of teaching when Park Hampel brought me a copy of the book – hot off the press. It was especially meaningful since in 1961-62 Park had been a sixth grade teacher when I was a high school senior in Butler, Indiana, where I took an "Exploratory Teaching" course initiated by my mother, a high school math and social studies teacher. Each day I spent about an hour in his classroom and did some of the teaching. Shortly after receiving the book, I put many of the ideas and practical approaches to work in my own sixth grade classes. Especially relevant, then and now, was the Postman and Weingertner admonition to engage in *crap detection* – something sorely needed today and for doubtless many tomorrows. Thank you, Ryan.

Inspired by Sara Hayes, Scott Sander, and Beck Lewellen, I return in my mind to the library at Indiana University where I first pondered Jerome Bruner's (1960) call for processes of inquiry and imagination patterned after those exhibited by the best scholars' awareness of the salient structure of any discipline. From Bruner's work it was deduced that if a student grasped the integral structure of a discipline, he or she would be able to make meaning of any dimension of phenomena in that discipline. U. S. teachers were blamed, as they are today, for failure to keep up with other world economic and political powers. So subject matter specialists and psychologists were solicited to reform education. Curriculum reform packages proliferated then, just as reform mandates do today, to *teacher proof* the curriculum. I recall my parents attending meetings on *new math*, inquiry learning, and other post-Sputnik reforms in the early 1960s. For the most part, however, in-service education was too brief and superficial to bring meaningful change. This turning of liberating ideas, such as those of Bruner, into rote recipes debased their original intention. Focus on this era should provide precedent for curriculum policy tomorrow, if policy-makers will only consider it seriously. Thank you, Beck, Scott, and Sara.

I am heartened by the fact that Timothy Vaughn has chosen to remind us of what I also deem THE GREAT NEGLECTED, namely, the insightful work of African-American scholars against all odds. From W. E. B. DuBois to Carter G. Woodson, one can hardly find a citation in mainstream curriculum books of the 1960s or before. Clearly, they were both Other and *othered*, if recognized at all. This dreadful state of affairs has not departed – far from it. Vaughn's selection of *Mansart Builds a School* (DuBois, 1959) is of particular value because so many are unfamiliar with this source. It reinforces the need to take seriously the writings of African Americans on curriculum and for that I site many of the works of William H. Watkins, the first of my advisees to complete a dissertation, in 1986, noting especially his categorization of Black

orientations to curriculum (Watkins, 1993). Educational policy makers of today need to build on the understanding of the orientations that Watkins sets forth. Thank you, Timothy.

Through Trevor Ngorosha from Zimbabwe we re-encounter Jerome Bruner and learn why many in the international community see Dewey and Bruner as the two most influential educational scholars to come from the United States. We can see Bruner's (1966) theory of instruction as a fluid structure (oxymoronic as that may sound) that is capable of translation and re-translation into diverse cultural realms. A conceptual and practical flow of ideas is needed to theoretically integrate meanings of development, knowledge, and instruction in different cultures. Bruner's lenses enable adaptation to needs and interests that derive from colonialism, post-colonialism, and neo-colonialism. Looking at Bruner and Paulo Freire (1970) together with Elliot Eisner, William Pinar, and others shows an eclecticism that is needed to pursue one of the most neglected and necessary trajectories for enhancing curriculum understanding – namely, to find instances of grassroots curricular theory and practice throughout the world that have arisen to overcome educational policies and practices that have served the greed of power-wielders rather than the needs and interests of learners. We need to open that window to human goodness widely. Thank you, Trevor.

To move in such a direction requires steady focus on goodness, and Carmen Scalfaro points in that direction by invoking the work of Philip Phenix. A noted theologian, philosopher, philosopher of science, Phenix's dissertation committee was made up of philosophers of science (Ernst Nagel and Felix Cohen) and eminent theologians (Niebur and Tillich), and before that his senior thesis at Princeton on rotation was praised by Albert Einstein. Finding scientific empirical knowing to be only one of many realms of meaning, Phenix (1964) argued that many different avenues must be taken to approach the common good (Phenix, 1961). Approaching the good

requires a reverence for the diversity of nature and uniqueness of each person that enables continuous growth of understanding and virtue. Again, then, one of my favorite projects of retirement is to explore examples of education in diverse cultural settings that have overcome oppression and constraint by realizing something of the reverence that Phenix sees in education that strives toward the common good. Thank you, Carmen.

The essay by Jennifer Mills on Herb Kohl is a fitting piece for concluding this commentary. It reminds me that my reading of Kohl's (1968) *36 Children* shortly after it was published inspired me to continue creating a more open classroom as an elementary school teacher – seeing this as a new incarnation of progressive education with its beginnings in Dewey. Kohl was educated in the liberal arts, philosophy, and the cultural revolution of the day – a background with which I resonate – all features of the student revolution that Joseph Schwab addressed with insightful seriousness. Kohl worked brilliantly with African-American children, which brings images of DuBois's *Mansart* and Walton's critique. Kohl responded from inside the hidden curriculum of classrooms – from living in classrooms that Philip Jackson studied as a scholar. Kohl was engaged in *crap detection* before Postman and Weingartner named it, and he expressed its detection in his opposition to myriad mandated constraints on teacher and student freedom – an illustration of which resides in oppressive uses of Mager's behavioral objectives. In the spirit of Louise Berman's challenge, Kohl also focused on new priorities without necessarily naming these integrative human processes in the same way that she did. Like Herndon, Kohl brought aesthetic sensibilities to bear on the continuous reconfigurations of his students' experiences, illustrating Eisner's image of evaluation as connoisseurship of their flowing relationships to build expressive objectives *with* them. Moreover, Kohl exemplified that the value of careful reflection on curriculum development was not a recipe (which I feel sure that

Tyler, Taba, and Goodlad would approve); rather, it was a process to be embodied and shared with students as they internalize curriculum-making for their lives in much the same way that Bruner advocated internalization of the deep structures of inquiry and imagination from the disciplines. Kohl and his students strove to do all this, as Holt called for so clearly, without fear of failure, and a never reachable though always approachable end that Philip Phenix saw as *the common good*. To do this, educators clearly need to engage in great political and economic struggles to overcome what Paulo Freire labeled *banking pedagogy* to open the windows of *problem posing pedagogy*. Of course, we know that Herb Kohl and others represented in this volume were exemplary teachers. Too many similar teachers, sadly, are pushed out of the profession. All of us, especially policy-makers, need to ask how to engage and retain such exemplary curriculum-minded teachers. Thank you, Jennifer, for stimulating this concluding reflection on Herb Kohl in a way that invokes landscapes that can be clearly viewed through windows provided by authors who are represented in this volume.

The windows that Tom Poetter, all of the authors of chapters of this book, and the curriculum scholars revisited here clearly need to be opened in order that we may benefit from breezes of revitalization for educational improvement today and tomorrow. Focusing on the works and ideas presented here helps us more fully ponder and pursue what is worth knowing, needing, experiencing, doing, being, becoming, overcoming, sharing, contributing, and wondering. Thank you, Tom and company!

References

American Educational Research Association Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, Number 1 (1967) *Perspectives of curriculum evaluation*. (by R. W. Tyler, R. M. Gagne, & M. Scriven). Chicago: Rand McNally.

American Educational Research Association Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, Number 2 (1969) *Perspectives of curriculum evaluation*. (by W. J. Popham, E. W. Eisner, H. J. Sullivan, & L. L. Tyler). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Berman, L. M. (1968). *New priorities in the curriculum*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Bloom, B. S., et al. (Eds.). (1956). *A taxonomy of educational objectives: The cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay.

Bruner, J. (1960). *The process of education.* New York: Vintage.

Bruner, J. (1966) *Toward a theory of instruction.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Conant, J. B. (1959). *The American high school today*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Conant, J. B. (1964). *The education of American teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Dewey, J. (1916) *Democracy and education.* New York: Macmillan.

DuBois, W. E. B. (1959). Mansart builds a school. New York: Mainstream.

Eisner, E. W. (1969). Instructional and experessive objectives: Their formulation and use in curriculum. In W. J. Popham, (Ed.), American Educational Research Association Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, Number 2 (1969) *Perspectives of curriculum evaluation*. (pp. 1-18). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Goodlad, J. I. (1966). *School, curriculum, and the individual*. Waltham, MA: Blaisdell.

Herndon, J. (1968). *The way it spozed to be.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Holt, J. (1964). *How children fail*. New York: Delta.

Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms.* New York: Holt, Reinhart, & Winston.

King, Jr., M. L. (1963). *Strength to love.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Klohr, P. R. (1971). The greening of curriculum. *Educational Leadership 28*(5), February, pp. 455-457.

Krathwohl, D. R., et al. (Eds.). (1964). A taxonomy of educational objectives: The affective domain. New York: David McKay.

Mager, R. F. (1962). *Preparing instructional objectives.* Palo Alto, CA: Fearon.

Marshall, J. D., Sears, J. T., Allen, L., Roberts, P., and Schubert, W. H. (2007). *Turning points in curriculum: A contemporary curriculum memoir* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall.

Neill, A. S. (1960). *Summerhill: A radical approach to child rearing*. New York: Hart.

Phenix, P. H. (1961). *Education and the common good.* New York: Harper & Brothers.

Phenix, P. H. (1964). *Realms of meaning*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Postman, N. & Weingartner, C. (1969). *Teaching as a subversive activity*. New York: Dell.

Reich, C. (1970). *The greening of America.* New York: Random House.

Roszak, T. (1969). *The making of a counter-culture.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Schubert, W. H. (1975). *Imaginative projection: A method of curriculum invention*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Schubert, W. H., and Lopez Schubert A. L. (1980). *Curriculum books: The first eighty years*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.

Schubert, W. H. (1986). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. New York: Macmillan.

Schubert, W. H. & Ayers, W. (Eds.). (1992). *Teacher lore: Learning from our own experience*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Schubert, W. H. (1997). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. Columbus, OH: Prentice- Hall.

Schubert, W. H., Lopez Schubert, A. L. L., Thomas, T. P., and Carroll, W. M. (2002). *Curriculum books: The first hundred years*. New York: Peter Lang.

Schubert, W. H. (2009a). *Love, justice, and education: John Dewey and the Utopians*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Schubert, W. H. (2009b). What's worthwhile: From knowing and experiencing to being and becoming. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*.

Schultz, B. D. (2008). *Spectacular things happen along the way*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Schultz, B. D. (Ed.). (2011). *Listening to and learning from students.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Schwab, J. J. (1969a). College curriculum and student protest. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schwab, J. J. (1970b). The practical: A language for curriculum. *School Review, 78*, 1-23.

Smith, B. O., Stanley, W. O., & Shores, J. H. (1950). *Fundamentals of curriculum development.* Yonkers-on-the-Hudson: World Book.

Smith, B. O., Stanley, W. O., & Shores, J. H. (1957). *Fundamentals of curriculum development.* [Revised ed.]. NY: Harcourt, Brace, and World.

Spencer, H. (1861). *Education: Intellectual, moral, and physical*. New York: D. Appleton & Company.

Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.

Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Walton, S. F. (1969). *The Black curriculum*. East Palo Alto, CA: Black Liberation Publishers.

Watkins, W.H. (1993). Black curriculum orientations: A preliminary inquiry. *Harvard Educational Review, 63*(3), 321-338.

Willis, G. H. & Schubert, W. H. (Eds.). (1991). *Reflections from the heart of educational inquiry: Understanding curriculum and teaching through the arts*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Willis, G.H., Schubert, W. H., Bullough, R., Kridel, C., & Holton, J. (Eds.). (1993). *The American curriculum: A documentary history*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.