

SPECIAL ISSUE

Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Educational Evaluation

education policy analysis
archives

A peer-reviewed, independent,
open access, multilingual journal



Arizona State University

Volume 26 Number 47

April 16, 2018

ISSN 1068-2341

Perspectives on Evaluation from Curricular Contexts

William Schubert

University of Illinois at Chicago (Emeritus)
United States

Citation: Schubert, W. (2018). Perspectives on evaluation from curricular contexts. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(47). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3812> This article is part of the Special Issue, *Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Educational Evaluation: Dialogues with the International Academy of Education*, guest edited by Lorin W. Anderson, Maria de Ibarrola, and D. C. Phillips.

Abstract: Educational issues in nations throughout the world center on teacher and student evaluation, leading to much consternation. The root of debate stretches to curriculum questions that directly address matters of worth or value. Examining evaluation of education at any level through curricular lenses increases its complexity. First, complexity is approached by focusing on three broad categories that can be framed as questions: What are value considerations in foundations of curriculum? What is worthwhile for subsequent generations? How should we evaluate extant impacts of curricular venues? Second, perspectives on the complexity of evaluation based in curriculum studies are advanced through responses from five orientations to curriculum: Intellectual Traditionalist, Social Behaviorist, Experientialist, Critical Reconstructionist, and Postmodern Global Anti-Imperialist. Each offers a perspective worth considering by those who wish to improve curriculum and its evaluation.

Keywords: evaluation; curriculum; intellectual traditionalists, social behaviorists, experientialists, critical reconstructionists, postmodernists, anti-imperialists

Perspectivas sobre la evaluación desde contextos curriculares

Resumen: En todas las naciones del mundo los principales temas a discusión se centran en la evaluación de maestros y estudiantes, causando mucha consternación. La raíz del debate alcanza cuestiones curriculares que convocan directamente temas de valoración; examinar la evaluación educativa de cualquier nivel a través de lentes curriculares incrementa la complejidad. En primer término, la complejidad se trata centrándonos en tres grandes categorías que pueden formularse como preguntas: ¿Cuáles son las consideraciones valorativas en los fundamentos del curriculum? ¿Qué es valioso para las próximas generaciones? ¿Cómo podemos evaluar los impactos de los procesos y espacios curriculares? En segundo, las perspectivas sobre la complejidad de la evaluación basada en estudios curriculares se analizan mediante respuestas que ofrecen cinco orientaciones curriculares: la intelectual tradicionalista, la conductista social, la experiencialista, la reconstruccionista crítica y la posmoderna global. Cada una ofrece una perspectiva que merece ser considerada por quienes desean mejorar el curriculum y su evaluación.

Palabras-clave: evaluación; curriculum; intelectual tradicionalista; conductista social; experiencialista; reconstruccionista crítica; posmodernista; antiimperialista

Perspectivas de avaliação em contextos curriculares

Resumo: Em todas as nações do mundo, os principais tópicos de discussão são focados na avaliação de professores e alunos, causando muita consternação. A raiz do debate atinge questões curriculares que convocam diretamente questões de avaliação; Examinar a avaliação educacional em qualquer nível através de lentes curriculares aumenta a complexidade. Em primeiro lugar, a complexidade é tratada enfocando três categorias principais que podem ser formuladas como perguntas: Quais são as considerações avaliativas nos fundamentos do currículo? O que é valioso para as próximas gerações? Como podemos avaliar os impactos de processos e espaços curriculares? Em segundo lugar, as perspectivas sobre a complexidade da avaliação baseada em estudos curriculares são analisadas através de respostas que oferecem cinco orientações curriculares: o intelectual tradicionalista, o social behaviorista, o experiencialista, o crítico reconstrucionista e o global pós-moderno. Cada um oferece uma perspectiva que merece ser considerada por aqueles que desejam melhorar o currículo e sua avaliação.

Palavras-chave: avaliação; currículo; intelectual tradicionalista; behaviorista social; experiencialista; reconstrucionista crítico; pós-modernista; antiimperialista

Perspectives on Evaluation from Curricular Contexts

To look at evaluation of basic education, or education at any level, through curricular lenses increases the complexity of the enterprise. In this chapter this complexity is first approached by focusing on three broad categories that can be framed as questions. What are the value considerations in foundations of curriculum? What is worthwhile for subsequent generations? How should we evaluate extant impacts of curricular venues? Second, five perspectives on the complex domain of evaluation based in curriculum studies are provided; these are derived from five different orientations to curriculum: Intellectual Traditionalist, Social Behaviorist, Experientialist, Critical Reconstructionist, and Postmodern Global Anti-Imperialist.

Background for this presentation derives from a rich history of curriculum studies in the United States, which has had world-wide influence (e.g., Caswell & Campbell, 1935, 1937; Connelly, He, & Phillion, 2008; Eisner, 1979; He, Schultz, & Schubert, 2015; Husen & Postlethwaite, 1994; Jackson, 1994; Kliebard, 1986; Kridel, 2010; Lewy, 1991; Marsh & Willis, 2007; Marshall, Sears, Allen, Roberts, & Schubert, 2007; Malewski, 2009; McCutcheon, 1995; Morris, 2016; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995; Seguel, 1966; Skilbeck, 1984b; Smith, Stanley, & Shores, 1957; Tanner & Tanner, 1975, 1990; Tyler, 1949; Willis, 1978; Willis, Schubert, Bullough, Kridel, & Holton, 1993). All of these sources directly or indirectly address curriculum evaluation. From a curriculum vantage point, it is indefensible to deal with matters of evaluation, assessment, or grading without addressing the complexities of curriculum within which they are embedded. Even if curricular complexities are not consciously considered, they still have marked influence.

The tack I take here, in presenting curricular categories and orientations, will involve role-playing as *guest commentators*, *characters*, or *guest speakers*, an approach based on my historical work (Schubert & Lopez Schubert, 1980; Schubert, Lopez Schubert, Thomas, & Carroll, 2002). I have used such role-playing on many occasions in an attempt to clarify topics of concern through lectures (e.g., Schubert 2004, 2015), articles (Schubert 1996, 1997), and self-critiques at the end of each chapter of my synoptic curriculum text, *Curriculum: Perspective, Paradigm, and Possibility* (Schubert, 1986/1997). In each lecture or written version I *conjure guest speakers* through whom I strive to deliver a fair version of each of the categories and orientations. I do not intend the role-played characters to be caricatures. Instead, I attempt to have each *speaker* represent the best of each position. Some key figures, such as John Dewey or Ralph Tyler, fit in more than one category or orientation. I have found the *speakers* to be helpful in dealing with many audiences, from beginning graduate students (even undergraduates) to practicing teachers, school leaders, educational evaluators, policy makers, teacher educators, curriculum scholars or researchers, and local school council members (governing boards of schools in Chicago). Although I adapt the rendition for different audiences, I use essentially the same routine, because I try to uphold a *common faith* (Dewey, 1934) that enables concerned individuals and groups, including teachers and students, to understand curricular issues and complexities.

Addressing Three Primary Curricula Questions: Explaining the Complexity of Evaluation

What are Value Considerations in Foundations of Curriculum?

From a curriculum standpoint evaluation must be a central thread of the entire process of curriculum development, design, implementation—and the whole realm of curriculum studies (e.g., Caswell & Campbell, 1935, 1937; Connelly et al., 2008; Eisner, 1979; He et al., 2015; Jackson, 1994; Kridel, 2010; Marsh & Willis, 2007; Marshall et al., 2007; Molnar & Zahorik, 1977; Pinar, 2006, 2012; Pinar et al., 1995; Schubert & Lopez Schubert, 1980; Schubert, 1986/1997; Skilbeck, 1984b; Smith et al., 1957; Tanner & Tanner, 1975; Tyler, 1949; Walker, 1990). The intersecting concerns of curriculum studies and social, historical, and philosophical foundations of education are palpable (Phillips, 2014; Provenzo, Renaud, & Provenzo, 2009; Stanley, Smith, Benne, & Anderson, 1956; Tozer, Gallegos, & Henry, 2011). These concerns pertain to all choices about assumptions (historical, philosophical, social, cultural, political, economic, and psychological) regarding decisions about the diverse range of ways to achieve purposes or objectives through curriculum development (selection of learning activities, experiences, or opportunities, and their organization, sequence, learning environments, and instructional strategies). All choices one makes, every action engaged, involve values; thus, they pertain to evaluation. Even if the values are not explicitly addressed, they

govern by default, chance, or expediency. How can evaluation at the level of grading and testing be pursued defensibly if it is not based on conscious consideration of questions about purposes, learning experiences, and organization—key elements of the Tyler's (1949) rationale for curriculum development?

What is Worthwhile for Subsequent Generations?

Through provision of key philosophical writings on education in Robert Ulich's (1954) surveys of literature, and those of others, I deduce that the primary curricular question is: What is worthwhile? I suggest that to conscientiously address questions about *what is worthwhile* was the central concern of those who became the first curriculum scholars. Such questioning can be traced back to Herbert Spencer (1861) who asked, "What knowledge is of most worth?" Of course, his *social Darwinist* perspective made many dissenting scholars modify this question by asking: What is worth knowing? They did not want to be forced to decide *the most* worthwhile, and they surely did not want to promote the self-preservation answer in Spencer's distortion of Darwin. Others have asked, for instance: What is worth needing, experiencing, doing, being, becoming, overcoming, contributing, sharing, just plain wondering, and more (see Schubert, 2008, 2009). These topics prompt consideration of much broader images of what should and can be informed by assessment and evaluation. Questions of worth are deeply connected with considerations of the meanings of *good education*, as Gert Biesta (2010) contends, in an age of measurement, especially regarding matters of ethics, politics, and democracy. These points of inquiry evoke questions that are metaphysical, epistemological, axiological, ethical, aesthetic, political, and more. To what extent should those who make choices about testing and grading explicitly address such philosophical matters, since those matters undergird decisions made and actions taken? How should we evaluate diverse extant curricular venues?

Curriculum is often equated with subject matter areas of study, textbooks, or purposes set forth in policy statements as objectives (i.e., the *intended curriculum*), or more recently the narrower strand of that which is tested. As worthwhile as it is to evaluate the *intended curriculum*, other curricular venues must be addressed (Schubert, 2008a, pp. 407-412). For example, there are the *taught curriculum*, the *hidden curriculum*, the *experienced curriculum*, the *embodied curriculum*, the *null curriculum*, the *extra-curriculum*, the *tested curriculum*, and the *outside curriculum*. While the *intended curriculum* might be explicitly stated in national or state mandates, it is not the same as the *taught curriculum*, or that to which students are exposed by teaching. Should not the differences between the intended and taught curricula be evaluated? Moreover, another curriculum is enacted via the mannerisms and personalities of teachers; it is often referred to as the *hidden curriculum*, and as Philip Jackson (1968) noted, it develops through the routines and procedures of the *daily grind* of classroom existence and school organization. Should evaluations address what students learn from this image of *hidden curriculum*? Further, at a deep level, the *hidden curricula* of structural aspects of any society's economic, ideological, racial or ethnic, political, and cultural life are explicitly and implicitly mediated through all institutions of that society, including school (e.g., Anyon, 1980; Apple, 1979/2004; Giroux & Purpel, 1983). How can evaluation take these powerful forces into account, and not simply accept the dominant view of the oppressors, colonialists, or conquerors who often make curriculum to enhance their interests? Too, there is the *null curriculum* (Eisner, 1979) or that which is simply not designated to be taught or is given short shrift through cut-backs in times of financial difficulty or ideological challenge. Should not evaluators want to identify null curricula in order to broaden their portrayals? Together, these curricular venues amass to create the *experienced curriculum* or all that happens in a student's life under the auspices of the school (Smith et al., 1957). Whatever students retain in their cognitive, affective, social, and psychomotor repertoires that can be recalled from the

experienced curriculum might be called the *learned curriculum*. Further, the *embodied curriculum* refers to the perspectives, life decisions, and subsequent actions that constitute growing identities of students as they move through life. What, then, would it require in terms of finance, time, and effort to adequately portray the kind and quality of curricular influence that schools provide? Curriculum is not merely a set of knowledge and skills to be covered, and the phrase *cover the curriculum* is so frequently uttered. Curriculum, when considering this diversity of venues, is something to be carefully *uncovered* as well. It is curious that the long-term *embodied curriculum* (knowledge, ideas, skills, and dispositions, which are lived) is rarely studied. What if a poem learned in school suddenly becomes meaningful to a life experience 20 or more years later? Is that captured by our evaluations? Should it be?

Making this even more complex, all of this *gestalt* of curricular venues is continuously mediated by a host of *outside curricula* (Schubert, 1981, 2010) or curricula of homes, families, neighborhoods, communities, cultures, languages, ethnicities, non-school organizations (e.g., churches, museums, scouts, dance and music studios, gangs, clubs), and mass media (television, popular music and art, movies, plays, videogames, the Internet, and a host of social media). The whole realm of *public pedagogy* (Giroux, 2000; Sandlin, Schultz, & Burdick, 2010) exposes the centrality of the outside curriculum, and implores curriculum evaluators to include it as they determine student needs and interests. As educators design curriculum, and as students are exposed to curriculum, teaching, and schooling situations, all of these *outside curricula* continuously influence the lived interpretations of what is experienced. This is why Joseph Schwab (1970, 1973) argues that curriculum needs to be seen through a dynamic interaction of commonplaces (teachers, learners, subject matter, and milieu) that continuously need to be monitored and evaluated in the course of curriculum enactment. So, what then should be included in evaluations of the experience of this myriad ecology of curriculum in our lives? What of it does current evaluation or assessment address? Who benefits from that which is evaluated or left out, and who is harmed? What does evaluation miss, that should be evaluated?

Guest Speakers from Diverse Curriculum Orientations

As the *moderator*, I have asked each of the following *speakers* to address: How do you characterize your orientation to curriculum studies, and thus to evaluation? What traditions do you draw upon? How do you build upon foundations of education? What is worthwhile? What evaluation do you use to determine what you deem worthwhile? Who, from the legacy of curriculum studies, do you draw upon and recommend to others? What kinds of curriculum do you recognize as important to evaluate? To what should evaluators attend? Of course, the *speakers* will not necessarily discuss these questions in systematic order. Nor will they explicitly address all of them. Instead, they are encouraged to work responses to them into their presentations. (I will play the role of a representative of each orientation. In so doing I try to exemplify *objectivity*, since (through me) each *speaker* will look and sound alike! Since I act as a character, speaking, the reader might imagine the comments are in quotations. The reader should also note that the written version has more references to pursue for elaboration, only a few of which are weaved into the acted version to remain in harmony with usual spoken commentary.

Speaker 1: Intellectual Traditionalist

I characterize my curricular orientation as an advocacy of liberal arts and sciences, derived from traditions espoused by such scholars as William T. Harris, William C. Bagley, Robert M. Hutchins, Mortimer Adler, and Robert Ulich. The most worthwhile contribution of this form of curriculum is acquiring insight into or understanding of *great ideas* and *mysteries and events of life* (Ulich,

1955) through *great works*. After considering over 100 great ideas, Adler (1981) synthesizes them into *truth, beauty, goodness, liberty, equality, and justice*. Stated another way, in a response to Ralph Harper's (1955) pioneering article on existentialism in education, Ulich (1955) says that education should be fundamentally about the "great mysteries and events of life: birth, death, love, tradition, society and the crowd, success and failure, salvation, and anxiety" (p. 255). Thus, a key issue in evaluation is the initial determination of what constitutes great works, ideas, mysteries, and events that should be made accessible to students. Do evaluators typically address the reasons for determining curricular purposes? Does evaluation address why, how, and by whom determinations are made?

I am convinced that experts in each field should make decisions about what and why, and that the teachers imbued with the art of teaching (Broudy, Smith, & Burnett, 1964; Broudy & Palmer, 1965; Highet, 1950; Rubin, 1984) should assess and implement the how. Moreover, I also agree with William C. Bagley (1934) who advocated that education provide a core of cultural knowledge that provides subsequent generations of human beings with common interests and concerns. Relative to evaluating student learning, teachers should become connoisseurs of student discussions, presentations, performances, and compositions in an effort to judge the ways in which they incorporate the ideas deemed worthy of teaching and learning. Outside judges from state and corporate sectors may offer useful topics, via curriculum materials and tests, but these should not overpower the judgment of good teachers. This is because the greatest outcomes of philosophy (meaning inquiry generally), as Whitehead (1938, p. 168) asserted, begin and end in wonder, though the hope is that it is a deeper wonder; or as Huebner (1975, p. 219) put it, the best educators stand in a *cloud of unknowing*, since the most insightful humans rarely claim certain knowledge. Good teachers are in a position to judge if students are achieving productive uncertainty (Dewey, 1929), *cultivating humanity* (Nussbaum, 1997), and *composing a life* (Bateson, 1989).

I have found that good practice for appreciating this orientation is for participants (students or educators) to share with each other a work that they consider to be great and to portray how it has had profound impact on their outlook. I ask them to explain how a great work's author or artist reaches them with meaning and inspiration when the author or artist does not know them personally. How is an author or artist a teacher, I challenge students, and how is their work a curriculum? How are the consequences of artists' works evaluated, and how should we evaluate work of teachers who are deemed artists? How can teachers come to know the impact of a work or educational experience on a student? How can they perceive students as their works of art? Moreover, could students see themselves as works of art continuously created and recreated throughout lifetimes? How might evaluation that addresses this further the educative process?

Speaker 2: Social Behaviorist

I am sometime called a *conceptual empiricist* (Pinar, 1975) or a proponent of *social efficiency* (Kliebard, 1986). I am convinced that science and objective analysis are the most important inventions of the past several centuries. The great advances in medicine, architecture, engineering, communication, transportation, and other spheres of life are results of scientific inquiry and analytic thought. Thus, it was thought in the early 20th century that this new thinking would contribute advancements in education, as well. Evidence around the turn of the 20th century was provided by William James and Edward L. Thorndike, who published research to empirically discredit faculty psychology that previously dominated 19th century educational thought and paved the way for a social efficiency movement. Robert W. M. Travers (1980) documented many ways in which research contributed to clarification of needed directions in educational policy and practice. This scientific approach to curriculum held that subject matters derived from disciplines of knowledge cannot be accepted as beneficial *cart blanche* unless their benefits can be defended with reason and evidence.

With an emergent faith in I.Q. and related testing as a veritable *blood test* of educational health or illness, my social efficiency ancestors, Franklin Bobbitt (1918, 1924) and W. W. Charters (1923), called for curriculum design that worked toward creating skills, knowledge, and behaviors that explicitly forged better members of society. Bobbitt, for instance, developed *activity analysis* in which successful persons were surveyed and their capabilities catalogued; for him curriculum-making became translation of knowledge and skills of successful persons into objectives for students, so that they, too, could become successful individuals. Similarly, Charters derived purposes from study of ideals of successful citizens, and then constructed curriculum to arrange learning activities to develop students who could live such ideals.

Although today an emphasis on purposes or objectives seems outmoded to some critics, Ralph Tyler (1987) reflected historically that his call for clarifying curricular purposes was novel in his early consulting ventures in the 1920s and 1930s, when educators could not give a rationale for perpetuating subject matter content, other than that it stood the test of time. Tyler's *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (Tyler, 1949), known as *The Tyler Rationale*, was fashioned as a result of consultation, study of many curriculum orientations, and work in the renowned Eight Year Study (Aikin, 1942), a longitudinal comparison of progressive and traditional curriculum relative to student outcomes. This study showed superiority of progressively taught students, by using a diverse array of evaluation methods. Arguably the *Tyler Rationale* had greater influence on curriculum policy, curriculum guides, lesson plan structures, and teacher education than any other book from the emergent curriculum field. After all, Tyler was an educational advisor to six U.S. presidents, and he was an exemplar among educational researchers and evaluators. Today's widely used manuals for curriculum development by Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe (2005), promulgated by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and their so-called *backwards design* are variations on Tyler's *rationale* for curriculum, though many users are not fully aware of this history.

Returning for a moment to the Eight Year Study (1933-41), especially the third volume (Smith & Tyler, 1942), a pioneering work on evaluation, we can see one of the most comprehensive compendia of evaluation procedures for complex purposes. In efforts to appraise student progress the evaluation team developed a host of qualitative and affective measures. Embedded in the Eight Year Study are levels of cognitive and affective objectives later developed by Benjamin Bloom (a renowned student of Tyler who worked with him on the Eight Year Study), David Krathwohl, and others (Anderson & Sosniak, 1994). This early work broadens perspective and looks at both intended and unintended outcomes, as does other early work on curriculum evaluation, for example: formative and summative evaluation (Bloom, Hastings & Madaus, 1971; Scriven, 1967); a call by Robert Stake (1967) to look at a multifaceted countenance of evaluation's content that includes antecedents, transactions, and outcomes; Daniel Stufflebeam's (1971) entreaty to evaluators to address context, input, process, and product; and a host of affective evaluation materials and approaches collected by Beatty (1969). Such work reflects insights from a recent portrayal of contributions through stories about the Eight Year Study by Craig Kridel and Robert Bullough (2007) wherein they recognize that curriculum evaluation entails experimental work of educators and collaboration of all engaged as stakeholders in deeply contextualized educational settings.

Even though there is much emphasis on evaluation in educational policy and practice today, the theoretical constructs of these authors from a half century or more ago deals with much greater complexity than does much of the most popular and superficial means-ends evaluation of today. Today's highly politicized evaluations, wherein evaluation instruments are too often surrogates for purposes, need to be contrasted with Ralph Tyler's (1949, 1987) frequent admonition that evaluation should be done to improve curriculum and instruction. Moreover, as mentioned in the previous chapter, another of Tyler's renowned students, Lee J. Cronbach (1963), proposed that evaluation

should be for course improvement. Some would consider Cronbach and Associates (1980) as the definitive statement that integrated and expanded the best of this early phase of curriculum evaluation. In the decades that followed, many continued to build on this work, especially Australian scholars, such as Malcolm Skilbeck (1984a, 1990) and Stephen Kemmis (1982; Kemmis & Stake, 1988). The work of these scholars has enabled me to suggest that the fullness of a curriculum perspective on evaluation means that it is necessary to perceive evaluation as being part of every aspect of determining purposes, and selecting experiences that facilitate acquisition of purposes, creation of organizational patterns (classroom environments, sequential patterns, school plant design, grouping arrangements, curricular structures, and more). By comparison, the evaluation of students, teachers, schools, and nations using only external tests seems narrow indeed, even though I am an advocate of beneficial uses of testing. Quite clearly, I am declaring that testing needs to be seen as part of a larger picture of evaluation. Testing is not to be equated with evaluation or even assessment.

To encourage educators to think as Social Behaviorists, I ask them to select a skill or disposition that they would like to see fostered among students and to then frame it, based on the best research available, in terms of purposes and objectives, selection of learning experiences or opportunities that help foster the purposes, organizational patterns through which to convey purposes via instructional strategies and materials, and then to develop modes of evaluation (marshalling evidence) to determine the extent to which purposes are obtained. The evaluation must account for all of the purposes as well as for unintended outcomes, and must be consistent with learning experiences selected, organizational patterns, instructional strategies, and learning environments.

Speaker 3: Experientialist

As long as you were speaking of Ralph Tyler, I say he was as much connected with the Experientialist orientation as with the Social Behaviorists. While Tyler (1949) frequently used the term *behavior*, he was not a behaviorist in the sense that B. F. Skinner was. Tyler said that his use of *behavior* was a brief substitute for saying *think*, *feel*, and *do* each time. Moreover, Tyler's use of the term *experiences* bespeaks a Deweyan (John Dewey, 1859-1952) orientation, one that differs from *activities* (Social Behaviorist) and *content* or *subject matter* (Intellectual Traditionalist). Dewey (1916) defined education as *reconstruction of experience* to guide subsequent experience (p. 76) and later elaborated the intricate interface of education and experience (Dewey, 1938). Tyler studied Dewey preparatory to working as Director of Evaluation for the Eight Year Study, in which the experimental group (experiencing Deweyan progressivism) advocated learning that built on student needs and interests through continuous collaboration and experimentation (Aikin, 1942; Kridel & Bullough, 2007). Tyler's experience on the Eight Year Study Evaluation Team provided a foundation in his *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (Tyler, 1949) for emphasis on two highly progressive threads woven throughout his *rationale*, which (like the Eight Year Study itself) are too often forgotten. Tyler (1977) re-elaborated them in a reflective retrospective, referring to them as: i) the active role of learners, and ii) the multiple non-school curricular areas. The latter was quite similar to the areas of education that influence students outside of school as characterized as dimensions of *public education* by Lawrence Cremin (1976), and elaborated as the *outside curriculum*, noted above (Schubert, 1981, 2010). Some argue that other intellectual ancestors of the experientialist orientation include Francis Parker (1837-1902), Maria Montessori (1870-1952), Jane Addams (1860-1935), Ella Flagg Young (1845-1918), with roots to Froebel (1782-1852), Herbart (1776-1841), Pestalozzi (1746-1827), and Rousseau (1712-1778).

Of Tyler's generation, L. Thomas Hopkins (1929) developed Experientialist curriculum principles through reflection on questions of practicing educators in schools where he consulted throughout the USA, and advocated (1) curriculum integration of subjects around student interests and concerns (Hopkins, 1937), (2) expanded integration based on embryonic research to embrace the democratic process (Hopkins 1941), and (3) that education should be focused on a more integrated self, facilitated by organic groups (as opposed to mere aggregates) in homes as well as in schools (Hopkins, 1954). The emphasis on student interests as a key to needs and a spur to effort (which Dewey, 1913, originally wanted to call *will*) was consistently a thread of Hopkins's work. Too, it was a primary dimension of the experimental or progressive schools in the Eight Year Study, as Kridel and Bullough (2007) also note the centrality of needs in the educative process. Dewey, Tyler, and Hopkins realized that interests of the moment can be valuable clues to deep and pervasive human interests, the pursuit of which helps students meet needs to consciously develop the project of composing their lives, as phrased so well by Mary Catherine Bateson (1989, 2010). This harkens back to the Intellectual Traditionalist focus on great ideas (Adler, 1981, 1982), especially life's great mysteries and events (Ulich, 1955). The original *core curriculum*, as developed by Harold Alberty (1947), ironically differs diametrically from the imposed and predetermined *common core* of recent years. Alberty's core, derived from Boyd's (1937) philosophy of living a democratic theory of education (which was close to Dewey's participatory democracy, 1916, 1938), perceived study of key social interests or problems as the core from which myriad realms of knowledge could be accessed and learned. Beane (1997) revived and renewed this orientation to integrated curriculum decades later.

To help educators become acclimated to the Experientialist orientation, I often ask them to construct a pathway that visually represents their life journey thus far, and to indicate turning points or milestones in the development of personal perspectives that guide their lives. In reflecting on milestones of their pathway, they begin to see education, as expressed by Ronald Swartz (2016), as an informal "philosophy of education for personal responsibility." Such a pathway, I suggest, is a student's most valuable curriculum, derived from both inside and outside of school. As educators discuss their journeys, they begin to see the need to view their students as continuously influenced by multiple curricula simultaneously. Educators need, therefore, to evaluate curricula they intend to teach in light of the diversity of other curricula of student lives. Then educators need to address what it would mean to evaluate that curriculum relative to short- and long-term consequences of enacting it. Many of the evaluation instruments (qualitative and quantitative) developed in the Eight Year Study by Tyler and his evaluation team (Smith & Tyler, 1942) could serve as prototypes for complex evaluation lenses needed to understand experienced curricula today. An evaluation question that cannot be neglected, as I see it, is how can evaluators provide insight for teachers and students to continuously re-create their lives, since composing one's life should be the key work of education?

Speaker 4: Critical Reconstructionist

My primary focus is on inequities and injustices perpetrated through educational institutions to those who live in poverty or suffer from persecution or oppression due to prejudice relative to race, class, gender, place, heritage, ethnicity, sexual orientation, cultural practices, religion or beliefs, language, appearance, credential, (dis)ability, or other markers of diversity. My point is that the Intellectual Traditionalist and the Social Behaviorist may differ from each other in what they choose to advocate, but neither of them engages students, parents, and communities in serious evaluation of curriculum matters. They remain essentially authoritarian. The Experientialist wants students, parents, and communities to be involved in curriculum development and to participate in processes of setting purposes; however, they rarely are consulted during curricular planning or enactment.

They definitely are not involved in establishing endpoints that could be a basis for *summative* evaluation. Further, decision and action during enactment seldom allow students and practicing educators to interpret *formative* evaluation as changing direction rather than getting back on a preordained track, when it is clear that forging ahead in a detrimental direction is not educationally sound. While understanding and agreeing with this, the Experientialist is too naïve to realize that educators in an acquisitive society (Dewey, 1933), cannot simply decide to build on student experiences and interests, or those of their parents and communities, when governmental and corporate greed is the ideological and economic power behind schooling which purports to be education (Counts, 1932, Schubert, 2009b).

The disparity between *haves* and *have-nots* must be exposed; the chasm is immense between those who are deemed worthy of being authoritative in creation and development of curriculum, i.e., those whom Paulo Freire (1970) calls *oppressors* and *oppressed* local administrators, teachers, parents, and community members who are expected only to implement or support it, or the even more oppressed students who are tricked and coerced to receive and internalize it. Influenced by Karl Marx (1818-1883), Erich Fromm (1900-1980), Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937), and Latin American liberation theologians, among others (see Lake & Kress, 2013), Paulo Freire (1970, 1998) called for teachers to be cultural workers who build curricular or pedagogical experiences through a dialogic exchange with students. Thus, evaluation becomes the evaluation of artifacts and events from student experience in an effort to enable them to become literate by transforming the word and the world through *praxis* (politicized theorizing in action) and by striving to overcome the kinds of inequities noted above.

What would evaluators and evaluation have to do and be in order to facilitate what I am advocating? Evaluation in the Critical Reconstructionist orientation is an effort to discover *radical possibilities* as characterized by Jean Anyon (2004) and to challenge societal disparities leading to hidden curriculum identified in her earlier work. In the early 1980s Anyon (1980) found that students from lower socioeconomic classes were taught to follow the rules, middle-class students learned to give answers wanted by superiors, professional-class students were taught to be creative without disturbing ruling class authority, and upper-class students were facilitated in their longstanding role of manipulating other classes and the system itself to their will. Freire (1970) criticized this *banking system* of education, and called for *problem posing pedagogy* as an alternative. Put another way by Michael Apple (1979/2004), educators need to address ways in which conventional curriculum reproduces ideological structures; thus, they must re-evaluate official knowledge (Apple, 2000) and seek democratic alternatives (Apple & Beane, 2007).

In an effort to develop empathy of educators with the plight of the oppressed, I often ask participants to reflect on or share instances of discrimination that they have faced, how they felt and acted or performed. I strive to help them frame the curriculum questions about what is worthwhile by bringing to the fore questions such as: Whose notion of worth is promoted? Who benefits? Whose image of worth should be promoted? Who should benefit? I sometimes ask educators to make a list of six things they hate to do and cannot do well; then I ask them to imagine having to go to a place where they are judged on their capacity to do those things—five days a week, about 200 days per year, for 13 years, equivalent to K-12 schooling. I follow by asking how they would change that distressing situation to maximize the experience of fairness and capacity building for all or most students and teachers involved. I also ask them to consider instances when they experienced or witnessed discrimination or inequity and how such situations could be prevented or overcome. With James B. Macdonald (1977) I implore them to address: “What is, or should be, curriculum talkers’ and workers’ idea of goodness? What fundamental values inform our own activity, arise out of that

activity?” (p. 19), and ... “What is the meaning of human life” ... “and how shall we live together?” (p. 20).

Speaker 5: Postmodern and Global Anti-Imperialist

All previous speakers share a common flaw; they wittingly or unwittingly see their own position as the master narrative. They are also often *centric* in favor of a region, nation, or epistemological orientation. This is why I draw on postmodern perspectives and combine them with anti-imperialism. I urge us to evaluate curriculum, teachers, students, and all of educational experience relative to imperialism in global proportions. By this, I mean a global imperialism of a kind of coalescing of conquerors—governmental, corporate, and other bastions of oppressive wealth. One of the key admonitions I take from postmodern perspectives is that there should be no master narrative that dominates, and that we should evaluate with the goal of fair representation of narratives from all stakeholders in providing perspectives on what is or ought to be in any given educational situation. In curriculum work, the often dominant Western, white, male educational ideals need to be balanced with a host of choices as evaluated by non-dominant groups (Doll, 1993; Slattery, 2006). The latter reap consequences of any given educational experience, especially in diverse nations. A prime question for evaluation, then, is how to plan, act, and evaluate consequences of action on insights of all stakeholders in any educational situation. All involved should decide together. The anti-imperialist global perspective that I advocate is based on my observations that the viewpoints of conquerors dominate all spheres of life, including and especially educational institutions. Let’s begin to look at this through the eyes of one dominant (and often dominating) nation, the United States, even though many others can be criticized from a similar vantage point.

Responding to this situation, Joel Spring (2010) has critiqued the master narrative of a white supremacist corporate state in the United States that *deculturalizes*, dominates, and even erases cultures and ways of life of Native Americans, African Americans, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, and Asian Americans. Clearly, this critique is not new, though it needs to be exposed frequently. Carter G. Woodson (1933), for instance, persuasively advanced it in the 1930s, as did others in decades that followed. Ronald Takaki (1989, 1993) focused on multicultural, especially Asian communities, whereas Ming Fang He (2003, 2010; He & Phillion, 2008), addressed the treatment of the issue in curriculum studies. Molefi Asante (1991) and bell hooks (1994) provide insights about the immense African American omissions from educative life outside of institutionalized curriculum studies; inside the curriculum field, I recommend examples by Cameron McCarthy (1990), McCarthy and Warren Crichlow (1993) and William Watkins (1993, 2001, 2015). So pronounced has been the disregard for African American insights, that as highly regarded as the Eight Year Study has been in scholarly circles, a principal offshoot study known as the Black High School Study (1940-1946), led by William A. Robinson, has been scarcely known until studied extensively by Craig Kridel (2015). Sandy Grande’s (2005/2015) work illuminates *red pedagogy* or educational approaches of Native Americans, which finally has been accepted in U.S. curriculum discourse after long ignoring earlier Native Americans, many of whom remain unnamed or unknown. The plight of Latino/a education in the USA is vividly captured by Angela Valenzuela’s (1999) term *subtractive schooling*, a force that diminishes or erases cultural knowledge and community understandings of Latino/a populations, while Gonzalez, Moll, and Amanti (2005) build on the corpus of work by Luis Moll, which acknowledges the legitimacy of formerly discredited *funds of knowledge* in repressed and suppressed Latina/o families and communities. Building on *funds of knowledge* could partially prevent or reinstate that which is lost by *subtractive schooling*. Dealing with

such issues involves a highly complex endeavor that Bernardo Gallegos (in press) shows to involve colonized, indigenous performances of persons or groups cast into subaltern experiences.

In the realm of recent curriculum history, scholars (e.g., Au, Brown, & Calderon, 2016; Baker, 2001, 2009; Grant, Brown, & Brown, 2016; Hendry, 2011; Miller, 2005; Munro, 1998; Watkins, 1993, 2005, 2015) admonish us not to neglect the contributions of scholars of color who were often left out of most of 20th century curriculum discourse by scholars who have created the academic field of curriculum studies. Along with the aforementioned courageous and insightful pioneers of diverse U.S. minority groups, I suggest that evaluation should entail seeking and acknowledging those from the past (as well as the present) who offer curriculum views that rarely have been recognized for doing so.

To begin, I advocate evaluating the contemporary and past relevance of leaders such as Chief Seattle (1786-1866), Cordero y Molina (1790-1868), Sojourner Truth (1797-1883), Frederick Douglass (1818-1895), Harriet Tubman (1822-1913), Sarah Winnemucca (1844-1910), Booker T. Washington (1856-1915), Ida B. Wells (1862-1931), Jane Addams (1860-1935), Black Elk (1863-1950), Anna Julia Cooper (1868-1964), W. E. B. DuBois (1868-1963), Carter G. Woodson (1875-1950), Helen Keller (1880-1968), Alain Locke (1885-1954), Septima Clark (1898-1987), Ella Baker (1903-1986), and George Sanchez (1906-1972). In these and other educators of color one could see examples of resistance to education. For example, in the mid-20th century, I suggest as exemplary the *freedom schools* of the U.S. Civil Rights Movement as developed by Septima Clark, Ella Baker, Charles Cobb, Myles Horton, and many others, as depicted by Charles Payne (1996). So, too, we should revisit critiques of U.S. history textbooks by James Loewen (1999/2007) in which he exposes *lies* that obfuscate evils such as conquest, slavery, and genocide in U.S. history curriculum. Earlier, Ruth Elson (1964) exposed many deleterious values taught by 19th century U.S. textbooks.

Moreover, lies have not been limited to what appears in textbooks for students. Work of recent curriculum scholars whose roots or interests reside in the well-being of non-dominant groups has recently questioned and critiqued the domination of Western white (some say *white supremacist*) curriculum history and development in the United States. This critique is part of a larger criticism of the Western white orientation of academe. In curriculum studies, recent work by Anthony Brown and Wayne Au (Brown & Au, 2014; Au, Brown, & Calderon, 2016) point to the need to expand curriculum literature in the U.S. to be inclusive of perspectives that lie outside the hegemonic power structure. Similar critiques are set forth by many others in a new generation of curriculum scholars (e.g. Hongyu Wang, Danise Taliaferro Baszile, Isabel Nunez, Min Yu, Nathalia Jaramillo, Lasana Kazembe, Elaine Chan, Valerie Kinloch, Maria Botelho, Kenneth Saltman, Jason Gulah, Jinting Wu, Erica Meiners, Therese Quinn, Sabrina Ross, Brad Porfilio, Derek Ford, Debbie Sonu, Sherick Hughes, Cynthia Cole Robinson, Robert Helfenbein, Ruben Gaztambide-Fernandez, Jason Lukasik, Nina Asher, Eve Tuck, and Sonia Janis). There are many more; however, all of these are included with others in *The SAGE Guide to Curriculum in Education* (He et al, 2015).

Furthermore, misinformation has been rampant in how the U.S. corporate state advances “knowledge” about schooling. For example, Seymour Sarason (1990) predicted the failure of neo-liberal and neo-conservative public school reform, for which Myron Lieberman (1995) declared an *autopsy*, and David Berliner and Bruce Biddle (1995) unearthed research that showed the U.S. educational *crisis* had been *manufactured* by governmental and corporate collaboration to sustain their own greed. A most brilliant critique of the lack of sound basis in research for educational policy, as well as the derailing of it by privatized socio-economic interests is found in Gene Glass’s (2008) exposure of the fate of education in the wake of fertilizers, pills, magnetic strips, and more. Peter Taubman (2009) insightfully deconstructed the uncritical uses of standards, testing, and accountability—emphasizing implications of doing so. Berliner & Glass (2014) have continued with

colleagues to show that the real crisis in education is constructed by a flat-out assault that seeks to privatize U.S. schools through dissemination of misinformation. This is consistent with the images of *assault* on public education in work provided by William Watkins (2011), which points to profound consequences of policies and practices on persons of color.

As a subset of curriculum studies, we need to address the extent to which curriculum evaluation is susceptible to similar critique. Again, how can or should orientations to evaluation be revised to focus more fully on questions about whose conceptions of knowledge count, whose do not, and whose should count? Clearly, this question raises more questions that are prerequisites to usual treatments of evaluation, assessment, and grading. Basically, as noted earlier by the Critical Reconstructionist, they challenge the field of education with questions about diversity, relative to race, class, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, (dis)ability, language, culture, tradition, place, and more. Whose voices should be heard? Whose values should be a basis for curriculum and evaluation? Who benefits from and who is harmed by past and present practices, who profits from the harm, how should the harm be overcome, and do some policy makers not want the harm to be overcome? Such questions are obviously matters for revision of assessment and evaluation of what we do as educators and evaluators. They bear heavily upon evaluation of schools, teachers, and students; however, they are too seldom considered evaluation questions. Thus, I move and second the motion, here, to see evaluation through lenses of the continuously expanding domain of curriculum studies.

It is increasingly clear to me that there is need for a more global or worldwide critique, similar to that emerging without much power or policy influence in the USA and in other dominant world powers. Critiques of oppression and neglect of diverse groups scattered throughout the world are not powerful enough without the global emphasis noted in my title. I concur with the centrality of the question of Noam Chomsky's (2016) most recent book: *Who Rules the World?* If a hybrid of governmental-private-corporate-military power and wealth rule the world, then it strives to influence education so as to sustain that rule and obedience to it. As laudable as it is, then, to critique U.S. curriculum, or any other national curriculum, and to include more diverse perspectives, there is a need to move past concern for any one nation or culture, no matter how pervasive it is or how sordid the injustices are within it. As evaluators we needed to evaluate whether we are playing into the hand of such powers. We need to evaluate ourselves and the evaluation structures and instruments we use. I, of course, advocate asking educators to address such issues and questions that follow. How, for instance, would they propose to study greed and injustice on a global scale?

At the same time, I am convinced that we need to search for possibilities from around the world—contemporary and historical. We need to evaluate or assess the myriad anti-imperialist or anti-colonial struggles and resistances to education created by conquerors or by generations of their descendants. As we do this, we should give serious attention to indigenous modes of research or inquiry (Denzin, Lincoln, & Tuhiwai Smith, 2008; Tuhiwai Smith, 2001/2012). For theoretical frameworks to guide such global inquiry, I suggest that we turn back to Frantz Fanon's (1963) devastating critique of imperialist forces that created persons he characterized as *wretched*, as in his book, *The Wretched of the Earth*. Too, they should move to Edward Said's (1993) continuation of Fanon's critique as it applies to nationalism and many forms of colonialism that followed the ages of empire, noting Rashid Khalidi's (2004) *resurrection of empire* as a revival of new kinds of colonialism in a globalized world. It is interesting to see this global threat to oppressed cultures in light of long-standing work of aforementioned Chomsky (2003, 2005) and its myriad implications for education (Chomsky, 2000). John Willinsky (1998) built on central features of Fanon and Said, as well as Chomsky, to argue that the current instantiation of empire teaches students benefits of nefarious ways to divide the world, defining the conquerors as good and right and the conquered as lesser

beings without heritage or contribution. It is important to realize that every region of the world (country, culture, or constellation of countries or cultures)—contemporary or historical, and probably future—is beset with its own special version of conqueror and conquered (vanquished, enslaved, wretched). This being the case, one should realize with William Pinar (2008) that the next reconceptualization of curriculum studies is international: “Internationalization promises a ... paradigmatic shift” (p. 501).

There are, of course, many possible ways of conceiving this. Maybe *national* and *international* are metaphoric of transnational entities or even flowing realms of power and capital that shape and reshape a global elite, a manageable middle or subservient class kept moderately content, and an increasing wretched class constantly controlled. Or the expectation might be essentially for nations to be more collaborative while remaining constituted much as they are. Nonetheless, we need to investigate our own work as evaluators with focus on the potential peril in exporting U.S. curriculum or that of other powerful nations in ways that facilitate military and economic conquest. Thus, evaluation is necessary to determine how to learn from resistance to conquest in many different places in the world. To exemplify a move from emphasis on a single nation state to the flow of power on a global scale, we could consider the contributions of Howard Zinn, whose *A People's History of the United States* (Zinn, 1980) is a critique of conquest of dominant groups in the USA, as an example of the kind of critique that could be developed in other regions, cultures, or places. Zinn's work is exemplary in this regard, and he also has provided global perspective with colleagues (Zinn, Konopacki, & Buhle, 2008) to portray, through a graphic novel format, consequences of American empire. Along with allies (former conquerors and colonialists) a supremacy of rich and powerful forces can be seen to devolve into their own sordid conjuring of manifest destiny for middle class, working class, and wretched peoples worldwide.

Thus, in the early 21st century there exists need to include more worldwide emphasis on curriculum studies, not merely the old approaches of comparative curricula which often magnified superiority of dominant cultures. In what may be responses to that need, I briefly note several responses from within the curriculum field. Pinar (2003), for example, and colleagues established the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies. Other examples include John Miller's (1988) long-time emphasis on exemplars of holistic education in many cultures, David Hansen's (2007) portrayal of ethical visions of education from many parts of the world, and Peter McLaren's and Nathalia Jaramillo's (2007) pedagogy offered particularly for what they call the *new age of empire*. Thomas Popkewitz (2013) pioneered relevant work on the *intercontinental*, and has provided international perspectives on the questions, methods, and knowledge of schools. McLaren (2015) expanded a *pedagogy of revolution, a critical rage pedagogy for self and social transformation*, while Noah De Lissovoy (2008, 2014) encourages me to hope that pedagogical communities and sharing of embodied theory offer possible challenges to colonialism in the globalized, neo-liberal world. Introduced by William Reynolds who called for expanded curriculum theory (Reynolds & Webber, 2004/2016), examples of expansion are provided in a book edited by Joao Paraskeva and Shirley Steinberg (2016) along with caveats about accepting a canonization of curriculum sources, since it could perpetuate another version of colonized knowledge. Paraskeva (2011, 2016) continues to provide provocative work on curriculum theory and *epistemicide*.

I continue to search for instances of resistance to imperial, nationalist, and colonial oppression, especially those neglected in curriculum history. I hope that communities that Fanon (1963) has called *wretched* can marshal challenges that bring at least a modicum of liberation. In most cases, I have found evidence in situations that have achieved a separation of school and corporate state. For instance, I note educational work by Princess Kartina (1879-2004) and Ki Hadjar Dewantara in Indonesia (1889-1959), Rabindranath Tagore (1861-1941) and Mahatma Gandhi

(1869-1948) in India, Jose Marti (1853-1995) in Cuba, Maria Montessori (1870-1952) in Italy, Tsunesaburo Makiguchi (1871-1944) and Daisaku Ikeda (b. 1928) in Japan, and of course, Paulo Freire (1921-1997) in Brazil, as already noted. Tagore, Montessori, and Ki Hadjar of Indonesia returned to their home countries from work within a small coterie of educators in the Netherlands who lived in self-imposed or forced exile. They created ideas together about alternatives to schools incubated within ideologies of conquest and colonialism. Some of the best of these alternatives embraced play, love, and peace in lived curricula. That is another story, though one well worth telling, enacting, and evaluating, revising, enacting, evaluation—many times over.

Conclusion

In conclusion, my *Guest Speakers* and I have characterized how Curriculum Studies has been and continues to be a source for expanding conceptualization of evaluation. Curriculum Studies, as a field, began with a strong focus on Foundations of Education; thus, my first *Speaker* cautioned that we need to be aware of the values that lie behind the major categories of curriculum development: purposes, learning experiences, and organization of learning experiences. This is a central and often neglected task of evaluation. The second *Speaker* magnified the central foundational question of education (in or out of school), asking: What is worthwhile? If evaluations bypass this question, then the rest of their effort is baseless. The third *Speaker* warned that evaluators dare not merely attend to the intended curriculum or to the curricular purposes implicit in standardized tests without seeing them in a large *ecological* web with the other powerful and often neglected curricula: taught, hidden, null, outside, learned, and embodied.

Looking again at Gert Biesta's (2010) challenge that educators not focus so fully on intricate techniques of measurement that they displace the above fundamental considerations about what constitutes *good* education. As Bertrand Russell (1926) noted long ago, striving to create good education is intricately connected to the quest for the good life. Accepting the importance of the notion of good education and education for the good life as basic is only a beginning. Alternative meanings of what *good education* and *good life* mean must also be addressed by evaluators. To illustrate this, I introduced the curriculum orientations of five *Speakers*: the *Intellectual Traditionalist*, the *Social Behaviorist*, the *Experientialist*, the *Critical Reconstructionist*, and the *Postmodern and Global Anti-Imperialist*. Each spoke to problems of evaluating teachers, students, and educational programs/systems. I might be asked why I devoted more space to the latter two speakers, especially the last one. Was it because I see their positions as more relevant? No! It is mainly because I see their positions as less emphasized and therefore in need of greater characterization. Also, the fifth is the newest, so it receives the greatest emphasis. Another question often arises: Which orientation do I adhere to most? I am not an official actor, so I am in a sense channeling different persona within me, a matter for which I should claim to be in therapy, but I am not. I think it is possible that each *Speaker* expands the complex portrayal of extant curriculum; therefore, together all of the speakers bring a more enhanced perspective of the complexity of education that evaluators must address.

Finally, however, I do hold to a tenet valued by the Postmodern and Global Anti-Imperialist and well expressed by Maxine Greene (1995, p. 197), namely, that we turn our attention to those made wretched by conquerors. She asks, "How can we reconcile the multiple realities of human lives with shared commitment to communities infused once again with principles? How can we do it without regressing, without mythicizing? How, like Tarrou in [Camus, 1948, pp. 229-230] *The Plague* can we move ourselves and others to affirm that "on this earth there are pestilences and there are victims, and it's up to us so far as possible, not to join forces with the pestilences? How can we, in every predicament, take the victims' sides, so as to reduce the damage done?" Returning to

Macdonald (1977), noted above, in each situation we should ask: What are our guiding values? What should they be? How should we live together? And who should be the *evaluators* who ask such questions? Should it be all who are involved? Evaluation from a curriculum perspective is keeping the curriculum questions alive, i.e., asking in each situation, “What is worthwhile? Who benefits? What should determine better situations for those who do not benefit? Perhaps asking such questions is also the purpose of evaluation. I suggest that they should always be asked, acted on, and asked again—continuously. Is that not a central calling of education itself?

References

- Adler, M. J. (1981). *Six great ideas*. New York: Macmillan.
- Adler, M. J. (1982). *The paideia proposal: An educational manifesto*. New York: Macmillan.
- Aikin, W. M. (1942). *The story of the Eight Year Study*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Alberty, H. (1947). *Reorganizing the high school curriculum*. New York: Macmillan.
- Anderson, L. W., & Sosniak, L. A., (Eds.). (1994). *Bloom's taxonomy: A forty year retrospective*. 93rd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education*, 162(1), 67-92.
- Anyon, J. (2004). *Radical possibilities: Public policy, urban education, and a new social movement*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (1979/2004). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W., & Beane, J. A. (Eds.). (2007). *Democratic schools: Lessons in powerful education* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Asante, M. K. (1991). *Afrocentricity*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Au, W., Brown, A. L., & Calderon, D. (2016). *Reclaiming the multicultural roots of the U.S. curriculum: Communities of color and official knowledge in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bagley, W. C. (1934). *Education and emergent man*. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons.
- Baker, B. (2001). *In perpetual motion: Theories of power, educational history, and the child*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Baker, B. (Ed.). (2009). *New curriculum history*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- Bateson, M. C. (1989). *Composing a life*. New York: Penguin (Plume).
- Bateson, M. C. (2010). *Composing a further life*. New York: Knopf.
- Beane, J. (1997). *Curriculum integration: Designing a core of democratic education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Beatty, W. H. (1969). *Improving educational assessment: An inventory of measures of affective behavior*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Berliner, D. C., & Biddle, B. J. (1995). *The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack on America's public schools*. New York: Longman.
- Berliner, D. C., & Glass, G. V. (2014). *Myths & lies that threaten America's public schools: The real crisis in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2010). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. Boulder, CO; London; Paradigm Publishers.
- Bloom, B. S., Hastings, T., & Madaus, G. F. (1971). *Handbook of formative and summative evaluation of student learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bobbitt, F. (1918). *The curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

- Bobbitt, F. (1924). *How to make a curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bode, B. (1937). *Democracy as a way of life*. New York: Macmillan.
- Broudy, H. S., & Palmer, J. (1965). *Exemplars of teaching method*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Broudy, H. S., Smith, B. O., & Burnett, J. (1964). *Democracy and excellence in American secondary education: A study in curriculum theory*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Brown, A. L., & Au, W. (2014). Race, memory, and master narratives: A critical essay on U. S. curriculum history. *Curriculum Inquiry* 44(3), 358-389.
- Camus, A. (1948). *The plague*. (Trans. S. Gilbert). New York: Knopf.
- Caswell, H. L., & Campbell, D. S. (1935). *Curriculum development*. New York: American Book Company.
- Caswell, H. L., & Campbell, D. S. (Eds.). (1937). *Readings in curriculum development*. New York: American Book Company.
- Charters, W. W. (1923). *Curriculum construction*. New York: Macmillan.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). *Chomsky on miseducation* [edited and introduced by D. Macedo]. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Chomsky, N. (2003). *Hegemony or survival: America's quest for global dominance*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Chomsky, N. (2005). *Imperial ambitions*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Chomsky, N. (2016). *Who rules the world?* New York: Metropolitan Books of Henry Holt and Company.
- Connelly, F. M., He, M. F., & Phillion, J. A. (2008). *Handbook of curriculum and instruction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Counts, G. S. (1932) *Dare the school build a new social order?* New York: John Day.
- Cremin, L. (1976). *Public education*. New York: Basic Books.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1963). Course improvement through evaluation. *Teachers College Record* 64, 672-683.
- Cronbach, L. J. & Associates (1980). *Toward reform of program evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., & Tuhiwai Smith, L. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dewey, J. (1913). *Interest and effort in education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. NY: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1929). *The quest for certainty*. New York: Minton, Balch.
- Dewey, J. (1933, April 23). Dewey outlines utopian schools. *New York Times*, 7. Also in Boydston, J. A. (Ed.) (1989). *The later works (1925-1953) of John Dewey* (Vol. 9, pp. 136-140) Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *A common faith*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- De Lissovoy, N. (2008). *Power, crisis, and education for liberation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- De Lissovoy, N. (2014). *Education and emancipation in the neoliberal era: Being, teaching, and power*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Doll, Jr., W. E. (1993). *A post-modern perspective on curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Eisner, E. W. (1979/1985/1994). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of educational programs*. New York: Macmillan.
- Elson, R. (1964). *Guardians of tradition: American schoolbooks of the nineteenth century*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

- Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare to teach*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Gallegos, B. (In press). *Postcolonial indigenous performances: Education, Genirozas, and slavery*. Boston: Sense Publishers.
- Giroux, H. A. (2000). *Stealing innocence: Corporate culture's war on children*. New York: Palgrave.
- Giroux, H. A., & Purpel, D. (Eds.). (1983). *The hidden curriculum and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Glass, G. V. (2008). *Fertilizers, pills, and magnetic strips: The fate of public education in America*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Gonzalez, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practice in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school*. Hightstown, NJ: McGraw-Hill.
- Grande, S. (2005/2015). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. 10th Anniversary Issue. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Grant, C. A., Brown, K. D., & Brown, A. L. (2016). *Black intellectual thought in education: The missing traditions of Anna Julia Cooper, Carter G. Woodson, & Alain Locke*. New York: Routledge.
- Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hansen, D. T. (Ed.). (2007). *Ethical visions of education: Philosophies in practice*. New York: Teachers College Press, in association with the Boston Research Center for the 21st Century.
- Harper, R. (1955) Significance of existence and recognition. In N. B. Henry. (Ed.). *Modern philosophies of education*. 54th Yearbook (Part I) of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 215-253). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- He, M. F. (2003). *A river forever flowing: Cross-cultural lives and identities in the multicultural landscape*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- He, M. F. (2010). Exile pedagogy: Teaching in-between. In J. A. Sandlin, B. D. Schultz, & J. Burdick (Eds.), *Handbook of public pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling* (pp. 469-482) New York: Routledge.
- He, M. F., & Phillion, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Personal~passionate~participatory inquiry into social justice in education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- He, M. F., Schultz, B. D., & Schubert, W. H. (Eds.). (2015). *Guide to Curriculum in Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hendry, P. M. (2011). *Engendering curriculum history*. New York: Routledge.
- Hight, G. (1950). *The art of teaching*. New York: Knopf.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Hopkins, L. T. (1929). *Curriculum principles and practices*. New York: Benjamin H. Sandborn.
- Hopkins, L. T. (Ed.). (1937). *Integration, its meaning and application*. New York: Appleton-Century.
- Hopkins, L. T. (1941). *Interaction: The democratic process*. Boston: D. C. Heath.
- Hopkins, L. T. (1954). *The emerging self in school and home*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Huebner, D. (1975). Curricular language and classroom meanings. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.). *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists* (pp. 217-236), Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Husen, T., & Postelthwaite, N. (1994). *The international encyclopedia of education*. Oxford, GB: Pergamon Press.
- Khalidi, R. (2004). *Resurrecting empire*. Boston: Beacon.
- Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Reinhart, & Winston.
- Jackson, P. W. (Ed.). (1994). *Handbook of research on curriculum*. New York: Macmillan and the American Educational Research Association.

- Kemmis, S. (1982). Seven principles for programme evaluation in curriculum development and innovation. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 14(3), 221-240.
- Kemmis, S., & Stake, R. (1988). *Evaluating curriculum*. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1986/1993/2004). *The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893-1958*. NY: Routledge.
- Kridel, C. (Ed.). (2010). *Encyclopedia of curriculum studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kridel, C. (2015). *Progressive education in Black high schools: The Secondary School Study, 1940-1946*. Columbia, SC: Museum of Education, University of South Carolina.
- Kridel, C., & Bullough Jr., R. V. (2007). *Stories of the Eight Year Study and rethinking schooling in America*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Lake, R., & Kress, T. (Eds.). (2013). *Paulo Freire's Intellectual Roots: Toward historicity in praxis*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Lewy, A. (Ed.). (1991). *The international encyclopedia of curriculum*. London: Pergamon.
- Lieberman, M. (1995). *Public education: An autopsy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Loewen, J. W. (1999/2007). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York: Touchstone.
- Macdonald, J. B. (1977). Value bases and issues for curriculum. In A. Molnar & J. Zahorik (Eds.), *Curriculum theory* (pp. 10-21). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marsh, C. (2004). *Key concepts for understanding curriculum*. London: Routledge.
- Marsh, C., & Willis. G. (2007). *Curriculum: Alternative approaches: Ongoing issues*. Columbus, OH: Pearson.
- Marshall, J. D., Sears, J. T., Allen, L., Roberts, P., & Schubert, W. H. (2007). *Turning points in curriculum: A contemporary curriculum memoir* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall.
- Malewski, E. (Ed.). (2009). *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment*. New York: Routledge.
- McCarthy, C. (1990). *Race and curriculum: Social inequality and theories and politics of difference*. Bristol, PA: Falmer.
- McCarthy, C., & Crichlow, W. (Eds.). (1993). *Race, identity, and representation in education*. New York: Routledge.
- McCutcheon, G. (1995). *Developing the curriculum: Solo and group deliberation*. New York: Longman.
- McLaren, P. (2015). *Pedagogy of insurrection: From Resurrection to revolution*. New York: Peter Lang.
- McLaren, P., & Jaramillo, N. (2007). *Pedagogy and praxis in the age of empire*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Miller, J. L. (1990). *Creating spaces and finding voices*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Miller, J. L. (2005). *Sounds of silence breaking*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Miller, J. P. (1988). *The holistic curriculum*. Toronto, ON: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) Press.
- Molnar, A., & Zahorik, J. (Eds.). (1977). *Curriculum theory*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Morris, M. (2016). *Curriculum studies guidebooks. Volume 1, Concepts and theoretical frameworks*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Morris, M. (2016). *Curriculum studies guidebooks. Volume 2, Concepts and theoretical frameworks*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Munro, P. (1998). *Subject to fiction: Women teachers' life history narratives and the cultural politics of resistance*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Paraskeva, J. (2011). *Conflicts in curriculum theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Paraskeva, J. (2016). *Curriculum epistemicide*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Paraskeva, J. M., & Steinberg, S. R. (Eds.). (2016). *Curriculum: Decanonizing the field*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Payne, C. (1996). *I've got the light of freedom*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Phillips, D. C. (Ed.). (2014). *Encyclopedia of educational philosophy and theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pinar, W. F. (Ed.). (1975). *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Pinar, W. F. (Ed.). (2003). *International handbook of curriculum research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pinar, W. F. (2006). *The synoptic text today: Curriculum development after the reconceptualization*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. F. (2008). Curriculum theory since 1950: Crisis, reconceptualization, internationalization. In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion (Eds.), *Handbook of curriculum and instruction*. (pp. 491-513). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pinar, W. F. (2012). *What is curriculum theory?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Popkewitz, T. (Ed.). (2013). *Rethinking the history of education: An intercontinental perspective on the questions, methods and knowledge of schools*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Provenzo, E. F., Renaud, J. P., & Provenzo, A. B. (Eds.). (2009). *Encyclopedia of the social and cultural foundations of education*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Reynolds, W. M., & Webber, J. A. (2004/2016). *Expanding curriculum theory: Dis/positions and lines of flight*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rubin, L. J. (1984). *Artistry in teaching*. New York: Random House.
- Russell, B. (1926). *Education and the good life*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Said, E. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Knopf.
- Sandlin, J. A., Schultz, B. D., & Burdick, J. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of public pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling*. New York: Routledge.
- Sarason, S. B. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schubert, W. H. (1981). Knowledge about out-of-school curriculum. *Educational Forum*, 45(2),
- Schubert, W. H. (1986/1997). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. New York: Macmillan.
- Schubert, W. H. (1996). Perspectives on four curriculum traditions. *Educational Horizons*, 74(4), 169-176.
- Schubert, W. H. (1997). Character education from four perspectives on curriculum. In A. Molnar, (Ed.), *The construction of children's character*. NSSE Yearbook, Part II (pp. 17-30). Chicago: University of Chicago Press and the National Society for the Study of Education.
- Schubert, W. H. (2004, April 15). Acceptance address on receipt of the Lifetime Achievement Award in Curriculum Studies. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Diego, CA.
- Schubert, W. H. (2008). Curriculum inquiry. (In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion, (Eds.), *Handbook of Curriculum and Instruction* (pp. 399-419). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schubert, W. H. (2009). What's worthwhile: From knowing and experiencing to being and becoming. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 6, 22-40.
- Schubert, W. H. (2009b). *Love, justice, and education: John Dewey and the Utopians*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Schubert, W. H. (2010). Outside curricula and public pedagogy. In J. A. Sandlin, B. D. Schultz, & J. Burdick (Eds.). *Handbook of public pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling*. New York: Routledge.

- Schubert, W. H. (2015, November 20). *Teaching and curricular challenges: Teaching and inquiring courageously and creatively in the era of standardization and commodification*. Augusta University, Augusta, Georgia, College of Education (with Ming Fang He).
- Schubert, W. H., & Lopez Schubert, A. L. (1980). *Curriculum books: The first eighty years*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Schubert, W. H., Lopez Schubert, A. L., Thomas, T. P., & Carroll, W. M. (2002). *Curriculum books*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Schwab, J. J. (1970). *The practical: A language for curriculum*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Schwab, J. J. (1973). The practical 3: Translation into curriculum, *School Review*, 81, 501-522.
- Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. In R. W. Tyler, R. Gagne, & M. Scriven, (Eds.), *Perspectives on curriculum evaluation* (pp. 39-83), AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, No. 1. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Seguel, M. L. (1966). *The curriculum field: Its formative years*. New York: Teachers College.
- Skilbeck, M. (1984a). *Evaluating the curriculum in the eighties*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Skilbeck, M. (1984b). *School-based curriculum development*. London: Harper & Row.
- Skilbeck, M. (1990). *Curriculum reform: An overview of trends*. Paris: OCED, Center for Educational Research.
- Slattery, P. (2006). *Curriculum development in the postmodern era*. (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Smith, B. O., Stanley, W. O., & Shores, J. H. (1957). *Fundamentals of curriculum development*. [Revised ed.]. NY: Harcourt, Brace, and World.
- Smith, E. R., & Tyler, R. W. (1942). *Appraising and recording student progress*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Spencer, H. (1861). *Education: Intellectual, moral, and physical*. New York: D. Appleton & Company.
- Spring, J. (2010). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Stake, R. E. (1967). The countenance of educational evaluation. *Teachers College Record*, 68, 523-540.
- Stanley, W. O., Smith, B. O., Benne, K. D. & Anderson, A. W. (Eds.). (1956). *Social foundations of education*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Stufflebeam, D. (1971). The relevance of the CIPP evaluation model for educational accountability. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 5, 19-25.
- Swartz, R. (2016). *From Socrates to Summerhill and beyond*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Takaki, R. (1989/1998). *Strangers from a different shore: A history of Asian Americans*. Boston: Back Bay Books.
- Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. N. (1975/1980/1995/2006). *Curriculum development*. New York: Macmillan.
- Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. N. (1990). *History of the school curriculum*. New York: Macmillan.
- Taubman, P. M. (2009). *Teaching by numbers: Deconstruction the discourse of standards and accountability in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Tozer, S., Gallegos, B. P., Henry, A. N. (Eds.). (2011). *Handbook of research in the social foundations of education*. New York: Routledge.
- Travers, R. W. M. (1980). *How research has changed American schools*. Kalamazoo, MI: Mythos Press.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2001/2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Tyler, R. W. (1977). Desirable content for a curriculum development syllabus today. In A. Molnar & J. Zahorik (Eds.), *Curriculum theory* (pp. 36-44). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tyler, R. W. (1987). *Education: Curriculum development and evaluation* (an interview conducted by Malca Chall). Berkeley, CA: The Regents of the University of California.
- Tyler, R. W., Schubert, W. H., & Schubert, A. L. (1986). A dialogue with Ralph W. Tyler. *Journal of Thought*, 21(1), 91-118.
- Ulich, R. (Ed.). (1954/1947). *Three thousand years of educational wisdom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ulich, R. (1955). Response to Ralph Harper's essay. In N. B. Henry. (Ed.), *Modern philosophies of education*, Fifty-fourth Yearbook (Part I) of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 254-257). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Walker, D. F. (1990). *Fundamentals of curriculum*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Watkins, W. H. (1993). Black curriculum orientations: A preliminary inquiry. *Harvard Educational Review*, 63(3), 321-338.
- Watkins, W. H. (2001). *The white architects of black education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Watkins, W. H. (Ed.). (2005). *Black protest thought and education*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Watkins, W. H. (Ed.). (2011) *The assault on public education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Watkins, W. H. (2015). The neglected historical milieu. In M. F. He, B. D. Schultz, & W. H. Schubert, (Eds.). *Guide to Curriculum in Education*. (pp. 303-310). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1938). *Modes of thought*. New York: The Free Press.
- Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Willis, G. H. (Ed.). (1978). *Qualitative evaluation: Concepts and cases in curriculum criticism*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Company.
- Willis, G. H., Schubert, W. H., Bullough, Jr., R., Kridel, C., & Holton, J. (Eds.). (1993). *The American curriculum: A documentary history*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Woodson, C. G. (1933). *The mis-education of the Negro*. Washington, DC: Associated Publishers.
- Zinn, H. (1980). *A people's history of the United States*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Zinn, H., Konopacki, M., & Buhle, P. (2008). *A people's history of American empire*. New York: Harper Perennial.

About the Author

William Schubert

University of Illinois - Chicago (Emeritus)

schubert@uic.edu

Dr. Schubert is Professor Emeritus of Curriculum and Instruction, University Scholar, former Coordinator of the Ph.D. Program in Curriculum Studies and the M. Ed. Program in Educational Studies, and Director of Graduate Studies in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), where he worked from 1975 to 2012. He served as Chair of Curriculum and Instruction (1990-1994; 2003-2006). The Ph.D. Program in Curriculum Studies (1982-present), which he founded and has coordinated, has ranked fifth, first, and third in the U.S. by Academic Analytics based on faculty productivity.

About the Guest Editors

Lorin W. Anderson

University of South Carolina (Emeritus)

anderson.lorinw@gmail.com

Lorin W. Anderson is a Carolina Distinguished Professor Emeritus at the University of South Carolina, where he served on the faculty from August, 1973, until his retirement in August, 2006. During his tenure at the University he taught graduate courses in research design, classroom assessment, curriculum studies, and teacher effectiveness. He received his Ph.D. in Measurement, Evaluation, and Statistical Analysis from the University of Chicago, where he was a student of Benjamin S. Bloom. He holds a master's degree from the University of Minnesota and a bachelor's degree from Macalester College. Professor Anderson has authored and/or edited 18 books and has had 40 journal articles published. His most recognized and impactful works are *Increasing Teacher Effectiveness, Second Edition*, published by UNESCO in 2004, and *A Taxonomy of Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*, published by Pearson in 2001. He is a co-founder of the Center of Excellence for Preparing Teachers of Children of Poverty, which is celebrating its 14th anniversary this year. In addition, he has established a scholarship program for first-generation college students who plan to become teachers.

Maria de Ibarrola

Department of Educational Research, Center for Research and Advanced Studies

mdeibarrola@gmail.com

Maria de Ibarrola is a Professor and high-ranking National Researcher in Mexico, where since 1977 she has been a faculty-member in the Department of Educational Research at the Center for Research and Advanced Studies. Her undergraduate training was in sociology at the National Autonomous University of Mexico, and she also holds a master's degree in sociology from the University of Montreal (Canada) and a doctorate from the Center for Research and Advanced Studies in Mexico. At the Center she leads a research program in the politics, institutions and actors that shape the relations between education and work; and with the agreement of her Center and the National Union of Educational Workers, for the years 1989-1998 she served as General Director of the Union's Foundation for the improvement of teachers' culture and training. Maria has served as President of the Mexican Council of Educational Research, and as an adviser to UNESCO and various regional and national bodies. She has published more than 50 research papers, 35 book chapters, and 20 books; and she is a Past-President of the International Academy of Education.

D. C. Phillips

Stanford University

d.c.phillips@gmail.com

D. C. Phillips was born, educated, and began his professional life in Australia; he holds a B.Sc., B.Ed., M. Ed., and Ph.D. from the University of Melbourne. After teaching in high schools and at Monash University, he moved to Stanford University in the USA in 1974, where for a period he served as Associate Dean and later as Interim Dean of the School of Education, and where he is currently Professor Emeritus of Education and Philosophy. He is a philosopher of education and of social science, and has taught courses and also has published widely on the philosophers of science Popper, Kuhn and Lakatos; on philosophical issues in educational research and in program evaluation; on John Dewey and William James; and on social and psychological constructivism. For several years at Stanford he directed the Evaluation Training Program, and he also chaired a national Task Force representing eleven prominent Schools of Education that had received Spencer Foundation grants to make innovations to their doctoral-level research training programs. He is a Fellow of the IAE, and a member of the U.S. National Academy of Education, and has been a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Among his most recent publications are the *Encyclopedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy* (Sage; editor) and *A Companion to John Dewey's "Democracy and Education"* (University of Chicago Press).

SPECIAL ISSUE
Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Educational Evaluation

education policy analysis archives

Volume 26 Number 47

April 16, 2018

ISSN 1068-2341



Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and **Education Policy Analysis Archives**, it is distributed for non-commercial purposes only, and no alteration or transformation is made in the work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>. All other uses must be approved by the author(s) or **EPAA**. **EPAA** is published by the Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education at Arizona State University. Articles are indexed in CIRC (Clasificación Integrada de Revistas Científicas, Spain), DIALNET (Spain), [Directory of Open Access Journals](#), EBSCO Education Research Complete, ERIC, Education Full Text (H.W. Wilson), QUALIS A1 (Brazil), SCImago Journal Rank; SCOPUS, Socolar (China).

Please send errata notes to Audrey Amrein-Beardsley at Audrey.beardsley@asu.edu

Join **EPAA's Facebook community** at <https://www.facebook.com/EPAAAPE> and **Twitter feed** @epaa_aape.

education policy analysis archives
editorial board

Lead Editor: **Audrey Amrein-Beardsley** (Arizona State University)

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Associate Editors: **David Carlson, Lauren Harris, Eugene Judson, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Scott Marley, Iveta Silova, Maria Teresa Tatto** (Arizona State University)

Cristina Alfaro San Diego State University

Gary Anderson New York University

Michael W. Apple University of Wisconsin, Madison

Jeff Bale OISE, University of Toronto, Canada

Aaron Bevanot SUNY Albany

David C. Berliner Arizona State University

Henry Braun Boston College

Casey Cobb University of Connecticut

Arnold Danzig San Jose State University

Linda Darling-Hammond Stanford University

Elizabeth H. DeBray University of Georgia

Chad d'Entremont Rennie Center for Education Research & Policy

John Diamond University of Wisconsin, Madison

Matthew Di Carlo Albert Shanker Institute

Sherman Dorn Arizona State University

Michael J. Dumas University of California, Berkeley

Kathy Escamilla University of Colorado, Boulder

Yariv Feniger Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Melissa Lynn Freeman Adams State College

Rachael Gabriel University of Connecticut

Amy Garrett Dikkers University of North Carolina, Wilmington

Gene V Glass Arizona State University

Ronald Glass University of California, Santa Cruz

Jacob P. K. Gross University of Louisville

Eric M. Haas WestEd

Julian Vasquez Heilig California State University, Sacramento

Kimberly Kappler Hewitt University of North Carolina Greensboro

Aimee Howley Ohio University

Steve Klees University of Maryland
Jaekyung Lee SUNY Buffalo

Jessica Nina Lester Indiana University

Amanda E. Lewis University of Illinois, Chicago

Chad R. Lochmiller Indiana University

Christopher Lubienski Indiana University

Sarah Lubienski Indiana University

William J. Mathis University of Colorado, Boulder

Michele S. Moses University of Colorado, Boulder

Julianne Moss Deakin University, Australia

Sharon Nichols University of Texas, San Antonio

Eric Parsons University of Missouri-Columbia

Amanda U. Potterton University of Kentucky

Susan L. Robertson Bristol University

Gloria M. Rodriguez University of California, Davis

R. Anthony Rolle University of Houston

A. G. Rud Washington State University

Patricia Sánchez University of University of Texas, San Antonio

Janelle Scott University of California, Berkeley

Jack Schneider College of the Holy Cross

Noah Sobe Loyola University

Nelly P. Stromquist University of Maryland

Benjamin Superfine University of Illinois, Chicago

Adai Tefera Virginia Commonwealth University

Tina Trujillo University of California, Berkeley

Federico R. Waitoller University of Illinois, Chicago

Larisa Warhol University of Connecticut

John Weathers University of Colorado, Colorado Springs

Kevin Welner University of Colorado, Boulder

Terrence G. Wiley Center for Applied Linguistics

John Willinsky Stanford University

Jennifer R. Wolgemuth University of South Florida

Kyo Yamashiro Claremont Graduate University

archivos analíticos de políticas educativas consejo editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editores Asociados: **Armando Alcántara Santuario** (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México), **Jason Beech**, (Universidad de San Andrés), **Angelica Buendía**, (Metropolitan Autonomous University), **Ezequiel Gomez Caride**, (Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina), **Antonio Luzon**, (Universidad de Granada), **José Luis Ramírez**, Universidad de Sonora)

Claudio Almonacid

Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencias de la Educación, Chile

Miguel Ángel Arias Ortega

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México

Xavier Besalú Costa

Universitat de Girona, España

Xavier Bonal Sarro Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, España

Antonio Bolívar Boitia

Universidad de Granada, España

José Joaquín Brunner Universidad Diego Portales, Chile

Damián Canales Sánchez

Instituto Nacional para la Evaluación de la Educación, México

Gabriela de la Cruz Flores

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

Marco Antonio Delgado Fuentes

Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Inés Dussel, DIE-CINVESTAV,

México

Pedro Flores Crespo Universidad

Iberoamericana, México

Ana María García de Fanelli

Centro de Estudios de Estado y Sociedad (CEDES) CONICET, Argentina

Juan Carlos González Faraco

Universidad de Huelva, España

María Clemente Linuesa

Universidad de Salamanca, España

Jaume Martínez Bonafé

Universitat de València, España

Alejandro Márquez Jiménez

Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la Universidad y la Educación, UNAM, México

María Guadalupe Olivier Tellez,

Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, México

Miguel Pereyra Universidad de

Granada, España

Mónica Pini Universidad Nacional de San Martín, Argentina

Omar Orlando Pulido Chaves

Instituto para la Investigación Educativa y el Desarrollo Pedagógico (IDEP)

José Luis Ramírez Romero

Universidad Autónoma de Sonora, México

Paula Razquin Universidad de San

Andrés, Argentina

José Ignacio Rivas Flores

Universidad de Málaga, España

Miriam Rodríguez Vargas

Universidad Autónoma de Tamaulipas, México

José Gregorio Rodríguez

Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Colombia

Mario Rueda Beltrán Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la Universidad y la Educación, UNAM, México

José Luis San Fabián Maroto

Universidad de Oviedo, España

Jurjo Torres Santomé, Universidad de la Coruña, España

Yengny Marisol Silva Laya

Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Ernesto Treviño Ronzón

Universidad Veracruzana, México

Ernesto Treviño Villarreal

Universidad Diego Portales Santiago, Chile

Antoni Verger Planells

Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, España

Catalina Wainerman

Universidad de San Andrés, Argentina

Juan Carlos Yáñez Velasco

Universidad de Colima, México

arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas
conselho editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editoras Associadas: **Kaizo Iwakami Beltrao**, (Brazilian School of Public and Private Management - EBAPE/FGV, Brazil), **Geovana Mendonça Lunardi Mendes** (Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina), **Gilberto José Miranda**, (Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brazil), **Marcia Pletsch, Sandra Regina Sales** (Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro)

Almerindo Afonso

Universidade do Minho
Portugal

Alexandre Fernandez Vaz

Universidade Federal de Santa
Catarina, Brasil

José Augusto Pacheco

Universidade do Minho, Portugal

Rosanna Maria Barros Sá

Universidade do Algarve
Portugal

Regina Célia Linhares Hostins

Universidade do Vale do Itajaí,
Brasil

Jane Paiva

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Maria Helena Bonilla

Universidade Federal da Bahia
Brasil

Alfredo Macedo Gomes

Universidade Federal de Pernambuco
Brasil

Paulo Alberto Santos Vieira

Universidade do Estado de Mato
Grosso, Brasil

Rosa Maria Bueno Fischer

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Jefferson Mainardes

Universidade Estadual de Ponta
Grossa, Brasil

Fabiany de Cássia Tavares Silva

Universidade Federal do Mato
Grosso do Sul, Brasil

Alice Casimiro Lopes

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Jader Janer Moreira Lopes

Universidade Federal Fluminense e
Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora,
Brasil

António Teodoro

Universidade Lusófona
Portugal

Suzana Feldens Schwertner

Centro Universitário Univates
Brasil

Debora Nunes

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Norte, Brasil

Lílian do Valle

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Flávia Miller Naethe Motta

Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Alda Junqueira Marin

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de
São Paulo, Brasil

Alfredo Veiga-Neto

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Dalila Andrade Oliveira

Universidade Federal de Minas
Gerais, Brasil