

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Mike Vail

Wednesday, July 12

We're going to take a look at a model for building a curriculum. First, let's take a look at outcomes for this session. When we finish this session, I hope that the participants will be able to describe the role of curriculum development in creating a coherent educational model. I also hope that you will be able to adapt a systematic curriculum development process to meet the local needs you have in your institutions or in your extension programs. The third thing probably is the most important outcome and that is that you will begin to value a learner-focused, outcomes-based education model.

Now those seem like fairly grand outcomes. I realize that in any short educational activity, all we can hope to do is start moving the students towards those kinds of outcomes.

Let's talk about curriculum development. There are lots of ways to put together ideas to create a curriculum. One of the most traditional ways is the body-of-knowledge method. In the body-of-knowledge method, you gather all the people who have studied a particular topic or field of knowledge – the experts. They know everything there is to know about theology, for instance. From their knowledge of theology, ask the experts to tell you, as an educator, how to structure that body of knowledge. What is the structure of that body of knowledge? How would they teach that structure to a new person who doesn't know about theology? How can we develop a framework that new students can hang all the ideas of theology on, so they will then know this body of knowledge that we call theology? This is the most traditional way to develop a curriculum.

Another way to develop curriculum is one that I ran into when I went for graduate study at the University of Wisconsin in Madison in the United States. My major professor was the person responsible for defining my graduate program. I asked my professor, “What classes should I take in order to be an educated person and to receive a doctorate in this area?” He said a strange thing to me. He said, “I want you to go over to the Department of Curriculum and I want you to take a class from this professor.” I said, “Okay. What class do you want me to take?” He said, “It doesn’t matter.” I said, “Oh, okay. What do you want me to do next?” “Go over to the Communication Department and take a class from this professor.” And I said, “What class would you like me to take?” And he said, “I don’t care. It doesn’t matter.” And I began to wonder, what kind of a curriculum he was developing for me. When I asked him he said, “What we’re doing is exposing you to different ways of thinking and it’s your responsibility to begin to synthesize the ways of thinking represented by these different people and formulate a method that works for you.”

That’s a different way of developing curriculum and I began to wonder if I had ever experienced it before. When I came to this job of developing a curriculum for clergy preparation in the Church of the Nazarene, people asked me where I had learned about theology and training ministers? And I responded, I don’t have any formal training in theology except what I took as an undergraduate at Northwest Nazarene College. But I began to think about the pastors that I’ve had and the ways they thought, and the ways they taught as they were preaching.

The first pastor that I remember was John E. Riley, president emeritus of Northwest Nazarene College. My next pastor was Eugene Stowe. I learned a lot from those two. My third pastor was a man who became a district superintendent named Wilson Lanpher. My fourth pastor was Jim Bond. The fifth pastor that I had was Gerald Johnson. I have been privileged to have some

great men as pastors. They are not only good preachers but have become leaders in the Church of the Nazarene. So where did I get my theological training? I got it by this second method of developing curriculum, which is exposure to a variety of men and women and their ways of thinking about theology. They helped to form my way of thinking about theology and how theology could be taught to others

The most systematic way of developing curriculum is the one we want to talk about today, outcomes-based education. Outcomes-based education is learner-focused and it is outcome-driven rather than content-driven like the body of knowledge method. What is the definition of outcomes-based education? In OBE all programs and instruction are designed to produce specific lasting results in learners by the time the learner leaves the program. Isn't that what we do in education? We try to make lasting, life-long differences in our learners, by the time they leave our program.

What does outcomes-based education look like? What are the elements in that education process? First, is a clarity of focus around significant, culminating, exit outcomes which are defined by each institution. The activities and the outcomes are all focused on the specific result that you're trying to obtain.

What's the second element? In outcomes-based education, the idea is that you expand the available time in resources so that all learners successfully reach the exit outcomes. Now that's in an ideal system. In education, we have to become pragmatists. And so while we always shoot for the highest level and we always state all of our outcomes ideally, we are aware that it may not happen that way. We will never hit a target that is higher than the one we set for ourselves.

The third element—we seek a consistent high expectation. We want 100% success by our students. Again, you've got to aim high if you're going to hit anywhere near the top. There has to be an explicit relationship between any learning experience and the ultimate outcomes to which that experience is essential. You don't do things just because it's nice. You do things with intention.

Bob mentioned earlier this morning processes and products. We need to define these very carefully. A process consists of one or more activity or events. It's something we're doing. For example, planning is a process because it involves many activities. Compared to process, at the other end is a product. A product is something that is produced by a process. When I come up with an instructional plan, that's a product that is a visible, tangible result of my planning process.

Let's look at some examples. Here's a statement. Instruction—a series of events intended to lead to some learning outcomes. Is that a process or is it a product? It's a process. Next, an instructional plan—a description of instructional events, methods and materials. Is it a process or a product? It's a product.

Another one, curriculum—curriculum is defined here as what is intended to be learned. Is that a process or a product? It's a product. How about curriculum development—selection and organization of a set of intended learning outcomes? Process.

How about educational goals? Educational goals are statements of what the learning should lead to. Product or process? It's a product.

Educational results—the cumulative affects of actual learning outcomes intended and unintended. Is that a product or a process? Product.

We introduced some new terms during the product-process examples: Instruction, educational goals, curriculum. What is the relationship between these three? If you make a statement and it's in terms of things to be learned, is it an educational goal, curriculum or instruction? Which would it be? Curriculum.

If a statement describes attributes of a well-educated person, is that curriculum, educational goal or instruction? Educational goals.

All right, the third one. We come up with a list of teaching strategies that we're going to use. Is that instruction, curriculum or educational goal? It's instruction.

How are educational goals, curriculum and instruction related? The curriculum indicates what is to be learned. The educational goals indicate why it is to be learned. And the instructional plan indicates how to facilitate that learning. So that's the relationship between educational goals, curriculum and instruction. Educators must be pragmatic. That means we have to know how to apply all of this stuff when developing a curriculum.

Here is a model that describes curriculum development. There are two parts to the model: products and the processes that lead to those products. In the model, boxes indicate a product and arrows leading from one product to the next indicate a process. You have a mission statement at your institution and everything you do should flow out of your mission statement. Bob talked about the fact that the institutions he studied, that were providing good education, had one mission statement and everyone understood what that mission statement was.

In curriculum development, you start with the mission statement and then develop everything else from the mission statement. The first thing you must do is to set the educational goals for the institution, out of its mission statement. In other words, what should your students be, know and do when they graduate or leave your institution? What is a well-educated person? When is a person ready to do ministry? These are your educational goals and it takes a group of people to determine them.

The curriculum development process directs you from statements of educational goals to the curriculum. The curriculum is all of the things that a person must learn, in order to be an educated person and to reach the educational goals of the institution. Educational goals, and curriculum must be designed before any instruction actually takes place. You can't go out and just teach a course to people in an extension program if you don't know how that course fits into the whole program.

In this curriculum development model, the process moves the mission statement of the institution down through the model until you get to the educational results. You can determine the educational results by testing your students to see whether or not they met your educational goals. If you want to know what to do in the classroom, look at the curriculum. Move from upper left down to the right to decide how to implement the mission of the institution.

If someone comes to you and says, why in the world are you doing that in the classroom, you move up the model. Your instruction is justified by the curriculum. Your curriculum exists because of the educational goals of the institution and the educational goals of the institution exist because of the mission statement of the institution. In Nazarene education, you can look back one more step. The mission of the institution is there because of the mission of the church.

Everything fits into the model. There are many different models you could use. This happens to be one that works for me.

Now let's get into an example. A situation occurred in North America several years ago where people began to question the results of our ministerial preparation programs. Some ministers were well-prepared for ministry and made good pastors. Others were good people but they did not make good pastors. There was a gap between what we expected from our education program and the actual outcome or performance of the students who went through that program.

Many people expressed concern. Educators, church leaders, district superintendents, laymen and many of the learners themselves asked why the performance gap existed. There seemed to be agreement that while some graduates performed well, that a more predictable, higher level of performance was needed.

About the same time the paradigm or the models that we were using in secular education were changing based on how people learn, and the skills people would need in the future. New research into how people learn had caused major changes in education. So we thought we needed to look at those changes to see how they affected the way we were doing ministerial development.

To look at these issues, The Office of the Ministry sponsored a series of meetings in Breckenridge, Colorado to talk about ministerial education. Breckenridge was a cooperatively sponsored event where people came together to discuss solutions to the needs of ministerial development. It involved pastors, educators, district superintendents and laymen.

The goal of the Breckenridge process was to develop a coherent, comprehensive program for preparing ministers to serve in North America. The real wisdom of the Breckenridge process was that it brought together all interested parties to collaboratively find the best solution.

The Breckenridge process was a series of annual meetings that took place over 9 years. The first thing to come from Breckenridge was a product providing for regionally designed programs. A defined approval process provided built in accountability.

This new program required partnering between the educational provider and the local church. It takes more than classroom learning to produce a minister. You also have to provide for practical experiences. The product that they produced reshaped the whole general curriculum in its approach to learning. It also recognized the importance of life-long learning. When you graduate from one of our institutions, you're not through with learning.

The Breckenridge product defined the mission of ministerial education—to equip ministers for a lifetime of effective ministry so they may respond to the Great Commission of Christ to go and make disciples of all nations and to advance God's kingdom by the preservation and propagation of Christian holiness as set forth in the scriptures. This mission statement was placed into the *Manual* by legislation of the General Assembly.

They established educational goals. They described what a Nazarene minister should *be*, what they must *know*, and what they must be able to *do*.

These three categories of goals are outlined in the *International Sourcebook on Developmental Standards for Ordination* and are listed on the next pages in your handout. We talk about the *Be*, *Know* and *Do* of ministerial preparation.

Another result of the Breckenridge process was the four C's. C is the third letter in the English alphabet. There are four words that begin with C. Four-C's does not mean four bodies of water sail across in a boat. When you translate these to four words to your languages I don't know if you will still have four C's or if it will be something else. It is the ideas that are important, not the specific words.

The first of the four C's is Content. Content is something educators understand very well because content is knowledge and we know how to handle knowledge. For hundreds of years our job has been to transmit knowledge to the next generation. So, there facts and basic knowledge that you need in a ministerial training program.

But you have to make it practical also. You must provide your students with skills to be a minister. We call these Competencies, the second of the four C's.

The third C is Character. What kind of people are our learners and how does our program helped develop their value system? Character determines how you live day in and day out and how you carry out ministry.

We also recognized that ministry does not happen in a vacuum. Ministry happens in context and our education program needs ways of dealing with different contexts. So these are the four C's. The *Manual* statement of the four C's is in your handout.

The other critical component that is written into the *Manual* is the application component. Partnering of the educational provider with the local church to direct students in ministerial

practices and competency development is required. What you learn includes what you experience as well as what you read and hear in a classroom.

The *Manual* also allows cultural adaptations. In a global church we realize that there are differences in the requirements for our ministers. We also recognized that the models we give are simply examples of how preparation can be done. The purpose of the models is to help you see how ministerial preparation might be done. They are not a prescription of how ministerial preparation must be done.

Let me show you how the four C's have been applied in three different contexts. The first context is a United States regional adaptation of those four C's. Ability statements were written for each of the four C's to describe what a minister should Be, Know and Do in the United States. These statements describe a curriculum that meets *Manual* and contextual requirements for the U.S. They are listed in your handout.

Multiple ways of delivering the instruction are provided. Multiple delivery systems include universities, directed study programs, extension education, district learning centers and distance learning. There are new technologies coming along that we will take advantage of, like Internet courses, correspondence, video tape series, and other channels we can use to deliver the education to the learners.

In the United States, because of immigration, we really have a microcosm of the whole world. There's a strong group in Florida of Haitian immigrants and they have Haitian pastors. There are groups in California of Vietnamese and Cambodian communities that need to have ministers who understand their culture. A Vietnamese culture in Los Angeles is not the same as the Vietnamese culture in Saigon but it is not wholly American either. It's been adapted, but we have

to understand what it means to have those different kinds of multicultural applications, even in a single country like the United States. So, we've tried to adapt the idea of the four C's to serve those different multicultural groups within our context.

The Spanish language curriculum represents how the core ability statements have been used in another context. The Spanish language group used the four C's and competency statements to test their existing curriculum and courses for possible gaps in their program. They determined that they needed to add a course in biblical interpretation to their curriculum.

The Latin American countries also have multiple delivery systems. They have resident institutions, the seminaries and Bible schools. They also have extension centers through Senta and in Mexico through the Cendas program, and distance learning.

The third application is in another world region. The South African government has required all institutions in South Africa to have an outcome-based educational model for their curriculum. NTC, South Africa had been using a more standard content-based model. So because of the government requirement, NTC, South Africa is in the process of developing an outcomes-based curriculum.

The original Breckenridge list of competencies was re-worked in February 2000 to make them culturally neutral. The committee attempted to write a set of common core statements to describe a Nazarene minister serving anywhere in the world.

NTC's faculty used these core statements as a starting place for defining their curriculum. They edited and added statements to better fit the South African context. One competency they added was the ability to address issues of witchcraft in their community.

Think about the idea of a core, which means the things that are common to many different regions. The core is not the whole. You have to add layers that make that core work for your region. The faculty at NTC South Africa added ability statements that were unique to their culture to create a curriculum that works here in Johannesburg. Then, they began to use that set of new ability statements to build the courses in an outcome-based model.

So we are back to the model. The mission statement of the institution drives everything else that is done. All you do has to flow from that mission statement. If you want to know what to do next, use the model and proceed from left down to the right. When someone challenges you to give a reason why you are doing what you are doing, go right to left. If someone asks for evidence of how well you are doing, that's not curriculum development. That's evaluation. In the 2:30 session Bob and I are going to talk about comparing your intended outcomes with your actual outcomes as a way of evaluating.