DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 149 HE 023 465

AUTHOR Genthon, Michele; Joscelyn, Mary K., Ed.
TITLE Why Does It Take "Forever" To Revise the Curriculum? Accent on Improving College Teaching and Learning, 3.
INSTITUTION Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor.; National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, Ann Arbor, MI.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 89
CONTRACT G008690100
NOTE 6p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, 2400 SEB, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259 (free with self-addressed, stamped envelope).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Committees; *Curriculum Development; Higher Education; *Individual Differences; *Instructional Development; *Intellectual Disciplines; Introductory Courses; Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the course-planning activities of faculty teaching introductory undergraduate courses, in order to assess influences on the process of curriculum revision. The findings of a survey of 2,311 faculty members in 97 institutions of higher education are previewed here, prior to publication. The study found that faculty from different disciplines discussing curriculum revision have various disciplinary influences that are associated with their beliefs about the purposes of education, about what describes a discipline, about what influences on course planning should be considered, and about how one should plan a course and arrange its content. It is felt that these differences create difficulties among members of curriculum revision committees in agreeing on tne content of a curriculum. Thirteen additional readings are listed. (JDD)

# IMPROVING COLLEGE TEACHING AND LEARNING

## Why Does It Take "Forever" to Revise the Curriculum?

Faculty and administrators on many campuses in the country have recently, are currently, or soon will be engaged in curriculum revision. This action is sometimes self-motivated, but more often it occurs in response to national reports, accountability demands from legislatures and accrediting agencies, or general concern about the preparation of college graduates. Revising the curriculum takes an average of five years to complete, with participants attempting to reach consensus. Collegial, democratic processes are often believed to contribute to the length of the debate. Disciplinary differences among faculty, however, may be the cause of the seemingly interminable process.

Often debates that delay curriculum decisions and subsequent implementation occur as faculty argue that courses from their discipline be included in the general education curriculum. This action is often interpreted as being politically motivated, as an effort to protect turf, or as a way to increase the number of students being taught. But faculty are not, in fact, always motivated by such self-serving concerns – they may simply be arguing for including the principles on which their disciplines are based.



### Disciplinary Differences

Because faculty have been so strongly socialized during their graduate training, they feel strongly about the purposes of education, about what constitutes a discipline, about how one should plan courses within a discipline, and about what the content of a course should be. Recent research at NCRIPTAL by Professors Joan Stark and Malcolm Lowther has shown that disciplinary differences among faculty are much stronger than all other influences on how faculty plan the courses they design for presentation to students.

During the fall and winter of 1986-87, Professors Stark and Lowther began a study of the course-planning activities of faculty teaching introductory undergraduate courses. As part of the study's pilot project, Professors Stark and Lowther interviewed eighty-nine faculty from eight different disciplines at eight different types of institutions. The results of these interviews guided a national survey. This survey was completed by 2,311 faculty members in ninety-seven institutions during the winter of 1988. Although the full results of this survey will not be available until spring, 1989, the early

results indicate that the findings of the national survey will reinforce the findings of the pilot study. Here is a preview of those findings.

**The purpose of education.** When asked to rank a number of possible purposes of education, more than half of the faculty members indicated that developing effective thinking is the most important purpose of education. They did not agree as a group, however, on the second most important purpose of education, although they did respond quite consistently within their disciplines. For example, literature and nursing faculty believe that clarification of values is an important purpose of education while mathematics faculty are not likely to share this belief.

**Characterization of one's academic discipline.** Faculty, when asked to characterize their discipline, gave disparate responses, although, once again, there were strong similarities within each specific discipline. Whereas many faculty in biology, business, nursing, and mathematics characterize their field as an organized body of knowledge, faculty in composition and literature rarely share this view of their field.

**Influences on course planning.** Faculty from different disciplines also responded to different influences when planning their courses. As with faculty responses on most issues in the research study, what influences faculty differs only modestly by type of institution, but it is consistent within disciplines. Faculty in history believe they are heavily influenced by the discipline while faculty in composition believe they are more heavily influenced by their own background and student characteristics. As part of a professional program, nursing faculty are very concerned about standards set by groups outside their program while many disciplines plan programs with little consideration of such influences.

**Course content arrangement.** The ways in which faculty arrange the content of their courses also varies greatly by discipline. Regardless of the type of institution, faculty from each discipline tend to arrange the presentation of content in much the same manner: History professors structure their courses according to chronological sequence; mathematics and biology faculty arrange them according to specific organizing concepts; faculty in literature and composition arrange content according to how they perceive the needs of learners in their courses.

None of these results is surprising. Because the socialization processes in the academic disciplines are such compelling forces, you would expect that faculty who are trained in the same discipline often teach in the same manner. What is surprising is that the imprinting of the disciplines on faculty is so strong that even the type of institution at which they teach appears to have little influence on how they present content in their courses.

Accordingly, faculty discussing curriculum revision have various disciplinary influences that are associated with different beliefs about the purposes of education, about what describes a discipline, about what influences should be considered, and about how one should plan a course and arrange its content. No wonder curriculum revision committees find it difficult to agree on the content of a curriculum that needs to encompass so many divergent ideas.

## Reaching Consensus

Because these differences are sometimes barriers to effective communication, it may be important to air them before any discussions about the content of a curriculum begin. By discussing various views on educational purposes, disciplinary influences, and course content arrangements, faculty can enter subsequent discussions with an understanding of the reasons behind differences of opinion. It might also be advantageous to agree in advance how differing viewpoints might be incorporated into curricular design and thus ease the way to quicker consensus on curricular change.

*—Michele Gonthon*

## Further Readings on This Topic

Association of American Colleges. (February 1985). ***Integrity in the college curriculum: A report to the academic community.*** Washington, DC: Association for American Colleges.

Bergquist, W. H., Gould, R. A., & Greenberg, E. M. (1981). ***Designing the undergraduate curriculum: A systematic guide.*** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chickering, A. W., Halliburton, D., Bergquist, W. H., & Lindquist, J. (1977). ***Developing the college curriculum.*** Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.

Conrad, C. F., & Pratt, A. M. (1983). Making decisions about the curriculum: From metaphor to model. ***Journal of Higher Education, 54***(5), 16-30.

Conrad, C. F., & Pratt, A. M. (1986). Research on academic programs: An inquiry into an emerging field. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), ***Higher Education Handbook of Theory and Research*** (Vol. II, pp. 235-273). New York: Agathon Press.

Dressel, P. L. (1980). ***Improving degree programs: A guide to curriculum development, administration, and review.*** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dressel, P. L., & Marcus, D. (1982). ***Teaching and learning in college.*** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Katchadourian, H. A., & Boli, J. (1985). ***Careerism and intellectualism among college students: Patterns of academic and career choice in the undergraduate years.*** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lindquist, J. (1978). ***Strategies for change.*** Washington, DC: Council of Independent Colleges.

Nordvall, R. C. (1982). ***The process of change in higher education institutions.*** AAHE/ERIC Research Report No. 7. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Stark, J. S., Lowther, M. A., Ryan, M. P., Smith Bomotti, S., Genthon, M., & Haven, C. L. (1988). ***Reflections on course planning: Faculty and students consider influences and goals.*** Ann Arbor, MI: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning (see attached request form for obtaining a copy of this publication).

Winter, D. G., McClelland, D. C., & Stewart, A. J. (1982). ***A new case for the liberal arts.*** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wood, L., & Davis, B. G. (1978). ***Designing and evaluating higher education curricula.*** ERIC/AAHE Research Report No. 8. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

This **Accent** is based on the research of Joan S. Stark and Malcolm A. Lowther and the staff of NCRIPTAL's research program on Curriculum Design, Influences and Impacts.



**Accents** summarize and present current issues and findings on teaching and learning in higher education. **Accents** are a publication of NCRIPTAL, the National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning. For a complete list of **Accent** topics, contact the NCRIPTAL Editor at the address below.

Please write to the Editor at NCRIPTAL for permission to reproduce this **Accent** partially or in its entirety.

Single copies of **Accent** are available free from NCRIPTAL if the request is accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Additional copies of this **Accent** are available at nominal cost; contact the Editor for prices.

NCRIPTAL, the National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, is funded at The University of Michigan by grant G008690010 from the U. S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI/ED) and The University of Michigan. The opinions expressed herein do not reflect the position or policy of OERI/ED or the Regents of The University of Michigan, and no official endorsement by the OERI/ED or the Regents should be inferred.

NCRIPTAL, 2400 SEB, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1259; (313) 936-2741
Joan S. Stark, Director; Wilbert J. McKeachie, Associate Director; Mary K. Joscelyn, Editor

# REQUEST FORM

Please send me the following reports for which is enclosed payment to The University of Michigan to cover the costs of production and handling.

**Materials requested are not returnable.**

| NCRIPTAL PUBLICATIONS | Price | Quantity | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for Faculty** *K. Patricia Cross and Thomas A. Angelo* 88-A-004.0 | $15.00 | | |
| **Success for the Underprepared: Linking Student Characteristics and Academic Programs** *Patricia J. Green, Gerald M. Gurin and Kathleen M. Shaw* 88-A-005.0 | $7.50 | | |
| **Approaches to Research on the Improvement of Postsecondary Teaching and Learning: A Working Paper** *Patricia J. Green and Joan S. Stark* 86-A-001.0 | $5.00 | | |
| **Focusing on Student Academic Outcomes: A Working Paper** *Joanne M. Alexander and Joan S. Stark* 86-A-002.0 | $5.00 | | |
| **Postsecondary Teaching and Learning Issues in Search of Researchers: A Working Paper** *Carol D. Vogel and Joan S. Stark* 86-A-003.0 | $5.00 | | |
| **Teaching and Learning in the College Classroom: A Review of the Research Literature** *Wilbert J. McKeachie, Paul R. Pintrich, Yi-Guang Lin, and David A. F. Smith* (Supplemented November, 1987) 86-B-001.0 | $10.00 | | |
| **Psychological Models of the Impact of College on Students** *Harold A. Korn* 86-B-002.0 | $5.00 | | |
| **Planning Introductory College Courses: Influences on Faculty** *Joan S. Stark, Malcolm A. Lowther, Richard J. Bentley, Michael P. Ryan, Michele Genthon, Gretchen G. Martens, and Patricia A. Wren* 89-C-003.0 | $15.00 | | |
| **Technical Report for Planning Introductory College Courses (2 vols.)** *Joan S. Stark, Malcolm A. Lowther, Richard J. Bentley, Michael P. Ryan, Michele Genthon, Gretchen G. Martens, and Patricia A. Wren* 89-C-004.0 | $60.00 | | |
| **Reflections on Course Planning: Faculty and Students Consider Influences and Goals** *Joan S. Stark, Malcolm A. Lowther, Michael P. Ryan, Sally Smith Bomotti, Michele Genthon, and C. Lynne Haven* 88-C-002.0 | $15.00 | | |
| **Designing the Learning Plan: A Review of Research and Theory Related to College Curricula** *Joan S. Stark and Malcolm A. Lowther, with assistance from Sally Smith* 86-C-001.0 | $10.00 | | |
| **Performance Appraisal for Faculty: Implications for Higher Education** *Robert T. Blackburn and Judith A. Pitney* 88-D-002.0 | $10.00 | | |
| **Faculty as a Key Resource: A Review of the Research Literature** *Robert T. Blackburn, Janet H. Lawrence, Steven Ross, Virginia Polk Okoloko, Jeffrey P. Bieber, Rosalie Maitland, and Terry Street* 86-D-001.0 | $10.00 | | |
| **The Organizational Context for Teaching and Learning: A Review of the Research Literature** *Marvin W. Peterson, Kim S. Cameron, Lisa A. Mets, Philip Jones, and Deborah Ettington* 86-E-001.0 | $10.00 | | |
| **Design in Context: A Conceptual Framework for the Computer Software in Higher Education** *Robert Kozma and Robert Bangert-Drowns* 87-E-002.0 | $10.00 | | |

| | Price | Quantity | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Electronic Information: Literacy Skills for a Computer Age** *Jerome Johnston* 86-F-001.0 | $ 5.00 | | |
| **The Electronic Classroom videotape series** *Jerome Johnston and Susan Gardner* (Available in VHS and 3/4" formats. Costs vary by format and length; contact **NCRIPTAL** for actual costs.) | | | |
| **The Electronic Classroom in Higher Education** (55 min.) 88-F-009 | | | |
| **The Electronic Classroom at the University of Michigan*** (57 min.) 88-F-006 | | | |
| **The Electronic Classroom in the Regional Teaching University*** (32 min.) 88-F-007 | | | |
| **The Electronic Classroom in the Community College*** (33 min.) 88-F-008 | | | |
| **The Best of '88** (including **The Best of '87**), videotape *Jerome Johnston and Susan Gardner* 88-F-013 | $25.00 | | |
| **1988 EDUCOM/NCRIPTAL Higher Education Software Awards** *Robert B. Kozma and Jerome Johnston* 87-F-011.0 | $10.00 | | |
| Other titles available in the **Accent** series (at no charge for single issues): | | | |
| **Helping Teaching and Learning Centers Improve Teaching** | | | |
| **Faculty Performance Appraisal: A Recommendation for Growth and Change** | | | |
| | Subtotal | | |
| *Institutional case studies (For videotapes or non-Book Rate handling, add $5.00) | | Special Shipping | |
| **ALL SALES ARE FINAL** | | **TOTAL** | |

NAME _____

TITLE _____

DEPARTMENT _____

INSTITUTION _____

MAILING ADDRESS _____

CITY/STATE/ZIP _____

TELEPHONE _____

☐ Please add my name to your mailing list

☐ Please correct my name or address on current mailing label

Mail request form and payment to:

**NCRIPTAL**
2400 School of Education Building
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1259
(313) 936-2741

*Make checks payable to* ***The University of Michigan.***