Five Curriculum Memos and a Note for the Next Half-Century[1]

Ted T. Aoki

Professor Emeritus
Department of Secondary Education
University of Alberta

Becoming question: 1949. *"Now as a degreed educator, what do you know of Henri Bergson?" (Bergson was not on my teacher-ed curriculum menu.) This question, asked of me when I convocated with a BEd degree (Alberta), has long haunted me. The question? My father. Early in this century, after writing a paper on Bergsonian phenomenological thought and Zen Buddhism, he studied with Daisetz Suzuki, a Zen scholar who in his own way engaged in East-West dialogue, a precursor of the coming Pacific Age.*

A phenomenological symposium: 1977. *For me the Pacific Age erupted half a century ago. As a part of a disruptive global war, on the other side of the Atlantic, some European scholars migrated to the sanctuary of the New School of Social Research (New York). Among them was Alfred Schutz, a noted phenomenologist. It was this line of phenomenological scholarship that opened up for me in 1977 when, as director of the newly founded Center for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction (UBC), I was beckoned to a symposium, "Phenomenological Description: Potential for Research in the Fine Arts," sponsored by Concordia University (Montreal) to inaugurate a doctoral program in their fine arts graduate program. At this symposium, I presented a paper, "Toward Curriculum in a new Key," in which I called for opening curriculum thought and action beyond positivistic instrumentalism to include European Continental scholarship. There I found myself amid inspiring scholars: Kenneth Beittel (Pennsylvania State University), a hermeneutic existentialist and a master Zen potter (author of* Zen and the Art of Pottery, *1989) and Helmut Wagner, a disciple and colleague of Alfred Schutz. (Wagner was later a visiting scholar whose lectures the University of Alberta Press published as* Introduction to Phenomenology, *1980).*

Polyphonic becomings: 1981. *In 1978 I rejoined the staff of the Department of Secondary Education as chair and became engaged in the practice of "enownment"—a letting be that nurtures polyphonic becomings. Stirring animatedly within the Department were Therese Craig, steeped in Bergsonian phenomenology and later in Jungian journalizing; Max van Manen, returning vigorously to Continental hermeneutic phenomenological scholarship; Al Olson, as mathematics educator harboring interest in the writings of Gregory Bateson; jan jagodzinski, becoming continentalized in critical social theory and later in postmodernism; Terry Carson, breaking out of consciousness-based phenomenological thought to one more discursively oriented; Robert Burch, as part-time member of staff, nurturing us into the autologically oriented philosophy of technology; Larry Beauchamp and Jim Parsons, legitimating stories of teaching in*

undergraduate C & I; Ken Jacknicke and Wallie Samiroden, opening to lived understandings of science. And there were many other stirrings.

With such polysemic polyphony, no wonder that at one of the Dean's regular meetings with the chairs, a Faculty's highly touted positivistic researcher taunted me referring to the Department staff as the "lunatic fringe" (a naming that today, in light of Foucault's Madness and Civilization, *I construe as a compliment of a sort). In the same year, after his summer visit, Bill Pinar (then of Rochester, now of LSU) wrote in the* JCT Newsletter, 5 *(1981): "I regard the department as one of the most important on the continent. Alberta must be considered as one of the institutions at the cutting edge of curriculum studies."*

It has been fun to dwell amid such polyphonic becomings.

In the geo-space between campus field: 1985. *Since my "retirement" in 1985, I have been inhabiting the inscribed geo-space between campus and the field of practice, feeling that in our lust for* episteme *we have tended to occlude* sophia, *the practitioner's wisdom. Out of that interest have appeared* Voices of Teaching, Vol. I *(1989) and* Vol. II *(1990), collections of narratives by teachers hearkening to the call of their calling that is teaching. Beyond these the Department has seen fit to gather a collection of recent talks as* Inspiriting Curriculum and Pedagogy: Talks to Teachers *(1991), a volume "dedicated to practicing teachers of Alberta and British Columbia who have drawn me to deeper, lived questions of curriculum and pedagogy, and to the Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta, which for years granted me a rhyzomian clearing that allowed a polyphony of contrapuntal sounds."*

On my desk are two books, both open: Keiji Nishilani's Religion and Nothingness *AND Gilles Deleuze's* Bergsonism, *a hermeneutic echo of becoming question, 1949.*

Allow me to gather random thoughts in what I call *Five Curriculum Memos and a Note for the Next Half-Century.* The title is a half-echo of a book that my son Edward, because of my recent interest in "reflective narrativity and curriculum," urged me to read: Italo Calvino's (1988) *Six Memos for the Next Millennium.*[2]

Memo 1: ED SEC or "Where Did ED CI Go?"

It was in the summer of 1945, not quite 50 years ago, that the Faculty of Education became a part of my life. I was then a student.

1945. Early in that year, I had left the logging camp at Burmis in the Crowsnest Pass, laid down the double-bit axe and eight-foot felling saw, and hiked to the Calgary Normal School, becoming a part of the last gasp of the disappearing normal school system. I understand that it was planned to phase the school out a few years earlier, but it was given a last gasping life by the provincial War Measures Act that tried to address the shortage of teachers created by the war. It was a two-month program meant to put warm bodies as temporary teachers with temporary certificates in Alberta's rural classrooms—a program augmented by three

summer sessions at its northern mother institution in Edmonton, the Faculty of Education—the only one then in Alberta.

I remember well the summer of 1945. For me it was following a four-month stint as a teacher of grades 1-8 in a one-room Hutterite school at Hines Creek in the Wheatland School District about 60 miles east of Calgary. That summer I landed in Corbett Hall on campus to continue the teacher certification program I had begun in January and February at the Calgary Normal School.

Among my instructors was Superintendent James McKay of Sangudo in northwest Alberta. He must have been desperate, for he offered me a principalship of a three-room school. Another instructor was Superintendent Tim Byrne of Foremost in southern Alberta, later the highly respected Deputy Minister of Education, and more recently President of Athabasca University. I worked for top marks in his class, got them, and then applied for a job in his school system. I got a junior high school job as social studies teacher in Foremost.

But what I remember most about my experiences of the summer of 1945 in the midst of the summer session courses was the night of raucous celebration on Jasper Avenue. The bombs that landed on Hiroshima and Nagasaki had done their jobs. I remember, amid the noise of celebration, recalling the Hiroshima I had seen 11 years earlier and meeting friends of the family that lived there.

Leap now to 1986. I was again in Hiroshima, this time as program chair for the Hiroshima Conference of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction (WCCI). While there, I visited alone, within walking distance of the Hiroshima railway station, a Japanese garden I had visited as a youngster in 1934. I lingered facing one memorialized tree, no longer a tree—a stark, twisted, black remnant of a tree, without foliage, with only a few twisted limbs. A memorial to what? Man's capacity for inhumanity?

***

I leap back to 1964 when the University of Alberta came to mean more for me. I joined the staff as the most junior staff member in the Faculty and the Department, claiming 19 years of teaching experience in southern Alberta, most of those years as a social studies teacher.

I remember priming myself and primping myself getting ready to teach teachers to be. Think, if you will, of my blind naiveté—oozing confidence, thinking that my 19 years of practical teaching experience would be sufficient to allow me to be a teacher of teachers.

I remember almost to the day when I was emptied of the confidence. I was given my teaching assignment in social studies methods: two undergrad classes and one AD (After Degree) class. What I thought were methods courses were labeled ED CI 266 Social Studies and ED CI 466

Social Studies—and for the first time, I was transfixed upon the prefix *ED CI*—curriculum and instruction. I twisted it; I turned it upside down; I tried many things to answer the question: "How do I understand CI?" I remember well that while I was in the midst of my quandary, J.J. Schwab, a renowned educator from the University of Chicago, came to campus. I recall taking in his lecture, which was for me in a foreign language. He used words like *concepts, conceptualization, the structure of knowledge, the structure of disciplines,* and *epistemology*—a new lexicon for a CI professor.

So began my career as a teacher educator with some practical understanding of social studies and social studies teaching, but with little understanding of curriculum and instruction in a curriculum and instruction department called Secondary Education.

But begin I did. I solicited my senior professors for help. I read Downey's (1965) book *The Secondary Phase of Education*;[3] I pored over an article Marion Jenkinson of Elementary Education gave me titled "Curriculum and Instructional Systems"[4] written by Mauritz Johnson, Jr. I remember being impressed by Downey's understanding of the structure of knowledge and by Johnson's general systems thinking. Johnson not only depicted "curriculum" as a system, "instruction" as a system, but he also took the little conjunction *and* of "C *and* I" and generated a system out of a coordinating conjunction. Marvelous, I thought.

Today I am thankful that with all its limitations there was the label *ED CI* attached to all the courses in our Department; more thankful that I became aware of my own ignorance of a field that was to hold my deep interest for years to come.

Last spring I was invited to teach on campus again. Ken Jacknicke, current Chair of the Department, handed me my assignment. It read "ED SEC 600." I had to ask him, "Where did ED CI go?"

And I reflected. If back in 1964 Lawrence Downey had given me my teaching "assignment" as ED SEC 266/ED SEC 466 instead of ED CI 266/ED CI 466, look at all the anguish and study I could have avoided trying to get to know what C&I really meant.

Memo 2: Curriculum in the News: "Science Must Be Taught as a Humanity": Curriculum Turbulence at the University Level?

Earlier this year, I heard over CBC radio a report of a Canada-wide curriculum study at the university undergraduate level. We were told that it was launched by an alarm over the finding that of the high school graduates entering the Faculty of Science undergraduate programs in Canada, by the end of the third year one third of the students were dropping out. This apparently triggered a questioning of why students "successful" in high school science were opting out of the university science programs. So a national study was directed to find out why this

was happening, and the researchers involved sought out dropouts to hear their stories of why they dropped out. Those dropouts, we were told, began to say things like:

We found science a bit boring; we just did experiment after experiment, all pre-set.

We felt our curriculum experiences were not too relevant to our lives.

We felt we were just being taught skills and techniques focusing mainly on "how to do's."

In other words, the researchers found that according to these ex-students, university science was somehow out of touch with their own lives. Of course, we don't know how out of touch with life these students themselves were. On reflecting upon the research report, Dr. Smith, the chair of the National Science Research Council, said flatly, "Science must be taught as a humanity."

Of course, it would be of interest to many of us to seek out the fuller texture of the report. But for us, the point of the anecdote is that in this study, to make sense of the university level science curriculum the researchers sought out students' portrayals of the science curriculum as experienced (i.e., the lived curriculum).

What is being acknowledged here is the presence of at least two curricula, the curriculum-as-plan and the curriculum-as-lived. We all know of the curriculum-as-plan often manifested in the syllabus, the course outline, or the course text, typically reflecting objective understandings. On the other hand, the curriculum-as-lived is one that students experienced situationally. It is a part of this situated curriculum that the researchers heard when students told their stories of being bored, of experiencing detachment from their life interests and activities.

We in the curriculum world are led to ask the place of stories and narratives in understanding curriculum or doing curriculum research.

Memo 3: Legitimating Narratives in Curriculum? Leaning on Lyotard

I lean on Jean-François Lyotard (1984) of France whose book *The Postmodern Condition* is influencing thoughtful curriculum thinkers.[5] In it he casts his eyes over the way of life characterized as modernism with its 2,500 years of tradition from the time of the Greeks, accelerated in modern times by the Age of Enlightenment and the Age of Reason.

Lyotard chooses as his focus not the "will to power" that Nietzsche espoused, not "instrumental reason" that Habermas and the neo-Marxists made as their central questioning, but rather the principle of legitimacy of narratives.

I feel sure that if Lyotard were to hear "Science must be taught as a humanity," he might entertain questions such as "What legitimated university science curriculum in the past, and how was it legitimated?"

and "What needs new legitimation, and how might we go about such legitimation?"

According to Lyotard, modernity is marked by the advance of a scientific and technological mind-set, which in the past has relied on metanarratives to legitimate itself. By the scientific mind-set, he is referring to the way we tend to constitute our world in terms of subject-object dualism, the way it constitutes realms of objective meanings or of subjective meanings. By metanarratives he means the grand stories through which we have come to believe about "truth," "progress," "rationality," "unity and totality," "subjectivity," "objectivity," "theory-practice" and so on—grand narratives that cradle modernism. He states that legitimation of metanarratives has led to delegitimation of understandings we come to through narratives and stories we daily tell and hear.

Lyotard (1984) boldly states:

> Simplifying to the extreme, I define postmodernism as incredulity toward metanarratives. This incredulity is undoubtedly a product of progress in the sciences.... To the obsolescence of the metanarrative apparatus of legitimation corresponds most notably the crisis of metaphysical philosophy and of the university institution that in the past relied on it. (p. 74)

By the obsolescence of the metanarratives of legitimation, he means the diminishing legitimacy of the grand stories about "progress" (progress is always good for us); about "rationality" (by sound reasoning we can arrive at all truths); about "truth" (somewhere there is a thing called "the truth" which by our striving we can discover); about "unity" (unity is not only possible but desirable; hence we should strive to connect things and people into a totality; about "theory" (we should strive for theory, for predictability and applicability throughout the universe are made possible by theory). These are illustrations of grand narratives whose privileged primacy Lyotard questions.

In the West these grand stories support metaphysical philosophy within whose framework the university institution as we know it came into being. With the questioning of the credulity of metaphysical philosophy legitimated by metanarratives, the university institution itself is in crisis, so claims Lyotard.

For us, the modernist/postmodernist dialogue allows us to become more deeply aware of the primacy of the modernist vision of the world that has come to dominate education, including curriculum with objectified meanings and objectified research legitimated by metanarratives. If Lyotard (1984) makes sense, it is time not to reject, I insist, but to consider decentering the modernist view of education and to open the way to include alternative meanings, including lived meanings, legitimated by everyday narratives—the stories and narratives in and by which we live daily.

In this context, we might reinterpret what Smith said when he said, "Science must be taught as a humanity." I now hear Smith (a) as recognizing the unwarranted centrality of the scientistic and technological curriculum mind-set understood almost totally in terms of objective meanings, and (b) as calling for a decentering such that a clearing can be opened up to allow humanly embodied meanings to dwell contrapuntally with objective meanings. For the university institution founded within a metaphysical philosophical framework that is fragmented into categories called faculties like the Faculty of Science and the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Smith's call that "science must be taught as a humanity" seems to beckon questioning from the ground up on how the university institution is constituted. Such a questioning, it seems to me, puts not only the structure of the university but also the structure of curriculum at all levels into turbulence, setting another line of movement for curriculum quest in the next half-century.

Memo 4: Curriculum Assessment on National TV: Cracks in Nationwide Testing?

Just a few days ago, I saw/heard on national TV a brief discussion of the national testing program being promoted, so I understand, by the Canadian Council of Ministers of Education. On the TV program emanating from Toronto were Ms. Fiona Nelson, a Toronto School Board member, and an assessment expert from OISE.

After listening to their stances on national testing, I sent a short letter to Ms. Nelson. It reads:

Ms. Fiona Nelson
Toronto Board of Education
Toronto, Ontario

Dear Ms. Nelson:

I chanced to see/hear you on national TV when you and an evaluation professor from OISE were being interviewed about the national testing movement. Allow me to applaud you for asking for space for localized situational evaluation, questioning the possibility of the dominance of the totalitarian standardized testing program that may misfire in the name of education. In this view, you seem to concur with the Minister of Education of your province who announced a few months ago hesitancy to go along with the national standardized testing program.

I interpreted your stance as one concerned with the possibility that a nation-wide standardized consensus may become indifferent to the situational differences from province to province, from school to school, from classroom to classroom.

In an era that seems to have given of itself to instrumental efficiency much too much, it is indeed encouraging to hear of educational leadership that is deeply concerned for the quality of situated living of teachers and students.

I have requested the BC Teachers' Federation to send you a copy of *Voices of Teaching, Vol. II*. In Part B are teacher narratives that speak thoughtfully to teachers' experiences of externally imposed assessment.

I wish you and the Toronto Board of Education well.

Cordially yours,
Ted T. Aoki

I look at *Voices of Teaching, Vol. II* (Aoki & Shamsher, 1991) where Part B is titled "Assessment That Is Indifferent to the Lived Situation of Teachers and Students." Within this part is a short but sensitive narrative by Wendy Mathieu, now a practicum associate in the Department. Wendy wrote this four years ago when she was engaged in her MEd program in the Department. She titled it: "Approaching D-Day: Experiencing Pedagogical Suffocation."[7]

Listen to her narrative:

It's day one of the new semester. Over the past thirty minutes or so, my Grade 12 English students have discussed and questioned with interest the course outline and materials we will be using this term. I've tried to give them a sense of the experiences that we as a class will encounter through all the strands of the language arts: reading, writing, viewing, speaking, listening, acting and thinking. They appear to be interested as we talk about the titles of some of the short stories in our text and about the possible novels and plays we might read. There are only a few minutes until bell time and I think I've made it ... but no, the inevitable question that has been lurking under the surface, the one that no one (including me) has addressed, is finally vocalized: "Aren't you gonna tell us anything about the Diploma Exam we'll be writing at the end of June?" Although I've been expecting it, the question still brings to mind my many criticisms of the exam as well as the frustrations that I experience in teaching an English course that ends in a mandatory exam.

My immediate thoughts run to the component of the exam that involves readings and multiple choice questions based on those readings. It irritates me to think that we should ask students to respond to something they have read by answering multiple choice questions that limit their response. This seems so counter to our classroom ambience which stimulates open-ended discussions allowing each student to explore the many interpretations that can be given to any one piece of literature. Personal response to literature has been our focus. Where is there room for the voice of the student in this type of exam?

Another feature involving the actual writing of this part of the exam quickly surfaces. In my classroom I am constantly encouraging my students to take advantage of the literary tools at their disposal, a dictionary and a thesaurus, to help them in their understanding of the literature they are reading. This component of "the exam" strictly forbids them from utilizing such tools. When my students ask me why they can't use them, I find it troublesome to have to rationalize the reasons for something I don't really believe in. It's difficult to be genuine in my explanation to them because I

am torn between what I have been expecting of them all year and what is allowed by the rules of the exam.

The rules for writing the multiple choice section of the test lead me to think about a prohibition that concerns the written component. As an English teacher in the eighties, and now in the nineties, I've become excited about the advantages and benefits that come from writing with a word processor. In fact, I've been encouraged to implement it in my classroom. It is another tool that has helped some of my students become better writers. The day for the written exam comes and again, its use is prohibited. At this point I worry about my students for whom handwriting is such an arduous task.

The format for writing the written component of "the exam" annoys me even more. All of my teacher education and the research in composition emphasize that the process of writing, not just the product, is what is important. "The exam" though asks for the three finished writing products—in two and a half hours! Again, I agonize because of my belief that writing is a recursive process that requires time for revising and editing. What does this say for the many hours we've spent working with peer editing and stressing the need for more than one draft?

Over the five months we're together, I encourage my students to be creative and original in their writing—to break away from the old ways—and to find their own voice in writing. I wonder if the people who mark my students' papers are able to recognize the attempts made by the writers to develop their own voice and style. What if the markers still believe in the old five paragraph essay? What if they don't believe that a sentence fragment can be an element of style?

"The exam" leaves no opportunity for my students to demonstrate the gains they have made in the acting, speaking and listening strands of the program, areas in which some of their greatest achievements have been made through the year. As a teacher I am given fifty percent of the student's final mark to assess these areas, but that is not enough. Although I am expected to teach one hundred percent of the course, I am left to determine only half of each student's final grade and the exam only tests three of the language arts strands. My students (and I) sometimes begin to question whether or not much of what we do all year is inane in light of the exam at the end. I believe I could be appeased if the diploma exam only counted for the thirty percent of my students' final grade. Ah yes! perhaps this mental tirade of criticisms and complaints about "the exam" touches only the surface of the struggle I am having with it.

Experiencing Pedagogical Suffocation

The problem centers more closely around the futility I feel as a teacher in trying to teach an integrated and individualized curriculum which, in the end, is evaluated by a cold and impersonal exam. Maybe, what is really bothering me is that I am upset by the notion that some outside exam could even attempt to "measure" the lived experiences that have occurred within my English classroom over the course of the term. Perhaps that's not the root of the frustration either. Maybe, I am really afraid that my teaching and many students' learning are being suffocated by the om-

nipresence of the impending exam. Emotionally, I am angry that "the exam" has become the most important thing to students (and to some teachers too!). How has this exam gained the prestigious position of being the finale for my students' high school English experience?

My physical reaction of teeth clenching belies the calmness with which my response comes. Underneath my nearly composed exterior is the ongoing personal struggle I am experiencing with this all pervading force—"The Diploma Exam." Having expected this question from my students though, I am prepared with copies of the materials the "department" has sent us to administer to our students. Things that explain all the what, where and when. I pass them out (knowing that they will have lost them by the end of the semester when we might glance at them). I explain to the students that we need not concern ourselves with this now, but come June, I will teach them how to succeed at "the exam." This satisfies them, and so until "D-Day" (my students' term for Diploma Exam day), we get on with living and experiencing what it really is to live and learn the joys that can evolve in a high school English classroom. I have come to terms that life in my classroom will continue before (and after) "the exam."

Memo 5: "Curriculum and Instruction" Goes; Up Pops "Curriculum and Assessment"

The anecdote involving Fiona Nelson and Wendy Mathieu's narrative remind me of the BC curriculum document that goes by the futuristic label *Year 2000* (BC Ministry of Education, n.d.),[8] marking the next millennium—a touch of Italo Calvino's interest! If we slide under the captivating title *Year 2000*, we find as subtitle: "A Curriculum and Assessment Framework for the Future."

A "Curriculum and Assessment Framework"? Is this the C & I framework in a new guise?

As I mentioned earlier, since 1964 I have been toiling with interested colleagues within this Faculty and beyond to make sense of the multiple ways in which the words *curriculum* and *instruction* can be understood. We've twisted and turned the word *curriculum* around this way and that way. We've tried curriculum as *currere*:[9] we've tried different ways of understanding curriculum development, curriculum implementation, curriculum evaluation, curriculum assessment, curriculum policy-making; we've tried curriculum praxis, curriculum as ideology;[10] we've tried curriculum-as-plan and curriculum-as-lived.

Likewise we've looked at *instruction*, and have tried replacing it with *teaching*; we've tried restoring the word *pedagogy*,[11] knowing of the Continental European's penchant for it (in North America, Max van Manen of our Department has been the driving force in legitimating the word *pedagogy*).

And without doubt, many members of this Department and Faculty have opened up clearings for new modes of understanding "curriculum and

pedagogy," "curriculum and teaching," thereby moving beyond the instrumentalism that underlies "curriculum and instruction."

Now we have before us a seemingly new framework labeled *curriculum and assessment*, a framework that seems to flow from prelegitimated existence of branches within some ministries like the Curriculum Branch and the Assessment Branch.

As we have boldly faced words like *curriculum* and *pedagogy* in the past, perhaps it is time that we began to explore more fully the question of the legitimacy of frameworks such as "the C & I framework" whose traces still remain after erasure under the label *curriculum and assessment framework.*

When we see an expression such as *curriculum and assessment*, we often succumb to the lure of the substantive terms *curriculum* and *assessment.* Some say that this fondness for substantive terms is a reflection of what some anthropological linguists say about western cultures' bent toward nouns with interest in the "whatness" of things compared with other cultures' bent toward relations and relational words like prepositions and conjunctions. Here I am reminded of Marcus and Fischer (1986) who in *Anthropology as Cultural Critique* wrote:

> The Samoan language has no terms corresponding to "personality," "self," "character"; instead of our Socratic "Know thyself," Samoans say, "Take care of the relationship."[12]

In keeping with such saying, I interrupt the gaze upon the nouns in "curriculum and assessment," and turn my attention to the *and,* reminiscent of Mauritz Johnson who included a concern for *and* when he explained the expression *curriculum* **and** *instruction.* Such a gaze places the *and* into a bit of turbulence. Let's play a bit with multiple meanings of *and.*

And, we were taught, is a conjunction, a word that relates. It is, moreover, a coordinate conjunction, said to co-join things of equal weight to promote a stilled balance. *Curriculum* and *assessment,* two separate words like two separate branches, but somehow connected. "And" as separator and co-joiner.

But when we become more thoughtful, we may begin to see *and* in motion, moving from left to right in a linear fashion. Our thinking might go, "We develop curriculum first and at the end we assess." We are well aware of this form of thinking. It is of the same breed of thinking as the following: curriculum development, curriculum implementation, and curriculum evaluation, sequentially arranged. It has a neat linear logic of its own.

If we continue our gaze upon *and,* we may begin to see the flow moving in the opposite direction "from assessment to curriculum." A few months ago at a BC Teachers' Federation-sponsored "student assessment" con-

ference, an assessment professor made an explicit statement on this flow. He almost shouted: "Assessment should direct curriculum." Again, *and* in linear movement, better said: "from this to that."

If we continue not so much to ponder upon the *and* but rather to slip underneath it or slide elsewhere, we are apt to come to sense that the label of the framework *curriculum and assessment* suggests, too readily perhaps, the presence of two identities that could be bridged by *and*. But accepting the two identities and situating ourselves in that geographic space between *curriculum* and *assessment*, we are led to ask, "Which understanding of *curriculum* is allowed? What sort of narrative legitimates it? What understandings of the word *curriculum* are erased?" So with the word *assessment* we can ask, "Which understanding of assessment is allowed? What metanarrative legitimates it? What understandings of the word *assessment* are erased?" With these questions, we become mindful not only of the multiplicity of meanings of each word in "curriculum and assessment," but also of how this multiplicity can proliferate the interplay among these meanings.

I feel convinced that we are at the threshold that calls for serious questioning of the curriculum frameworks that under different guises seem entrenched in our educational discourse.

A Note for the Next Half-Century ... and ... and ... and ...

At this moment, I await a response from Fiona Nelson of the Toronto School Board. And as I wait, I pause to remember some of the *ands* in the five previous memos:

Memo 1: Curriculum *and* Instruction
ED CI *and* ED SEC

Memo 2: Science *and* Humanity
Curriculum-as-Plan *and* Curriculum-as-lived

Memo 3: Metanarratives *and* Narratives
Modernity *and* Postmodernity

Memo 4: National Testing *and* Situational Evaluation

Memo 5: Curriculum *and* Assessment

As I move to dwell in the *and*, I sense I need to caution myself, for I seem to be caught in all the risks of dualism. I jump up and down in the *and* and let more *ands* tumble out. I rewrite:

Memo 1: *and* Curriculum *and* Instruction *and*

Memo 2: *and* Science *and* Humanity *and*
and C-as-P *and* C-as-L *and*

Memo 3: *and* Metanarratives *and* Narratives *and*
and Modernity *and* Postmodernity *and*

Memo 4: *and* National Testing *and* Situational Education *and*

Memo 5: *and* Curriculum *and* Assessment *and*

... AND... AND... AND...

I revel in the writing space that seems to dissolve beginnings and endings, that proliferates and disseminates *ands* here, there, and in unexpected places. I am now thinking, maybe I would like to play in and among the *ands* for a while, at least for a part of the next 50 years.

Notes

1. This talk was presented as the first of the Curriculum Lecture Series inaugurated on September 27, 1991 by the Department of Secondary Education in celebration of the 50th year since the establishment of the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta in Edmonton, Canada, the first such faculty in Canada.
2. The title of the talk echoes Italo Calvino's (1988) book *Six Memos for the Next Millennium*, a series of lectures that Calvino, a noted Italian storyteller, prepared for an invited series of lectures at Harvard. Unfortunately, he died on the eve of his departure from Italy. The titles of the memos are "Lightness," "Quickness," "Exactitude," "Visibility," and "Multiplicity." My reading of Calvino follows a reading of Kundera's (1988) *The Art of the Novel*.
3. Lawrence Downey (1965) was Chair of the Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta (1961-1966). He has been a long-time mentor opening doors for me, leading me particularly to scholars in curriculum associated with the University of Chicago such as J.J. Schwab and Elliot Eisner.
4. It was Marion Jenkinson, a noted scholar in linguistics and language education, who led me to several curriculum writers. Among them was Mauritz Johnson Jr. whose article titled "Curriculum and Instructional Systems" led me to general systems thinking and curriculum. At that time I admired the holism Johnson brought to curriculum and instruction as he interpreted it through general systems theory. I was, however, less aware then of how the generalized abstraction emptied "C and I" of the concretely lived life of teachers and students.
5. Some readers might be interested in a shorter version entitled "The Postmodern Condition" in Baynes, Bohman, and McCarthy (1987).
6. Aoki and Shamsher (1990; 1991) are collections of narratives written by teachers. In these, their efforts were to allow voices of teaching to be heard through the voices of teachers. Underlying is the understanding that teaching as vocation (from Latin *vocare*) is a calling and it is the voice of this calling that speaks to what teaching truly is. For an effort on the place of "listening," see Aoki (1991).
7. Wendy Mathieu, "Approaching D-Day: Experiencing Pedagogical Suffocation" in Aoki and Shamsher (1991). This sensitive article also appeared in *The Teacher, 3*(5), a magazine publication of the BC Teachers' Federation in 1991.
8. *Year 2000: A Curriculum and Assessment Framework for the Future* is a curriculum document published by the BC Ministry of Education (n.d.) following discussion throughout the province with parents, educators, and the public. It serves as a "blueprint for provincial curriculum and assessment work leading into the next century."
9. In the most notable pioneering work in curriculum in North America have been the efforts of Bill Pinar, currently of Louisiana State University. His *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists* (1975) marked a turn away from instrumentalism that was the hallmark of curriculum to literary and linguistic discourse, nurturing thereby the life of language in curriculum. His work is being carried on most notably by scholars such as Madeleine Grumet, Jo-Ann Pagano, and Janet Miller, all of whom have been visiting scholars in curriculum studies at the University of Alberta by invitation of the Department of Secondary Education. Without doubt the

linguistic turn in curriculum discourse they have been advancing will blossom further in the '90s.

10. Undoubtedly the work of Michael Apple of the University of Wisconsin beginning with his publication *Ideology and Curriculum* (1979), became a dominant line of curriculum thought and action in the 1980s. Flowing from the neo-Marxist critical social theory framework aligned with the Frankfurt School in Germany, Apple pioneered the establishment of a discourse of praxis with its distinctive flavor of "reflection." Apple and his fellow workers, like Nancy King and Glenn Hudak, have been visiting scholars in the Department of Secondary Education.
11. The word *pedagogy* as a key lexicon in North American curriculum discourse today resulted in the main through the efforts of Max van Manen of our Department. I recall an early conversation with Max, who himself is a product of the Continental European tradition, about how the word *pedagogy* seems to have been set aside in North American educational discourse in favor of the more instrumentalist word *instruction*. As founding editor of *Phenomenology + Pedagogy*, he has not only introduced the word pedagogy textured in the language of phenomenology, but has promoted a notion of theorizing that breaks with the traditional understanding of theory in "theory and practice." His books *Researching Lived Experiences* (1990) and *The Tact of Teaching* (1991) are no doubt major contributions to curriculum discourse.
12. In curriculum thinking, we in North America are becoming aware of the dominance in our discourse of Euro-Ameri-centricity and the need for openness to others. In this connection, it is of interest to see how postmodernist scholars are exploring premodernist East Asian thought. See, for example, Miyoshi and Harootunian (1988).

References

Aoki, T. (1991). *Inspiriting curriculum and pedagogy: Talks to teachers*. Edmonton, AB: Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta.

Aoki, T., & Shamsher, M. (Eds.). (1990). *Voices of teaching, volume I*. BC Teachers' Federation.

Aoki, T., & Shamsher, M. (Eds.). (1991). *Voices of teaching, volume II*. BC Teachers' Federation.

Apple, M.W. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Baynes, K., Bohman, J., & McCarthy, T. (1987). *After philosophy: End of transformation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

BC Ministry of Education. (n.d.). *Year 2000: A curriculum and assessment framework for the future*. Victoria, BC: Author.

Calvino, I. (1988). *Six memos for the next millennium*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Downey, L. (1965). *The secondary phase of education*. New York: Blaisdell.

Kundera, M. (1988). *The art of the novel*. New York: Grove.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Miyoshi, M., & Harootunian, H.D. (Eds.). (1988). *Postmodernism and Japan*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Marcus, G., & Fischer, M. (1986). *Anthropology as cultural critique*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Pinar, W. (1975). *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experiences*. New York: State University of New York Press.

van Manen, M. (1991). *The tact of teaching*. New York: State University of New York Press.