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3: CURRICULUM EVALUATION
IAN WESTBURY*
University of Chicago

Curriculum evaluation appeared as a topic of a chapter in three of the five issues of the 1969 Review of Educational Research. The emphasis on this topic is, if nothing else, disconcerting to a reviewer who must plow the same field again; it is also puzzling when compared with the infrequent appearances of evaluations of actual curricula or curricular materials in either the research or the subject journals. AERJ, for example, contained no papers in its last three volumes (77-'79) that might be counted as an evaluation of a curriculum, a curricular prescription (such as Montessori or Headstart), or curricular materials. This is perhaps not surprising given the character of AERJ, but when this same finding was obtained after a survey of School Review, Harvard Educational Review, Social Education, Science Teacher, College English, College Composition and Communication, Research in the Teaching of English, and Theory into Practice, the contrast with the concerns reflected in the Review of Educational Research is striking. These journals do have short reviews of texts and notes on curricular problems, but nothing equivalent to the preoccupation of the Review with this one theme.

This is perhaps not unusual. Evaluations exist in the files and reports of those who developed curricula. Yet, while these evaluations remain in files, the proposals and prescriptions of developers circulate freely, without any readily available critical scrutiny. There is a literature of curriculum evaluation, but it is neither publicly available in journals nor has it grown out of an accessible tradition of formal or informal appraisal of curricula. There is no "consensus of public knowledge" (Ziman, 1968, ch. 6) on the nature of curriculum evaluation which warrants methodological formalizations about its character or provides the substance of such formalizations.

Curriculum evaluators are also experiencing difficulties in their relations to developers: "Evaluation of the wrong kind, at the wrong time, and for the wrong reasons has characterized too much of the current effort to appraise educational reforms. Meaningless evaluation is ruining the cutting