

CURRICULUM LEADERSHIP: A FOUR-FOLD PROCESS

AUDREY M. DENTITH
North Carolina A & T State University

PEACHES HASH
Appalachian State University

Democratic Curriculum Leadership: Critical Awareness to Pragmatic Artistry
James G. Henderson, Daniel J. Castner & Jennifer L. Schneider
Rowman & Littlefield / 2018

*Curriculum exists in spaces where minds, bodies, hearts, guts, souls,
memories, values, histories, relationships, and more collide*

Henderson, Castner & Schneider, 2018, p. 72

In *Democratic Curriculum Leadership*, Henderson, Castner & Schneider advocate for a critical awareness that leads into forms of pragmatic artistry aimed at cultivating informed curriculum through reflective practice. Throughout the book, the authors attempt to “[present] a problem-solving process that, hopefully, will inspire [readers] to be [...] critical and creative problem [solvers]” (p. x). Although they present a process of problem-solving, their intention “is not to effectively get [readers] through the maze but to embrace experiences that foster awakening, awareness, and insight” (p. x).

At the heart of this work is a call for teaching, leading, and evaluating as forms of eclectic artistry, which are all essential to the needs of education in a democracy. These are not new ideas for curriculum theorists, but what stands apart in this work is the meticulous attention to the reflective dispositions and skills needed for this to be realized in a current climate of standardization and draconian accountability. The authors seek to foster awakening, awareness, and insight. Henderson, Castner, and Schneider take the readers on a personal, non-linear journey to find interconnectedness of their work through the curriculum (p. x). As Eisner (1994) proclaimed 25 years ago, we need to acknowledge that “teaching is an art in

that the teacher's activity is not dominated by prescriptions or routines but influenced by qualities and contingencies that are unpredicted" (p. 155). Before introducing their fourfold process, the central approach of their work, Henderson, et al. (2018) explain that their "book is organized around the following four questions: 1. Why should educators pursue such a demanding professional purpose and social responsibility? 2. What is this problem-solving artistry? 3. How should educators build their capabilities to practice this problem-solving artistry? 4. How should this problem-solving artistry be evaluated?" (pp. 1-2). Additionally, the authors claim that "seven principles of quality education" serve to guide the writing: professional responsibility; critical pragmatism; circuits of valuation; the value of pluralistic humanism; folding in problem solving; an eclectic approach to curriculum, teaching, and leadership studies, and the ethics of democratic practical wisdom (pp. 2-8).

The fourfold process is defined as a disciplined, open-minded inquiry centered in continuous learning (p.xi). By introducing the readers to the fourfold process, educational leaders are encouraged to reawaken, reclaim, reorganize, and review the practice of curriculum leadership. The fourfold process is organized around four central constructs in which each of these folds hold questions to encourage reflective, thoughtful, and deliberative practice for curriculum leaders.

Henderson, Castner, and Schneider describe the foundations of their work in a "theoretical platform" (p. 17). The use of the word, "platform" is purposeful; it connotes a "a coherent articulation of [the authors'] beliefs and images of what constitutes educational artistry in societies with democratic aspirations" (p. 17). In this theoretical platform, they describe the following four folds of practice organized around pivotal questions: In *Professional Awakenings*, the authors ask us if we have awakened to a professionally-compelling interpretation of purpose. In *Holistic Teaching*, they ask if we are experiencing the transactional artistry of teaching for students' understanding deepened by an acknowledgement of democratic self and social learning. In *Generative Lead-Learning*, they ask us to consider reorganizing for an authentic culture that nurtures the capacity-building required by pedagogical artistry. Finally, in *Participatory Evaluating*, we are confronted with the question of how we might democratically review the diversified expressive outcomes and social impacts of this pedagogical journey (p. 11).

The development of the fourfold process in the remaining text provides an in-depth analysis of *Professional Awakening*, *Holistic Teaching*, *Generative Lead Learning*, and *Participatory Evaluating*. Outlined in a chart with bullets at the end of the *Preface* and explicated further in the text, the fourfold Process includes key features that encourage educators' active connection, reflection, and establishment of practice as they develop their critical professional awareness and related practices (p. xiv). Through the fourfold process, the authors hope that readers will embrace "not always knowing" and find the possibility of continuous learning "liberating" (p. xi).

This complex and compelling inquiry process begins with an understanding of 3S pedagogy. The 3S pedagogy, the *subject*, *self*, and the *social*, had been articulated earlier by Henderson & Gornik (2007) in *Transformative Curriculum Leadership* and is a concept based on vision of the purpose and structure of education in a democracy. The *subject* is the matter at hand or the discipline in which one situates their learning. The *self* concerns one's understanding of one's own emerging understanding of self in the context of democratic schooling. The *social* is the outward expression of that awareness articulated within a desire to realize the full goals of democratic life (Henderson & Gornik, 2007). These ideas are not new and have been articulated by others, including Pinar (2004) who called on us to "articulate relations among school subjects, society and self-formation" (p. 191). Even earlier, Dewey (1938/1997) recognized that there are multiple internal and external factors that create one's overall experience: "The conceptions of *situation* and of *interaction* are inseparable from each other. An experience is always what it is because of a transaction taking place between an individual and what, at the time, constitutes his environment" (p. 43). In this new book, Henderson and associates (2018) encourage teachers to embark on the journey of 3S pedagogical artistry, "a disciplined journey of understanding" (p. 23), in an effort that is, at once, teacher-centered as well as student-centered. Teachers gain experience in 3S artistry, while also providing experiences for their students that enhance their development in 3S transactional learning.

The text provides resources to guide readers through the process and to enable them to understand one's identity (self) as the core of the fourfold process. Both the fourfold process and the 3S model are integrated with the democratic leadership approach to develop curriculum transformation. In doing so, Henderson, Castner, and Schneider share knowledge gained over many years to capture a capacity-building agenda that is particularly important for the growth of 3S pedagogical artistry: The cultivation of specific conceptual, reflective, and virtuous repertoires (p. 31).

Professional Awakenings

Professional awakenings is a far cry from the pervasive standard-management processes being used in today's schools. Beginning with a description of the "standard-management consciousness" and the "wisdom-seeking consciousness" (p. 48), the authors borrow from Henderson's earlier works (Henderson & Gornik, 2007; Henderson & Kesson, 2004) to challenge teachers to think of the purposes of education and the role they play in it. They urge teachers to know where they stand as this is part of understanding one's social competence (Eisner, 1994). They are careful to acknowledge that this is not either/or thinking, as each offers perspectives that are useful at different times. The dominant culture, however, "anesthetizes us to our inner thoughts, feelings, imaginations, and creativity" (Henderson, et.al, 2018, p. 49) with its focus on control/predict, compare/contrast, extrinsic motivations, and measurement. The authors urge teachers to examine their "performativity" (p. 50) by using performative theory (Tienken, 2017) to "shed critical light" on "how we communicate, act, react, enact, and

construct identities in standardized teaching- learning environments” (p. 50), acknowledging that the language, behavior, and rhetoric prevalent in schools largely goes unnoticed. Becoming critical of the dominant culture is one important part of the awakening journey; however, “turning the critical lens back on yourself” (p. 52) is also a crucial part of the process. The authors ask us to consider where “your beliefs, thoughts and actions fall out of balance” (p. 53) with the purposes of education that have informed your desire to go into the field of education in the first place.

To illustrate the ways that these conversations might play out, the authors include a fictional conversation that exemplifies their suppositions. Dorothy and Cindy exchange commentary under the prodding of Dan (presumably the 2nd author of this book) that demonstrates the ways most educators are “adhering to ideological structures that reproduce social inequities” (p. 57). Professional awakening, on the other hand, puts forward a process for democratic relations rather than a reliance on ideological structures. The authors assert, however, that “disrupting [. . .] habits and dismantling structures of [the] traditions [of social inequities] is vital but is only one side of the coin. The other is hopeful and pragmatic” (p. 59). The authors assure us that this is a complicated conversation as well as an “existential journey of pivotal importance” (p. 59).

Holistic Teaching

At its heart, holistic teaching is about fostering students’ learning in a process that develops their intellectual, emotional and spiritual growth. The authors rely on the words of Elliot Eisner (1994) to make a case for teaching as artistry: “[T]eaching is an art in that teachers, like painters, composers, actresses, and dancers, make judgements based largely on qualities that unfold during the course of action” (p. 155). Henderson, Castner, and Schneider go on to assert that pedagogical artistry is “sensitive, intelligent, and creative—those qualities that confer on it the status of art.” Eisner (1994) goes on to explain that teaching is not a matter of talent, but an expression of “humans exercising their highest levels of intelligence” (p.156). Teaching, Eisner (1994) states, “is an art guided by educational values, personal needs, and by a variety of beliefs or generalizations that the teacher holds to be true” (p. 154).

Extending these notions of artistry, the authors use Dewey to connect this to democratic values that we might “revitalize a Deweyan heritage [that recognizes] teaching as the supreme art in a society with democratic aspirations” (Henderson, et.al, 2018, p. 74). Dewey (1938/1997) recognized that “[i]t is the business of an intelligent theory of education to ascertain the causes for the conflicts that exist and then, instead of taking one side or the other, to indicate a plan of operations proceeding from a level deeper and more inclusive than is represented by the practices and ideas of the contending parties” (p. 5). This notion of resolving issues through a fusion of diverse views, experiences, and beliefs is what enables democracy in education; however, Dewey (1938/1997) does not define resolution as compromise, but instead calls for

“a new order of conceptions leading to new modes of practice” (p. 5). Ultimately, Dewey (1938/1997) argues that “democratic social arrangements promote a better quality of human experience, one which is more widely accessible and enjoyed, than do non-democratic and anti-democratic forms of social life” (p. 5). Likewise, Henderson, Castner, and Schneider illustrate ways in which leadership can be markedly more effective if democratic structure is employed.

The authors’ intentions to describe teaching as artistry can be traced to the words of Dewey (1987) who made the following assertion in *Art as Experience* about the nature and work of artists: “[I]n comparison with his fellows, [the artist] is one who is not only especially gifted in powers of execution but in unusual sensitivity to the quality of things. This sensitivity also directs his doings and makings” (p. 56). For Dewey, this was not an abstract matter as he was intensely interested in how one copes with the matters of practical life. Teachers are artists, Dewey contended, and being an artist goes to the heart of what teaching is all about (Willis, 2005). Much later, Eisner (1994) called for a disposition among teachers that requires them to “feel free to innovate, to explore, and to play [as] teaching is not an act modeled after the sequences of a highly efficient assembly line” (p. 162). Likewise, for Henderson (2005), the exercise of teachers’ artistry is cultivated in thought, feeling and action, all of which can take place in the process of teaching and learning.

According to the authors, holistic teaching has two parts: “the activating of a teacher’s vocational calling and the cultivating of students’ holistic 3S understandings” (p. 68). In this type of teaching, teachers and students reside in relationships of reciprocity that benefit each of them. This type of teaching pushes educators to work in generative ways. There are no step-by-step guides or set of directions to tell us how to teach. There are no preconceived beginnings and no definite ends to the process. Instead, as teachers gain more experience with the problem-solving process, they enhance democratic values in our classrooms.

In holistic teaching, educators are made to become aware of the tacit judgments they make all throughout the course of a school day. Holistic teaching requires teachers to stop and acknowledge these thoughts and the resulting action in order to make judgments based on “commitments to inclusive, caring relationships and not a cold analysis of data collected on standardized measures” (p. 74).

Generative Lead Learning

Eisner (1994) saw the only option for improving schools to be teachers and leaders “[taking] charge,” as so “many reform efforts have failed” (p. 6). In Generative Lead Learning, Henderson, et.al. continue to explore ideas that support teachers to reorganize themselves in ways that nurture leadership. There are three important criteria for this reorganization: 1) the cultivation of an authentic culture that welcomes diverse and/or competing ideas and

interests; 2) the support of generative processes that offer opportunities for dialogue amid a willingness to listen to stakeholders with contrasting viewpoints; and 3) the positioning of leaders as learners. Thus, generative lead-learning is an inviting and inquiry-based way to lead.

In *Generative Lead Learning*, uncertainty is acknowledged and viewed as part of the process of learning and leading. Conversely, in most schools, uncertainty is regarded as a sign of “incompetence, and disagreement [...] a toxicity and something to be [avoided]” (p. 84). The first step in supporting generative lead learning is “to distinguish holistic journeys of understanding [...] from euphemisms hiding a management agenda” (p. 85). Henderson & Gornik (2007) previously spoke of this reflective process of leading as leadership within a curriculum problem-solving cycle. This cycle is characterized as one that includes a marriage of deliberative choice and action with the diversified study of educational problems. Using Schwab’s (1997) notion of the practical and the eclectic arts, a process of artful deliberation ensues.

The authors lament that teacher competencies are often assessed against a static set of knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Teachers are not encouraged to engage in generative learning. There also exists a “doublespeak” in which teachers are asked to “coexist unproblematically with contradictory practices” (p. 82). In the process of *Generative Lead Learning*, teachers come “to feel and understand the effect of educational doublespeak” (p. 85) as they develop a sense of artistry and critical consciousness. One area of critique that exemplifies this assertion is the practice of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), which are so widely lauded in schools today. While Henderson, Castner, and Schneider acknowledge that such collaborative structures can support some of educators’ decision-making, PLCs do so separately from the “implicit and less frequently discussed value judgements” (p. 83) that are part of all educational courses of action. Moreover, because PLCs are often overly concerned with specifics, the collaborative processes practiced in these structures tend to stifle educators’ learning. By over-relying on consistency, PLCs often uphold “an image of professionalism based on sanctioned credentials and observable competencies” (p. 83). Finally, the authors are critical of the tendency of schools to embrace concepts of leadership that regard one individual or a group of individuals as “the savior or liberator with all the perfect answers to our educational problems” (p. 84).

In summing up their description of *Generative Lead Learning*, the authors urge the readers to cultivate repertoires: conceptual, reflective, and virtuous. Conceptual repertoires are based on the theories that guide practice. All of practice is guided by theory whether or not the educator is aware of or understands them. Developing a conceptual repertoire is about engaging with theory and seeing its value in your own practice. Reflective repertoires “concretize theory in the empirical realities of practice” (p. 90). This is a regard for the ways that theory meets practice, understanding that teaching in this way is a complex endeavor. In

reflection, we regard the use of theory into practice as well as “model holistic journeys of understanding” (p. 91). This requires one to be on a journey of wisdom-loving understanding one’s self. Finally, the third repertoire, the *virtuous repertoire* asks readers to refine “one’s capacity to make democratically wise practical decisions in educational contexts” (p.92), always maintaining a “moderate and humble stance in the world” (p. 92).

Participatory Evaluating

Evaluation is too often the bottom line of what is reported in education, and it is often framed as “a mechanism of accountability” (p. 95). The authors do go on to explain that “the complexities of teaching are concurrently reduced to the outcomes of [...] tests and a set of observable behaviors. [As a result] curriculum, teaching, and leadership studies are reduced to overly simplistic and prefabricated formulations of which constitute effective educational practice” (p. 96).

The authors assert that these reductions create a “violent ethos” (p. 97). Individualism is promoted in place of ecological or communitarian perspectives. Instead of generating cooperative relationships, embracing complexity and differences, the objective evaluation so prevalent in today’s schools only encourages competition. Furthermore, the use of objective measures of evaluation impose a centralized and distant form of practice that is removed from the realities of teaching and learning in schools.

Participatory evaluating, on the other hand, stands as a vivid contrast through “its embrace of the complexities and ambiguities of human experience” (p. 97). The authors’ believe that education is a deeply personal and contextual phenomena answerable only to local experience. Certainly, when teachers embark on journeys of developing, they embrace a process of continuous growth and a widening of their own intellectual horizons. Therefore, a more contextual and complex form of evaluation is necessary. Professional awakening, holistic teaching, and lead-learning are more expansive, inclusive, and flexible methods of evaluation that do not only rely on standardized outcomes of educational experiences, such as the acquisition of particular sets of knowledge and skills. While Henderson, Castner, and Schneider agree that these are important, they advocate for more “long-term *personal, interpersonal, institutional, community, and social impacts*” (p. 101) measures of achievement. They encourage educators and all stakeholders to acknowledge what is immediately measurable, but also to consider “the enduring value of the experience” (p. 101), insisting that teachers already know how to realize lofty aims that “are not so easily calculated and quantified” (p. 103) in the short term.

Participatory evaluating has a “more expansive purpose, including immediate outcomes but also long-term impacts of educational enterprises” (p. 104). 3S education is transactional experience, not simply a transfer of knowledge from teacher to student. In participatory

evaluation the “complexities and unpredictability of human affairs are embraced, rather than simplified” (p. 104).

Current methods of evaluation are characterized by often overwhelming amounts of quantitative data and, as the authors note, are not participatory in nature. Participatory evaluating is a radical departure, then, from traditional authority-based evaluative processes as it does not impose authoritative guidelines, but rather honors and offers “qualitative dimensions and qualitative data of education” (p. 105). Such results are more likely to be understandable to the greater public, further bridging the opportunities for schools to build democratic relationships with public stakeholders.

A History of Curriculum Theory and Thought

Democratic Curriculum Leadership: Critical Awareness to Pragmatic Artistry exhibits a vast knowledge of curriculum theory with is regard for the field’s history in the words of Dewey, Eisner, Greene, Noddings, Schwab, and others. More than any other curriculum studies scholars in the field, Henderson with his associates over the years have extended the works of these scholars into the real work of teaching, keeping in the forefront the notion of teaching as artistry and a high regard for the necessity, ambiguity and complexity of the reflective process in teaching and learning. Teacher’s development through a process of rigorous reflection is the hallmark of their work.

The insertion of hypothetical conversations among practitioners and academics that are portrayed at the end of each of the chapters on each of the fourfold process are created to bring theories to light while offering examples that might resonate with educators who are actively involved in the real work of schools today. Although at times, there are contrived and predictable, the authors include these, one can assume, in order to appeal to the teacher practitioner in K-12 settings. The text is intended to give guidelines on how to understand and apply scholarship from the field of curriculum studies to the everyday practice of teachers. Although not an easy feat, Henderson and his associates attempt to do just that: make theory explicit and relevant. The book, *Democratic Curriculum Leadership*, is replete with reflective inquiry questions, visuals, and charts that support the ideas discussed in each section.

In the *Preface*, Henderson, Castner, and Schneider (2018) acknowledge the variety of reactions audiences may have as they read, including “pondering some complex professional development issues,” “[experiencing] some ambivalence about what [is advocated],” or feeling “that the concepts promoted in this book are appealing as theoretical ideas, but for a number of reasons, [wondering if] they are realistic given [. . .] current educational policies and teacher management practices” (p. x). Their work provides no “formulas or recipes for producing programs” (Eisner, 1994). Towards the end of the book, the authors include an

epilogue using the work of Maxine Greene who exemplifies and personifies authentic democratic living (p.111).

The contemporary practicing teacher may find it daunting to contemplate the often ambiguous and unfamiliar orientation to curriculum theory and history articulated and advocated in this book. They might read it as too out-of-touch with the real demands of teaching and learning today; however, the work does successfully offer teachers and other K-12 practitioners a deliberate process in which to contemplate one's practice. It could be tempting to shrug off this work as too idealistic and/or disconnected to the real practice of teachers in a standards-based climate of accountability, but this is at the very heart of the book: To imagine a conversation that brings intellectual artistry to the practice of democratic teaching. This critique is a strength of the book; it can fundamentally change the conversation.

Henderson's work, using action research with practicing teachers in his graduate classes, informs his ideas. He has, undoubtedly, worked closely with practicing teachers in his classes, which does allow one to better understand the trends, the challenges, and the [possible] wiggle room around standards and the accountability focus of what goes on in schools today. He is careful not to come across as the esteemed professor with the answers for today's teachers who are struggling to retain the intellectual vestiges of their practice that is increasingly being regulated by outside forces. The gentle approach taken in this work and his previous works attests to this thoughtful, affirming method. Throughout the book, there is a clear high regard for the intellectual work of teachers and the power of the curriculum to positively alter the experiences of teachers and their students. These authors demonstrate an approach to the curriculum that flies in the face of the reductionist models of curriculum development that prevail in the directives given to practitioners today. Henderson, et.al. (2018) clearly demonstrate the power of experience, intellect, and the importance of contextual understanding and rigorous reflection in the curriculum-making process. This is at the heart of the field of curriculum studies. The authors consistent attention to the intellectual life of teachers is a testament to their own experience and the power of an eclectic and tender approach to curriculum development. Importantly, it is clear that this book cannot be read as an advice-giving book; it is a distinct departure from a prescriptive, reductionist recipe for excellent, innovative, and effective teaching.

Surpassing Standardization and Finding the Wiggle Room

Today, administrators are the gatekeepers in the pervasive standardized management culture; therefore, if teachers are going to have support to study and practice 3S pedagogy, they will need their administrators' "approval and proactive backing" (p. 31). Although Henderson, Castner, and Schneider "[imagine] a critical mass of future teachers who are passionately pursuing" what they value in education, such as "vocational artistry" (p. 25), the authors disappoint by failing to give any semblance of an explicit program of how readers can

practically and effectively move from a personal professional awakening to real proactive change when, in fact, they are subject to administrators who have the final decision in most of the dealings within schools.

The authors do advise readers that “if official administrative support is not forthcoming, teachers can still seek out small-scale, informal development opportunities” (p. 31). As a former K-12 teacher, Peaches had sought out her own professional development (PD) opportunities. She recalls her intense dissatisfaction with her former administration’s obsession with standardized test scores and relative lack of interest in innovative teaching methods. She sought and found multiple PD opportunities outside of her K-12 school, including a Folger Shakespeare workshop funded by the English Speaking Union and two National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Institutes. For weeks, Peaches reported some of the most meaningful, inspiring experiences with colleagues across the U.S. and excitedly brought that knowledge back to her school.

In the end, however, that was all occurred: Peaches implemented new techniques in her own classroom while school administrators kept promoting testing, and other colleagues found little interest in developing anything new. Ultimately, the techniques garnered were dismissed since they were not from a required, school-sanctioned professional development day. Yes, there were some teachers and curriculum coaches who showed limited interest in what she had learned, but it was a far cry from sparking a professional awakening in others. When a teacher’s vision extends beyond the administration’s scope, the development will remain what Henderson, Castner, and Schneider have described here as “small-scale” (p. 31), especially when a teacher has no resources outlining how one can move beyond one’s personal growth as an educator. To that end, it seems dubious to imagine how finding some “wiggle room” can actually promote anything more than individual change.

Henderson, Castner, and Schneider would appear to oppose standardized testing. Castner’s fifteen years as a kindergarten teacher likely took place before Common Core was nationally rolled out, and it is possible that Henderson and Schneider have never had current students who took standardized tests. While reading, readers are asked to contemplate “[h]ow precisely [...] test scores [are] *valuable*?” and if “standardized tests are the best way to encourage and advance students’ democratic values? If not, what would be better ways to proceed?” (p. 4). But the issue the authors never address is that, regardless of whether or not teachers have an “awakening” about the uselessness of these standardized tests, they really have little choice in whether they are promoted or not, that is, if they desire to keep their jobs. As previously referenced, the authors describe administrators as “the gatekeepers in the current standardized management cultures,” which supports the notion that teachers have little power in the world of standardized tests (p. 31); consequently, K-12 teachers reading this text are likely to feel frustrated with their current situation. It is incumbent on the professor who uses this text to have the skill and ability to help practitioners navigate this new terrain.

Given his many years of experience doing so, Henderson has likely acquired some proficiencies in this regard. For many others, taking teachers on this journey of self-discovery and sustained reflective practice promises to be a complex undertaking.

The point of their negative rhetoric on the subject of standardized testing is to promote a professional awakening where “generative learners” can “navigate teaching in a culture of testing,” but are somehow able to “strive for balance” (p. 49). Certainly, all those working in education desire a balance between testing and other forms of educational techniques. Henderson, Castner, and Schneider suggest a form of reflection turned to action, rather than a clear path with specific directions. In the beginning of their text, the authors warn readers that “there are no easy answers on how to cultivate the problem-solving artistry [they] are advocating. Because the fourfold process is challenging and complex, the practical guidance [they] will be offering is not organized into a step-by-step format” (p. x). In the end, the authors’ “practical” advice amounts to forms of personal quests for professional improvement that are limited to the amount of approval they have from administration.

While this book seems primarily written for those working within the K-12 context, it also has potential utility for higher education and other educational sites, including community and extracurricular organizations. Over the years, Audrey has enthusiastically consumed Henderson’s work. She has used his writings in her own curriculum work, which has included university program revisions, new program development in higher ed, as well as in the planning of outdoor programs for urban youth (see Dentith & Harper, 2010; Dentith, Cohen-Miller, Jackson & Root, 2011). Audrey finds Henderson’s work to be highly versatile and able to inform a plethora of educational initiatives and programs in practical ways. In her university teaching, she refers to the “curriculum wisdom paradigm” (Henderson & Gornik, 2007, p. 11-12) put forth in Henderson’s earlier work and has noted that students working in higher educational settings find much resonance with these constructs. The 3S pedagogical model and the curriculum wisdom paradigm continue to ground her curriculum work in higher education.

Audrey’s students and the faculty involved in her program development have also found the 3S model and the reflective map from his previous work instructive (Henderson & Gornik, 2007) and inspiring, with many using it in their own work as professional developers in higher education. Interestingly, graduate students with considerable experience as administrators in higher education have also found this work resourceful. While questions remain about how new audiences for this work could be found beyond the K-12 environment, we see great potential in this regard. Certainly, suggestions of larger audiences are seen in the organizing questions the authors put forward in the beginning of the book, but a more explicit inclusion of those in higher education and in community education would be helpful

In all, Henderson, Castner, and Schneider ask us to “[i]magine the impact of thousands of highly motivated lead-learning educators engaging in this text’s fourfold process as they go about their daily lesson planning, student-centered teaching, collegial communicating, program development, and a host of other educational activities” (p. 13). In this book, they have helped us to imagine this possibility, one that seeks to enlarge our capacity for growth. We therefore found this book to be a powerful read, one that resonates with our experience as teachers and faculty members who so desire to intellectualize the profession through the art of teaching and curriculum work.

As Eisner (1994) proclaimed in *The Educational Imagination*, we must “deepen the discourse and provide some ways of doing sophisticated analytical work on the aims, structure, and process of schooling” (p. 2). In a current system where many K-12 educators are leaving the field due to burn out over standardization, heavy-handed administrative policies, and a general lack of community support, Henderson, Castner, and Schneider have offered us a source of encouragement and a wide-ranging road map in which we can actively engage in our own professional awakenings, holistic teaching, generative leadership and forms of evaluate that are participatory.

References

- Dentith, A. & Harper, F. (2010). Enhancing self, social and subject through experience in service learning and environmental studies. *Journal of Curriculum & Pedagogy*, 7(1) 61-80.
- Dentith, A., Cohen-Miller, A., Jackson, G. & D. Root. (2011) Developing a globalized teacher education curriculum through interdisciplinarity. *Curriculum Teaching and Dialogue*, 13(2) 77-92.
- Dewey, J. (1987). Art as experience. In *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925-1953*. In Boydston, J. A. Vol. 10: 1934, 1 - 456. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1997). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster. (1938).
- Eisner, E. W. (1994). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs*. New York, NY: McMillian.
- Eisner, E. W. (2001). What does it mean to say a school is doing well? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(2) 367 - 72.
- Henderson, J. G., & Kesson, K. R. (2004). *Curriculum wisdom: Educational decisions in democratic societies*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Henderson, J. G. (2005). Educator’s genuine freedom. In Breault, D. A. & Breault, R. (Eds.). *Experiencing Dewey: Insights for today’s classrooms*, 67-70. Indianapolis, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.
- Henderson, J. G., & Gornik, R. (2007). *Transformative curriculum leadership, (3rd Ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

- Henderson, J. G., and Colleagues. (2015). *Reconceptualizing curriculum development: Inspiring and informing action*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Henderson, J. G., Castner, D.J., & Schneider, J. L. (2018). *Democratic curriculum leadership: Critical awareness to pragmatic artistry*. New York: Rowan & Little.
- Pinar, W. F. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schwab, J. J. (1997). The practical: A language for curriculum. In D. J. Flinders & S. J. Thornton (Eds.). *The curriculum studies reader*, p. 101 - 115. New York: Routledge.
- Tienken, C. H. (2017). *Defying standardization: Creating curriculum for an uncertain future*. Landam, MD: Rowan & Little.
- Willis, G. (2005). The teacher-artist. In Breault, D. A. & Breault, R. (Eds.). *Experiencing Dewey: Insights for today's classrooms*, 55-56. Indianapolis, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.