

Translating knowledge through blended teaching: A comparative analysis of face-to-face and blended teaching methods. *Rehabilitation Research, Policy, and Education*, 26(4), 305-314.

xxxiii. Kazakoff, E. R., Macaruso, P., & Hook, P. (2018). Efficacy of a blended teaching approach to elementary school reading instruction for students who are English learners. *Educational Technology, Research and Development*, 66(2), 429-449. xxxiv. Kazu, I. Y., & Demirkol, M. (2014). Effect of blended teaching environment model on high school students' academic achievement. *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 13(1), 78-87. xxxv. Laher, S., & Boshoff, E. (2017). Understanding learner attitudes towards the use of tablets in a blended teaching classroom. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(1), 200-213.

University managers as Curriculum Leaders: A literature review

A Case of Universities in East Africa.

Samuel Mukasa¹ ¹ Department of In-service Education.,
Faculty of education, St. Lawrence University (Uganda)

Abstract.

This research aims to review the curriculum leadership indicators and the role of university managers as curriculum leaders in the implementation of curriculum leadership processes, experiences of curriculum leaders in utilization of curriculum leadership processes, Challenges facing Curriculum Leaders in the utilization of curriculum leadership processes. This stands as the main research objective through documentary analysis and reviewing all curriculum leadership dimensions for HEIs.

Keywords: *Curriculum leadership processes, Utilization, curriculum leader, University managers, East Africa.*

Research Purposes

1. Explaining the experiences of curriculum leaders in the utilization of curriculum leadership processes.
2. Understanding the roles played by Curriculum leaders in the implementation of curriculum leadership processes.
3. Understanding Challenges facing Curriculum Leaders in the utilization of curriculum leadership processes.

According to the research purposes above, below are relative questions to be answered as follows:

1. What experiences Curriculum Leaders have in the utilization of curriculum leadership processes?
2. What roles are played by Curriculum Leaders in the implementation of curriculum leadership processes?
3. What are the Challenges facing Curriculum Leaders in the implementation of curriculum leadership processes?

LITERATURE DISCUSSION

This research aims to discuss the theoretical content and the argument contribution of university manager as curriculum leaders, the vital part of curriculum leaders and the indicator system of curriculum leadership in higher education systems and the utilization of curriculum leadership processes. Therefore, before proceeding the research, related theories and the empirical literature were discussed in order to build up the framework of this study.

Literature discussion in this research includes the aspects of experiences of curriculum leaders in the utilization of curriculum leadership processes, the role of played by Curriculum Leaders in the implementation of curriculum leadership processes, and the Challenges facing Curriculum Leaders in the utilization of curriculum leadership processes to function as the reference for the subsequent studies.

Experiences of curriculum leaders in the utilization of curriculum leadership processes

In most of the universities, the academic staffs remain the gatekeepers of curriculum leadership (Bourner 2004; Bovill 2014). Thus, they are challenged to pay explicit attention to how their conceptualization of curriculum informs their curriculum leadership potential. Wiles (2009), defines curriculum leadership as a process in which a university manager works with others to find a common purpose of instruction. Mullan (2007) reveals that curriculum leaders and curriculum leadership mean active participation in moving colleges forward to provide a learning programme that is vigorous and relevant in preparing learners for a successful future. As such many colleges are also attempting to develop greater valence to improve their curricula (Avizhgan, Javari, Nasr & changiz, 2015). In higher education, managers have been conceived as the main factor for making changes and reforms in universities of all kinds (Clark, 1997; Julius, Baldrige & Pfeffer, 1999; Leslie & Fretwell, 1996).

This implies that higher education Institutions managers should effectively utilize curriculum leadership processes so as to make learning, teaching and research function well in their universities. According to Sorenson, Goldsmith, Mendez and Maxwell (2011), curriculum leadership begins with vision, mission and goals backed by a high expectation with a shared commitment to implement and manage institutional systems and safety. For example, the lived experiences of curriculum leaders in the curriculum leadership decision making include; the study by Ngussa and Gabriel (2017) recommends that teachers should share different ideas and experiences with university management and their participation in decision-making on issues such as budget planning and policy formulation is an important ingredient for proper functioning of institutions in terms of enhancing conducive teaching, learning and research experiences. In regard to the study by Wade Sango (2012), teachers usually get satisfied if given an opportunity to participate in decisionmaking and directly participate in the utilization of curriculum leadership processes. This is because teachers who participate in decision-making are expected to put in more sincere efforts to implement those decisions (Ojukuku & Sajuyigbe (2014). Similarly, Hecht, et al. (cited in Carl, 1995) says that change cannot be successful if the teacher focuses on the classroom teaching only.

Sagvandy & Omidian.(2015), showed that the involvement of teachers in managerial and curricular decisions is associated with job satisfaction, and their involvement in curricular decisions is associated with their commitment for effective learning, teaching and research. Therefore, curriculum leaders need involvement in curriculum leadership decisions making so as enhance learning, teaching and research. Wainaina, Iravo & Waititu,(2014), conducted a study about effect of teachers' participation in decision making on the organizational commitment amongst academic staff in the private and public universities in

Kenya and they revealed that decisions made in consultation with teachers are more effective. More so, curriculum leadership role involves tasks like managing budgets and resources, curriculum planning, and working with people and teams (Blandford, 1997; Gold, 1998; Kemp & Nathan, 1989). To the current scholarly contribution, all this has been thinly researched on the capacity for curriculum leadership/management decision making on conducting curriculum reviews, teaching and examination timetabling. Similarly, the study by Robinson (2010) further reinforces the primacy of curriculum leadership practice and its potential benefits to student learning outcomes, this agrees well with the work of Earley, (1998). Curriculum leaders 'contribution to the educational institution 's leadership is regarded as an integral part of the college success. Thus, curriculum leaders are vital in ensuring the quality of teaching, learning, and in inspiring their institution to be successful (Earley, 1998), if curriculum leadership processes are fully utilized.

Curriculum Leadership is not based on position or authority (Adrianna and Holcombe, 2017), thus curriculum leaders can play a vital role in managing and leading the curriculum for the purpose of improved learning and research. Similarly, the major function of curriculum leadership is to have an impact on students learning and progress (Indris, Fahimirad and Kotamjani, 2016). It is unfortunate that much of the reviewed literature tends to focus on processes, behaviors and practices of teacher leadership than to their contribution towards utilization of curriculum leadership processes particularly in higher education institutions. The contribution that this form of curriculum leadership makes to classroom, college and system improvement should not be overlooked or underestimated (Fullan and Gallagher 2020), which is in support of my study. Even when Harris, Jones and Crick (2020) looked at the types of curriculum-focused leadership practice, enacted by teachers, he argues that it is unlikely that education systems around the world will become less complex or demanding and pressures placed upon those who work in educational institutions are set to remain.

According to Busher and Harris (1999) curriculum leaders perform multi-tasks translation, supervisory leadership, transformation, and representative leadership. However, Pieters et al (2019) indicated that having competent curriculum leaders without the involvement and collaboration of the department teachers on curriculum design matters would not probably yield effective curriculum design practices and outcomes. This implies that utilization of curriculum leadership processes is based on the love curriculum leaders have. Curriculum Leadership/Management Decision Making in Contemporary Higher Education Institutions: A case of Public Universities in Uganda. Similarly, Knight and Trowlers, (2000), add that at department level for instance, the key to improvement in teaching and students learning depends on the departmental leadership. I agree with Busher and Harris (1999), because at managerial level, curriculum leaders interpret policies from senior leaders into departmental operations so as to make teaching better by adopting good leadership practices. In other words, curriculum leaders can be regarded as the core managers in the educational organization hierarchy.

A study by Scott, Coates, & Anderson (2008) in Australia found that academic leaders need to come up with prompt high quality responses to changes. The role academic managers can advance the curricula thus effective curriculum leadership (Brown, Rutherford, & Boyle, 2000; Neumerski, 2012; Nguyen, 2012; Vieira da Motta & Bolan, 2008. I agree with what Indris, Fahimirad and Kotamjani, (2016) said that it is of no doubt that academic leaders can influence their universities for the better or worst. This is similar to what Stark, (2000) and Neumerski, (2012) said that academic managers are expected to move beyond the traditional administrative role by attending more to their role as curriculum leaders by planning educational programs, maximizing the learning experiences of students, and attending to external and internal curricular

influences. However, the purpose of my study is to explore the capacity for curriculum leadership/management decision making process, this is based on the assumption that Curriculum Leadership/Management decision making process has to be upheld and positively enhanced in higher education institutions. I perceive curriculum leadership as planning the learning programs (proper teaching and examination timetables), proper supervision of the academic programs and a managed review of the university curriculum which at the end, benefit the learners' academic performance.

The study by Lattuca & Stark, (2009) and Neumerski, (2012) on academic managers, complies well with what my study intends to find out, though their study never pointed at decision making with planning the learning programs (proper teaching and examination timetables), proper supervision of the academic programs and the review of the curriculum, thus I concur with what Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, (2009) that academic leaders should be considered as the primary issue if the institutions are serious in enhancing the academic standards and quality and establishing the objectives of the university and creating the environment where improvements in teaching are welcomed (Richards, 2011), from the literature reviewed, it is clear that most of the studies have overlooked curriculum leadership/management decisions making that point at curriculum review, proper timetable for teaching and learning as a top university manager. This remains a gap of which my study will address.

Contrary to the above, some studies are in disagreement that the capacity for curriculum leadership/management decisions in higher education institutions can influence managerial roles, instead many of these studies, reveals that curriculum leaders/managers concentrate more on learning and teaching than leadership decisions on the curriculum. For example, Bamard (in Chanman-Tak et al, 1997) suggest that at a certain point of view, there is a zone of indifference in each individual teacher within which orders are accepted without serious question (not involved in decision making).

Blandford (2006); Fitzgerald (2000a) suggest that curriculum leaders are not only responsible for leading and managing, but they are also accountable for teaching. This is due to the fact that most of the higher education research on leadership largely fail to notice the role of the academic leadership both informal; distributed leaders (Bolden, Petrov, & Gosling, 2008) and formal leaders in universities. Taking into account, that conducting research is more highly valued and rewarded in context of higher education, this gap generally might reveal the priorities of the managerial circles. Therefore, the role of curriculum leadership has not been explored in the context of managing curriculum review and managing a proper teaching and examination timetable in higher education. This research aims to fill this gap in existing literature to understand the managerial role of curriculum leaders in higher education. Generally, the study aims to conceptualize the curriculum leadership in higher education institutions. All the above looks as if it is encouraging where the international discourse on curriculum leadership and management is thriving with a missing component regard curriculum leadership and with all the above studies, it is evident that contemporary literature on 'curriculum leadership' is less well developed thus a need to conduct a study on capacity for curriculum leadership and management. **The role of university managers in curriculum leadership.**

Some higher education institutions in Uganda are still far from this effort of Curriculum Leadership decision making, because Universities have become more like businesses in many aspects (Gonzales, 2010). In literature about higher education, managers have been considered as a main factor for making changes and reforms in universities of all kinds (Clark, 1997; Julius, Baldrige & Pfeffer, 1999; Leslie & Fretwell, 1996). This complies well with what Baruah & Ward, (2015) and Miner, (2015) say that in any organization, managers are responsible for ensuring effective organizational operations and achieving the goals set. According to Weber (1987), a principal is the prime instructional leader. The concept of principals

embracing their roles as instructional leaders is of paramount importance in a new era of school management if they wish to improve the performance levels of the students (Heaven and Bourne, 2016). The principal in his or her role as the lead decision maker can make these decisions without input (Gordon & Alston, 2009; Hoy & Miskel, 2008). In the study conducted by Abd. Razak & Abdullah, 2003 the principals bear the trust to manage efficiently and effectively such that school goals are met.

Colleges and Universities have operated under principles of shared governance and collegial decision making (Macfarlane 2014; Middlehurst 2012) and this has been supplemented by rigorous efforts from school principals. For example, the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership describes a principal's role as 'the leading educational professional in a school' whose role 'in the twenty first century is one of the most exciting and significant (AITSL, 2011). In the same way, Principals play an important role in developing high quality, critical, and community-oriented curriculum leadership and renewal (DeMathews, 2014). In the same way, Sorenson, Goldsmith, Mendez and Maxwell (2011), confirms that, Curriculum leadership is for everyone, if the role of the principal as a curriculum leader is done. Therefore the principal's primary role is to promote the learning success of learners in the school (Lunenburg, 2010). In this regard, I believe that if higher education institutions are to become effective places of teaching and learning, the principal should be in the steering of leading and managing the curriculum. In many ways the principal is the most important person in the school because he or she coordinates activities that support student learning (DE Mathews, 2014), though Jenkins (2009) sees instructional leaders as leaders who are involved in setting clear goals, allocating resources to instruction, managing the curriculum, monitoring lesson plans and evaluating teachers.

In a similar way, Marishane (2011) reveals that, the principal is a transformational leader who is actively involved in four main tasks, such as, school vision building, capacity building, team building and programme design and management. This has inspired more research efforts in this area, with effective instructional principals who are focused mostly on improving student outcomes (Hallinger and Murphy 1986; Leithwood et al. 1990) with a great focus on teaching and learning which is driven by their own values and vision and an agreed school vision.

Therefore, higher education faces complex managerial controls and the obligation to demonstrate relevance, accountability and benefit for society (Scott, Coates, & Anderson, 2008b) and in this regard, Principals have a leadership role to fill (Jefferies, 2000), thus the principal as an instruction leader has been a subject of much research (Cawletti, 1982; Firestone and Wilson 1985; Hallinger and Murphy, 1987). I agree with Firestone and Wilson (1985) who suggested that principals and other educational administrators can influence the quality of instruction through bureaucratic linkages. In addition, Bush, (1995) argued that a principal provides an indirect curriculum leadership through the development of a vision and shared goals. However, the study of Bush doesn't comply with my study objectives at all, I only agree with what Cawletti, (1982); Firestone and Wilson (1985); Hallinger and Murphy, (1987) say and what Jones, (2012) say that collective collaboration rather than individual power and control to build leadership capacity in learning and teaching is important.

Similarly, (Avolio & Gardner, 2005) say that, there are contested meanings of leadership in higher education that need to be understood and considered in these debates, namely: leadership as position; leadership as performance and leadership as practice; and leadership as professional role model. My study does not look at all these debates, instead leadership as a performance, and leadership as practice. Here the principal is a key curriculum leader (instructional leader) and manager. Mattar (2012) found that the principals of high-achieving schools performed better than those of low-achieving ones in both sets of functions. Effective leaders in higher education play a critical role in causing particular changes to occur by including people in

the institutional and personal transformation and enhancement process (Indris, Fahimirad & Kotamjani, (2016).

Most of the previous researches have examined the concept of formal leadership in higher education governance and few studies have examined how principals and senior administrators can lead and manage the curriculum. Therefore, among the many tasks and obligations, the principals perform, a small percentage is devoted to providing instructional leadership, thus the principal's instructional leadership role is not given the attention it deserves, hence a need to conduct this study. There seems to be disagreement among education scholars about the responsibility of monitoring and implementation of higher education curriculum. For example, some argue that the main responsibility of heads of departments, is curriculum delivery (Nkonki & Mammen, 2012) , not leadership and managing the curriculum, Therefore, school leaders are not just implementers of curriculum through teaching textbooks in the classroom, rather, empirical findings reveals that they exercise their personal agency to adapt and enrich nationally developed curriculum in order to serve the meaningful learning purpose of the students (Hussain & Meher,2015). This implies that curriculum leadership is vital for higher education and higher education managers should take it important.

In relation to the above, Arikewuyo (2009) relates well to the works of Akpa (1990) who said that principals in most African states entirely look at curriculum development, teaching and instructional supervision. This finding suggests that to these principals, management is regarded as being more important than instructional leadership. Although it appeared that some principals engage in instructional leadership activities at a minimal level. In the same way, Mulkeen, Chapman, DeJaeghere and Leu (2007) support the assertion by Akpa (1990) by indicating that principals in most African countries do not have any regard for instructional supervision and hence they don't take it as not part of their duties. However, Bush and Jackson (2002); Bush and Oduro (2006); and Bush (2007; 2008) support the submissions made by Asonibare (1996), Arikewuyo (2009) and McKenzie et al. (2007) regarding the role of effective school leadership in the improvement of learner achievement, and the professional development of education leaders for school effectiveness and improvement, but this still does not comply with my intended study. Despite the fact that scholars have revealed the managerial aspect of the principal, for example; the principal as an instructional leader, manager, instructional supervisor, but not particularly in the context of higher education and not in relation curriculum leadership.

Murphy (2018) reveals that principals (school leaders) play instrumental roles in ensuring the success of inclusive special education in the schools they oversee. It is likely that curriculum leadership can impact on learning negatively if not managed well by the University administrators. However, university managers are positioned as implementers of inclusive practices for students with disability through engaging institutional norms and inertia by aligning structures with purpose and a focus on building all teachers' capacity to teach inclusively (Black & Simon, 2014). Similarly, Huber, Rosenfeld, and Fiorello (2001) imply a strong role for curriculum leaders when they define inclusive practices as "training and curricular support in general education". University managers continue to wrestle with concerns regarding institutional norms, resources, and the capacity of educators to meet the needs of students with disabilities through inclusive educational approaches (Crockett, et al., 2012). Implementation of inclusive curriculum leadership in schools to support students is recognized as a complex and significant challenge within educational leadership (Clayton, & Sherman, 2010; Shields, 2010; Theoharis, 2010). Such complex and comprehensive curriculum leadership work often resides at the intersection of various arenas of reform activity (Kozleski, Artiles, & Lacy,

2012). In addition, school leaders are challenged with the task of adopting or developing curriculum materials, and then supporting teachers' implementation of these materials through learning, coaching, and supervision (Bryk et al., 2010; Pak & Desimone, 2019), in spite of the fact that educational leaders have an influence over teaching and learning (Boyce & Bowers, 2018). The influence of university managers over curricula matters, is important given the fact that educational leaders are often teachers' main sources of knowledge on standards-based instruction (Supovitz et al., 2016) and set the tone for the type of culture around curriculum use (Ylimaki, 2012) for a better implementation. Similarly, proper implementation of the curriculum leadership required traditional textbook companies that started producing curricular materials that were purportedly aligned to the standards, early analyses suggested these alignment claims were overstated (Polikoff, 2015). However, Spillane et al., (2006) talked of curriculum leadership hurdles that involved leaders' own misunderstandings of the standards, mixed messaging, and lack the adaptive Challenges of Curriculum Implementation to calibrate implementation by attempting to develop their own materials instead of relying on published materials that misinterpreted the intentions of the standards, resurfacing the same issue of misaligned curricular resources.

Therefore, research suggests that curriculum leaders need ongoing, contextualized opportunities with their leaders to deeply learn the connections between the curriculum, the standards, and the leadership goals (Allen & Penuel, 2015). On top of that, Pak, Pickoff, Desimone & García (2020) reveals that educational leaders must encounter issues of equity when faced with curriculum implementation decisions. For example, Universities value good curriculum leadership by identifying and supporting staff leadership capabilities (Anderson, Johnson and Saha, 2002; Aziz, Mullins, Balzer, Frauer, Burnfiled, Lodato, Cohen-Powless, 2005; Coates, Meek, Brown, Friedman, Noonan & Mitchell, 2010; Scott, Coates and Anderson, 2008; Scott, Tilbury, Sharp & Deane, 2012). I agree with the above view, what about leadership capabilities to implement inclusive curriculum leadership decision making that is not recognized? However, little has been done to investigate mechanisms for transferring this knowledge to harness valid implementation of inclusive curriculum leadership amongst leaders in their capacity to influence institutional improvement, particularly in the areas of learning and teaching (Deane & Stanley, 2015).

However curriculum leaders still find it difficult to deal with learners with various learning disabilities, while universities' lack of suitable infrastructure compounds the problem for curriculum leaders (Khoaeane & Naong, 2015). Similarly Schoeman (2012) point out that the creation of inclusive school communities requires attending to the rights of all learners; shared responsibility among all school professionals and changing organizational structures to promote collaborative decision making, in that the principle of inclusion seeks to achieve education for all by restructuring schools as institutions that include everybody (Khoaeane & Naong, 2015). No matter Causton and Theoharis (2013) reveals that including learners with special needs in every education institution remains a goal and challenge for most educational systems around the world. Evidence indicates that the lack of relevant facilities and materials is a major obstacle to the implementation of effective inclusion (Beyene and Tizazu 2010), however Khoaeane & Naong (2015) revealed well that educational policies and financing arrangements can positively encourage and facilitate the development of inclusive schools. The actual contribution of university managers on implementation of inclusive curriculum leadership remains questionable.

Anderson, Johnson and Saha, 2002; Aziz, Mullins, Balzer, Frauer, Burnfiled, Lodato, Cohen-Powless, 2005; Coates, Meek, Brown, Friedman, Noonan & Mitchell, 2010; Scott, Coates and Anderson, 2008; Scott, Tilbury, Sharp & Deane, 2012) said that there are demonstrated positive outcomes on staff leadership capabilities for the proper implementation of inclusive curriculum leadership in Colleges and Universities. This agrees with the view of Khoaeane & Naong (2015) that proper educational policies can stimulate the

improvements to teaching and learning at every heart of curriculum leadership and its improvement. This doesn't agree with study done by Pak, Pickoff, Desimone & García (2020) who reveals that educational leaders encounter issues of equity when faced with curriculum implementation decisions. However, this is different from the assertion of Boyce & Bowers, (2018) that educational leaders have an influence over teaching and learning. This positively agrees with Bryk et al., (2010) that educational leaders can develop curriculum materials, and then support teachers' implementation of these materials through learning, coaching, and supervision. In the same way Murphy (2018) reveals that, school leaders lack the knowledge and skills to effectively oversee quality inclusive special education programs. Moreover, one of the largest indicators of successful inclusive education programs is school leaders' positive attitudes toward inclusion (Bublitz, 2016; Chandler, 2015; Hack, 2014). Indeed, literature in regard inclusive curriculum leadership, is still wanting and all what has been studied, has been done among European, American, Asian, and in a few sub-Saharan countries.

Challenges facing Principals (top university managers) in curriculum leadership.

In a study conducted by Mestry & Grobler, (2004,), they reveal that a lot of demands and challenges face principals in the school contexts in which they work. For example; inconsistent and conflicting expectations from their staff and communities, establishing a conducive environment for teaching and learning; the implementation of favorable policies for teaching and learning; academic conflicts and limited resources are major challenges that harden the role of principals (Chikoko et.al, 2011). Additionally, principals often face unbecoming behaviour and conduct from learners and teachers, which normally affect curriculum leadership. In a similar way, Msila (2012,) reveals that a large percentage of principals lack the capacity to manage conflict which can be detrimental to organizational growth. This is due to the fact that most of the principals are appointed with no merit in educational management. In the study done by Suarez & Oin (2004), it is revealed that changes are usual; acquiring human and technical-related skills is of importance to educational managers. Unfortunately, in recent years, there has been efficacy and adequacy of management in higher education amongst educational managers (Fayol, 1949; Griffin, 1987).

Stark (1997) says that management of changes in university curricula should be made according to current changes and evolution. I agree with what stark and Dehghani, Pakmehr & sani (2011) say; however, all that has been affected by the Organizational structure which is another management indicator, thus an organization can be centralized or decentralized. In the former, decisions are made in higher levels of an organization and in the latter; decision making is given over to lower organizational levels Dehghani, Pakmehr & sani, (2011). Even when managers are changed unexpectedly and tremendously, this has caused inefficacy in management as reported in Iran's higher education (Araste, 2001). The question now remains for this research to be conducted in regard to the challenges faced in curriculum leadership and management for higher education in Uganda. I concur with what Araste (2001) said and this calls for planning in higher education which still pause a gap to be researched upon. Planning has been defined as a coordinated means of attaining pre-determined objectives (Sadik, 2018).

Curriculum leaders should identify and proactively act on the challenges (**Rudhumbu, 2015**) of which this study is targeting. Planning still insufficient in the management and leadership of higher education curriculum due to inadequate resources, time, professional support, professional knowledge, professional attitude and interest (**Fullan 2005; Hargreaves & Fink 2006**). However, this contrary to what Dehghani, Pakmehr & sani, (2011) say that When curricula are prepared and approved by country's decision-makers and policy-makers, their implementation starts and implementation of a curriculum is more important and valuable than its preparation and design. This provides a gap to explore the curriculum leadership/management decision making capacity amongst the managers in selected Universities in Uganda. Similarly,

principals need to communicate their universities' mission to the lecturers and ensure that their heads of departments play their supervisory and monitoring roles (Namutebi, 2019). Therefore, Fullan (2005; Hargreaves and Fink (2006) agree with what Namutebi (2019) says and in this regard, there is a need to conduct this study so as to explore the challenges faced by curriculum leaders in planning and supervision of the Curriculum.

The above is also echoed by Ottavenger, Van de Grint and Ana'am, (2010), who talked of inadequate organizational support in form of limited follow up on the curriculum works, encouragement and monetary incentives that teachers and their heads of department face. In addition, Akomaning and

Gervendink (2012), talk of the continuous mobility of the critical curriculum stakeholders that negatively affects curriculum leadership. Therefore, it is important to overcome the challenges of curriculum leadership and management, thus a need to conduct this study.

CONCLUSIONS AND RELATIVE SUGGESTIONS

According to literature analysis, the discussion and analysis, this research proposed the following conclusions. The top university managers as curriculum leaders must look at the major foundations for managing the curriculum that is being taught and the leadership operations for the university. In other words, curriculum theory is not sufficient enough to accomplish curriculum leadership work. In contrast, with only administrative leadership theory, the curriculum leadership attributes like Implementation, Program design, Curriculum management and Curriculum planning. The current condition of curriculum leadership in the world is primarily classified into the main curriculum leaders, the role and tasks of the curriculum leader, and the model and development of curriculum leadership as a role of university managers. The top managers share the responsibility of curriculum leadership through the second promoter as administrative personnel with a diversified role of curriculum leadership, able to bear the diversified curriculum leadership responsibility for higher education.

According to the above-mentioned conclusions, this research proposed the relative suggestions as follows: Top university managers playing the role of curriculum leader in developing the university curriculum and the leadership operation theories with unique academic shape, should be enthusiastic workers and thinkers with dimensional consideration, since enthusiasm is the dynamics that can maintain curriculum leadership work and progress. And should be trustable administrative personnel of the university.

REFERENCES

Abas.C. & Imam.O. (2016). Graduates' Competence on Employability Skills and Job Performance.

International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE) Vol.5, No.2, June 2016, pp. 119~125 ISSN: 22528822.

Abd. Razak, N., & Abdullah, W. M. R. (2003). Practice of principals from teacher perspective. Digest Educator 3 (1): 23-35. Agnes, M. & Laird, C. (Ed.) (2002). Webster's New World Dictionary and Thesaurus, 2nd .New York: Hungry Minds, Inc.

- Ainscow, M. (2020) Inclusion and equity in education: Making sense of global challenges. 49:123–134 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09506-w>.
- Akomaning and Gervendink (2012,). Improving students internship through collaborative curriculum design in Ghanaian polytechnics .Doctoral dissertation, Netherlands:University of Twente.[https://doi.org.10.3990/1.97890365333188](https://doi.org/10.3990/1.97890365333188).
- Albashiry, N., Voogt, J. M., & Pieters, J. M. (2015a). Curriculum design practices of a vocational community college in a developing context: Challenges and needs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*,39(12),1137–1152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2014.942894>
- Albashiry, N., Voogt, J. M., & Pieters, J. M. (2015b). Improving curriculum development practices in a technical vocational community college: Examining effects of a professional development arrangement for middle managers. *The Curriculum Journal*, 26(13), 425–451. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2015.1040041>
- Alfagira, S.A., bin Zumrah, R., bin Mond Noor, K., & bin Ab, O. (2017).Investigating the factors influencing academic staff performance: A Makerere Journal of Higher Education 115 conceptual approach. *Rahman Scholars Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 4(11), 842-848.
- Ali.I. and Abdalla.M.S (2017). Educational Management, Educational Administration and Educational Leadership: ©Scholars Academic and Scientific Publishers (SAS Publishers)
- Allen, C. D., & Penuel, W. R. (2015). Studying teachers’ sensemaking to investigate teachers’ responses to professional development focused on new standards. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(2), 136–149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114560646>.
- Allen, S. J. (2007). Adult Learning Theory & Leadership Development. *Leadership Review* Claremont McKenna College Kravis Leadership Institute, *Leadership Review*, 7(7), 26–37
- Anderson, R., & Dexter, S. (2000). School technology leadership: Incidence and impact. *IT in Education*.
- Anderson. D., Johnson, R. & Saha, L. (2002) Changes in academic work: Implications for universities of the changing age distribution and work roles of academic staff, Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia. at http://www.dest.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/57E92071-C591-4E15-879C468A9CDE80A1/910/academic_work.pdf
- Androniceanua.A. & Ristea.B.(2014). Decision Making Process in the Decentralized Educational System. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 149 (2014) 37 – 42.
- Araste, H. (2001). Management in the universities under supervision of the Ministry of Science, Research and Technology: Challenges and deficiencies, *Journal of Research and Planning in Higher Education*, 21, 22, 41-70. [in Persian]
- Australian institute for teaching and school leadership (A.I.T.S.L.). (2011) Australian Professional Standards for Principals (Melbourne: Educational Services Australia).
- Autio, T. (2016). Contested educational spaces: Some tentative considerations inspired by curriculum theory and history. *IJHE Bildungsgeschichte: International Journal for the Historiography of Education*, Heft 1-2016.
- Avizhgan, Javari, Nasr & changiz, (2015). Curriculum leadership in the postgraduate: Gap between current and optimal status. © Journal of Research in Medical Sciences. *J Res Med Sci*; 20(4): 387–392.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001>

- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421–449.
<http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621>
- Aziz, S., Mullins M., Balzer, W., Frauer, E., Burnfield, J., Lodato, M. & Cohen-Powless, M. (2005) ‘Understanding the training needs of department chairs’, *Studies in Higher Education*, 30(5), 571-593.
- Barnes, E., Goldring, L., Best wick, A. & Wood, J. (2011). A collaborative evaluation of student-staff partnerships in inquiry-based educational development, in Little, S (ed) (2011) *Staff-student partnerships in higher education* London: Continuum pp.16-30.
- Baruah, B., & Ward, A. (2015). Metamorphosis of entrepreneurship as an effective organizational strategy. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 11(4), 811-822.
- Baruah, B., & Ward, A. (2015). Metamorphosis of entrepreneurship as an effective organizational strategy. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 11(4), 811-822.
- Bass, B.M. (1998). *From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to share the Lavery*, S. (2011). Transactional, transformative and a servant: *Principal Matters*, 28-31. *vision. Organisational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-36.
- Bass, B.M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research and Managerial Applications*. (4th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ben-Pertez, M (1994). Teachers as Curriculum Makers (2nd ed.).*The International Encyclopedia of Education* (10), pp 6089-6092).
- Black. W.R & Simon.M.D. (2014). *Leadership for All Students: Planning for More Inclusive School Practices* NCEA *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, Vol. 9, No. 2, ISSN: 2155-9635; National Council of Professors of Educational Administration.
- Blandford, S. (1997). *Middle management in secondary schools: How to harmonise managing and teaching for an effective school*. London: Pitman.
- Bolden, R., Petrov, G., & Gosling, J. (2008). Tensions in higher education leadership: Towards a multilevel model of leadership practice. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(4), 358–376.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2008.00398.x>
- Bourner, T. (2004). The broadening of the higher education curriculum, 1970-2002: an ipsative enquiry. *Higher Education Review*, 36(2), 39–52.
- Bovill, C. (2014). An investigation of co-created curricula within higher education in the UK, Ireland and the USA. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 51(1), 15–25.
- Bovill.C. & Woolmer.C. (2018). How conceptualisations of curriculum in higher education influence student-staff co-creation in and of the curriculum. *Higher Education* (2019) 78:407–422
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0349-8>.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Rochford, K. & Taylor, S. N. (2015). The role of the positive emotional attractor in vision and shared vision: toward effective leadership, relationships, and engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6(May), 670. <http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00670>
- Boyce, J., & Bowers, A. J. (2018). Toward an evolving conceptualization of instructional leadership as leadership for learning. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 56(2), 160– 182. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-06-2016-0064>.

- Brown, M., Rutherford, D., & Boyle, B. (2000). Leadership for school improvement: The role of the head of department in UK secondary schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 11, 237– 258. [https://doi.org/10.1076/0924-3453\(200006\)11:2;1-Q;FT237CrossRefGoogle Scholar](https://doi.org/10.1076/0924-3453(200006)11:2;1-Q;FT237CrossRefGoogle Scholar)
- Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226078014.001.0001>.
- Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: a literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(6), 693–710. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701685114>
- Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: a literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(6), 693–710. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701685114>
- Blublitz, G. (2016). *Effective strategies for district leadership to create successful inclusion models: Special education directors and school reform in context of least restrictive environment*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global. (1804049365).
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bush, T. (2003). *Theories of Educational Management*, (3rd ed.). London: Sage
- Bush, T. (2007). *Educational Leadership and Management: Theory, Policy, and Practice*. *South African Journal of Education*, 27(3), 391-406.
- Bush, T. 2011. *Theories of educational leadership and management*. 4th ed. London: Sage
- Bush, T. and Bell, L. (Ed.) (2002). *The Principles and Practices of Educational Management*. Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Bush.T. (1995). *Effective management of educational organisations. Theory and practice*. *New Zealand journal of educational administration* 10, 43-57.
- Carey, P. (2013). Student as co-producer in a marketized higher education system: a case study of students' experience of participation in curriculum design. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 50(3), pp.250-260.
- Caspi, A., & Roccas, S. (2013). Passive leadership: An initial investigation of university instructors as leaders in a virtual learning environment. *Management Administration and Leadership*, 41(3), 372–392. doi:10.1177/1741143212474805.
- Causton J, Theoharis G 2013. Inclusive schooling: Are we there yet? Making legal U-turns from outdated principles and practices to better serve students with disabilities. *School Administrator*, 70(2): 19-25.
- Cawelti, G. (1990). Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary results in schools. *Educational Leadership*, 48(1), 89–91.
- Cawleti.G. (1982). Training of school education administrators; *Educational leadership* 39(5), 324-329.
- Chandan, J. S. (1987). *Management theory and practice*, Vikas Publishing House Put Ltd.
- Chandler, T. L. (2015). *School principal attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global. (1651236077).
- Chikoko, V., Naicker, I., & Mthiyane, S.E. (2011). Leadership development: Principals' portfolios as an instrument for change. *Education as change*, 15(2), 317-329.
- Christopher.D. and Gu, Qing and Sammons, Pam (2016) *The impact of leadership on student outcomes:*

- how successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52 (2). pp. 221-258. ISSN 1552-3519.
- Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*, Oxford: Pergamon press.
- Coates, H., Meek, L., Brown, J., Friedman, T., Noonan, P & Mitchell J. (2010). VET leadership for the future: Contexts, characteristics and capabilities, LH Martin Institute and Australian Council for Educational Research. Accessed at http://research.acer.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1013&context=higher_education
- Cray, D., Inglis, L., & Freeman, S. (2007, Winter). Managing the arts: Leadership and decision making under dual rationalities. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, 295– 315.
- Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design Choosing Among Five Traditions*. Thousand Oaks California: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (3 ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining Validity in Qualitative Inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, 39(3), 124–130. <http://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903>
- Crick, T., and M. Priestley. (2019). “Co-construction of a National Curriculum: The Role of Teachers as Curriculum Policy Makers in Wales.” Presented at European Conference on Educational Research (ECER 2019)
- Crockenberg, V. and Clark W.(1979). *Teachers Participation in School Decision Making*. The San Jose Teacher Involvement Project the Phi Delta Kappan.,
- Crockett, J. B., Billingsly, B., & Boscardin, M. (Eds.) (2012). *Handbook of leadership and administration for special education*. New York: Routledge.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Meyerson, D., LaPointe, M., & Orr, M. (2009). *Preparing principals for a changing world: Lessons from effective school leadership programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ddungu, L. (2017). Challenges of supervising postgraduate educational research and their effects on its quality in universities in Uganda. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education*, 7(1), 13-29.
- Dehghani, Pakmehr & sani (2011). Managerial Challenges of Curriculum Implementation in Higher Education. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 15 (2011) 2003–2006.
- Dehghani.M.,Pakmehr.H. and sani.H.J, (2011). Managerial Challenges of Curriculum Implementation in Higher Education. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 15 (2011) 2003–2006.
- DeMatthews.D.E.(2014). How to Improve Curriculum Leadership: Integrating Leadership Theory and Management Strategies, *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 87:5, 192-196, DOI: [10.1080/00098655.2014.911141](https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2014.911141).
- Desimone, L. M., Stornaiuolo, A., Flores, N., Pak, K., Edgerton, A. K., Nichols, T. P., Plummer, E., & Porter, A. (2019). Successes and challenges of the “new” college- and career-ready standards: Seven implementation trends. *Educational Researcher*, 48(3), 167–178. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X19837239>.
- Dimmock C (1993) *School-based management and linkage with the curriculum* in Dimmock C (ed.) *School-based Management and School Effectiveness*, London: Routledge

- Dinham, S. (2005). Principal leadership for outstanding educational outcomes. *Journal for Educational Administration*, 43(40), 338-356. doi: 10.1108/09578230510605405.
- Donald, D., Lazarus, S. and Lolwana, P. (2004). *Educational Psychology in Social Context*. 2 nd Edition, South Africa: Oxford University Press.
- Donaldson, G. (2015), *Successful Futures: Independent Review of Curriculum and Assessment Arrangements in Wales*, Welsh Government, <http://gov.wales/docs/dcells/publications/150225successful-futures-en.pdf>.
- Druguş.d. & Landoy.I (2014). Leadership in higher education. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov Series V: Economic Sciences • Vol. 7 (56) No. 2*.
- Drysdale, Goode, & Gurr, (2009) An Australian model of successful school leadership: Moving from success to sustainability. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47 (6), 697-708
- Dunne, E & Zandstra, R. (2011). Students as change agents - new ways of engaging with learning and teaching in higher education. Bristol: A joint University of Exeter/ESCalate/Higher Education Academy Publication. <http://escalate.ac.uk/8064>
- Earley, P. (1998). Middle management: Key to organisational success? . In D. Middlewood & J. Lumby (Eds.), *Strategic management in schools and colleges*. London: SAGE.
- Earley, P. and Weindling, D. (2004). *Understanding School Leadership*. London; Paul Chapman.
- Ehlers, T., & Lazenby, K. (2007). *Strategic Management, Southern African concepts and cases*, (2nd ed.). CTP Book Printers: Cape Town.
- Elbers, D. (1973). Curriculumreformen in den USA: ein Bericht über theoretische Ansätze und praktische Reformverfahren mit einer Dokumentation über Entwicklungsprojekte, M.P.I. für Bildungsforschung (Vol. 28). Berlin: Max-Planck-Institut für Bildungsforschung. [Google Scholar](#)
- Ersozlu, A., & Saklan, E. (2016). Instructional leadership in higher education: how does it work? *British Journal of Education*, 4(5), 1-15.

REACTION OF TEACHERS AND LEARNERS TO THE CONSTRUCTIVISM BASED CURRICULUM

Prof. John C. Ssekamwa (Ph.D)² & Alex Tukamushaba¹

¹Ssekamwa. C, Faculty of Education, St. Lawrence University

²Alex Tukamushaba, Faculty of Education ,St. Lawrence University

Abstract

The researchers were intrigued about the learner centered curriculum which is now familiarly referred to as “The new curriculum” which the Ministry of Education and Sports in Uganda introduced in 2020. Much publicity was made about it and there were some reactions about this curriculum from the society, while authorities from the Ministry of Education and Sports were threatening to take punitive action against those teachers and other people who would interfere with the smooth application of this curriculum. The researchers wanted to find out the reaction of teachers and learners to this learner centered curriculum. The