

Proseminar in Curriculum, Instruction, and Teacher Education I

TE901

Fall 2010 Syllabus

Michael Sedlak
Section 1
207 Erickson Hall
432.1260
msedlak@msu.edu

Peter Youngs
Section 2
364 Erickson Hall
353.4348
pyoungs@msu.edu

Seminar: Tuesdays, 4:10 - 7 p.m.

Office hours: By appointment

Purposes of the course

This course is the first of two proseminar courses required of all entering students in the doctoral program in Curriculum, Instruction, and Teacher Education. TE901 also serves as the proseminar for students entering the all-college Educational Policy doctoral program.

The proseminar experience is intended to provide a foundation for you as a doctoral student. The experience will introduce you to an array of questions about education, immerse you in seminal works in the educational literature, and induct you into ways of framing and pursuing issues that you will draw on in the rest of your scholarly career. The two proseminar courses share these broad aims, but they differ in the substantive issues that each uses as the means of achieving these aims. TE901 draws on the literature about teaching and learning in elementary and secondary classrooms and the connection between these classrooms and the larger social context. TE902 draws on the literature on teaching as a professional practice, learning to teach, and teacher learning.

The proseminar experience will encourage you strongly to draw from your own personal and professional experience in education, using these experiences as a reservoir of issues to explore and as a rich array of data to use in testing the assertions that arise in the theoretical and empirical literature. At the same time, you need to be aware that you are now embarked on an intellectual journey that will ask you to look at the familiar practices of education in a new, analytical way. You will need to step back from the particulars of your own experience and start looking for the analytical bridges that link that experience to the larger picture in education. We are offering the scholar's analytical approach to education as a supplement to one's personal and professional approach and not as a substitute for them. At the same time, we ask that you show an open mind to considering the value of this analytical perspective as a new way to consider old problems. Also, you should keep in mind that our intent is not to provide you with the right answers but with useful tools for pursuing your own answers; and we don't want to give you a single canonical conceptual framework for understanding education but a variety of perspectives from which you can draw to develop your own emerging framework.

Focusing on several key dimensions of schools and schooling, our aim is to help you develop new understandings of the role and nature of schools and teaching, as well as to construct alternative perspectives on and approaches to examining educational issues. While material draws heavily from the U.S. educational experience and provides one context for our work, we will also pursue particular themes and questions in the educational systems of other

nations, and contrast the past with the current wave of critique and reform. So, if you have experience with education in another country, we encourage you to bring that comparative perspective to your analysis of all of the issues we explore in the course.

This proseminar course is about learning about particular themes and struggles common to public education, in the past and the present, in the U.S. and in other countries. But it is also a course in learning to think, analyze, argue, and write -- about teaching and learning, about schools and society, about teachers, students, and the public -- with both imagination and discipline. Because we think of doctoral study as learning to participate in new communities of discourse, we focus explicitly on methods and forms of thought and expression -- particularly methods of interpretation, analysis, and argument, as well as approaches to reading and forms of writing -- that are part of what you will be learning throughout the programs.

The course also serves as an opportunity for you to begin to build and participate in an intellectual community with others entering the doctoral programs. The nature of the work in this course will involve interpreting and analyzing texts and other materials, framing and revising questions, making conjectures, and testing alternative assertions. All this involves taking new intellectual risks; developing a culture in which taking such risks is valued, encouraged, and supported is part of our collective task.

Course organization

In this course, we will explore the educational enterprise and alternative ways of describing, analyzing, and interpreting the K-12 system. The course will first explore the history of changes in educational thought and practice that shaped the drive to provide mass public schooling, and the consequent struggles faced in educating a diverse population: the *purposes* of education and the consequent *manifestations or internal effects* of competing purposes on knowledge, learning, teaching, and structure. It will then turn more directly to the recent era of reform and analysis, and will focus largely on shifts in the theoretical and interpretive perspectives that scholars have used in explaining the relationship between schooling and larger social and economic developments.

Our investigations will involve us in examining the curriculum, teaching and learning, the nature of modal teaching practice, the experience of different groups in schools and what students learn; criticisms of school, efforts to improve schools, and the consequences of such efforts.

We will consider the ways in which education is influenced by cultural and social forces, as well as by a range of philosophical ideas about the value of knowledge, the nature of the learner, and the nature of society. This course is designed to assist you in thinking through the most perennially perplexing problems that confront us in education now and through history. What should be taught? Why? What is the purpose of education? What is the relationship between schools and society? How should education be understood, organized, and improved? This thinking includes the recognition that:

1. Education must be understood in **historical** context; it takes place within intellectual and cultural traditions, and within political, economic and social contexts that extend backwards and forward in time well beyond the present moment.
2. Education has **social** foundations; it is shaped by social forces and, in turn, has social consequences that extend well beyond the walls of the classroom.
3. Education has, in the widest sense, a **political** dimension; it is influenced by the decisions of political authorities and shapes the quality of political life in society.

4. Education and educational research makes **epistemological** claims; it involves an understanding of the nature, origin, and scope of knowledge and knowing.
5. Education makes **ethical** claims; it involves an understanding of the meaning of goodness, of valuable knowledge and of a well-educated person, and a good society.

The precise nature of teaching as historical, social, political, epistemological and ethical however, is a matter of considerable controversy. What, for example, are the actual social consequences of teaching? What moral responsibilities do teachers have to their students and to society? On what grounds do we decide? And thus, the practice of education and educational research entails much more than technical proficiency. It requires, first, an understanding of the wide range of answers that have been and can be given to these and related questions. By exploring education through these lenses we hope you will develop a richer understanding of developments in the history of education as well as an understanding the varied discourses that define current scholarship in education. Second, we hope this understanding will help you articulate and justify worthwhile questions to ask about education and will help you locate research traditions and interpretive frameworks that are personally and professional meaningful to you.

Course themes

The following themes are central to our investigations. We hope that you will leave this semester with new insights and questions related to each theme.

Outsider and insider perspectives

One orienting theme will draw competing portraits of the educational setting. We will attempt to differentiate between two complex and to some degree unsatisfactory but revealing perspectives: one represented by many outsiders (members of the larger public who have tended to view the schools through the lens of rational policymaking, who have expressed themselves through laws, campaigns, speeches, scholarship, and research); the other perspective represented by participants and keen observers, insiders, in the educational enterprise (teachers, scholars, and of course the students themselves).

Conflicting visions of schools and their purpose

One theme we will explore is the perennial tension about the aims of schooling. In the U.S., for example, from the time of the common school era, Americans have expected much of schools. And since then, purposes and aims have multiplied, accompanied by more and more critique. Strategically, we will consider multiple criticisms of schooling and the visions of reform they spawn. Examining such waves of criticism and reform, we want to probe what reformers explicitly promote for the improvement of education. And, because, in times of ferment, multiple critiques and visions of reform co-exist, we will try to uncover the conflicts and connections within the discourse about schools and schooling in different contexts.

In the talk about education, who is the subject and who is the object? Who is in the conversation, who is out, and whom are they talking about?

Another theme for our investigations concerns the actors and targets of reform visions. Who critiques schools, who lobbies for what kinds of change, and whose voices are heard and why? We notice, for example, that educational discourse about other people's children differs from discourse about one's own. We also note that the participants in debates about education change over time. Who is talking? Who is being talked about? These differences in "who" across the waves of critique and reform are important in uncovering shifts in the conversation about the improvement of schooling. In making comparisons of the different

visions that reformers advanced, we want to look closely at how who the actors are, and on whom they focus, affects the dynamic of the reform and its consequences.

The interconnectedness of dimensions of schooling

Although analysis of particular dimensions of schooling can be illuminating, a fourth theme in our investigations of reform is the interconnectedness of those dimensions. Isolating any one dimension leads to misrepresentation and oversimplification; we need to keep the relationships complex. Views of learning are embedded within images of teaching; the formal curriculum reflects the surrounding political context. Larger societal issues shape the emergence of particular reform ideas, and notions about whom the students are and what they need to learn shape the content of textbooks. As we pursue questions about teachers, teaching, content, learning, students, purposes of schooling, and the contexts in which these are discussed, we want to look for relationships among these dimensions that will offer clues to understanding schools and those who seek to shape or change them.

The unforeseen consequences of reform

Another theme in our inquiry is to look beyond the obvious outcomes of the reform. As reformers seek to change the processes and outcomes of schooling for particular students, it is reasonable to ask about the extent to which their dreams are realized. However, we are also concerned with what happens in the wake of efforts to make change. What unforeseen consequences emerge that shape subsequent problems, critiques, and reform efforts? What happens that reformers did not intend, and why? Does anyone seem to notice these unintended consequences, and, if so, what do they do about it? To what extent do solutions aggravate the problems they were intended to remedy? To what extent do they create new problems?

Skepticism about change

Finally, we want to cultivate a skeptical stance toward the question of change. How can we distinguish between superficial change and change that affects deep patterns and assumptions? Are the views of knowledge that undergirded the curriculum of the nineteenth century different from those reflected in the current reform movement? Have the purposes of schooling changed? Who teaches and who goes to school does seem to have changed: Has the relationship between teachers and students changed? When we think we see deeper change, we want to try to distinguish fundamental shifts from accumulations and additions. Do we sometimes see change along one dimension -- views of what is worth knowing in a particular area -- without accompanying changes in related dimensions -- views of learning or knowing? We should not underestimate continuity in practice and in the discourse about that practice; we also want to be on the lookout for what really appears to have changed over time. A final theme in our work will be to look critically at efforts to effect change, at evidence of change and continuity, and at claims about the success -- and value -- of change.

Course structure

The course will be divided into two sections, each led by a different faculty member. There may be occasions when we re-group as an entire class, and occasions when you will work in small groups. Your section leader will take responsibility for reading and responding to your work.

The work of the class: Inquiry through reading, discussion, and writing

Another way to talk about the course involves attending to the actual work entailed. This course involves inquiring into educational issues in three ways: reading, discussing, and writing. We explain our assumptions and expectations about each of these below.

Reading

We will be reading a wide variety of texts this semester. Some are primary source materials gathered from other places and times; others are secondary or interpretive commentaries written from different standpoints. The work we will be doing depends on reading interactively, on bringing both collective and individual goals to the act of reading, considering, and reconsidering our texts. In its most straightforward expression, this involves bringing questions to think about while preparing to read something, reading a text, and reflexively placing what one has read in the context of both evolving scholarship bearing on a subject and one's own development as a scholar. Below we pose several sets of general questions for all of us to bring to our reading, questions that we and our colleagues have found effective.

- *What is the author trying to say?*

What are the author's principal and subsidiary arguments or theses? What are the important conceptual terms? What do the author's assumptions seem to be? What sorts of evidence and methods are used? Can you identify specific passages that support your interpretation? Are there other passages that either contradict or appear less consistent with your understanding? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the author's argument? Can you make sense of, or account for, these differences?

- *How has the author constructed the text?*

What clues can you get from the work's structure? Does the organization give you insights into the argument? Are there patterns in the author's presentation that help you to locate and understand the most valuable material? What can you do to concentrate your attention and interrogation of the text?

- *What is the author's purpose?*

Who was the author? Why was this work written? To whom was the author speaking and why? What can you know or infer about the author's motivation? What seems to be the context for the work's origination? Can you dissect its politics? How does the work's purpose seem to affect the author's selection of questions, methods, or interpretation? Was the author trying to confront a body of scholarship with a new interpretation based on new methodologies, or new evidence? Was the work intended to persuade a segment of the public to change its mind or to act on something it already believed?

- *What are your purposes in reading this?*

Different purposes have different requirements: should you skim the piece, acquire mastery or fluency, use it as a source of examples or illustrations?

- *How do the author's assumptions and ideas fit with your own understanding?*

How might your response to the work be affected by values, beliefs, and commitments that you think that you share with the author? Can you read and make sense of the work on its own terms, not just that it confirms your existing thinking or values? Can you consider all of the work, rather than just those passages that you agree with, or which you can label "good," or dismiss as "bad?" Can you approach it with a spirit of discovery and let the story be told in its own right? Can you notice what seems strange or surprising, and accept its offerings as opportunities for discussion?

- *How do the author's arguments fit within various communities of discourse?*

How is a piece of work connected to the efforts of others dedicated to similar purposes? In what community or communities does the author locate him or herself? How can you tell? How might an author's work connect with your own understanding of the work of others, and of your own evolving work on an issue or topic?

It is essential that you read all of the required texts for each class meeting. Much of the reading that we will do this term will consist of pieces you will return to repeatedly in your doctoral studies. You'll see them referenced in other readings, you'll revisit some of them in your comprehensive exams. Because they are constantly called on to remember what they have read in the past, most scholars develop systems for keeping track of their literature. The most efficient bibliographic management and control tool is a software program called *Endnotes*.

Discussion

Because the course will be run as a seminar, your participation in discussions is important not only for your own learning but also the learning of others. What you learn in this course will be influenced by the degree of everyone's engagement in and contributions to these discussions. Preparing the readings and coming to class with questions, insights, and issues is crucial to making the course work. A learning community like this one relies on the contributions and participation of all its members. Building the culture of the class so that genuine inquiry is possible will take all of our efforts. We want to make the seminar a context, in which people listen and are listened to, in which evidence matters, in which thoughtful questioning of one another's claims is desirable, and in which alternative perspectives and interpretations are valued.

Writing

Writing is an important vehicle for exploring and clarifying ideas, for trying out interpretations and arguments, and for representing ideas and communicating with others. Writing plays a central role in doctoral work, and in educational scholarship. For some students, the amount of writing in the doctoral program is completely new. You may never have been asked to do much writing, not in school and not in any position you have held. The writing you are asked to do may therefore be unfamiliar, and perhaps even make you feel anxious. For other students, writing is commonplace. You may feel comfortable with writing and write a lot. You may have been told you are a good writer, and you may find writing easy and enjoyable. However, whether you have done much writing or little, whether you feel yourself to be a good writer or not, the writing we are trying to help you learn to do is different from writing you have done in other school and non-school contexts. It may be helpful to keep in mind that you are now expanding, not replacing, your writing style and skill. You are learning to participate in a community of educational scholars who have a specialized discourse, of which writing is an important part. Because we want the proseminar to provide you with occasions to focus on and develop these new aspects of your writing, we have structured the assignments to provide guidance and resources, as well as the opportunity for comments and suggestions.

Course Assignments

I. Analysis papers. You are required to write **two** short reaction papers. These papers should be **turned in by 12:00 noon** on the required due date. They should be approximately **three pages in length (750 words)**, typed and double-spaced. They can run longer, if you wish, but this is not necessary or even necessarily desirable. Please use Verdana 10pt font, with one-inch margins on all sides. Do not forget to put your name at the top of the first page; do not use a cover or title page.

Please submit these essays as email attachments. Because your section leader may wish to respond through the Word Tracker tool, please make certain that you submit your file as a Word.doc document that is *not saved* in "read only." Do not save the papers in Word.docx. And, please remember this for **everything** you submit as an email attachment: **always** include your last name in the file name. So, to enable us to handle your submissions properly, title your file in the following fashion: TE901Essay1[*your last name*].doc: i.e., **TE901Essay1Smith.doc**. You should adjust the other document title accordingly: TE901Essay2Smith.doc.

You will receive further guidelines for preparing these two brief essays. Every student will prepare the first Analysis Essay for **Week 3, due by 12:00 noon on September 21, 2010**; you can choose any other week, **except** Weeks 8 and 9, to submit your other essay. It is desirable to wait at least until you have received full feedback on your first essay before preparing your second essay; so, it is probably a bad idea to submit it for Week 4. Your second Analysis Essay will be due before noon on the day that the readings are discussed. **Together, they will comprise 20 percent of your final grade.**

We have two aims in asking you to write these brief analysis papers. First, they will encourage you to keep up with the reading and to come to class with some already-formulated thoughts about the reading. This course will be run as a seminar, with students sharing responsibility for the conduct of the class. This means you should come in every week with a set of questions and comments and issues that you developed while doing the week's readings, and you should be prepared to draw on these insights selectively in a constructive effort to help shape seminar discussion. The reaction papers help to facilitate this kind of preparation and thereby help to promote an informed and broad-based discussion of the issues in class each week. Second, these short papers will provide you, at the end of the term, with a set of elaborated notes on course issues and readings that should serve as a useful resource when you write your final paper, when you encounter related issues in your future work, or when you want to revisit some of the readings at a later point. You may want to use these papers to write a running commentary on the issues in the course, with your individual papers building on each other from week to week -- perhaps from the standpoint of a particular subject matter or a particular perspective on schooling. You may want to try out ideas in these papers that you will later develop in a final paper for the course. Also, you may want to use these papers as a way to hold an ongoing conversation with us about readings, schools, and teaching. Whatever you do in each of these papers, however, you should make sure that in some substantial way you are making a response to a significant aspect of the reading.

II. Educational artifact project. You are also required to write a paper analyzing an artifact from education. For this paper, we ask you to find an artifact from K-12 schooling or the professional education or experiences of K-12 teachers or administrators. The artifact might be a policy statement of some sort, piece of curriculum, a student test, or another remnant of schooling. You can choose to find these artifacts in small groups, pairing up with someone with similar interests, say, in language arts or social studies instruction, or in educational policy. Many course readings highlight complexities about assumptions we collectively or individually hold about the nature of teaching and learning, the respective roles of teachers and students, and the nature of school knowledge.

There are **three options** for this selection: you might choose **an historical artifact**; or **a contemporary artifact**; or you could **compare and contrast** an historical artifact with its analogous contemporary equivalent.

In this paper, you are expected to provide an analytically rich discussion of the single artifact or a comparison between the two artifacts. Artifacts could include curricula (worksheets, textbooks, scope and sequence), pictures or drawings of schools, policy documents, commission reports, school evaluations, teacher tests, and the like. If you choose the comparison option, make sure to pick two documents that parallel one another (i.e., are about the same topic or issue). You are welcome to use international artifacts, as long as you are able to provide an English translation, if appropriate.

One helpful tool for thinking about a piece of scholarly work is to phrase the work in the following way: "The purpose of this study is to describe and explain" *The purpose of this investigation is to describe and explain the similarities and differences in the assumptions (implicit or explicit) about teaching, learning, and knowledge present in one or two artifacts of schooling.*

The final paper for this project should include a discussion of the following:

1. Description of the artifact(s):

Remember that your readers will not know much about the artifact(s) to which you are referring. So part of your analysis should include a description of the relevant features and contexts of your artifact(s). Note too that simply showing the reader the artifact(s) will not help, for we all see different things when presented with an event. You will need to guide your readers' viewing of the artifact(s). Relevant questions you might want to consider include:

- Where did the artifact come from?
- Who is the author?
- What was the intellectual/political/practical purpose or context of the production of this artifact?

2. Answers to the following questions, as appropriate:

- What assumptions about school knowledge are present?
- What philosophy of education and curriculum are described?
- What assumptions about teachers' work and/or roles are present?
- What assumptions about students' work and/or roles are present?
- What assumptions about the nature of learning are present?
- What assumptions about the organization of educational experiences are present?

3. A cross case comparison that examines changes (or lack thereof) over time, where appropriate.

4. An explanation of those changes based on the relevant literature.

Papers should be approximately **ten double-spaced pages (2500 words)**. You may choose to work on this inquiry with one or two partners, but the paper *you* turn in should be your own individual work. As part of this assignment, we will group students to comprise panels of presenters, and organize a mini-conference on **November 2**. The panels will present and discuss their findings outside of their "home" section. The final paper is **due on November 9, 2010**, and should be submitted as an email attachment (with a hard copy of the relevant artifact(s) supplementing the electronic version of the paper). Please follow the titling guidelines presented in the first assignment [**TE901ArtifactPaperSmith.doc**]. **This assignment will comprise 35 percent of the course grade.**

III. Synthesis paper. For the final paper, we will give you a question that asks you to analyze a major issue related to the course and support it with a synthesis of relevant course readings. The paper should be no more than **10 double-spaced pages (2500 words)**. We will distribute the assignment for this piece of writing near the end of the semester. You should follow formal citation guidelines. It will be due before noon, just after

our last regular class meeting, **December 10, 2010 [TE901FinalPaperSmith.doc]**. **This synthesis paper will comprise 35 percent of the course grade.**

Please note: The writing you do for this course is to be your own work; standard practices for citation and attribution are expected. Additionally, the writing should be work produced solely and specifically for this course.

To help you with your writing, we would like to recommend a text, *The Craft of Research*, by Wayne Booth and his colleagues. While not intended to be a primer for how to construct a scholarly argument, the authors of this text nevertheless offer significant insights into scholarly work.

IV. Participation: You are entering a trade where you often need to live by your wits and on the fly. Learning in this class is assumed to be more than scanning documents accurately. Participation in discussions as an active listener and speaker is a skill we want you to take seriously. What happens in the class should be as valuable as what occurs when you sit down in isolation to do your reading or writing. So, realize we take the development of our classroom culture as worth your attention. **Our evaluation of the quality of your contributions to seminar discussions will comprise ten percent of the final course grade.**

Summary of course requirements and evaluation:

Your grade for this course will be based on the following distribution:

Brief analysis papers (2)	20%
Education artifact project	35%
Synthesis paper	35%
Class participation	10%

Course Schedule

Note: a CD containing all of the course readings (except the three required books) will be distributed free to all class members. The required book is readily available through internet sources, including amazon.com. In addition to the readings, there will be a series of required films, which will be available from the course Angel site; directions to follow.

Reading Syllabus

Required Books:

E. D. Hirsch, *The Schools We Need: Why We Don't Have Them*. New York: Doubleday, 1996.

Week 1 (September 7, 2010): Introduction.

How can different kinds of source material provide clues about teaching, learning, and schooling? What hypotheses are supported by available evidence? What questions do they expose or suggest? What is not visible? What are the various historical and theoretical ways that the field of teaching, learning, and schooling is conceived and divided?

Week 2 (September 14, 2010): Competing Purposes of Education and Their Implications for Schooling.

Required:

David F. Labaree, "Public Goods, Private Goods: The American Struggle Over Educational Goals," *American Educational Research Journal* 34 (1997), pp. 39-81.

Jennifer Hochschild and Nathan Scovronick, *The American Dream and the Public Schools*, pp. 1-27, New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Michael Todaro, "Education and Development." In Todaro, *Economic Development*, pp. 378-404. New York: Addison-Wesley, 1997.

Week 3 (September 21, 2010): Historical Foundations: Emerging Conflicts Over Educational Purpose in the Nineteenth Century.

Required:

School: The Story of American Public Education. Episode I: The Common School (1770-1890). Stone Lantern Films, 2001. Film

John L. Rury, "Colonial Origins: Education in a Preindustrial Society," and "The 19th Century: Beginnings of a Modern School System." In Rury, *Education and Social Change: Themes in the History of American Schooling*, pp. 22-129. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002.

Barbara Finkelstein, "The Teacher as Instructor: Reading," **OR** "The Teacher as Instructor: Writing, Mathematics, and Geography." In Finkelstein, *Governing the Young: Teacher*

Behavior in Popular Primary Schools in Nineteenth-Century United States, pp. 41-65, 67-93. New York: Falmer Press, 1989.

Primary Sources:

Horace Mann, *Fifth Annual Report of the Secretary to the Board of Education of Massachusetts*, excerpts. Boston, 1842.

Horace Mann, *Seventh Annual Report of the Secretary to the Board of Education of Massachusetts*, excerpts. Boston, 1844.

Calvin Stowe, "Americanization of Immigrants." Daniel Drake's "Response." *Transactions of the Fifth Meeting of the Western Literary Institute and College of Professional Teachers*, pp. 65-66, 68-71, 80-81. Cincinnati, 1836.

Recommended:

Per Adam Siljeström, *The Internal Activity of the School System of the United States, c. 1855*.

Horace Mann, *Ninth Annual Report of the Secretary to the Board of Education of Massachusetts*, excerpts. Boston, 1846.

Horace Mann, *Twelfth Annual Report of the Secretary to the Board of Education of Massachusetts*, excerpts. Boston, 1849.

Week 4 (September 28, 2010): Historical Foundations: Educational Progressivism: The Intellectual and Structural Bases for Differentiation in Modern Schooling, 1880-1930.

Required:

School: The Story of American Public Education. Episode II: As American as Public School (1900-1950): Americanizing Immigrants. Stone Lantern Films, 2001. Film

David K. Cohen and Barbara Neufeld, "The Failure of High Schools and the Progress of Education," *Daedalus* 110 (Summer, 1981): 69-89.

Steven E. Tozer, Paul C. Violas, and Guy B. Senese, "Social Diversity and Differentiated Schooling: The Progressive Era. In Tozer, Violas, and Senese, *School and Society: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, pp. 85-124. Second edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1995.

Primary Sources:

Charles W. Eliot, "Industrial Education as an Essential Factor in our National Prosperity," National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, *Bulletin*, No. 5 (1908): 12-14.

Edward C. Elliott, "Equality of Opportunity. . .," National Education Association, *Proceedings and Addresses* (1908): 159-61.

Walter Lippmann, "The Mental Age of Americans," *New Republic* 32, no. 412 (October 25, 1922): 213-215; no. 413 (November 1, 1922): 246-248; no. 414 (November 8, 1922):

275-277; no. 415 (November 15, 1922): 297-298; no. 416 (November 22, 1922): 328-330; no. 417 (November 29, 1922): 9-11.

Lewis M. Terman, "The Great Conspiracy or the Impulse Imperious of Intelligence Testers, Psychoanalyzed and Exposed by Mr. Lippmann," *New Republic* 33 (December 27, 1922): 116-120.

Recommended:

William J. Reese, *America's Public Schools: From the Common School to "No Child Left Behind,"* pp. 79-214. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.

James Fallows, "The Case Against Credentialism," *Atlantic Monthly* (December, 1985): 49-67.

Bill Bigelow, "Testing, Tracking, and Toeing the Line: A Role Play on the Origins of the Modern High School." In Bill Bigelow, et al., eds., *Rethinking Our Classrooms: Teaching for Equity and Justice*, 117-124. Milwaukee: Rethinking Schools, 1994.

Lewis M. Terman, *The Intelligence of School Children* (Boston, 1919), pp. 21, 24—25, 27—29.

Week 5 (October 5, 2010): Historical Foundations: Curriculum Debates, 1890-1965.

Required:

Arthur Powell, Eleanor Farrar, and David Cohen, "Origins." In *The Shopping Mall High School: Winners and Losers in the Educational Marketplace*, pp. 233-308. Boston: Little Brown, 1985.

William J. Reese, *America's Public Schools: From the Common School to "No Child Left Behind,"* pp. 215-26, 251-81. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.

Primary Sources:

Franklin Bobbitt, *The Curriculum*, excerpts. Cambridge, MA: Riverside Press, 1918.

George S. Counts, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order*, excerpts. New York: John Day, 1932.

John Dewey, "The Democratic Conception in Education." In Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, pp. 81-99. New York: Macmillan, 1916.

John Dewey, *The Child and the Curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902.

Robert S. and Helen M. Lynd. "The Things Children Learn," *Middletown: A Study in Modern American Culture*, pp. 188-205. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1929.

Hyman G. Rickover. *Education and Freedom*, pp. 15, 18—24, 37—38. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Albert Lynd, "Quackery In The Public Schools." *The Atlantic* CLXXV (1950): 33—35, 37—38.

Recommended:

Report of the Committee of Ten: Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies Appointed at the Meeting of the National Education Association. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1893.

Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education: A Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Appointed by the National Education Association. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1918.

Jerome S. Bruner, *The Process of Education*, pp. 1-54. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960/1977.

Week 6 (October 12, 2010): Historical Foundations: Struggles for Equity, 1954-1980.

Required:

School: The Story of American Public Education. Episode III: Equality (1950-1980): Social Upheavals in Education. Stone Lantern Films, 2001. Film

Robert Church and Michael Sedlak, "Changing Definitions of Equality of Educational Opportunity, 1960-75," *Education in the United States: An Interpretive History*, pp. 431-476. New York: Free Press, 1976.

Joel H. Spring, *The American School: 1642-2004*, pp. 405-40. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2004.

Primary Sources:

Booker T. Washington, "Industrial Education for the Negro." In Booker T. Washington, et. al., *The Negro Problem. A Series of Articles by Representative American Negroes of Today* New York: J. Pott & Co., 1903.

W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, "Of Mr. Booker T. Washington and Others." In Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (Chicago, 1903).

Recommended:

Jennifer Hochschild and Nathan Scovronick, *The American Dream and the Public Schools*, pp. 133-67, New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

U.S. Supreme Court, *Brown et al. v. Board of Education of Topeka et al.* 347 US 483 (1954).

Week 7 (October 19, 2010): 1980s Responses: Standardization and Privatization.

Required:

National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk*. Washington, DC: GPO, 1983.

Philip A. Cusick, "The Curriculum, Part I," *The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School*, pp. 43-71. New York: Longman, 1983.

Philip A. Cusick, "The Curriculum, Part II," *The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School*, pp. 72-103. New York: Longman, 1983.

Michael Sedlak, Christopher Wheeler, Diana Pullin, and Philip Cusick, *Selling Students Short: Classroom Bargains and Academic Reform in the American High School*, excerpts. New York: Teachers College Press, 1986.

Recommended:

George Akerlof and Rachel Kranton, "Identity and Schooling: Some Lessons for the Economics of Education," *Journal of Economic Literature* 40 (December, 2002), pp. 1167-1201.

Week 8 (October 26, 2010): Private Purposes: What it meant to become educated.

Educating Rita, Film.

Required:

W. E. B. Du Bois, "Of the Coming of John." In Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York, 1903.

Maya Angelou, *I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings*, pp. 142-56. New York, 1970.

Ron Suskind, "Something to Push Against." In Suskind, *A Hope in the Unseen: An American Odyssey from the Inner City to the Ivy League*, pp. 1-23. New York: Broadway Books, 1998.

Helen M. Todd, "Why Children Work: The Children's Answer," *McClure's Magazine* 6 (April 1913), pp. 68-79.

Choice of one novel, autobiography, or biography:

E. Hoffman, *Lost in Translation: A life in a New Language*. New York: Penguin, 1989.

Richard Rodriguez, *Hunger for Memory: The Education of Richard Rodriguez*. New York: Bantam, 1982.

Sapphire, *Push*. New York: Knopf, 1996.

Ron Suskind, *A Hope in the Unseen: An American Odyssey from the Inner City to the Ivy League*. New York: Broadway Books, 1998.

Keith Gilyard, *Voices of the Self: A Study in Language Competence*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1991.

Week 9 (November 2, 2010): Presentations of Educational Artifacts and Accounts.

Week 10 (November 9, 2010): An Orientation to Theories of School and Society: Structuralism: Neo-liberalism and Neo-institutional Theories.

Required:

Kathleen Weiler, "Critical Educational Theory." In Weiler, *Women Teaching for Change: Gender, Class, & Power*, pp. 1-25. Introduction and Conclusion included. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey, 1988.

Theodore W. Schultz, "Investments in Human Capital," *American Economic Review* 51 (March 1961), pp. 1-17.

Recommended:

Kathleen DeMarrias and Margaret LeCompte, "Theory and Its Influences on the Purposes of Schooling." In DeMarrias and LeCompte, *The Ways Schools Work: A Sociological Analysis of Education*, pp. 1-39. Third edition. New York: Longman, 1999.

David Tyack and Larry Cuban, "How Schools Change Reforms." In Tyack and Cuban, *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform*, pp. 60-84. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Paul DiMaggio and W. Powell, "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." In, W. Powell and P. DiMaggio. *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, pp. 63-82. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Brian Rowan and Cecil Miskel. 1999. "Institutional Theory and the Study of Educational Organizations." In, J. Murphy and K. S. Louis, (Eds.). *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*, 2nd Ed., pp. 359-84. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1999.

John Meyer and Brian Rowan, "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." In, W. Powell and P. DiMaggio. *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, pp. 41-62. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Randall Collins, "The Myth of Technocracy," and "The Rise of the Credential System." In *The Credential Society: An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification*, pp. 1-21, 90-130. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Christopher J. Hurn, "The Functional and Radical Paradigms." In Hurn, *The Limits and Possibilities of Schooling*, pp. 31-38, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.

Week 11 (November 16, 2010): Reproduction and Resistance Theories.

Required:

Stanley Aronowitz and Henry Giroux: "Reproduction and Resistance in Radical Theories of Schooling." In Aronowitz and Giroux, *Education Under Siege: The Conservative, Liberal, and Radical Debate Over Schooling*, pp. 69-114. Boston: Bergen & Garvey, 1985.

Specific assignments from the following sets:

1.

Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, "Education, Inequality, and the Meritocracy." In Bowles and Gintis, *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*, pp. 102-24. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Annette Lareau, "Social Class Differences in Family School Relationships: The Importance of Cultural Capital," *Sociology of Education* 60 (1987), pp. 73-85.

Jean Anyon, "Social Class and School Knowledge," *Curriculum Inquiry* 11 (1981), pp. 3-42.

2.

Paul Willis, *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*, excerpts. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.

Linda McNeil, "Defensive Teaching and Classroom Control." In McNeil, *Contradictions of Control*, pp. 157-90. Boston: Routledge, 1986.

Reba Page, "The Uncertain Value of School Knowledge: Biology at Westridge High," *Teachers College Record* 100 (1999), pp. 554-601.

Recommended:

Pierre Bourdieu, "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction." In Richard Brown, ed., *Knowledge, Education, and Cultural Change: Papers in the Sociology of Education*, 71-112. London: Tavistock, 1973.

Michael Apple and Nancy King, "Economics and Control in Everyday School Life." In Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum*, pp. 43-60. London: Routledge, 1979.

Week 12 (November 23, 2010): Postmodern, Poststructural, and Existential Perspectives.

Required:

To be announced.

Week 13 (November 30, 2010): Cultural and/or/vs. Critical Theories and Curriculum.

Required:

E. D. Hirsch, "Introduction: Failed Theories, Famished Minds," "Intellectual Capital: A Civil Right," and "Critique of a Thoughtworld." In Hirsch, *The Schools We Need: Why We Don't Have Them*, pp. 1-47, 69-126. New York: Doubleday, 1996.

Anthony O'Hear, *Education and Democracy*. London, 1991.

Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, excerpts. New York: Continuum, 1970.

John D. Holst, "Paulo Freire in Chile, 1964-1969: *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* in its Sociopolitical Context," *Harvard Educational Review*, 76 (2006): 243-70.

Recommended:

Nicholas C. Burbules and Rupert Burke, "Critical Thinking and Critical Pedagogy: Relations, Differences and Limits." In Thomas S. Popkewitz and Lynn Fendler, eds., *Critical Theories in Education: Changing Terrains of Knowledge and Politics*, pp. 45-65. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Week 14 (December 7, 2010): New Progressivism.

Frederick Wiseman, *High School II*. Film

Required:

David K. Cohen, "Teaching Practice: Plus Ça Change" in *Contributing to Educational Change: Perspectives on Research and Practice*, pp. 27-84. Phillip Jackson, ed., 1988, Berkeley: McCutchen.

Timothy J. Lensmire, "Following the Child, Socioanalysis, and Threats to Community: Teacher Response to Children's Texts," *Curriculum Inquiry* 23 (1993), pp. 265-99.

Sarah Theule-Lubienski, "Successes and Struggles of Striving Toward 'Mathematics for All: A Closer Look at Socio-Economic Class." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, 1997.

Lisa Delpit, "The Silenced Dialogue: Power and Pedagogy in Educating Other People's Children," *Harvard Educational Review* 58 (1988), pp. 280-99.

Cynthia E. Coburn, "Rethinking scale: Moving beyond numbers to deep and lasting change." *Educational Researcher*, 32 (2003), pp. 3-12.

Recommended:

Deborah Meier, *The Power of Their Ideas: Lessons from a Small School in Harlem*, sections. Boston: Beacon Press, 1995.

Lisa Delpit, "Teachers, Culture, and Power: An Interview with Lisa Delpit." In David Levine, et al., *Rethinking Schools: And Agenda for Change. Leading Educators Speak Out*, pp. 136-47. New York: New Press.

Week 15 (December 14, 2010): Choice and Choices.

School: The Story of American Public Education. Episode IV: The Bottom Line (1980-2001): Challenges to the Notion of a Common School. Stone Lantern Films, 2001. Film

The Wire, Season IV, excerpts. Film

Required:

Diane Ravitch, *The Death and Life of the Great American School System: How Testing and Choice are Undermining Education*, pp. 1-30, 113-48. New York: Basic Books, 2010.

Milton Friedman, "The Role of Government in Education." In Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom*, pp. 85-107. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Jeffrey R. Henig, "Understanding the Political Conflict over School Choice." In, Julian R. Betts and Tom Loveless, eds., *Getting Choice Right: Ensuring Equity and Efficiency in Educational Policy*, pp. 176-209. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2005.

Recommended:

John E. Chubb and Terry M. Moe, "The Root of the Problem," and "An Institutional Perspective on Schools." In Chubb and Moe, *Politics, Markets and America's Schools*, pp. 1-68. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1990.

Albert O. Hirschman, *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*, pp. 1-54. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Henry M. Levin "Multiple 'Choice' Questions: The Road Ahead." In Noel Epstein, Ed., *Who's in Charge Here? The Tangled Web of School Governance and Policy*, pp. 228-55. Denver and Washington, D.C.: Education Commission of the States and Brookings Institution, 2004.

H.L. Fuller, "The Continuing Struggle of African Americans for the Power to Make Real Educational Choices." Paper presented at the Annual Symposium on Educational Options for African Americans. Milwaukee, WI. ERIC Document 441905, 2000.

A Nation Still at Risk. William J. Bennett, Willard Fair, Chester E. Finn Jr., Rev. Floyd Flake, E.D. Hirsch, Will Marshall, Diane Ravitch, et al.
<http://www.policyreview.org/jul98/nation.html>

Jeffrey Henig, "Evolution of an Idea." In Henig, *Rethinking School Choice: Limits of the Market Metaphor*, pp. 57-77. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

David N. Plank and Gary Sykes, eds. *Choosing Choice: School Choice in International Perspective*, pp. vii-xxi, and Helen Ladd, "Introduction," pp. 1-23. New York: Teachers College Press, 2003.

J. Witte, "Accountability and Regulation in American Schools: A Critical Appraisal." Paper prepared for the "No Child Left Behind Act and the Federal Role in Education: Accountability and Equity in America's Public Schools" conference. Madison, WI. February 2-4, 2005.