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Purposes of the Course

TE 901 is the first of two proseminar courses required of all entering students in the doctoral program in Curriculum, Instruction, and Teacher Education (CITE). 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 during 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 the larger historical, social, and educational context in and outside the U.S. and the connection between a) larger historical, social, and educational issues and b) teaching and learning in elementary and secondary classrooms. TE902 draws on the literature on teaching as a professional practice, learning to teach, and teacher learning.

In particular, TE 901 focuses on four core strands:

1. History of U.S. Education
2. International Education
3. Social and Educational Theory
4. Contemporary Educational Issues

The proseminar experience will encourage you to draw from your personal and professional experiences in education in addressing ideas and issues that arise in the literature in these four core strands. At the same time, please be aware that you are now embarking on an intellectual journey that will ask you to examine the familiar practices of education in a new, analytical way. You will need to step back from the specifics of your experiences and look for the analytical bridges that link those experiences to the larger picture in education. We offer the scholar’s analytical approach to education as a supplement to (not a substitute for) one’s personal and professional approach. At the same time, we ask that you be open to considering the value of this analytical perspective as a new way to analyze old problems. Also, please note that our intent is not to provide you with the right answers but with useful tools for pursuing your own answers; we will not 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 and their relationship to larger social contexts, 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. The course material will draw from the U.S. educational experience as well as school systems outside the U.S.; and we will pursue themes and questions pertinent to schooling in many nations. If you have experience with education in another country, we strongly encourage you to bring your perspective to your analysis of each of the issues we explore in the course.
The course also serves as an opportunity for you to begin to build and participate in an intellectual community with others entering the CITE and Educational Policy 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 of this involves taking intellectual risks; developing a culture in which taking such risks is valued, encouraged, and supported is our collective responsibility.

Working Assumptions for the Course

1. We will respect one another. Our beliefs, values, and ideas often differ from one another because we draw from different life experiences. In this class, we will discuss, question, and challenge ideas, but we need to be careful not to attack individuals or to create an unsafe, unproductive space.

2. We will challenge our own beliefs, values, and ideas. We need to be open to challenging our own prejudices, assumptions, and interpretations. We also need to expect to discuss topics we often do not discuss in public, but still feel strongly about. It is alright to feel uncomfortable when we do so. This involves taking risks (both intellectual and personal).

3. We are here for a positive educational experience. Please ask questions, share your thoughts, and make this class meaningful for yourself.

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 across the two sections. Your section leader will take responsibility for reading, responding to, and evaluating your work.

Course Organization

In this course, we will explore the educational enterprise and alternative ways of describing, analyzing, and interpreting K-12 school systems in and outside of the U.S. In Week 2, the course will investigate competing purposes of education across different contexts—themes that will recur throughout our readings and discussions this semester. Next, in Weeks 3 and 4, we will examine the drive to provide mass public schooling at the elementary and secondary levels in the U.S., the consequent struggles faced in educating diverse populations, the actions of such populations, in particular African Americans, to forge their own educational paths, and the manifestations or internal effects of competing purposes on knowledge, learning, teaching, and school structure. In Week 5, we will study the origins, theories, and practices of progressive education, one of the most important and influential eras in U.S. educational history.

In Weeks 6 and 7, the course will explore education of the “the Other:” specifically, we will investigate the ideologies underlying the educational experiences of African Americans, American Indians, and Mexican Americans from the mid 1800s to the early 1900s. In Week 8, we will consider what it means to be educated through reading first-hand accounts: novels and autobiographies. (Week 9 there will be no readings assigned because the class will be comprised of students’ artifact presentations). In Week 10, we will return to the study of “the Other” in education, study the reasons for educational expansion outside the U.S., and continue examining the role of colonialism in influencing education in developing countries.

From there, the course shifts to theory and more recent and contemporary educational issues. In Weeks 11 and 12, we will study the theoretical perspectives that scholars have used in explaining the relationship between schooling and broader social developments— theories that have implications for research and practice. In Week 13, we will study efforts and struggles for educational equity in mid-twentieth century...
United States. In the final two weeks of the course, Weeks 14 and 15, we will consider several policy issues and debates including those related to accountability, school choice, and progressive education.

Our investigations will involve us in examining curricula, teaching and learning, the nature of modal teaching practice, the experience of different groups in schools and what students learn, and criticisms of school. In addition, we will examine efforts by both marginalized and dominant groups 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 a historical context; it takes place within intellectual and cultural traditions, and within political, economic, and social contexts that extend backwards and forwards 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 can be better understood by adapting an international perspective and examining schooling practices in a given context in relation to such practices in other contexts.
5. Education and educational research makes epistemological claims; it involves an understanding of the nature, origin, and scope of knowledge and knowing.
6. Education makes ethical claims; it involves an understanding of the meaning of goodness, valuable knowledge, and a good society.

However, the precise nature of teaching as historical, social, political, international, epistemological, and ethical 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 a) the history of U.S. education and b) international contexts, as well as an understanding of 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 professionally 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.

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. 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.
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.

**The interconnectedness of dimensions of schooling**

Although analysis of particular dimensions of schooling can be illuminating, a second theme is the interconnectedness of those dimensions. Isolating any one dimension can lead to 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 textbook content. As we pursue questions about teachers, teaching, content, learning, students, purposes of schooling, and the contexts in which these are discussed, we will look for relationships among these dimensions that offer clues to understanding schools and those who seek to shape or change them.

**Outsider and insider perspectives**

A third theme will draw competing portraits of the educational setting. We will attempt to differentiate between two largely distinct 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).

**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 tends to differ 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 unforeseen consequences of reform**

A fifth 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 movements? 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.
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, discussion, 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 various 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, and/or 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 may 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 in TE 901 will consist of pieces you will return to repeatedly in your doctoral studies. You’ll see them referenced in other readings, and 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. Two efficient bibliographic management tools are a) *Endnotes* (a software program) and b) *Zotero* (an on-line program).

**Discussion**

As the course will be run as a seminar, your participation in discussions is important not only for your own learning but also for that 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, both the amount and nature 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 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. Short Analysis Papers.** You are required to write two Short Analysis Papers (SAPs). These papers need to develop and ultimately to display an array of strengths: an understanding of the authors’ arguments and who or what the authors are writing in reaction to; an understanding of the arguments’ strengths and weaknesses—what type of evidence do the authors draw upon and how well does the evidence support the authors’ claims; what do the arguments help us to understand better or to “see” anew, what critical concerns do the arguments leave unexamined and/or whose voices does it silence; and what questions do the articles raise for you in terms of how you think about schools and schooling, or how you think about the goals and purposes of educational research.

The first SAP is written in response to readings assigned for Week 2, and it is due **Friday, September 14th by 11:59 pm**. The second SAP can be written in response to readings assigned on weeks 6, 7, 12, or 13. The second SAP is due by 4:00 pm on the day the reading about which you are writing the SAP is due. The two analysis papers will make up 25% of the course grade.

**II. Educational Artifact Project.** For this paper you will analyze an artifact from education. The purposes of this project are to (1) to help you further develop your critical analysis skills; (2) to help you deepen your knowledge of the context of the time period of the artifact; and (3) to deepen your knowledge of the
relevant course readings. Your paper should focus on one of the following: (1) analysis of a historical artifact; (2) analysis of a contemporary artifact; or (3) comparison of a historical artifact to its analogous contemporary equivalent. We ask you to find an artifact(s) from K-12 schooling or the professional education or experiences of K-12 teachers or administrators. Artifacts could include curricula (worksheets, textbooks, scope and sequence), pictures or drawings of schools, policy documents, commission reports, school evaluations, teacher tests, 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. However, the paper you turn in should be your work. 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. In your paper, you are required to draw on TE 901 course readings to examine some of the assumptions represented by your artifact. You will present your analysis of your artifact in a public setting on October 30th. The Educational Artifact Project is due Friday, November 9th by 11:59 pm.

III. Synthesis Paper. For this paper, we will give you a choice of questions, each of which asks you to analyze a major issue related to TE 901 and support it with a synthesis of relevant course readings. The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate your understanding of course readings and their relationship to a course theme or themes. This synthesis paper will comprise 35% of the course grade. The Synthesis Paper is due Wednesday, December 12th by 11:59 pm.

IV. Class participation: You are entering a trade where you often need to live by your wits and on the fly. Learning in TE 901 is assumed to be more than skimming documents accurately. Participation in discussions as an active listener and speaker is a skill to take seriously. What happens in class should be as valuable as what occurs when you sit down alone to do your reading or writing. So, realize we take the development of our classroom culture as worth your attention.

You are expected to be present and prepared to participate in class each week. If an extenuating circumstance prevents you from attending class, you should notify your instructor by phone or e-mail before the start of class that week and communicate with your instructor and another student about what happened in the class you missed. Attendance and class participation will count as 10% of your course grade. Note! The 10% is not automatic. If you come to class and do not participate on a regular basis, do not expect to receive the full 10%.

Detailed information about each assignment and rubric will be shared and discussed in class and posted on the TE 901 ANGEL site. Please note that TE 901 will use one ANGEL site, even though there are two sections. We will use the ANGEL site for TE 901 Section 1.

Academic Honesty and Citations

We assume that the student is honest and that all course work and examinations represent the student’s own work. Also, the writing should be work produced solely and specifically for this course. Violations of the academic integrity policy such as cheating, plagiarism, selling course assignments, or academic fraud are grounds for academic action and/or disciplinary sanction as described in the University’s student conduct code. The principles of truth and honesty are recognized as fundamental to the community of teachers and scholars. This means that all academic work is prepared by the student to whom it is assigned, without unauthorized aid of any kind.

Incidents of plagiarism are taken very seriously and will be pursued and punishment can result in automatic failure of the course. Students are warned not to use any text verbatim on any class assignments without quotation marks and source citations. Warning: do not go to a site like Wikipedia (not always a reliable or thorough source anyway), copy and paste, and then “rearrange” words or sentences or replace a few words here and there: that constitutes plagiarism. When quoting verbatim, always use quotation marks and cite the page number and source (unless you are using block quotes, and
in that case, be sure to indent the block quote to distinguish it from the rest of the text. Consult the APA Publication Manual. If you have any questions, please ask.

Note: please see the following website for more information on what constitutes plagiarism: http://plagiarism.org/learning_center/paraphrase.html

For University regulations on academic dishonesty and plagiarism, refer to

http://www.vps.msu.edu/SpLife/rule32.htm
http://www.msu.edu/unit/ombud/plagiarism.html

Scholars in education use different citation styles, but APA is the most-often used style for education. Learning APA early on in your career will save you time and energy later on. For this course, students are required to have a copy of the APA Publication Manual: American Psychological Association, *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.) Washington, DC: Author, 2010.

Directions for APA style for references and citations are available at http://webster.commnet.edu/apa/apa_index.htm and many other places on the web.

**Evaluation**

Rubrics will be used to assess written assignments according to the following criteria: consistency with assignment, thoughtfulness of response, effectiveness of argument, and clarity of communication. You will receive the rubrics in class well before the assignments are due.

Class participation will be evaluated on the following criteria: thoughtfulness of contributions (including questions), respectful consideration of and response to others’ comments/questions, and demonstrated mastery of the reading.

*Summary of course requirements and evaluation:*

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Analysis Papers (2)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Artifact Project</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis Paper</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Participation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grading Scale for TE 901**

- 93-100 = 4.0
- 85-92  = 3.5
- 77-84  = 3.0
- 69-76  = 2.5

**Note:** We wish to fully include persons with disabilities in this course. Please let us know if you need any accommodations in the curriculum, instruction, or assessments to enable you to fully participate.

**Required Texts**

The following texts are required for the course. The first three can be purchased from the MSU Bookstore (321 Grand River) or they can be purchased on-line. The fourth text is a novel of your choosing that will not be sold in campus bookstores.


4. One novel of your choosing (for Week 8). You are responsible for getting a copy of this book (they will not be sold at the campus bookstores).

5. CD (distributed in class on September 4, 2012). The readings are organized in folders for each week. Most of the readings are labeled by the last name(s) of author(s), although occasionally they are labeled by first and last name, or by document title.

Below we list both the required readings and recommended readings for each class session. As we mentioned earlier, productive class discussion will depend on every student having read all the required readings. This is a reading-intensive course (just as doctoral study is reading intensive). Early on in the course, we will discuss what constitutes critical, productive, and generative reading of texts and share suggestions for reading. Please note that readings will vary in terms of coverage during class discussion: we will spend more time on some readings than others. Because the direction of our class sessions relies on the questions and insights you bring to class, we cannot always predict which readings will receive the most attention.

On occasion, each TE 901 instructor may assign recommended (or other) readings as required. However, unless we indicate otherwise, the recommended readings are not required. We recognize time will not permit you to read all or even much of recommended reading. In part, we list these here for your artifact analysis, reference after the course, and further reading of topics that are especially interesting to you during the course. We invite you refer to recommended readings in class discussion, but please be mindful that other students may not have read the reading. Thus, you may need to provide a quick overview to give your classmates context for your comments.

**Course Schedule for Readings**

Each week, TE 901 will feature readings that address one or more of the four core strands of the course:

1. History of U.S. Education
2. International Education
3. Social and Educational Theory
4. Contemporary Educational Issues

**Week 1 (September 4, 2012): Course Introduction**

No assigned readings

**Week 2 (September 11, 2012): Competing Purposes of Education and Their Implications for Schooling**

1. Labaree, D. F. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal, 34*(1), 39-81. *(The intention of this reading is to provide a broad introduction to the history of U.S. schooling and contemporary issues. Also, this piece can be linked to readings on colonialism and education.)*
2. Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher, 35*(7), 3-12. (The purpose of this reading is to provide a broad introduction to the history of U.S. schooling and contemporary issues.)


Recommended:


**Week 3 (September 18, 2012): Historical Foundations: Emerging Conflicts Over Educational Purpose in the U.S. in the Nineteenth Century**

1. Reese, W. J. (2006). The origins of the common school. In W. J. Reese, *America’s public schools: From the common schools to “No Child Left Behind”* (pp. 10-44). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. (The purpose of this reading is to introduce students to the text and to provide students an overview of the origins of the Common School Movement.)


4. Fraser, J. (2009). The common school movement, 1820-1860. In J. Fraser, *Education in the United States: A documentary history* (2nd ed.) (pp. 44-57). New York: Routledge. (This reading features excerpts from two primary sources: Horace Mann’s Tenth (1847) and Twelfth (1849) Annual Reports of the Secretary to the Board of Education of Massachusetts. Mann was one of the main leaders of the Common School Movement.)

Recommended:

5. Mann, H. (1842). *Fifth Annual Report of the Secretary to the Board of Education of Massachusetts*, excerpts. Boston. (This primary source complements the Labaree and Reese pieces by addressing the three goals of schooling discussed by Labaree: democratic equality, social efficiency, and social mobility.)

6. Mann, H. (1844). *Seventh Annual Report of the Secretary to the Board of Education of Massachusetts*, excerpts. Boston. (This primary source is based on Mann’s travels to Prussia, Germany, and Scotland. The purpose of this piece is to help students consider educational developments outside the U.S. in the 1800s.)

7. Reese, W. J. (2006). Postbellum America and the common school. In W.J. Reese, *America’s public schools: From the common schools to “No Child Left Behind”* (pp. 45-78). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. (The purpose of this reading is to provide students: background of the
social changes in the United States during this period, an overview of the Common School Movement, and an introduction to some of the leading educational figures of the time.)

8. Tolley, K. (Summer 1996). “Science for ladies, classics for gentlemen: A comparative analysis of scientific subjects in the curricula of boys’ and girls’ secondary schools in the United States, 1794-1850,” History of Education Quarterly, 36(2), 129-53. (The purpose of this reading is to provide an example of an analysis of primary source materials on the topics of science education and gender and schooling; this piece focuses on the differences between science education for boys and girls through the mid nineteenth century.)

**Joint Discussion, 6:15 pm:** “Reading and Doctoral Studies” with Dr. Alicia Alonzo (http://education.msu.edu/search/Formview.aspx?email=alonzo@msu.edu)

**Week 4 (September 25, 2012): Historical Foundations: Educational Practices in Schools for Whites and African Americans**


4. Strunk, W., & White, E. B. (2009). The elements of style (4th ed.). New York: Pearson Longman. (SKIM; the purpose of this reading is to provide rules, advice, and techniques for effective academic writing.)

**Recommended:**


**Optional Session, 7:00 pm:** "The U.S. Governance System, Title I, and Race to the Top" by Dr. Peter Youngs (http://education.msu.edu/search/formview.aspx?email=pyoungs@msu.edu)

**Week 5 (October 2, 2012): Historical Foundations: Educational Progressivism—The Intellectual and Structural Bases for Differentiation in Modern Schooling, 1880-1930**

of urbanization, immigration, industrialization, and the increasing centralization of business and governmental decision making.)

2. Cohen, D. K., & Neufeld, B. (1981). The failure of high schools and the progress of education. Daedalus, 110, 69-89. (The purpose of this reading is to examine how assumptions about “equality of condition” evolved into notions of “equality of opportunity” and what this meant for different groups of students; and to consider how reform initiatives are shaped by the results of past problem-solving efforts.)


Recommended:

5. Dewey, J. (1916). The Democratic conception in education. In J. Dewey, Democracy and education. (pp. 81-99) New York: Macmillan. (This piece links Dewey’s vision for schooling with his vision for democratic society; it can be linked to readings on colonialism.)

6. Reese, W. J. (2006). Democracy, efficiency, and school expansion. In W.J. Reese, America’s public schools: From the common schools to “No Child Left Behind” (pp. 118-148). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. (The purpose of this reading is to provide students: background of the enormous economic, demographic, and social changes during the Progressive Era, the role of women in social movements, as well as details on trends in the “administrative” progressive education such as social efficiency, expansion of high schools, and tracking. This period has been referred to by Robert Wiebe as a “search for order.”)

7. Reese, W. J. (2006). A democracy of differences. In W.J. Reese, America’s public schools: From the common schools to “No Child Left Behind” (pp. 149-179). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. (The purpose of this reading is to introduce students to trends in pedagogical progressivism and to show the tensions between the “old” and the “new” education.)


Week 6 (October 9, 2012): History and Philosophy of How to Educate “the Other”: African Americans


Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. (The intention of this reading is to describe efforts by southern white school reformers and northern philanthropists to establish manual training secondary schools for African Americans in the 1920s and 1930s.)

Recommended:


5. Walker, V. S., & Archung, K. N. (2003). The segregated schooling of Blacks in the southern United States and South Africa. *Comparative Education Review, 47*(1), 21-40. (The purpose of the article is to consider the similarities in the educational experiences historically of these two groups relying on primary and secondary sources and oral history interviews. Additionally, this piece provides implications for considerations of contemporary desegregation policies in both countries by accounting for the cultural beliefs and styles still held by both groups, though often in contrast to the dominant beliefs about educational practices.)


**Week 7 (October 16, 2012): History and Philosophy of How to Educate “the Other”: American Indians and Mexican-Americans**

1. Lesiak, C. (1992). *The American experience: In the White man’s image* [Television series]. Lincoln, NE: Native American Public Broadcasting Consortium. (The purpose of this film is to introduce students to the government-sponsored boarding schools for American Indians in the 1800s.)


Recommended:


5. Lomawaima, K. (1994). They called it *Prairie Light: The story of Chilocco Indian School*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press. (This book seeks to present the complex experiences of
American Indians who attended boarding school. Please note this book is not included in the readings on your CD.

6. Nabokov, P. (1991). To learn another way. In P. Nabokov. Native American testimony: A chronicle of Indian-White relations from prophecy to the present, 1492-1992 (pp. 213-231). New York: Viking Press. (The purpose of this piece is to offer a short summary of American Indian educational history through the late 19th century and to provide primary sources from American Indians about their educational experiences in boarding schools and the policies on their reservations.)

Week 8 (October 23, 2012): Private Purposes: What It Meant To Be Educated

1. Dangarembga, T. Chapter one. In T. Dangarembga, Nervous conditions (pp. 1-34). Banbury, England: Ayebia Clarke Publishing. (This reading is the first chapter of a semi-autobiographical account of a 1960s Rhodesian family in the post-colonial era.)
2. Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). Of the coming of John. In W. E. B. Du Bois, The souls of Black folk (pp. 228-249). New York: Penguin. (The purpose of this piece is to provide a personal account of the challenges faced by black men during the late nineteenth century and to the concept of “double-consciousness.”)

Choice of one novel, autobiography, or biography: (see Appendix for descriptions of these readings).


Recommended:


Week 9 (October 30, 2012): Presentations of Educational Artifacts and Accounts

No assigned readings

Week 10 (November 6, 2012): History and Philosophy of How to Educate “the Other”: The Role of Colonial and Domestic Powers in Shaping International Education

2. Tsurumi, P. (1984). The non-western colonizer in Asia: Japanese educational engineering in Taiwan. In P. G. Altbach & G. P. Kelly (Eds.), Education and the colonial experience (pp. 55-74). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction. (The intention of this piece is to consider how Japan, as a colonial power, influenced the development of the educational system in Taiwan.)

Recommended:

4. Paulet, A. (2007). To change the world: The use of American Indian education in the Philippines *History of Education Quarterly* 47(2), 173-202. [The purpose of this article is to detail how the US relied on its conceptions about American Indians in developing its educational ideology and practices in the Philippines. This piece complements the Adams reading from Week 7.]

5. Hong, W., & Halvorsen, A. (2010). Teaching Asia in US in secondary school classrooms: A curriculum of othering. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 42(3), 371-393. [There are two purposes of this piece: to provide students an analysis of how Asia is taught in six US social studies classrooms and to provide an example of a published piece based upon a former CITE student’s dissertation study.]


4. Trouillot, M-R. (1995). The power in the story. In M-R. Trouillot, *Silencing the past: Power and the production of history* (pp. 1-30). Boston: Beacon Press. [The purpose of this reading is to show the relationship between history and power—specifically, how whose history is being told is dependent upon the power of the subjects—both individuals and groups—of the narratives.]

Recommended:


7. Coloma, R. S. (2011). Who’s afraid of Foucault? History, theory, and becoming subjects. *History of Education Quarterly*, 51(2), 184-201. [This piece, a self-reflexive historiography, is an example of one educational historian’s analysis of the inclusion of Foucault in educational history, including the barriers to the use of Foucault in educational history, and his own process of utilizing Foucault as an analytical tool in his work.]


1. Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). The foundations of critical pedagogy. In J. L. Kincheloe, *Critical pedagogy primer* (pp. 45-105). New York: Peter Lang. ([The purpose of this chapter is to introduce students to the notion of “critical pedagogy” and consider it in relation to other educational theories.])

Students will read one of the following (to be assigned):

2. Apple, M. W. (1990). The politics of official knowledge in the United States. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 22(4): 377-400. ([The purpose of this piece is to introduce the concept of “official knowledge” particularly in a political context of conservative restoration. This is a short piece, the concepts of which are developed in greater depth in Apple’s 1993 book, *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age.*])


4. Lather, P. (2004). Scientific research in education: A critical perspective. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 20(1): 11-30. ([The purpose of this article is for students to read how a critical theorist analyzes the U.S. accountability movement, in particular the concept of science-based evidence.])


Students will read one of the following (to be assigned):

6. Dewey, J. (1902). *The child and the curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. ([This piece presents Dewey’s position on teaching and learning; it can be linked to Delpit, Lensmire, and Lubinski in Week 14.])


8. O’Hear, A. (1991). *Education and democracy* (pp. 5-40). London: Claridge Press. ([This reading argues against democratic education and university-based teacher preparation, and in support of education that is elitist and authoritarian.])


**Joint Discussion (Time TBD) with Dr. Jeff Bale**

(http://education.msu.edu/search/formview.aspx?email=jbale@msu.edu)

2. Church, R., & Sedlak, M. (1976). Changing definitions of equality of educational opportunity, 1960-75. In Education in the United States: An interpretive history. (pp. 431-476). New York: Free Press. (This piece addresses the Civil Rights Movement, the disillusionment many African Americans and white liberals felt towards public education in the late-1960s and 1970s, and federal and state policy efforts to address equity during this time period.)

3. U.S. Supreme Court. Brown et al. v. Board of Education of Topeka et al. 347 US 483 (1954). (The purpose of this reading is to introduce students to the landmark desegregation case in the U.S.)


Recommended:


6. U.S. Supreme Court, Brown et al. v. Board of Education of Topeka et al. 349 US 294 (1955). (The purpose of this reading is to introduce students to the Brown II decision, which addressed the implementation of the Brown I decision.)

7. Donato, R. (1997). Emergence of grassroots activism. In R. Donato, The other struggle for equal schools: Mexican Americans during the Civil Rights Era (pp. 57-85). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. (The purpose of this chapter is to consider the activism of working class Mexican Americans in the 1960s who challenged their local educational system in Brownfield, California (pseudonym) for more equitable conditions, greater access and participation in decision-making, and enactment of social justice.)


10. Warren, D. (1972). Pregnant students/public schools. Phi Delta Kappan 54(2): 111-114. (This reading is an advocacy piece, written in 1972, for the critical importance of public education for pregnant students. Although it is 30 years old, this article has contemporary relevance.)


Week 14 (December 4, 2012): Contemporary Educational Issues: Accountability and Choice

1. National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A Nation at risk*. Washington, DC: GPO. (The purpose of this reading is to introduce students to a landmark report that shaped educational policy for the next 28 years.)


3. Henig, J. R. (2005). Understanding the political conflict over school choice. In, J. R. Betts & Tom Loveless (Eds.), *Getting choice right: Ensuring equity and efficiency in educational policy* (pp. 176-209). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press. (This piece argues that government and market-based approaches incorporate at least four dimensions: delivery, financing, regulation, and decision-making; and that conflicts over these dimensions lead to a) criticism of traditional public schools and b) resistance to school choice programs.)


Recommended:


8. Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2007). The practical relevance of accountability systems for school improvement: A descriptive analysis of California schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 29(4), 319-352. (This article examines whether schools that perform well on high-stakes tests can be readily distinguished from those that perform poorly on such tests with regard to principal leadership, school organization, and instructional quality.)


10. Reese, W. J. (2006). Epilogue. In W.J. Reese, *America’s public schools: From the common schools to “No Child Left Behind”* (pp. 322-337). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. (The purpose of this reading is to provide an overview of contemporary educational issues.)

**Week 15 (Wednesday, December 12, 2012; 5:45-7:45 pm): Contemporary Educational Issues: New Progressivism**

1. Cohen, D. K. (1988). Teaching practice: Plus ça change. East Lansing MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Education. (The purpose of this reading is to consider historical and contemporary reasons why it is difficult for teachers to enact progressive, student-centered instruction.)

2. Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review* 58, 280-99. (The intention of this piece is to introduce students to a foundational critique of whole language instruction, an example of progressive, student-centered literacy instruction that was prevalent in the U.S. in the late-1980s and early-1990s.)

3. Lensmire, T. J. (1993). Following the child, socioanalysis, and threats to community: Teacher response to children’s texts. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 23, 265-299; (The goal of this article is to document challenges to enacting writers’ workshop with elementary students, a progressive, student-centered approach to teaching writing; Lensmire graduated from the MSU CTEP (CITE) PhD program.) OR Lubieniski, S. T. (1997). Successes and struggles of striving toward “Mathematics for All:” A closer look at socio-economic class. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. (The aim of this paper is to consider some of the challenges to enacting reform-oriented, discussion-based math instruction with students from low-income and working-class families; Lubieniski graduated from the MSU CTEP (CITE) PhD program.)

**Recommended:**


Appendix: Descriptions of Novels and Autobiographies for Week 8


In 1972 Cary, a bright and ambitious black teenager from Philadelphia, was offered the opportunity to attend the elite St. Paul's School in New Hampshire as a scholarship student. She would be one of the first black students, and one of the first girls, to study there. After some initial trepidation she decided to accept the challenge. Determined not only to succeed academically but to impress her personality on the school, to "turn it out," Cary threw herself into her new life with zeal.

Yet once she had settled in at St. Paul's, Cary found her position to be unexpectedly difficult, often fraught with emotional ambiguities and potential traps. Had she earned her place at St. Paul's fairly, or was she simply a "token black," part of a liberal experiment? Should she place her trust in the teachers and her white fellow-pupils, or should she remain suspicious of their motivations and loyalties? How might she best serve the interests of her race: by excelling at her studies, or by being rebellious? When she takes a position on the student council, will her black friends see it as a betrayal in favor of the power structure and values? And as time passes, Cary feels herself to be increasingly estranged from the family she loves and the black Philadelphia community that had been her home throughout her life.


A unique blend of memoir and scholarship, Keith Gilyard's *Voices of the Self* is a penetrating analysis of the linguistic and cultural "collision" experienced by African-American students in the public education system. Gilyard examines how black students "negotiate" their way through school and discusses the tension between the use of Black English and Standard English, underlining how that tension is representative of the deeper conflict that exists between black culture and white expectations. Vivid descriptions – often humorous, sometimes disturbing, always moving – of Gilyard's own childhood experiences in school and society are interlaced with chapters of solid sociolinguistic scholarship. Encompassing the perspectives of both the "street" and the "academy," *Voices of the Self* presents an eloquent argument for cultural and linguistic pluralism in American public schools.

"Original and creative in structure, Gilyard's book explains analytically how urban blacks use language and learn dialects other than the Black English that characterizes their early speech pattern . . . The book delivers brilliantly . . . a classic that should appeal to parents, students of sociolinguistics and education, and those interested in the language challenges that face ghetto youth." - R. B. Shuman, *Choice*.


The condition of exile is an exaggeration of the process of change and loss that many people experience as they grow and mature, leaving behind the innocence of childhood. Eva Hoffman spent her early years in Cracow (Poland), among family friends who, like her parents, had escaped the Holocaust and were skeptical of the newly imposed Communist state. Hoffman's parents managed to immigrate to Canada in the 1950s, where Eva was old enough to feel like a stranger – bland food, a quieter life, and schoolmates who hardly knew where Poland was. Still, there were neighbors who knew something of Old World ways, and a piano teacher who was classically Middle European in his neurotic enthusiasm for music. Her true exile came in college in Texas, where she found herself among people who were frightened by and hostile to her foreignness. Later, at Harvard, Hoffman found herself initially alienated by her burgeoning intellectualism; her parents found it difficult to comprehend. Her sense of perpetual otherness was extended by encounters with childhood friends who had escaped Cracow to grow up in Israel, rather than Canada or the United States, and who were preoccupied with soldiers, not scholars. Lost in Translation is a moving memoir that takes the specific experience of the exile and humanizes it to such a degree that it becomes relevant to the lives of a wider group of readers. (This text refers to the Paperback edition)
From Publishers Weekly:

Daughter of Holocaust survivors, the author, a New York Times Book Review editor, lost her sense of place and belonging when she emigrated with her family from Poland to Vancouver in 1959 at the age of 13. Although she works within a familiar genre here, Hoffman's is a penetrating, lyrical memoir that casts a wide net as it joins vivid anecdotes and vigorous philosophical insights on Old World Cracow and Ivy League America; Polish anti-Semitism; the degradations suffered by immigrants; Hoffman's cultural nostalgia, self-analysis and intellectual passion; and the atrophy of her Polish from disuse and her own disabling inarticulateness in English as a newcomer. Linguistic dispossession, she explains, "is close to the dispossession of one's self." As Hoffman savors the cadences and nuances of her adopted language, she remains ever conscious of assimilation's perils: "But how does one bend toward another culture without falling over, how does one strike an elastic balance between rigidity and self-effacement?"


From Azar Nafisi's Website: http://azarnafisi.com/books/reading-lolita-in-tehran/

Every Thursday morning for two years in the Islamic Republic of Iran, Azar Nafisi, a bold and inspired teacher, secretly gathered seven of her most committed female students to read forbidden Western classics. Some came from conservative and religious families, others were progressive and secular; some had spent time in jail. They were shy and uncomfortable at first, unaccustomed to being asked to speak their minds; but soon they removed their veils and began to speak more freely, their stories intertwining with the novels they were reading by Jane Austen, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Henry James, and Vladimir Nabokov. As Islamic morality squads staged arbitrary raids in Tehran, as fundamentalists seized hold of the universities and a blind censorship stifled artistic expression, the women in Nafisi’s living room spoke not only of the books they were reading but also about themselves, their dreams and disappointments.


This book transcends categorization as memoir, literary criticism or social history, though it is superb as all three. Literature professor Nafisi returned to her native Iran after a long education abroad, remained there for some 18 years, and left in 1997 for the United States, where she now teaches at Johns Hopkins. Woven through her story are the books she has taught along the way, among them works by Nabokov, Fitzgerald, James and Austen. She casts each author in a new light, showing, for instance, how to interpret The Great Gatsby against the turbulence of the Iranian revolution and how her students see Daisy Miller as Iraqi bombs fall on Tehran. “Daisy is evil and deserves to die,” one student blurts out. “Lolita becomes a brilliant metaphor for life in the Islamic republic. The desperate truth of Lolita's story is . . . the confiscation of one individual's life by another,” Nafisi writes. “The parallel to women's lives is clear: we had become the figment of someone else's dreams. A stern ayatollah, a self-proclaimed philosopher-king, had come to rule our land . . . And he now wanted to re-create us.” Nafisi's Iran, with its omnipresent slogans, morality squads and one central character struggling to stay sane, recalls literary totalitarian worlds from George Orwell's 1984 to Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale. Nafisi has produced an original work on the relationship between life and literature.


In this autobiographical work, Rodriguez attempts to put forth his views on a number of topics within a personal context. He does this within the framework of his being Mexican-American. His parsing of the effect that education had on his life is both interesting and food for thought. While education provided a means of connecting to the world outside his cultural enclave, it also created a distance between him and his cultural roots. As he assimilated into the larger world outside his immediate cultural milieu, it created a divide between him and his parents. As they remained in their self-contained, unassimilated world, only
their mutual love for each other was able to bridge the chasm that education created, for figuratively they no longer spoke the same language.

Likewise, the impact and influence that his early Catholic parochial school experience had on him resonated with me, as I myself was a product of such schooling. His reminiscences brought back many memories for me, most of them positive ones, despite some of the obvious pitfalls inherent in that sometimes narrow, parochial education framework that often favored rote learning over intellectual or critical thinking. Indeed, his love of reading, as did mine, emanated from that early educational experience, which greatly emphasized reading. The impact and influence that Catholicism had on him had are fertile grounds for discussion in the context of liturgical reform and its effects upon community. As a Catholic having lived through the reforms initiated by Vatican II, I understand and appreciate his analysis of the demystification of the liturgy and the loss of the mystical in its transition from Latin into a vernacular language in its celebration of the concept of community. These reflections are intermingled with his thoughts on the Catholicism that he was taught in school by the nuns, a Catholicism that was influenced by the "bleak melancholic strain" that runs through Irish Catholicism.

The author’s personal educational experiences and reflections have caused him to formulate certain views on bilingual education and affirmative action. His views on these issues are the very same views that I hold. Being a Cuban-American, I relate to many of his experiences as a Mexican-American, and his careful analysis of these issues hits home in many ways. Integrated into his analysis is a certain amount of irony. I agree that, oftentimes, a minority who has succeeded academically and professionally is often marginalized by society, relegated to speaking for all minorities, as if one size fits all. Missing from the equation, now a parody of social reform, is the fundamental issue of social class. It is an issue that is largely unaddressed in programs of social reform. For those who claim that the author was the beneficiary of affirmative action, it should be noted that the author would have been able to get into Stanford, where he went to college, on his own merits, as he was certainly not educationally disadvantaged. Moreover, as a scholar who desired the intellectual stimulation of academic life, he chose to give it up as a form of protest against affirmative action. Instead, he became a noted essayist and social critic.

What is also of interest in this book is what is missing. As I read the book, the sense of estrangement from his family was palpable, as was his loneliness and the lack of any mention of social congress. His was, indeed, a solitary existence, as if the author were not yet in touch with a part of himself that he had sublimated. His sexual identity is a totally blank slate within the pages of this book, as if a portion of himself had been excised. Where it is indirectly alluded to, it is ambiguous, at best, referred to as sexual anxieties. At Stanford, he notes, however, that he began to have something of a "conventional" sex life. This, I felt was a curious use of the adjectival and more meaningful within the context of what is not discussed. His mother called him, "Mr. Secrets", ostensibly because he told her little about his work in San Francisco. As a mother, I suspect it is probably because she already knew at some level what the author was reluctant to reveal at the time, even to himself. Later on, the author made a declaration that was probably already subliminally known to his family. As did his educational advancement, this secret may have also contributed to his feeling of estrangement from his family and his culture. After all, in the world of machismo, the concept of homosexuality is one that many traditional Latino families still have difficulty accepting. It took the author many years to come to grips with his sexual orientation. It was only years later that he publicly acknowledged what is evident to the discerning reader of this book.