

ED 790
FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION
Fall 2000
Revised Syllabus

Course Instructors:

	David K. Cohen 4117 School of Education Bldg.	Deborah L. Ball 4119 School of Education Bldg.
Office phone*	647-7449*	647-7449*
Email	dkcohen@umich.edu	dball@umich.edu

Secretary: Erika Beck, 4204 School of Education Building
Phone: 764-8416

*David and Deborah's assistant: Terri Voskuhl
Fax: (734) 647-6937*

Class email address: ed790@umich.edu

Class meetings:

Wednesdays, September 6 – December 13
1:00 – 4:00pm
2211 School of Education Building (MMCI)

Course focus and purposes:

The purpose of this course is to investigate and reconsider the **foundations of education**. This term is typically used to refer to two different things, both of which will be of interest in this course. One use of the term "foundations" is to identify basic ways of thinking about schooling and formal processes of education. Another meaning of the term refers to the basic social influences on schooling, which typically have been seen as politics, social structure, culture, history, and economics. The basic ways of thinking about education have been thought to lie in those disciplines, sometimes with the addition of philosophy. Courses in this area typically focus both on the structural influences (or issues which enable exploration of those influences), and on classic works in the foundational disciplines which illuminate those influences.

This approach to foundations courses tends to affirm two large assumptions: the conventional social science view that social structure and culture cause individual action, and the equally conventional view that the established disciplines offer adequate frameworks for understanding schools and what transpires inside them. But students often have noticed that the ways in which these structures and cultures actually bear on instruction (by which we mean teaching and learning) often remain unexplored. And some students and faculty have noticed serious limitations in the accounts which politics, social structure, culture, history, and economics offer, both of teaching and learning, and of other professional work like curriculum development and management. Students therefore often were puzzled about the relevance which courses on "foundations" had for teachers, teacher educators, school leaders, and their work.

Our chief purpose in this course is to explore the relations, between presumably foundational structures and disciplines on the one hand, and instruction on the other. To do so we will suspend conventional assumptions about the causal priority of social structures and culture, and will ask whether and how these do affect instruction – as well as how instruction may shape their influence. In the course of doing so we will read leading examples of the ways in which those relations have been portrayed in social science, and inquire about the adequacy of those representations.

We do so for three main reasons. First is that these matters have considerable relevance to our understanding of education. How professionals and researchers understand the enterprise matters for how they frame problems, for the improvements that seem plausible, and for what they expect from schooling. Our understanding of how

schools work depends both on our picture of how teaching and learning are related to their social circumstances, and on the intellectual resources which we use to inquire about the nature of instruction and its relation to its environments.

Second, these issues have practical as well as intellectual interest. For example, if we think that social structure is the chief influence on teaching and learning, we would be inclined to believe that schooling was a weak treatment. For in a society as unequal as the U.S., there would be severe limits on what teachers and schools could do to improve achievement for disadvantaged learners, to enhance social mobility, to reduce bigotry, or to do anything else which ran across the grain of social structure. There would be similarly little which school leaders or curriculum specialists could do to improve instruction. If, by contrast, we thought that social structure was not controlling, we could have rather different ideas about schools' effects, and about what teachers and schools could do to improve achievement for disadvantaged learners. The differences between these two polar views ramify to conceptions of management, professional knowledge and skill, and professional ethics and responsibilities, as well as to ideas about effective practice.

A third reason for our approach is that the issues which we propose to consider are timely. American educators have, for more than two decades, been working in an unprecedented period of school reform. Widely accepted assumptions -- such as the impossibility of intellectually ambitious schoolwork in an anti-intellectual society, or the lack of any significant national role in schooling -- have been re-opened. Several states and localities have taken significant steps to raise the intellectual challenge of academic work, and education has become one of the two or three top issues in state and national politics. The persistent pressure for reform is premised on the notion that schools and teachers could and should be much more effective. Unlike previous waves of reform, contemporary efforts have raised questions about a issues often left untouched, including the nature, role, and effectiveness of professional education and, the relations between schools and their environments. Instead of assuming that improvement can be realized by simple, single steps, like better curriculum, there is a growing sense among reformers that they must deal with the relationships among key elements of schooling, such as curriculum, teachers, students, school organization, and professional education.

This preface suggests that we will venture into difficult territory in this course. There are no settled answers to the issues which we propose to address; ours is a time of extraordinary hope but also appreciable uncertainty. But this is the territory in which members of the class will work, at least for the foreseeable future. We will explore the issues above to develop workable provisional answers, and will consider how the issues may be further explored in subsequent professional education.

Course map:

Three sets of core questions will shape our investigations this term:

1. What relationships exist between social structures (the "social foundations of education") and how schools, teachers, and learners work?
2. How have these relationships between society and schools been portrayed in the literatures of education and social science? How adequate and useful are these portrayals for understanding differences in educational experience and outcomes?
3. What do our answers to the queries above imply about the relations between professionals and students on the one hand, and social structure on the other? What do those answers imply about how we might construe the "foundations" of education? What do they imply for what it would take to improve schools' effectiveness?

In the first section of the course (roughly September 6 – October 18), we examine three bodies of work in which researchers have investigated schooling, and the relationships between social structures and practice within them. We will be concerned both with the ways in which the "foundations" of schooling are portrayed, and with the differences among the analytic frames which scholars bring to their work.

We will begin with studies which view social structure, in this case, social class, as the key determinant of what happens in school. Schools are portrayed as agents for the reproduction of social stratification and inequity. We will investigate how teachers' work is portrayed, what agency they may have, and how change in education is conceived.

The second set of readings concerns the relationships between schools' organization and culture on the one hand, and classroom practice on the other. These studies focus on schools or their departments, not on social systems, and several of them portray differences among elementary schools, and among high school departments, attempt to relate those differences to teaching and learning. These studies offer a perspective on the relations between instruction and its environments which contrasts with that of Bowles and Gintis. Again, we will investigate how teachers' work is portrayed, what agency they may have, and how change in education is conceived.

We then will consider scholarship which examines work inside schools and classrooms. Analysis of this sort focuses on teachers and students, and their interactions. It seeks to illuminate the nature of teaching, or the determinants of effective teaching and learning, or both. Once again we will investigate how teachers' work is portrayed, what agency they may have, and how change in education is construed.

At this point we will compare the three sets of scholarship, and especially their views two issues. What are the "foundations" of education? How can we explain differences in how schools, teachers, and students work, accounting for the roles of social structures, schools' organization and culture, and individual agency? This set of questions will comprise the domain for the first course project (see below).

Comparisons among the studies we have read will allow us to probe further the ways in which instruction is represented in these views. By extension, we will consider the adequacy of the representations of instruction in existing disciplinary accounts. Several additional readings, focusing on the problems of fairly accounting for social structure, school organization and culture, and individual agency in analyses of teaching and learning, will provide more material for our appraisal of the ways in which instruction is represented (October 25 and November 1). In these sessions we will again focus on trying to portray teachers' and students' work, what agency they have, and how change in education is conceived.

We expect that these first parts of the course will open up fundamental questions about the nature of professional work in education, and the appropriate knowledge and norms for teachers and other educational professionals. In the remainder of the course (November 9 – December 13), we will pursue those issues in two ways. One will be to examine professionalism in education, and especially the organization and practice of teaching and professional education, for they are central to the field. To that end we will read and discuss several leading studies of professionalism in education. Second, we will explore what it would take to significantly improve professionalism. To that end we will present several alternative design projects (see below), in which students will design ways to contend with key problems of professional practice.

Other course purposes:

We have designed this course to help you cultivate practices and stances that contribute to disciplined scholarly and professional work. These include how you think, analyze, argue, and write, how you keep track of your ideas as well as others' and ours, and how you use texts, discussions, interactions, people, and experiences, to help yourself develop. Doctoral study involves, in part, learning to participate in new communities of discourse. Hence, the course is designed to 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 participating in these communities. It also involves developing new practices as a learner.

The course also serves as an opportunity for you to build and participate in an intellectual community with others in the doctoral program. The nature of the course work will involve interpreting and analyzing texts, observations, experiences, and other materials, framing and revising questions, making conjectures, and testing alternative assertions. All this involves taking new intellectual risks, and developing a culture in which that is valued, encouraged, and supported is part of our collective work. Further, each of you comes to this class with different experiences, interests, perspectives, and expertise. The opportunity to have your ideas questioned and challenged is crucial to doing good work. Who we are and what we bring to the class can be resources for the course, if we learn to make use of them, and of one another.

We see the course itself as a case of teaching and learning which can become one more resource for our inquiry. Collectively, we can examine and analyze what each of us -- as teachers and students -- does as we construct the curriculum, discourse, relations, and culture of the class. But doing that requires attention to practices of teaching and learning, and making that attention part of the course work.

Course work: Inquiry through reading, practice, discussion, making records, and writing

Reading

We will read a wide variety of texts. The work of the class will depend on reading interactively, on bringing both collective and individual goals to reading, considering, and reconsidering 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 on a subject and one's own development as a scholar.

The following sets of questions offer a framework for reading generously and critically:

- *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 does the author seem to assume? 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 text'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 to and interrogation of the text?
- *What is the author's purpose?*
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 is the relationship between the author's assumptions and ideas and your own understanding?*
How might your response to the work be affected by your values, beliefs, and commitments? Can you read and make sense of the work on its own terms?
- *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?

Using and considering practice

The course seeks to explore a range of explanations for how schools, teachers, and students work. Along the way, we want to work in a grounded way as we explore new lenses and interpretive frameworks. Hence, we will use practice in a variety of forms as a medium for our learning. We will regularly watch videotapes from real classrooms, and read case material, in order to connect the ideas we are reading about to these actual instances of teaching and learning. We refer to this work as work with records of practice, and along the way we will ask questions about what any particular record makes visible, and what it takes to make, interpret, and use records of practice. These are questions central to the course, for they ask what is entailed in perceiving, understanding, and explaining practice. We will also invite others wrestling with these questions to the class to talk with us about their work, and the problems they face. Finally, the major course project will engage you in a design task in a practice setting.

Discussion

Creating thoughtful arguments requires making conjectures and offering justification for them. Sometimes justification comes from the texts -- specific references to an argument that an author has made well. At other times, justification is based on the logical analysis of a term or set of ideas.

Because the course will be run as a seminar, your participation in discussions is important not only for your own learning but also for others. What you learn in this course will be influenced by the degree of everyone's engagement in and contributions to the discussions. Preparing the readings and coming to class with questions, insights, and issues is crucial to making the course work; we rely on everyone's contributions and participation. Building the culture of the class so that genuine inquiry is possible will take all of our efforts to make the seminar a context in which 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. Because we will investigate a complex topic, we will need to try out ideas that are only partially developed. Doing so is an important part of developing the capacity to think in disciplined way, and how we listen to one another, assist with the formulation of an interpretation, question, and challenge will affect the quality of what we can do together. How we listen to others' reactions to our ideas, accommodate critique and questions, change our minds and revise at some times, and reinforce our analyses at others -- all will affect the intellectual culture of the class.

We therefore will need to work attentively on norms for the class. Listening carefully, treating ideas with respect and interest, raising and responding to questions, sharing the floor -- all these will matter in constructing an environment where satisfying and challenging intellectual work can take place. One part of exploring an idea or an argument is to attend closely to it to understand its logic, intention, meaning. Listening generously, assuming that ideas and claims are made for good reasons, is crucial to thinking well. Another part is to be skeptical, to consider what is missing or logically flawed. Using both -- generosity and skepticism -- contributes to careful unpacking of ideas and to good thinking.

Making records

So much whizzes by in class discussions. Sometimes we even lose track of important points, or develop only one aspect of an idea. Potential connections are lost because we forget an earlier point. To enable closer consideration of the "text" we produce as we work in class, we will make collective public records of our discussions, texts to which we can all refer, and that we can modify and extend as we continue to work.

We ask that you also make records of the class discussion, and of your work outside of class, alone and with others. These might be by hand in a single handwritten notebook, with numbered pages, or on your computer with dated or categorical indexing. The important element is to make explicit records of what would otherwise be thinking and talk elusive for ongoing scrutiny. We will talk together about ways to make useful records, and ways to use them productively. Considering how such records are indexed and created is not a minor point, and we urge you to talk with others about how to make usable records -- including links among readings, class discussions, and individual or other out of class work. We will also take this up from time to time explicitly in class.

Writing

Writing is a fourth 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. It is an important part of learning to participate in a community of educational scholars who have a specialized discourse. We have tried to provide occasions to focus on and develop these new aspects of your writing, and the writing assignments are structured to provide guidance and resources, as well as the opportunity for comments and suggestions.

Course requirements:

- 1) Short writing assignments: Everyone will write several short assignments that we design, to help you use the materials we are reading, and to prepare for class work together. We will read these and comment. Writing is a central tool in learning as well as in scholarly work, and we want to provide ample opportunity for you to learn to use writing. Along with reading and discussing, it is a core practice that we want to help you develop.
- 2) Major course projects: Everyone also will complete two larger projects. One, due in early November, will focus on analysis and comparison of the different perspectives that we will have examined by the middle of the term. The second, on which you will begin working in mid-October and complete by the beginning of December, will require you to take the issues of the course into account in designing a scheme to improve practice. While all the projects must focus on designing a means to improve practice, the practices may vary, because we expect that students' interests and career choices differ. The practices in question are teacher education (including professional development), curriculum development, administration, or research on these practices.

Books and course readings

Books are available from Shaman Drum Bookstore, 313 S. State Street, phone 662-7407.

1. Anyon, J. (1997). *Ghetto schooling: A political economy of urban educational reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.
2. Jackson, P. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
3. Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
4. Rosenholtz, S. (1991). *Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Course packet of photocopies of readings will be available from a local printer and on reserve at IRIS (on the second floor of the School of Education). Some readings will also be distributed in class.

Email

We will use email extensively in the course. Please plan to check email regularly and please use the following conventions to make the management of email simpler:

Email attachments should be titled with a conventional label, e.g.: <paper#1_name.doc> or <midterm_name.doc>.

Subject headers: Please also use ED790 in the title of email messages to make them easier to locate and track.

COURSE OUTLINE

Reading and writing assignments are listed with the class for which they are due.

September 6

Introductions to one another and to course

Overview of course scope, purposes, and work; guiding orientations to our work together

Looking at records of practice:

I. *Looking and understanding practice*

1. What is going on in these classrooms? How is it different? Similar?
2. What are the major categories of similarity and difference?
3. Why are these categories important?

II. *Looking at and understanding records of practice*

1. What problems did you have in understanding and interpreting these records of practice?
2. How do these three records of practice differ?
3. What more would you have to know to understand these records?
4. What would you have to learn in order to understand these records?

September 13

Social structures and their effect on schooling

1) Bowles, S. and H. Gintis. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. Preface, and chapters 2, 3, 4 (pp. vii – x; 18 - 124). New York: Basic Books.

1. What role do Bowles and Gintis argue that school teaching and learning play in U.S. society?
2. What role does professional practice play in their account of schooling? What are the key problems which teachers must solve? Was there anything that teachers could do about their situation, in Bowles & Gintis's view? If not, why not? If so, what could they do?
3. What do the answers to the queries above imply about the relations between professionals and students on the one hand, and social and economic structure on the other?
4. What are the foundations of schooling, in their view?

Write a short paper, framed by these questions. Papers are due as email attachments by Tuesday, September 12.

September 20

Schools and the construction of practice

Read:

Rosenholtz, S. (1991). *Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools*. Chapters 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, pp. 1 – 70; 105 – 166. New York: Teachers College Press.

What are the differences between more and less effective schools, according to Rosenholtz?

1. What explains these differences, in Rosenholtz's view? What are the key problems which teachers must solve?

2. What is the role of knowledge, skill, professional norms, and other factors? What role does professional practice play in her picture of schooling?
3. What do the answers to the queries above imply about the relations between professionals and students on the one hand, and social and economic structure on the other?

September 27

Viewing practice from the perspectives of social structure and of schools as workplaces

Small group assignment: Comparing Bowles and Gintis and Rosenholtz through the close study of videotaped records of two classroom lessons. (See handout with details for this assignment.) Group reports due by Monday, October 2 @ 5 p.m.

1. Viewed from the perspective of (a) Bowles and Gintis's ideas, and (b) Rosenholtz's ideas, are there particular elements to which your attention is called? What would each of these authors pay attention to, and what comments might they make?
2. Is there evidence on either of the two tapes that either supports or raises doubts about either Rosenholtz's or Bowles and Gintis's ideas? If there is such evidence, what is it and what does it support or on what does it cast doubt? Please be as specific as possible, with references to particular things in the videos.
3. If there is not such evidence, please discuss what sort of evidence would enable you to consider their ideas in relation to the texts that we have studying. Again, be as specific as possible, with reference to the particular sorts of evidence which would be required, and why.
4. Finally, does watching these tapes raise any significant questions for you about either book? If so, what, and why are those questions raised for you?

October 4

School departments and the construction of practice

Commentaries on small group work from September 27.

Read:

McLaughlin, M. & J. Talbert. (Manuscript in preparation). *Professional communities and the work of high school teaching*. (chaps. 1 –3). Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

1. What were the differences between more and less effective departments, as McLaughlin and Talbert portray them?
2. What explains why some high school departments were more effective than others? What are the key problems which teachers must solve? What was the role of knowledge, skill, professional norms, and other factors? What role does professional practice play in their picture of schooling?
3. What do the answers to the queries above imply about the relations between professionals and students on the one hand, and social and economic structure on the other?
4. What are the foundations of schooling, as McLaughlin and Talbert portray them?

Upcoming assignment:

Midterm paper topic distributed. Due Monday, November 6.

October 11

The work of teachers: Effects on practice

Read:

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapters 1, 4, 5, 6, 8: pp. 1 – 24; 82 – 161; 187-213.

1. What role does professional practice play in Lortie account of schooling? What are they key problems which teachers must solve in their work, according to Lortie?
2. What roles do knowledge, skill, and professional norms play in solving those problems?
3. What elements of the environments in which classrooms exist does Lortie attend to? What does he ignore? How does he address the relations between professionals and students on the one hand, and social and economic structure on the other?
4. What are the foundations of education as Lortie portrays it? Does it even make sense to ask this? Why or why not?
5. How does Lortie's view of the foundations of schooling compare with that of Bowles & Gintis, Rosenholtz, and McLaughlin & Talbert?

Final course project specifications distributed before class on email. Due December 6. We will spend 15 minutes discussing the project in class; please have read the assignment carefully beforehand.

October 18

The work of teachers and students and in environments (Part 1)

Having examined how scholars have considered the relations between society and schools, and sought to explain how schools work, we wonder how much we have probed instruction. We ask how adequate, then, is our understanding of the dynamics of schooling, and explore what it might mean to take teaching and learning as the foundations. In order to investigate the implications of this perspective, we shift here to working from instruction out, considering the work of teachers and students in schools, situated in broader social and political environments. What explanations might be offered, in contrast, for how schools work, and therefore, what it might take to improve how they work?

Read:

Jackson, P. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Lampert, M. (in press). Excerpts from chapters 1, 2, and part of 3, and all of chapter 10: Teaching students to be people who study in school. In *Teaching problems: A study of classroom practice*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

1. How do Jackson and Lampert portray teachers' and students' work, and how do they explain it? How do their accounts compare to those of Lortie, Rosenholtz, and McLaughlin & Talbert?

2. How do these two authors treat the role of the environment in teaching?
3. What key problems must teachers solve in their work?
4. What roles do knowledge, skill, and academic norms play in solving those problems?
5. What elements of the environments in which classrooms exist do Jackson or Lampert attend to in what we read? What do they leave out?
6. What are the foundations of education as seen in this work?

October 25

The work of teachers and students in schools and in environments (Part 2)

Brophy, J. and Good, T. (1986). In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook for research on teaching, 2nd ed*, (pp. 328-375). New York: Macmillan.

Delpit, L. (1985). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58, 280-298.

Lensmire, T. (1993). Following the child, socioanalysis, and threats to community: Teacher response to student texts. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 23, 265-299.

Reissman, F. (1965). *The culturally deprived child*, (pp. 1-9, 65-80). New York: Harper and Row.

1. How do these authors portray teachers' and students' work, and how do they explain it? How do their accounts compare to those of the authors we read previously (McLaughlin & Talbert, Lortie, Jackson, Lampert)?
2. How do these two authors treat the role of the environment in teaching?
3. What role does professional practice play in these authors' accounts of schooling? What key problems must teachers solve in their work?
4. What roles do knowledge, skill, and professional norms play in solving those problems?
5. What elements of the environments in which classrooms exist do any of these authors attend to? What do they leave out?
6. What are the foundations of education as seen in this work?

November 1

Teaching and learning with environments: How can teachers' and students' work be redesigned and reinterpreted?

Carol Lee, Northwestern University

Read:

Lee, C., Rivers, A., Hutchinson, K, Dixon, K. (2000, April). *Participatory appropriation and its consequences in a cultural modeling classroom*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Lee, C. and Majors, Y. (2000, April). *Cultural modeling's response to Rogoff's challenge: Understanding apprenticeship, guided participation, and participatory appropriation in a culturally-responsive, subject-matter specific context*. Paper presented at the

annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

November 8

Taking stock

Midterm papers due Monday, November 6 at 5 p.m.

Discussion of analyses in papers

November 15

Educational improvement: Conventional approaches

Questions for reading and discussion: What are the relations between educational improvement and the foundations of schooling? What happens to improvement when the foundations are neither well understood nor adequately managed?

Sarason, S. (1996). *Revisiting "The Culture of the school and the problem of change."* New York: Teachers College Press. pp. 1-3, 15-20, chapters 1, 2, 3 (pp.23-91), chapter 8 (pp. 243-271), and pp. 272-84.

Welch, W. (1979). Twenty years of science curriculum development: A look back. *Review of Research in Education*, 7, 282- 306.

November 22

Professional education and socialization: Conventional approaches

Questions for reading and discussion: What are the relations between professional education and the foundations of schooling? What happens to professional education when the foundations are neither well understood nor adequately managed?

Lanier, J. and Little, J. (1986). *Research on teacher education.* New York: Macmillan. pp. 528 - 556.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapters 2 and 3, pp. 25- 81.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of teacher education "washed out" by school experience? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 32 (3), 7- 11.

November 29

Historical evidence on school improvement

Questions for reading and discussion: How do differences in how school systems manage educational improvement and the foundations of schooling affect the course of improvement? How far did the Denver and New York systems get in managing the foundations of schooling? Could they have done more? If so, what? If not, why not?

Cuban, L. (1993). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms 1890- 1990.* New York: Teachers College Press. pp. 15 - 20, chaps. 1, 2, 3, and 8; pp. 273-284.

December 6

Educational improvement and professional education

Questions for reading and discussion: What were the elements which District 2 leaders used to manage school improvement? In what respects did they differ from the managerial approach in Denver? In New York City? What does this imply for planning and enacting school improvement?

What are the key differences between teacher education in the U.S., and China and Japan? What explains the U.S. situation?

Elmore, R. F. and Burney, Deanna. (1999). Investing in teacher learning: Staff development and instructional improvement. In L. Darling-Hammond and G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 263-291). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Paine, L. and L. Ma. (1993). Teachers working together: A dialogue on organizational and cultural perspectives of Chinese teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 19, 675-697.

Shimahara, N. K. (1998). The Japanese model of development: Teaching as craft. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14, 451-462.

December 13

Design projects