

SUNY Oswego
Course Outline for Project SMART 2007

- I. COURSE NUMBER AND CREDIT: EDU 505 - 3 SH
- II. COURSE TITLE: Looking Back, Looking Forward: Twenty Years of Professional Development.
- III. COURSE DESCRIPTION: In this 20th annual institute of Project SMART, participants will examine a range of models for parent and community involvement to support inquiry-oriented, teaching for social justice. They will consider the role of this professional development program in light of their own professional experiences, in relation to the experiences of their colleagues, and within the scope of the School of Education's Conceptual Framework, the NYS Learning Standards, NCLB, and National Board Certification.
- IV. PREREQUISITES: Acceptance in Project SMART for 2007.
- V. JUSTIFICATION FOR COURSE:
This course is part of Project SMART, a year-round professional development initiative that provides on-going, sustained, collaborative, inquiry-oriented, standards-based experiences for teachers, pre-teachers, and college faculty. This course involves teacher teams in assessing/reflecting on/designing instructional and professional development activities on some aspect(s) of their teaching that relates to student achievement, inquiry, diversity, reflection, authentic learning, and social justice. Participants will include K-12 teachers from Oswego County, the Syracuse City, and New York City schools, supported by higher education faculty.
- Ongoing teams formed in the academic year will use the institute to examine the impacts of the practices implemented during the year on teaching practice and student learning. Teachers will use this reflective process to plan for the upcoming year. Teachers will bring data on these topics and will have conversations about intended and unintended consequences of high stakes testing, with particular attention to the impacts on relationships with parents and communities. Teachers will examine and perhaps develop alternative forms of assessment that empower teachers, parents and students to examine work to represent self-directed learning.
- VI. COURSE OBJECTIVES: As a result of taking this course, participants will be able to:
1. Using "Data Strategies", develop, identify, pilot authentic assessment tasks that provide data about the impact of curriculum they have implemented and/or will implement to assess student progress.
 2. Reflect on approaches to engaging parents and community in school activities, planning, and assessment.

3. Identify aspects of effective school/community partnerships that successfully bridge racial, class, and cultural differences in an inclusive learning community.
4. Learn strategies for helping parents to be advocates and active participants in school decision-making.
5. Based on analysis of data on student learning, plan instruction and curriculum activities for the upcoming year to strengthen partnerships with school and community to improve student learning in one or more core curricular areas.
6. Participate in GESA (Generating Expectations for Student Achievement) Alliance overviews and plan to disseminate this information at their school/district.

VII. COURSE OUTLINE:

1. Study group teams share reports of academic-year instructional and professional development work, including data on teacher learning and student performance.
2. GESA facilitator training orientation (for new participants) or update (for continuing participants) as part of two day GESA Educational Alliance – research, observation, facilitation skills around the five areas of disparity. For those already GESA facilitators—focus is on deepening facilitation skills, increasing repertoire of awareness activities about anti-bias teaching, and increasing knowledge about the research base for GESA.
3. Teams disaggregate data on student and teacher learning in one (or more) core curricular areas, examine and analyze samples of their student work to assess learning outcomes, and plan curriculum and instruction activities to strengthen student learning in the area examined.
4. Teachers reflect and report on their own learning in the area of parent and community involvement, curriculum and instruction, and formulate professional development goals and an action plan for the upcoming year.

VIII. METHODS OF INSTRUCTION: Readings, team discussion, data analysis, dialogues, team sharing.

IX. COURSE REQUIREMENTS: Each student will work on a team to (1) review, reflect on, and share the past year’s professional development activities; 2) participate in overviews or advanced training relating to the GESA professional development model; (3) complete a team report on disaggregated student performance data and an action plan for curriculum, instruction, parent/community involvement, and professional development.

X. MEANS OF EVALUATION: 33% review, reflect upon, and share past curriculum, instruction, and professional development activities in light of new information; 33% planning for upcoming curriculum, instruction and professional development activities; 33% attendance and participation.

XI. RESOURCES: This course will place no additional demands upon the Department or the College. All costs for personnel and materials will be defrayed through a Project

SMART T/LQP grant to the Center for Interdisciplinary Educational Studies at SUNY Oswego.

XII. FACULTY REQUIREMENTS: The course will be instructed by an interdisciplinary team of teacher educators, Project SMART teachers, and consultants involved in Project SMART.

XIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Aikman, S., Challender, C., & Unterhalter, E. (March 2005). The education MDGs: achieving gender equality through curriculum and pedagogy change. *Gender and development*, 13(1), 44-55.

Birchak, B., Connor, C., Crawford, K.M., Kaser, S., Turner & Short, K. (1998). Teacher study groups: Building community through dialogue and reflection. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Bigelow, B., Christensen, L., & Karp, S. (2002). *Rethinking our classrooms: Teaching for equity and justice*. Volume 2. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, Ltd.

Boggs, H. (1996). Launching school change through teacher study groups: An action research project. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Mid-Western Education Research Association, Chicago, IL October 2-5, 1996. ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 402 286.

Burnafor, G., Fischer, J., & Hobson, D. (Eds). (2001). *Teachers doing research: The power of action through inquiry*. Second Edition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1998) *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Davies, D., Henderson, A.T., Johnson, V.R., & Mapp, K.L. (2007). *Beyond the bake sale: the essential guide to family-school partnerships*. New York: The New Press.

Duggan, S., & Gott, R. (2002) Problems with the assessment of performance in practical science: Which way now? *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 32(2), 183-201.

Epstein, J. L. (2005). Attainable Goals? The Spirit and Letter of the No Child Left Behind Act on Parental Involvement. *Sociology of Education*, 78(2), 179-182.

- Fewster, S., & MacMillan, P. D. (May/June 2002). School-based evidence for the validity of curriculum-based measurement of reading and writing. *Remedial and Special Education, 23*(3), 149-56.
- Ginsberg, M.B. (March 2007). Lessons at the kitchen table. *Educational Leadership, 64* (6), 56-61.
- Gipps, C. V. (1999). Socio-cultural aspects of assessment. *Review of Research in Education, 24*.
- Goldstein, H. (2001). Using pupil performance data for judging schools and teachers: Scope and limitations. *British Educational Journal, 27*(4), 433-442.
- Grayson, D. A., & Martin, M. D. (1997). *Generating expectations for student achievement: An equitable approach to educational excellence*. Canyon Lake, CA: Graymill.
- Henderson, A.T., & Mapp, K.L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: the impact of school, family and community connections on student achievement*. Austin, TX: Southwest educational development laboratory.
- Howard, G.R..(March 2007). As diversity grows, so must we. *Educational Leadership, 64*(6), 16-22.
- Lucas,T., & Villegas, A.M. (March 2007). The culturally responsive teacher. *Educational Leadership, 64*(6), 28-33.
- Meier, D. (2000). *Will standards save public education?* Boston: Beacon.
- Meisels, S. J., DiPrima, D., Nicholson, J., & Atkins-Burnett, S. (2001). Parental reactions to authentic performance assessment. *Psychology and behavioral Sciences Collection, 7*(1), 1-24.
- Melaville, A. (n.d.) Community schools: partnerships for excellence. Retrieved May 1, 2007, from the Coalition for community schools website <http://www.communityschools.org/CCSDocuments/partnerships.html>
- Miretzky, D. (2004). The Communication Requirements of Democratic Schools: Parent-Teacher Perspectives on Their Relationships. *Teachers College Record, 106*(4), 814-851.
- Murrell, Jr. P. C. (2001). *The community teacher: A new framework for effective urban teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Payne, R. K. (1998). *A framework for understanding poverty*. Revised Edition.

Highlands, Texas: RFT Publishing Company.

Remaley, M.H., & Wadsworth, D. (March 2007). What families want. *Educational Leadership*, 64(6), 23-27.

Ross, S. M., Nunnery, J. A., Goldfeder, E., McDonald, A., Rachor, R., Hornbeck, M., et al. (2004). Using School Reform Models to Improve Reading Achievement: A Longitudinal Study of Direct Instruction and Success For All in an Urban District. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 9(4), 357-388.

Scott, S. J. (2001). A task-centered *approach* to performance-based assessments. *General Music Today*, 14(3), 10-14.

Tuten, J. (March 2007). There's two sides to every story: How parents negotiate report card discourse. *Language Arts*, 84(4), 314-324.

Vogler, K. E. (2003). An integrated curriculum using state standards in a high-stakes testing environment [Electronic version]. *Middle School Journal*. 34(4), 5-10.

SUNY Oswego's Project SMART is supported by a New York State Education Department's Teacher/Leadership Quality Partnership grant (formerly Dwight D Eisenhower Higher Education Professional Development funds), Entergy, and other local businesses.