

SUNY Oswego
Course Outline for Project SMART/BLEND Summer 2009

- I. COURSE NUMBER AND CREDIT: EDU 505 & EAD 600, 3 semester hours
- II. COURSE TITLE: Using Technology to Support Multiple Literacies
- III. COURSE DESCRIPTION: In this 22nd annual institute of Project SMART, participants will examine the role of technology in supporting critical literacy through Student-centered, Multicultural, Active, Real-world Teaching for social justice (SMART). They will learn about readily available technologies and software such as cell phones, Skype™, YouTube™, and Facebook™ and will examine their role in supporting K-12 learners, particularly low socio-economic status (SES) and Special Education (SPE) students. They will develop leadership strategies for supporting teacher professional development in this area. Teacher leaders will investigate the role of organizational change theory and practice as they develop an integrated model that reflects the technology and relevant professional development needs of a school building and is congruent with the school district's technology plan.
- IV. PREREQUISITES: Acceptance in Project SMART Summer Institute for 2009.
- V. JUSTIFICATION FOR COURSE:

This course is part of Project SMART/BLEND, 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 teacher/leaders from Oswego County, Syracuse City, and New York City schools, as well as school inspectors from Benin, West Africa, 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. Teacher leaders will use this reflective process to plan for the upcoming year. Teachers will bring data on these topics and will have conversations about how students engaged with the technologies used and how learning in core curricular areas was impacted.

- VI. COURSE OBJECTIVES: As a result of taking this course, participants will be able to:
 - 1. Examine current research on using technology to support critical literacy and apply to one or more curricular areas relevant to the focus of their teacher/leader team.

2. Explore and critically examine a range of technologies/strategies showcased in the institute including web based learning, YouTube™, Face book™ , 2nd Life, Skype™, ANGEL, Cell phones, MP3 players, digital video, interactive whiteboards, tablets/computers, handhelds, graphic calculators/projector, Lego Mind storms™. Teacher leaders will select the most promising technologies/strategies to address the needs of learners in their context and develop action plans for implementing during the next school year, and providing professional development within their school/district contexts.
3. Learn strategies for becoming advocates for appropriate and adequate technology based instruction to support critical literacy for all students and their families in schools and with institutions beyond the school.
4. 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 through technology support in one or more core curricular areas.
5. Participate in GESA awareness sessions, updates, three day facilitator training, or GESA for Administrators, based on their current level of familiarity with GESA.
6. Design a technology integration model that incorporates organizational change theory and practice, and enhances the school/district's current technology plan and related professional development.

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 update and focus is on deepening facilitation skills, increasing repertoire of awareness activities about anti-bias teaching, and increasing knowledge about the research base through participation in GESA workshops as well as ongoing GESA on-line learning community.
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, applying appropriate technologies/strategies.
4. Teachers reflect and report on their own learning and formulate professional development goals and an action plan for the upcoming year.
5. Teacher leaders research effective models for organizational change that reflect current strategies for effective technology integration that is congruent with districts' technology plans and goals.

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

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 technology to support critical literacy and GESA professional development sessions; (3)

complete a team report on disaggregated student performance data and an action plan for curriculum using technology to support critical literacy, instruction, assessment, and professional development. (4) Design a professional development presentation that integrates organizational change theory and practice.

X. MEANS OF EVALUATION: 33% review, reflect upon, and share past curriculum, instruction, and professional development activities in light of new information and demonstrate knowledge of organizational change theory and practice; 33% planning for upcoming curriculum, instruction and professional development activities and the development and implementation of an effective professional development presentation; 33% attendance and participation that demonstrates individual competence and teaming skills.

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 TLQP 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 teacher leaders, 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.

Angeli, C., & Valanides, N. (2004). The effect of electronic scaffolding for technology integration on perceived task effort and confidence of primary student teachers. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 37(1), 29.

Banks, J. (2008, April). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher*. 37(3) 129-139.

Barth, R. (2001). *Learning By Heart*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Bransford, J., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.) (1999). How people learn: Brain, mind experience, and school. Washington, DC: National Academy Press

Behrman, E.H. (2006, March). Teaching about language, power, and text: A review of classroom practices that support critical literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*. 49(6), 490-498

- Bergmann, S. (2007). *Lead me I dare you*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education
- 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.
- Bolman, L. & Deal, T. (2003). *Reframing Organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass.
- Collier, S. (2004). Infusing technology skills into a teacher education program: Change in students' knowledge about and use of technology. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 12(3), 447-468.
- 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.
- Davis, N. E., & Roblyer, M. D. (2005). Preparing teachers for the schools that technology built. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 37(4), 399-409.
- Donovan, S. & Bransford, J. (2005). *How students learn: History, mathematics, and science in the classroom*: National Academies Press.
- 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.
- Espinosa, L. M., & Chen, W.-J. (2001). The role of technology in supporting multiage classroom practices. *Information Technology in Childhood Education Annual*, 5-31.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Garofalo, J., Drier, H., Harper, S., Timmerman, M. A., & Shockey, T. (2000). Promoting appropriate uses of technology in mathematics teacher preparation. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 1(1), 66-88.
- 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.

- Gladwell, M. (2000). *The tipping point*. Boston: Little Brown and Company.
- Gossett, T. F. (1997) *Race the history of an idea in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Higginbotham, Jr., A. L. (1978) *In the matter of color: race and the American legal process*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Howard, G.R..(March 2007). As diversity grows, so must we. *Educational Leadership*, 64(6), 16-22.
- Hung, D. (2001). Theories of learning and computer-mediated instructional technologies. *Education Media International*, 281–287.
- Li, Q. (2005). Infusing technology into a mathematics methods course: Any impact? *Educational Research*, 47(2), 217.
- Jones, C. A. (2001). Tech support: Preparing teachers to use technology. *Principal Leadership*, 1(9), 35–39.
- Kellner, D. (2000). New technologies/new literacies: Reconstructing education for the new millennium. *Philosophy of Education Yearbook*, 21-36.
- Kress, G. (2006). Literacy in the new media age; Reading Images: The grammar of visual designs. New York: *Routledge and Taylor & Francis Group*.
- Kist, W. (2004). *New Literacies in a Action: Teaching and learning in multiple media*. New York: *Teachers College, Columbia University*
- Lucas,T., & Villegas, A.M. (March 2007). The culturally responsive teacher. *Educational Leadership*, 64(6), 28-33.
- Marshall, C. (2006). *Leadership for social justice: making revolutions in education*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

- Martin-Kniep, G. (2007) *Communities that learn, lead & last: building and Sustaining Educational Experience*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.
- 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.
- Munro, J.H. (2008). *Round table viewpoints, Organizational leadership*. Dubuque, IA: McGraw-Hill.
- Murrell, Jr. P. C. (2001). *The community teacher: A new framework for effective urban teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Owens, R.G. (2004). *Organizational behavior in education: adaptive leadership and school reform*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Patterson, J. (2003). *Coming even cleaner about organizational change*. Lanham: MD: The Scarecrow Press.
- Payne, R. K. (1998). *A framework for understanding poverty*. Revised Edition. Highlands, Texas: RFT Publishing Company.
- Qing, L. (2007). Student and teacher views about technology: A tale of two cities? *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 39(4), 377-397.
- Qualls, A. L. (1998). Culturally responsive assessment: Development strategies and validity issues. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 67(3), 296-301.
- Rakes, G. C., Flowers, B. F., Casey, H. B., & Santana, R. (1999). An analysis of instructional technology use and constructivist behaviors in K-12 teachers. *International Journal of Educational Technology*, 1(2), 1-18. 101
- Reeves, D. (2009). *Leading change in your school. How to conquer myths, build commitment, and get results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD
- Remaley, M.H., & Wadsworth, D. (March 2007). What families want. *Educational Leadership*, 64(6), 23-27.
- Roblyer, M. D., & Edwards, J. (2000) *Integrating educational technology into teaching*.

Upper Saddle River, NJ. Prentice Hall.

- 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.
- Schmoker, M. (1999). *Results the key to continuous school improvement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Sime, D., & Priestley, M. (2005). Student teachers' first reflections on information and communications technology and classroom learning: Implications for initial teacher education. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 21(2), 130-142.
- Skouras, A. S. (2006). Coordinating formal and informal aspects of mathematics in a computer based learning environment. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science & Technology*, 37(8), 947-964.
- Spector, K., Jones, S. (September 2007). Constructing Anne Frank: Critical literacy and the Holocaust in eighth-grade English. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 51(1), 36-48
- 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.
- Wepner, S. B., & Tao, L. (2002). From master teacher to master novice: Shifting responsibilities in technology-infused classrooms. *The Reading Teacher*, 55, 642-651.
- Willingham, D. T. (2007). Critical thinking: Why is it so hard to teach? *American Educator*, 31(2), 8-19.
- Wursta, M., Brown-DuPaul, J., & Segatti, L. (2004). Teacher education: Linking theory to practice through digital technology. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 28(10), 787.
- Zinn, H. (1995). *A people's history of the United States: 1492- present, revised and updated edition*, New York: HarperPerennial

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.