GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

EDUC 850
The Study of Teaching
Spring, 2010
Wednesday, 4:30 – 7:10, Enterprise 275

Gary Galluzzo
Robinson A-339A
703.993.2004
ggalluzz@gmu.edu
Office hours: T/W/Th: 2:30 – 4 (or by appt.)

Course Description: Explores the history and development of the search for teaching effectiveness. The course will trace the various definitions of effectiveness and the methods created to study and determine effectiveness.

Course Objectives:

Upon completion of this course, the students will:

1. trace the history of research on teaching.
2. compare and contrast the multiple perspectives that researchers have brought to the field.
3. learn to pose researchable questions to advance this literature both substantively and methodologically.
4. continue to improve your writing skills as doctoral students.

Relationship of EDUC 850 to the Ph.D. Program

The content of this course is the foundation for the specialization in Teaching and Teacher Education. It explores the history of the research-base for teaching and for the continued study of teaching and builds a sense of inquiry into the students' repertoire.

Required Course Texts:

Gage, N.L. (2009). *A conception of teaching*. New York: Springer.

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning*. New York: Routledge.

Additional Required and Suggested Readings

Bangert, R.L., Kulik, C.C., Kulik, J.A., & Morgan, M.T. (1991). The instructional effects of feedback on test-like events. *Review of Educational Research*, 61(2), 213-238.

Black, P.J., & William, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy, and Practice*, 5(1), 7-73.

Brophy, J.E. & Good, T.L. (1996). Teacher behavior and student achievement, in M. Wittrock (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. New York: Macmillan.

Clark, C.M. & Peterson, P.L. (1996). Teachers' thought processes, in M. Wittrock (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. New York: Macmillan.

Goddard, R.D. & Goddard, Y.L. (2001). A multilevel analysis of teacher and collective efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17,* 807-818.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.

Marzano, R. (2007). *The art and science of teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Naftulin, D., Ware, J., Donnelly, F. (1973). The Doctor Fox lecture: A paradigm of educational seduction. *Journal of medical education*, 48, 630-635.

Nuthall, G. (2005). The cultural myths and realities of classroom teaching and learning: A personal journey. *Teachers College Record. 107*, 895-934.

Rosenshine, B., (2002). Converging practices on classroom instruction. In A. Molnar (ed*.). School reform proposals: The research evidence*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University Research Policy Unit.

Rosenshine, B. & Stevens, R. (1996). Teaching functions, in M. Wittrock (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. New York: Macmillan.

Seidel, T. & Shavelson, R. (2007). Research on teacher effectiveness in the past decade: The role of theory and research in disentangling meta-analyses research. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(4), 454-499.

Shulman, L.S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, *15*(2), 4-14.

Shulman, L.S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations for the new reform. *Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.

Toch, T. (October/November, 2005). Measure for measure. *Washington Monthly*.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68,* 202-248.

Wilson, S.M., Shulman, L.S., and Richert, A.E. (1987). "150 different ways of knowing: Representations of knowledge in teaching. In J. Calderhead (ed.), *Exploring teachers' thinking*. London: Cassell Educational.

<u>Recommended Text</u>:

<u>Publication of the American Psychological Association</u>. 6th ed. (2009).

Additional readings posted on blackboard.com

<u>Some Relevant Websites:</u>

http://www.aera.net/divisions/?id=76 This is the website for Division K of the American Educational Research Association. Division K is devoted to research on Teaching and Teacher Education.

The Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. http://www.depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. http://www.carnegiefoundation.org

<u>Supplies</u>

Computer with Internet access and current GMU email account.
<u>CEHD Course Expectations</u>

The College of Education and Human Development (CEHD) expects that all students abide by the following:

- **Professional Dispositions**: Students are expected to exhibit professional behavior and dispositions. See http://www.gse.gmu.edu/facultystaffres/profdisp.htm for a listing of these dispositions.

- **Attendance**: Attendance is mandatory, as the discussions that take place in this class are essential to achieving the course objectives.

- **Tardiness**: Prompt arrival for the beginning of class is expected.

- **Participation**: Each student is expected to complete all the assigned readings and participate in the discussions. It is expected that each student will be attuned to group dynamics in order to ensure the active participation of all in the class.

- **Absence**: If you must miss a class, you are responsible for notifying me (preferably in advance) and for completing any assignments, readings, etc. before the start of the next class.

- **Assignments**: All assignments must be completed in MSWord and sent to me as an attachment via email prior to class on the date each is due. Late assignments will not be accepted without making prior arrangements with me.

- **University Honor Code**: Students must follow the guidelines of the University Honor Code. See http://www.gmu.edu/catalog/apolicies/#TOC_H12 for the full honor code.

- **Students with disabilities** who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with the GMU Disability Resource Center (DRC) and inform the instructor, in writing, at the beginning of the semester. See www.gmu.edu/student/drc or call 703-993-2474 to access the DRC.

- **Computing Use**: Students must agree to abide by the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing. See http://mail.gmu.edu and click on Responsible Use of Computing at the bottom of the screen.

Course Delivery

This course is a doctoral seminar. As such it is expected that you will read in advance of class and continue to try to find the bigger picture as you learn to sort through the findings of one study to the next. In addition to classroom attendance and participation, I expect you to participate fully in whole class and small group discussions, group, pair, and individual projects, internet research, analyses of case studies, and reflections on practice. I will use GMU's web-accessible Blackboard course framework periodically throughout the course; many of the examples are posted there for you to read in advance of our discussions.

Course Assignment

There is only one assignment: a well-integrated research proposal. In this paper, I want you to identify a researchable problem in your area of study, e.g. content area teaching, media and technology, diverse classrooms, etc. and to prepare a literature review of the relevant research that would serve as a proposal to conduct a study. You are not expected to conduct the study, just to gain some deeper understanding of your area as it relates to the study of teaching and to identify the next best research question.

NB: Two of the citations must be dissertations. In this way, you will see some models of other dissertations so you can get a sense of what goes into preparing your own.

The format for the entire paper is:
- The nature of the problem/purpose of the study
- What others who have studied this problem have found
- (Locating a gap in the literature) a description of the next study you think should be conducted
- A description of the methods you would use to conduct the study

See the rubric below for how I will be reviewing these papers.

As you review your research studies, please use the following format:
- The nature of the problem
- The subjects/participants studied
- The methods used to conduct the study
- The findings
- The conclusions

I'm using these two formats to help you with your writing as you proceed toward your dissertation. So often the findings from studies are affected by the nature of the first four bullets above. I'm having you "track" these because they are essential to determining whether a study is worth citation in your work.

Three Tasks
These tasks are intended to encourage you to think about your perspective and skill as a beginning researcher.

Task #1: For this first assignment, I would like you to give me a statement of the problem about which you want to know more. It must be a problem that focuses on the study of *teaching* in any of its various forms. I don't expect you to break new ground, but do expect you to be grounded in extant literature. *Due: March 24*

Task #2: For this second assignment, I would like an annotated bibliography of the studies you are considering for your final paper. *Please use the following format*: Author (last name first). (date). Title. Publication information, e.g. journal with volume and number; or for a book location and publisher; or URL and date retrieved, and then four to six sentences describing the reference. Refer to APA guidelines. *Due: April 7*

Task #3: A Proposal for a Study of Teaching. A well-integrated review of the literature in support of a researchable problem. The real goal of this task is to give you a chance to go beyond writing another paper, and to get you closer to the actual task of identifying a good problem and writing up the literature to make your case for conducting the study. This is a proposal with an introduction, a statement of the problem, a literature review, and a proposed method with instrumentation for studying the problem. *Due: May 12*

Tentative Schedule	**Topic**
January	
20	Introductions, syllabus, background for the course
	Art or Science?
27	Positivism, Nate Gage, and the foundations of research on teaching
	Read Gage, pp. 11-40
	Read Floden on e-reserve
February	
3	Can teaching be measured?
	Read Hattie, pp. 1-38
	Read Fenstermacher and Richardson on blackboard
10	Quantitative or Qualitative?
	Read Gage, pp. 41-60
	Read Crawford & Impara on e-reserve
	Read Eisenhart on e-reserve

17	Good People are Good Teachers: Teacher Personality Read Hattie, pp. 108-128 Read Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk, and Hoy on blackboard Read Goddard and Goddard on e-reserve
24	Curriculum Read Hattie, pp. 129-160

March
3	Maybe it's the Methods Teachers Use Read Hattie, pp. 200-235
10	Spring Break
17	What Teachers Do: Teacher Behavior Read Gage, pp. 61-84 Read "Time and Learning" on blackboard Read Rosenshine and Stevens on electronic reserve
24	What Teachers Do: Teacher Behavior Read Brophy and Good on electronic reserve Read "Teacher Praise" on blackboard *Task #1 due today*
31	Summarizing Teacher Behavior Read Hattie, pp. 161-236

April
7	It's the Decisions They Make: Teacher Thoughts Read Clark and Peterson on e-reserve
14	You Can't Teach What You Don't Know: Teacher Content Knowledge Read Gage, pp. 85-99 Read Shulman on e-reserve Read Wilson, Shulman, and Richert on e-reserve *Task #2 due today*
21	You Have to Study the Students! Read Hattie, pp. 72-107 Read both Sanders documents on blackboard Read The Widget Effect on blackboard Read Amrein-Beardsley on blackboard
28	Maybe the School Influences Student Learning Hattie, pp. 61-71

May

   5   Well, actually, its multivariate, but we need new hypotheses
And new forms of research
Read Seidel and Shavelson on blackboard
Read Nuthall on blackboard

  12   Presentation of papers
Final papers due

Rubric for Judging Research on Teaching Proposals

	Accomplished	*Basic*	*Unsatisfactory*
The problem/research question	The problem is clearly stated and it significance to the field is discussed	The problem is clearly stated, but the significance is neither discussed nor does it place the problem in the context of the literature	The problem statement is a collection of global assertions and its significance is neither discussed nor related to the problem
The literature review	The literature review is well-integrated with the logic within each set of studies tight and the transitions from one set of studies to another drawn clearly	The literature review is "reportorial" i.e., a mechanical listing and description of each study, but unable to create a coherent "whole" that is tightly supportive of the problem/question	The literature review is vague with global citations that don't describe the studies with enough clarity for the reader to see the argument for the study build from one study to the next
The proposed subjects	The subjects are consistent with previous research and are appropriate for the problem under study, or if the subjects represent a new group, the rationale for their inclusion is clearly made.	The subjects are consistent with previous research and are appropriate for the problem under study.	The subjects are inconsistent with previous research or no explanations are offered for studying a different set of subjects.
The proposed methods	The methods are consistent with previous research and are appropriate for the problem under study, or if the methods introduce a new strategy, the rationale is made clear.	The methods are consistent with previous research and are appropriate for the problem under study.	The methods are inconsistent with previous research or no rational is offered for introducing a new strategy.