

**GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT**

EDUC 850
The Study of Teaching
Spring, 2012
Wednesday, 4:30 – 7:10, Thompson L003

Gary Galluzzo

West 2202

703.993.2567

ggalluzz@gmu.edu

Office hours: M/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. (2009). *A conception of teaching*. New York: Springer.

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

Lemov, D. (2010). *Teach like a champion*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

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.
- Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research* 77 (1), 113-143. DOI:10.3102/003465430298563
- Clark, C.M. & Peterson, P.L. (1996). Teachers' thought processes, in M. Wittrock (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. New York: Macmillan.
- Floden, R.E. (2001). Research on effects of teaching: A continuing model for research on teaching, in V. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*, (4th ed). Washington, DC: AERA.
- Goddard, R.D. & Goddard, Y.L. (2001). A multilevel analysis of teacher and collective efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 807-818.
- Harris, D. & Rutledge, S. (2010). Models and predictors of teacher effectiveness: A comparison of research about teaching and other occupations. *Teachers College Record*, 112, 914-960.
- 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.
- Morris, A. & Hiebert, J. (2011). Creating shared instructional products: An alternative approach to improving teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 40(5), 5-14. DOI: 10.3102/0013189X10393501
- 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.
- Porter, A. C. (2002, October). Measuring the content of instruction: Uses in research and practice. *Educational Researcher* 31(7), 3-14.

- 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.
- Silva, E. (2007). *On the clock: Rethinking the way schools use time*. Washington, DC: Education Sector.
- Stuhlman, M.W., Hamre, B.K., Downer, J.T. & Pianta, R.C. (n.d.). *A practitioner's guide to conducting classroom observations: What the research tells us about choosing and using observational systems*. Unpublished report. Charlottesville, VA: Curry School of Education.
- 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.
- Tyler, L. (2010, January 26). Measuring teaching effectiveness. *Education Week*. 29(19), 18-19
- 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.

Recommended Text:

Publication of the American Psychological Association. 6th ed. (2009).

Additional readings posted on <https://mymasonportal.gmu.edu/webapps/portal/frameset.jsp>

Some Relevant Websites:

<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>

Supplies

Computer with Internet access and current GMU email account.

CEHD Student Expectations

- **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. Late assignments will not be accepted without making prior arrangements with me.
- **Honor Code:** Students must adhere to the guidelines of the George Mason University Honor Code [See <http://academicintegrity.gmu.edu/honorcode/>].
- **Exceptionalities:** Students with disabilities who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with the George Mason University Office of Disability Services (ODS) and inform their instructor, in writing, at the beginning of the semester [See <http://ods.gmu.edu/>].
- **Computing:** Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing [See <http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/1301gen.html>].
- **Email:** Students are responsible for the content of university communications sent to their George Mason University email account and are required to activate their account and check it regularly. All communication from the university, college, school, and program will be sent to students solely through their Mason email account.
- **Distractions:** Students must follow the university policy stating that all sound emitting devices shall be turned off during class unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.
- **Dispositions:** Students are expected to exhibit professional behaviors and dispositions at all times.

Campus Resources

- The George Mason University Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) staff consists of professional counseling and clinical psychologists, social workers, and counselors who offer a wide range of services (e.g., individual and group counseling, workshops and outreach programs) to enhance students' personal experience and academic performance [See <http://caps.gmu.edu/>].
- The George Mason University Writing Center staff provides a variety of resources and services (e.g., tutoring, workshops, writing guides, handbooks) intended to support students as they work to construct and share knowledge through writing [See <http://writingcenter.gmu.edu/>].
- For additional information on the College of Education and Human Development, Graduate School of Education, please visit our website [See <http://gse.gmu.edu/>].

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 format for the entire paper is:

- The nature of the problem/purpose of the study
- What others who have studied this problem have found
- A description of the next study you think should be conducted
- A description of how you would conduct it
- A brief discussion of why this study has educational significance

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: No later than March 21

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, the digital object identifier (doi) and then four to six sentences describing the reference. Refer to APA 6 guidelines. **Due: No later than April 11**

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 a 250 word abstract, an introduction to the problem, a statement of the problem, a literature review, and a proposed method with instrumentation for studying the problem. **Due: May 9**

Tentative Schedule

Topic

January

25

Introductions, syllabus, background for the course
 Art or Science?
 Read "The Widget Effect" on blackboard
 Read "What Makes a Great Teacher?" on blackboard
 Read "Models and Predictors" on blackboard

February

1 Positivism, Nate Gage, and the foundations of research on teaching
Read Gage, pp. 11-40
Read Floden on blackboard course content
Read “Measuring teaching effectiveness” on blackboard

8 Can teaching be measured?
Read Hattie, pp. 1-38
Read Lemov, pp. 1-23
Read Fenstermacher and Richardson on blackboard
Read Rust on blackboard course content

15 Quantitative or Qualitative?
Read Gage, pp. 41-60
Read Crawford & Impara on blackboard
Read Eisenhart on blackboard

22 Good Teachers...
Read Naison on blackboard
Read Hattie, pp. 108-128
Read Lemov, pp. 24-56; 167-202
Read Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy on blackboard

29 Curriculum and Methods
Read Hattie, pp. 129-160 and 200-235

March

7 What Teachers Do: Teacher Behavior
Read Gage, pp. 61-84
Read Lemov, pp. 71-109
Read “Time and Learning” on blackboard
Read Rosenshine and Stevens on blackboard

14 Spring Break

21 What Teachers Do: Teacher Behavior
Lemov, pp. 111-144
Read Brophy and Good on blackboard
Read “Teacher Praise” on blackboard
Task #1 due today

- 28 Summarizing Teacher Behavior
 Read Hattie, pp. 161-236
 Read Lemov, pp. 235-245
 Read Cornelius and White on blackboard
 Read Silva “On the clock” on blackboard
- April
- 4 It’s the Decisions They Make: Teacher Thoughts/Cognitions
 Read Lemov, pp. 57-70
 Read Clark and Peterson on blackboard
- 11 You Can’t Teach What You Don’t Know: Teacher Content Knowledge
 Read Gage, pp. 85-99
 Read Shulman on blackboard
 Read Wilson, Shulman, and Richert on blackboard
 Read Porter on blackboard
Task #2 due today
- 18 Teachers’ Effects? You Have to Study the Students!
 Read Hattie, pp. 39-60
 Read both Sanders documents on blackboard
 Read Value-Added Framing paper on blackboard
 Read Amrein-Beardsley on blackboard
 Watch: Value-Added Modeling on blackboard (article optional)
- 25 Well, actually, its multivariate, but we need new hypotheses
 And new forms of research
 Read Seidel and Shavelson on blackboard
 Read Nuthall on blackboard
- May
- 2 Writing week (no class)
- 9 Final paper due

Rubric for Judging Research on Teaching Proposals

| | <i>Accomplished</i> | <i>Basic</i> | <i>Unsatisfactory</i> |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|
| The problem/research question | The problem is clearly stated and its 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 rationale is offered for introducing a new strategy. |
| Quality of writing | The writing lacks a clear and convincing tone. APA guidelines are not closely followed. | The writing is inconsistent with periodic episodes of clarity and logic. APA guidelines are not closely followed. | The writing is clear. The logic of the argument flows easily. APA guidelines are closely followed. |