**GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY**
College of Education and Human Development

Teacher Development and Education Policy
EDUC 876.X01
Summer 2013

Tuesday/Thursday 7:20-10:00
West Hall 1004

Professor: Dr. Diana D'Amico                                                     Office: 2106 West Hall
Email: **ddamico2@gmu.edu**                                                  Phone: 703.993.5596
Office Hours: By appointment

## Catalog Description:
Focuses on the impact of policy actions at the local, state, and national levels on teacher preparation and continuing professional development.

*Prerequisite*: Admission to the Ph.D. program and EDUC 870 or permission of instructor.

## Student Outcomes:
At the conclusion of this course, students should be able to:

1. Demonstrate a detailed and sophisticated understanding of major policy issues in teacher education and development.

2. Analyze and describe the legal, political, and social forces that influence decision making on these issues.

3. Understand and explain the intersection of teacher policy at various levels (local, state, federal) and research.

4. Analyze existing scholarship around teacher policy and develop a new research agenda.

## Relationship to Program Goals and Professional Organizations:
There are no specialized standards specific to education policy studies. The conceptual framework for this course is linked to the mission of the Center for Education Policy as outlined in its Charter: (1) Translate education research into policy options and recommendations for a variety of audiences (decision makers, practitioners, and the public); (2) Conduct timely, sound, evidence-based analysis; and (3) Develop interdisciplinary and cross-sector policy networks.

## Nature of Course Delivery:
This course is taught using lectures and discussions

**Required Readings:** *All course readings will be available in a shared drop-box folder*

Baker-Doyle, K. (2010). Beyond the labor market paradigm: A social network perspective on teacher recruitment and retention. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *18*(26).

Buck, S., & Greene, J. P. (2011). Blocked, diluted, and co-opted. *Education Next*, *11*(2), 26–38.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). The problem of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *55*(4), 295–299.

Cochran-Smith, M., Piazza, P., & Power, C. (2013). The politics of accountability: Assessing teacher education in the United States. *Educational Forum*, *77*(1), 6–27.

Corcoran, S. P., Evans, W. N., & Schwab, R. M. (2004). Women, the labor market, and the declining relative quality of teachers. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *23*(3), 449–470.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Who will speak for the children? How "Teach for America" hurts urban schools and students. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *76*, 21–34.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2002). Research and rhetoric on teacher certification: A response to "Teacher Certification Reconsidered." *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *10*(36).

Glazerman, S., Mayer, D., & Decker, P. (2006). Alternative routes to teaching: The impacts of Teach for America on student achievement and other outcomes. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *25*(1), 75–96.

Goodman, S., & Turner, L. (2011). Does whole-school performance pay improve student learning. *Education Next*, *11*(2), 66–71.

Hazi, H. M., & Rucinski, D. A. (2009). Teacher evaluation as a policy target for improved student learning: A fifty-state review of statute and regulatory action since NCLB. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *17*(5), 1–22.

Hulleman, C. S., & Barron, K. E. (2010). Separating myth from reality. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *91*(8), 27–31.

Ingersoll, R., & Merrill, L. (2010). Who's teaching our children? *Part of a special issue: The Key to Changing the Teaching Profession*, *67*(8), 14–20.

Kennedy, M. M. (2010). Attribution error and the quest for teacher quality. *Educational Researcher*, *39*(8), 591–598.

Labaree, D. F. (1994). An unlovely legacy: The disabling impact of the market on American teacher education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *75*, 591–595.

Newton, X. A., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., & Thomas, E. (2010). Value-added modeling of teacher effectiveness: An exploration of stability across models and contexts. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *18*(23).

Sykes, G., & Dibner, K. (2009). *Fifty years of federal teacher policy: An appraisal* (Commissioned Paper). Center on Education Policy. Retrieved from www.cep-dc.org/cfcontent_file.cfm?Attachment=SykesDibner%5F50Years%2DFedTeacherPolicy%5F030109%2Epdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *Our future, our teachers: The Obama Administration's plan for teacher education reform and improvement*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/teaching/our-future-our-teachers

Varenne, H. (2007). On NCATE standards and culture at work: Conversations, hegemony, and (dis-)abling consequences. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *38*(1), 16–23.

Walsh, K. (2001). *Teacher certification reconsidered: Stumbling for quality*. Baltimore: The Abell Foundation.

## Course Requirements:

- Students are expected to attend all classes. Please provide advance notice, when possible, if you must miss a class. On these occasions, please get notes and any handouts from a colleague.
- Students are expected to read all assignments prior to class and bring copies (either hard or electronic copy) to class.
- Students are expected to actively participate in class discussions and activities and to treat one another with respect.
- Students are expected to submit all assignment on time, unless prior arrangements are made:

    **1. Case study presentations**: Students will each take a turn presenting a case that pertains to the topic of the day. The goal of these presentations is to make vivid an issue we are reading about. Students will offer a brief introduction of a specific case and highlight key players, policy goals, assumptions, and consequences. Please bring in a 1-page handout for each member of the class that outlines the salient themes and issues at stake and lists 2-3 discussion questions. Students are encouraged to make use of the technology available in the classroom to show other visuals. Presentations should last approximately 15 minutes. (10pts)

    **2. Brief Response Essay**: On the day students present their case studies they will submit a brief response essay (2-3pages) that puts the case study and assigned research into conversation. How does the case relate to the research? How might one be informed by the other? What might policymakers have to say to researchers, and vice versa? What new questions might emerge from this fusion? (15pts)

    **3. Licensure/Certification Presentation**: Students will select a state other than Virginia and provide an overview and analysis of how one becomes a teacher focusing on requirements, pathways and reciprocity. Please bring in a 1-page handout that outlines these themes for all classmates. (10pts)

    **4. Policy Proposal and Tentative Bibliography**: In a brief essay (2-3 pages), identify a *specific* teacher policy of interest. Where does this policy play out (local, state, federal level)? Who does it impact and who are the key stakeholders? Who created it and why? What debates and tensions surround or inform this policy? Why do you want to study this policy: what do you hope to learn or figure out? Identify at least **6** scholarly, peer-reviewed sources (original research) that pertain to the general policy in a bibliography formatted according to APA guidelines. Students may select any policy pertaining to teachers that is of interest. In addition to the topics listed on the syllabus, others to consider include: Teacher Leadership, Professional Learning Communities, Tenure Practices, National Board Certification. (15pts)

    **5. Final Essay**: The goal of this paper (8-10 pages) is to think about the relationship between policy and research and to carve out a space for a new research agenda. Select a policy that pertains to teachers. Examine how this policy

exists in reality (consider implementation, goals, debates that surround the issue, consequences, etc.). Examine and analyze the research on this issue (students must make use of at least 6 scholarly, peer-reviewed sources containing original research). What is the relationship between the policy as it exists in a particular context and the state of research on this issue? What questions or tensions emerge? Design a research project that will examine these emergent issues, calling attention to site selection, evidence, methodologies, and framing questions.  What might you learn from this project that policymakers and researchers do not already know? What might be the policy outcomes? *Please refer to the rubric in the back of this syllabus for grading guidelines.* (40 pts)

**6. Poster Session Presentation:** During the last two classes student will present their final papers in a poster format, following AERA guidelines (to be distributed). Students will outline the specific policy issue, the state of current scholarship surrounding the topic and the gaps or tensions between the two. Students should devote the majority of their presentation to their proposed research project. Students will highlight site selection, evidence, methodologies and framing questions. Students will call particular attention to the ways in which this proposed research contributes to current scholarship and potential policy outcomes. In addition to the poster, please prepare a 1-page handout for classmates. (10pts)

## Evaluation:
All papers must be typed and formatted according to the *APA Manual of Style, 6ᵗʰ Ed*. If you would like feedback electronically, please email your assignments to me **before** the start of class on the date due.

Grading Scale:

| | |
|---|---|
| A = 96-100 | B = 80-88 |
| A- = 92-95 | C = 75-79 |
| B+ = 89-91 | F = 74 and below |

## GMU Policies and Resources for Students:

a. Students must adhere to the guidelines of the George Mason University Honor Code [See **http://oai.gmu.edu/honorcode/**].

b. Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing [See **http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/1301gen.html**].

c. 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.

d. 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/**].

e. Students with disabilities who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with the George Mason University Office of Disability Services (ODS) and inform teir instructor, in writing, at the beginning of the semester [See **http://ods.gmu.edu/**].

f. Students must follow the university policy stating that all sound emitting devices shall be turned off during class unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.

g. 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/**].

## PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS

Students are expected to exhibit professional behaviors and dispositions at all times.

## CORE VALUES COMMITMENT

The College of Education & Human Development is committed to collaboration, ethical leadership, innovation, research-based practice, and social justice. Students are expected to adhere to these principles. **http://cehd.gmu.edu/values/**

**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 Calendar:**

| Date | Topic/Activity | Readings |
|---|---|---|
| June 25 | **Course Introduction**<br>• State selection<br>• Presentation selection | |
| June 27 | **The Political Nature of Teacher Policy**<br>• AACTE versus NCTQ<br>• Views from across the aisle<br>• ***Please bring in laptops for in-class research*** | • Sykes & Dibner, "Fifty Years of Teacher Policy: An Appraisal."<br><br>• U.S. Dept. of Education, "Our Future, Our Teachers: The Obama Administration's Plan for Teacher Education Reform and Improvement." |
| July2 | **Teacher Preparation: Universities and Alternate Models**<br>• What do future teachers need to know and be able to do?<br>• Training versus Education<br>• ***Please bring in laptops for in-class research*** | • Cochran-Smith, "The Problem of Teacher Education."<br><br>• Labaree, "An Unlovely Legacy: The Disabling Impact of the Market on American Teacher Education." |
| July 4 | **No Class – Independence Day** | |
| July 9 | **Alternate Pathways into the Profession**<br>• TFA and the Teacher Corps<br>• In-Class Debate on Pathways: Good for teachers? And what about students? | • Glazerman, et.al, "Alternative Routes to Teaching: The Impacts of Teach for America on Student Achievement and Other Outcomes."<br><br>• Darling-Hammond, "Who Will Speak for the Children?: How 'Teach for America' Hurts Urban Schools and Students." |
| July 11 | **Discussion: Proposed Topics**<br>• ***Policy Proposal and Annotated Bibliography Due*** | |
| July 16 | **Accreditation**<br>• NCATE and TEAC: where did they come from; what were they supposed to do?<br>• Examination and Evaluation of CAEP standards: different or more of the | • Cochran-Smith, et.al, "The Politics of Accountability: Assessing Teacher Education in the U.S."<br><br>• Varenne, "On NCATE Standards and Culture at Work: Conversations, Hegemony, and (Dis-)Abling |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | same? What's the goal? | Consequences." |
| **July 18** | **Certification & Licensure**<br>• *State presentations* | • Darling-Hammond, "Research and Rhetoric on Teacher Certification: A Response to 'Teacher Certification Reconsidered.'"<br><br>• Walsh, "Teacher Certification Reconsidered: Stumbling for Quality." |
| **July 23** | **Teacher Recruitment**<br>• Duncan: "Working Toward 'Wow'"<br>• Urban, Suburban and Rural Contexts: Who should teach and why? Incentives? Differing needs? | • Baker-Doyle, "Beyond the Labor Market Paradigm: A Social Network Perspective on Teacher Recruitment and Retention."<br><br>• Corcoran, "Women, the Labor Market and the Declining Relative Quality of Teachers."<br><br>• Ingersoll, "Who's Teaching Our Children." |
| **July 25** | **Defining Quality: Teacher Evaluation Systems**<br>• What should we measure, how, and why?: Federal level, IMAPCT, SMARTR Goals<br>• What's at stake for kids and teachers?<br>• *Please bring in laptops for in-class research.* | • Kennedy, "Attribution Error and the Quest for Teacher Quality."<br><br>• Hazi & Rucinski, "Teacher Evaluation as a Policy Target for Improved Student Learning: A Fifty State Review of Statute and Regulatory Action Since NCLB."<br><br>• Newton, et.al, "Value-added Modeling of Teacher Effectiveness: An Exploration of Stability Across Models and Contexts" |
| **July 30** | **Teacher Compensation: Merit Pay**<br>• Incentivizing teachers: does it work and for whom; what's the cost?<br>• What are other ways to compensate teachers and/or organize teachers' division of labor? | • Buck & Greene, "Blocked, Diluted and Co-Opted."<br><br>• Goodman & Turner, "Does Whole-School Performance Pay Improve Student Learning?"<br><br>• Hulleman & Barron, "Performance Pay and Teacher Motivation: Separating Myth from Reality." |
| **Aug 1** | **Writing Workshop** | |
| **Aug 6** | **Poster Session Presentations** | |
| **Aug 8** | **Poster Session Presentations & Course Wrap-Up** | |

## Rubric: Final Essay

| Criteria | Outstanding | Competent | Minimal | Unsatisfactory |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Introduction** | Author provides a clear overview of what the essay will accomplish and the themes to be examined. The author offers a specific thesis statement. | Author provides an overview of what the essay will examine. However, it is unclear why the author wishes to examine this topic or what he/she hopes to learn. The author offers a general thesis statement. | The author provides a general overview of the essay; however, the introduction lacks logic and clarity. The thesis statement is vague. | The author does not provide an overview of the essay. The thesis statement is absent. |
| **Presentation of Teacher Policy** | The author provides a clear and thorough examination of a specific policy issue pertaining to teachers. The author calls attention to where the policy plays out, who is involved, implementation issue and other factors. The author clearly identifies the relevant issues or debates that surround this policy. | The author provides an examination of a policy issue pertaining to teachers, but offers little specific detail. | The author offers a vague exploration of a policy issue. | The author does not offer an exploration of a policy issue that pertains to teachers. |
| **Examination and Analysis of Existing Scholarship** | The author provides a logical and specific exploration of the relevant research highlighting methodologies and the state of knowledge. Beyond summarizing articles, the author offers an analysis of this body of literature. The author highlights the gaps or tensions that exist between research and policy. The author makes use of at least 6 scholarly, peer-reviewed sources (original research). | The author provides a summary of existing scholarship, but offers little analysis. The author offers a general examination of the state of knowledge. The author references at least 6 sources. | The author offers a general overview of the existing scholarship but speaks in vague terms. | The author offers an inaccurate overview of the existing scholarship, or an overview of the existing scholarship is absent. |
| **Research Agenda: Rationale and Design** | The author provides a clear rationale for a research agenda that attends to the gaps or tensions between the selected policy issue and the pertinent research. The author proposes a clear research study and highlights site selection, evidence, methodology and framing questions. The research study design is a logical outgrowth of the preceding sections of the paper. | The author calls for a research agenda, but precisely how it stems from the intersection of policy and existing scholarship is unclear. The author offers clear and specific details of the proposed project. | The author offers a general call for more research, but it is unclear how it pertains to the current relationship between policy and research. The details of the proposed research are vague. | The author does not offer a specific call for more research that stems from the relationship between policy and existing research. The author does not propose a research design. |
| **Conclusions and Implications** | The author offers a clear and compelling statement of what this proposed | The author offers a general statement of how the proposed research project | The author offers a vague statement of the proposed study's contributions to | The author does not discuss the ways the proposed research project |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | research study would reveal that current scholars do not yet know or have yet to consider. In addition, the author provides a clear and specific discussion of the potential policy outcomes of such research. | would engage and contribute to existing scholarship. The author offers general policy outcomes. | existing scholarship. The author offers a vague discussion of the ways in which such research might inform policy. | would contribute to existing scholarship. The author does not discuss how such research might inform policy. |
| **Writing** | The writing is clear, error-free, and adheres to proper APA guidelines. | | | The writing is sloppy and/or grammatically incorrect. The author does not use correct proper APA guidelines. |