

**GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION & HUMAN DEVELOPMENT  
EDUCATION LEADERSHIP PROGRAM**

**EDLE 813 (Smith), Fall 2014.001, CRN 75086  
Social and Political Forces in Education Leadership**

**Instructor:** Robert G. Smith  
**Phone:** Office: 703-993-5079; Mobile: 703-859-6944  
**Fax:** 703-993-3643  
**Website:** <http://www.taskstream.com>  
**E-mail:** rsmithx@gmu.edu  
**Mailing address:** George Mason University  
Education Leadership Program  
Thompson Hall Suite 1300, Office 1306  
4400 University Dr., MSN 4C2  
Fairfax, VA 22030-4444  
**Office hours:** Tuesday, 1:00-6:30 p.m. or by appointment

**Schedule Information**

**Location:** Thompson Hall, L014

**Meeting times:** Tuesdays, 7:20 – 10:00 p.m., 8/26/14-12/2/14.

**Course Description: EDLE 813 Social and Political Forces in Education Leadership (3:3:0)**

Examines the social and political forces that shape education in the United States and the effect of these forces on school leadership. Examines the social and political functions of schooling in the past and present.

**Course Overview**

The nation's schools exist within and are shaped by a complex nexus of social and political forces. In various ways, administrators, teachers, parents and even students behave as political actors at the local, state and federal levels. Schools socialize the nation's youth, affirming and imparting important lessons about citizenship and power. Fundamentally and inextricably, school leadership is a political act. In today's political milieu, debates surrounding school choice, teachers, and accountability assume center stage. However, these are not new issues. The American public has grappled with various incarnations of similar questions since the rise of the common schools in the mid-nineteenth century. This course examines the social and political forces that travel through the schools and shape school leadership from an historical perspective.

*Program vision: The Education Leadership Program is dedicated to improving the quality of pre-K – 12 education through teaching, research, and service. Candidates and practicing administrators engage in course work devoted to experiential learning, professional growth opportunities, and doctoral research that informs practice. We educate exceptional leaders who act with integrity as they work to improve schools.*

This course begins with a consideration of education as a social institution as well as the ways in which education and politics intertwine. In what ways are the schools political? How and in what ways do economic, social and cultural transformations unfolding beyond the schools' doors shape education and school leadership? Where and in what ways is power exercised? How is history relevant to current education policy and to school leadership? Following this, the course is divided into three units: Market Forces, Privatization and Effectiveness; Teachers – Recruitment, Retention, Improvement and Evaluation; and Data and Decision Making: Equity, Accountability, and the Achievement Gap. Each inquiry will begin with an historical examination of how the issue or an incarnation of the issue unfolded in the past. Using this lens, students will explore the intricacies of a variety of pressing education debates and examine the social and political context in which today's schools operate.

### **Nature of Course Delivery**

Each session will consist of some combination of large and small group work and discussion. Students will work with a variety of primary sources and original research in class, both individually and in small groups. Knowledge is constructed collaboratively. For this reason, it is essential that you read the assigned materials carefully and come prepared to participate in discussion.

### **Student Outcomes**

Students who successfully complete this course will:

1. Gain an understanding of the development and structure of American schooling.
2. Understand political contexts of schooling.
3. Consider the ways in which school leadership is a political act.
4. Understand the variety of ways in which social forces shape schooling and school leadership.
5. Develop a broad framework that will support and help shape their future research.
6. Analyze primary source materials and seminal research.
7. Analyze and evaluate original research.
8. Evaluate and engage with secondary source materials.
9. Hone critical thinking skills.

### **National Standards**

The following Education Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standard elements are addressed, in part, in this course:

- 2.1 Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.
- 2.3 Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.

- 4.1: Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment.
- 4.3 Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers.
- 4.4: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners
- 5.3: Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity.
- 5.5: Candidates understand and can promote social justice within a school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.
- 6.1 Candidates understand and can advocate for school students, families, and caregivers.
- 6.2 Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment
- 6.3 Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

## Course Materials

**Textbook.** Lubienski, C.A. & Lubienski, S.T. (2014). The public school advantage: Why Public schools outperform private schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

**Readings.** All additional readings are available in Taskstream. See the Tentative Weekly Schedule below for specific titles. Additionally, optional articles and documents will be available on Taskstream.

**Outside-of-Class Resources.** Online access is vital for the distance learning aspects of the course and is important if we experience school shutdowns because of the weather or other problems. **All students are now required to activate and monitor their GMU e-mail accounts.** If you are uncertain about how to do this, please see me. It is my expectation that you will be fully competent to send and receive e-mail messages **with attachments.**

All students are required to use <http://www.taskstream.com> as part of this course. This is an Internet site at which I will post vital information for the course and through which we will communicate from time to time.

It is my expectation that all students have access to standard word processing software that can be read by Microsoft Office 2007.

## Course Requirements, Performance-based Assessment, and Evaluation Criteria.

**Attendance.** Students are expected to attend every class for its entirety. Maximum class participation points will be earned by students who attend all classes, are on time and do not leave early.

**General expectations.** Consistent with expectations of doctoral courses in the Education Leadership program, grading is based heavily on student performance on written assignments. The assignments constructed for this course reflect a mix of skills associated with the application of research to education leadership contexts. Overall, written work will be assessed using the following broad criteria:

1. Application of concepts reflected in class discussion and readings
2. Creativity and imagination
3. Clarity, concision and organization

**Weights of performances.** Additionally, a portion of the class grade will be based on participation and the contribution made to class discussions. The overall weights of the various performances are as follows:

**Class participation 20 points.** Students are expected to participate actively in class discussions, in group activities, and in serving as critical friends to other students. Attendance is expected for all classes. **If you must be absent, please notify me by e-mail or phone.** More than one absence may result in a reduction in participation points. Arriving at class more than 30 minutes late or leaving more than 30 minutes before the end of class may result in loss of points.

**Written assignments 80 points.** Several different types of performance-based assignments will be completed during the semester. Each of the first two assignments builds toward the final Research Essay. The directions for each assignment and a rubric for grading each assignment are described at the end of this syllabus. The assignments and the points assigned are:

1. Topic Proposal (15 points)
2. Literature Review (25 points)
3. Research Essay (Required performance for course) (40 points)

**Submission of assignments.** All assignments must be submitted electronically, through TaskStream. TaskStream is an online assessment system used by the college to collect student work, provide feedback to students, and maintain an ongoing record of student assessment data. You will be provided with a TaskStream account and use TaskStream to submit work for courses, as well as to prepare and submit your internship portfolio.

**Late work.** I expect all students to submit their work on time, meaning no later than midnight of the due date. Papers due on a day when you are absent must be submitted via TaskStream by the due date.

**Rewrites.** Students may rewrite a paper (other than the final paper) and re-submit the paper for re-grading within one week of receiving the paper back. I recommend that students not consider re-writing papers with scores of 3.6 or higher. If you wish to discuss your work, I am

willing to do so at a time of mutual convenience.

### **Grading Scale.**

A+	100
A	95-99
A-	90-94
B+	87-89
B	83-86
B-	80-82
C	75-79
F	0-74

### **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/the-mason-honor-code/>).
- b. Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing (See <http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/policies/responsible-use-of-computing/>).
- 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 their 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 <http://gse.gmu.edu/>.

### Tentative Weekly Schedule (subject to change). EDLE 813 (Smith) Fall 2013.001

To accommodate the learning needs of class members, the topic, reading and assignment schedule may be amended during the semester. When the tentative weekly schedule is revised, revisions will be posted on Taskstream.

Class#	Date 2014	Topic(s)	Reading/Writing Assignment
1	8/26	Introductions Thinking about reform and change	Cuban, L. (2013). Why so many structural changes in schools and so little reform in teaching practice? <i>Journal of Educational Administration</i> , 51, 109-125. doi 10.1108/09578231311304661 Sarason, B. (1976). NASP distinguished lecture series: What should we do about school reform? <i>School Psychology Review</i> , 26,104-111. Tyack, D. & Tobin, W. (1994). The “grammar” of schooling: Why has it been so hard to change? <i>American Educational Research Journal</i> , 31, 453-479.
<b>Market Forces, Privatization and Effectiveness</b>			
2	9/2	The roots and conflicting models of modern schooling	Katz, M.B. (1976).The origins of public education: A reassessment. <i>History of Education Quarterly</i> , 16, 381-407. Text (L&L). pp. xi-44
3	9/9	Choice and privatization	Chubb, J.E. & Moe, T.E. (1988).Politics, markets, and the organization of schools. <i>American Political Science Review</i> , 82,1065-1087. L&L. pp. 45-95 Noguera, P.E. (1994). More democracy not less: Confronting the challenge of privatization in public education. <i>Journal of Negro Education</i> , 63, 237 – 250. <i>Read one of the two studies below:</i> Reckhow, S. & Snyder, J.W. (2014). The expanding role of philanthropy in education politics. <i>Educational Researcher</i> , 43, 186-195. doi:10.3102/0013189X14536607 Scott, J. & Jabbar, H. (2014). The hub and the spokes: Foundations, intermediary organizations, incentivist reforms, and the politics of research evidence. <i>Educational Policy</i> , 28, 233-257. doi:

			10.1177/0895904813515327
4	9/16	Charter schools	<p>L&amp;L. pp. 96-146.</p> <p>Finn, C.E. &amp; Kanstoroom, M. (2002). Charter schools: Do charter schools do it differently? <i>Phi Delta Kappan</i>, 84(1), 59-62.</p> <p><i>Read one of the following studies:</i></p> <p>Almond, M. (2012). The Black charter school effect: Black students in American charter schools. <i>The Journal of Negro Education</i>, 81, 354-365.</p> <p>Jacobs, N. (2011). Understanding school choice: Location as a determinant of charter school racial, economic, and linguistic segregation. <i>Education and Urban Society</i>, 45, 459-482. doi: 10.1177/0013124511413388</p> <p>Jeynes, W.H. (2012). A meta-analysis on the effects and contributions of public, public charter, and religious schools on student outcomes. <i>Peabody Journal of Education</i>, 87, 305-335. doi: 10.1080/0161956X.2012.679542</p> <p>Schneider, M &amp; Buckley, J. (2003). Making the grade: Comparing DC charter schools to other DC public schools. <i>Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis</i>, 25, 203-215. doi:10.3102/01623737025002203</p> <p>Wei, X., Patel, D. &amp; Young, V.M. (2014). Opening the "black box": Organizational differences between charter schools and traditional public schools. <i>Education Policy Analysis Archives</i>, 22(3), 1-30. Retrieved from: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22n3.2014">http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22n3.2014</a></p> <p>Yeh, S.S. (2013). A re-analysis of the effects of KIPP and the Harlem Promise Academies. <i>Teachers College Record</i>, 115, 1-20.</p>
-----	9/21	<b>Assignment #1: Topic Paper Due</b>	
<b><i>Teachers: Recruitment, Retention, Improvement and Evaluation</i></b>			
5	9/23	Teachers and teaching in historical perspective	<p>Bernard. R.M. &amp; Vinovskis, M.A. (1977) The female school teacher in antebellum Massachusetts. <i>Journal of Social History</i>, 10(3), 332-345.</p> <p>Cuban, L. (2007). Hugging the middle: Teaching in an era of testing and accountability. <i>Education Policy Analysis Archives</i>, 15(1), 1-27. Retrieved from <a href="http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v15n1/">http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v15n1/</a>.</p> <p>Strober, M.H. &amp; Tyack, D.B. (1980). Why do men manage and women teach? A report on research in schools. <i>Signs</i>, 5, 494-503</p>
6	9/30	Teacher development: competing models	<p>Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). The problem of teacher education. <i>Journal of Teacher Education</i>, 55, 295-299. doi: 10.1177/0022487104268057</p> <p>Labaree, D.F. (2005). Life on the margins. <i>Journal of Teacher Education</i>, 56, 186-191. doi: 10.1177/0022487105275916</p> <p>Darling-Hammond, L., Holtzman, D. J., Gatlin, S. J., &amp; Heilig, J. V. (2005). Does teacher preparation matter? Evidence about teacher certification, Teach for America, and teacher effectiveness. <i>Education Policy Analysis Archives</i>, 13(42). Retrieved from <a href="http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v13n42/">http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v13n42/</a></p>

7	10/7	Teacher recruitment and retention Formative evaluation of class	<p>Read two of the articles below</p> <p>Borman, G. D. &amp; Dowling, N. M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. <i>Review of Educational Research</i>, 78, 367–409. doi: 10.3102/0034654308321455</p> <p>Engel, M., Jacob, B.A., &amp; Curran, F.C. (2014). New evidence on teacher labor supply. <i>American Educational Research Journal</i>, 51, 36–72. doi: 10.3102/0002831213503031</p> <p>Hornig, E.L. (2009). Teacher tradeoffs: Disentangling teachers’ preferences for working conditions and student demographics. <i>American Educational Research Journal</i>, 46, 690–717. doi:10.3102/0002831208329599</p> <p>Jones, N. &amp; Youngs, P. (2012). Attitudes and affect: Daily motions and their association with the commitment and burnout of beginning teachers. <i>Teachers College Record</i> 114, 1-36.</p> <p>Ingersoll, R.M. &amp; May, H. (2012). The magnitude, destinations, and determinants of mathematics and science teacher turnover. <i>Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis</i>, 34, 435–464. DOI: 10.3102/0162373712454326</p> <p>Ingersoll, R.M. &amp; Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. <i>Review of Educational Research</i>, 81, 201–233. doi: 10.3102/0034654311403323.</p> <p>Morgan, M., Ludlow, L., Kitching K., O’Leary, M. &amp; Clarke, A. (2010). What makes teachers tick? Sustaining events in new teachers’ lives. <i>British Educational Research Journal</i>, 36, 191–208. doi:10.1080/01411920902780972</p> <p>Reininger, M. (2012). Hometown disadvantage? It depends on where you’re from: Teachers’ location preferences and the implications for staffing schools. <i>Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis</i>, 34, 127–145. doi: 10.3102/0162373711420864.</p> <p>Ronfeldt, M. (2012). Where should student teachers learn to teach? Effects of field placement school characteristics on teacher retention and effectiveness. <i>Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis</i>, 34, 3–26. doi:10.3102/0162373711420865</p> <p>Ronfeldt, M., Reininger, M. &amp; Krok, A. (2013). Recruitment or preparation? Investigating the effects of teacher characteristics and student teaching. <i>Journal of Teacher Education</i>, 64, 319-337. doi: 10.1177/0022487113488143</p>
---	10/14	No Class / Trade off for Labor Day for Monday Classes	
8	10/21	Determining “quality” and evaluating “effectiveness”	<p>Corcoran, S.P., Evans, W.N. &amp; Schwab R.M. (2004). Women, the labor market, and the declining relative quality of teachers. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>, 23(3), 449-470. doi: 10.1002/pam.20021</p> <p>Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, Haertel, E. &amp; Rothstein, J. (2012). Evaluating teacher evaluation. <i>Phi Delta</i></p>



			<p><i>Kappan</i> 9(6): 8-15.</p> <p>Supovitz, J. (2012, April). The linking study—first year results: A report of the first year effects of an experimental study of the impact of feedback to teachers on teaching and learning. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Vancouver, BC, Canada.</p>
-----	10/23	<p><b><i>Eleventh Annual Brown Lecture in Education Research.</i></b> The Ronald Reagan Building &amp; International Trade Center Amphitheater, Concourse Level, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW. , Washington, D.C. Federal Building: photo ID required to enter. 6:00 p.m.  <b><i>RECEPTION TO FOLLOW.</i></b>          James D. Anderson (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign), noted expert on American education history and desegregation, has been selected to present the 2014 Brown Lecture.</p>	
-----	10/26	<p><b>Assignment #2: Literature Review Due</b></p>	
<p><b><i>Data and Decision Making: Equity, Accountability, and the Achievement Gap</i></b></p>			
9	10/28	Education and social justice: The history of African-American education	<p>Brown v. Board of Educ. 347 U.S. 483 (1954)</p> <p>Ladson-Billings, G. (2012). Through a glass darkly: The persistence of race in education research &amp; scholarship. <i>Educational Researcher</i>, 41, 115–120. doi: 10.3102/0013189X12440743</p> <p>Ravitch, D. (2000). A different kind of education for Black children <i>Journal of Blacks in Higher Education</i>, 30, 98-106.</p> <p>Siddle Walker, V. (2000). Valued segregated schools for African American children in the south, 1935-1969: A review of common themes and characteristics. <i>Review of Educational Research</i>, 70, 253-285.</p>
10	11/4	Closing achievement gaps	<p>Smith, R.G. &amp; Brazer, S.D. (2013, April). Achievement gaps and superintendent decisions. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA.</p> <p>Sue, D.W., Capodilupo, C.M., Torino, G.C., Bucceri, J.M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K.L., &amp; Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. <i>American Psychologist</i>, 62, 271–286. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271</p> <p>Yeager, D. S. &amp; Walton, G. M. (2011). Social-psychological interventions in education: They’re not magic. <i>Review of Educational Research</i>. 81, 267–301. doi: 10.3102/0034654311405999</p>
11	11/11	The school curriculum: The Common Core State Standards	<p>Porter, A., McMaken, J., Hwang, J. &amp; Yang, R. (2011). Common core standards: The new U.S. intended curriculum. <i>Educational Researcher</i>, 40, 103-116. doi: 10.3102/0013189X11405038</p> <p>Tienken, C.H. (2012). The Common Core State Standards: The emperor is still looking for his clothes. <i>Kappa Delta Pi Record</i>, 48, 152-155. doi: 10.1080/00228958.2012.733928.</p> <p>Read one of the following:</p> <p>Applebee, A.N. (2013). Common Core State Standards: The promise and the peril in a national palimpsest. <i>English Journal</i>, 103(1), 25-</p>

			<p>33.</p> <p>Hiebert, E.H. &amp; Mesmer, A.E. (2012). Upping the ante of text complexity in the common core state standards: Examining its potential impact on young readers. <i>Educational Researcher</i>, 42, 44-51. doi: 10.3102/0013189X12459802</p> <p>Schmidt, W. &amp; Houang, R.T. (2012). Curricular coherence and the common core state standards for mathematics. <i>Educational Researcher</i>, 41, 294–308. doi: 10.3102/0013189X12464517</p>
12	11/18	Accountability and high stakes testing	<p>Read two of the following articles:</p> <p>Amrein-Beardsley, A., Berliner, D.C., Rideau, S. (2010). Cheating in the first, second and third degree: Educators’ responses to high-stakes testing. <i>Education Policy Analysis Archives</i>, 18(14), 1-32.</p> <p>Madaus, G. &amp; Russell, M. (2010-11) Paradoxes of high-stakes testing. <i>Journal of Education</i>, 190, 21-30.</p> <p>Nichols, S.L., Glass, G.V. &amp; Berliner, D.C. (2012). High-stakes testing and student achievement: Updated analyses with NAEP data. <i>Education Policy Analysis Archives</i>, 20(20), 1-30.</p> <p>Supovitz, J. (2009). Can high stakes testing leverage educational improvement? Prospects from the last decade of testing and accountability reform. <i>Journal of Educational Change</i>, 10, 211-227. doi 10.1007/s10833-009-9105-2</p>
13	11/25	The federal role in education: NCLB and RTTT	United States Department of Education. (2002). <i>Executive Summary of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</i> . Washington, DC: Author.
14	12/2	Paper presentations Wrap-up Course Evaluation	<b>Assignment #4: Research Essay Due</b>

**Assignment #1: Topic Proposal**  
**15 points**

**Rationale**

The goal of this assignment is to highlight the details of a precise and particular education debate. This debate will form the foundation for your individualized scholarly inquiry. Before you can generate your own research questions, you need to demonstrate an understanding of the key issues. Before you can insert your voice into and inform current educational debates and policies, you need to have a clear understanding of the current state of the debates.

**Tasks**

1. Submit a 3-4 page essay that offers an overview of your selected issue.
2. Begin by addressing the following questions:
  - a. Where is this issue visible?
  - b. Who is involved?
  - c. What are the competing perspectives surrounding this issue?
  - d. What is at stake?
3. Once you have addressed the above questions, begin to move beyond the details of the current issue and raise your own research questions.
  - a. What do you want to learn more about?
  - b. What do you want to figure out?
  - c. Develop a set of at least three questions that will drive your research over the course of this semester.
4. Using at least 4 sources, this essay will focus *only* on the current incarnation of this debate.
5. In addition, submit a proposed bibliography of at least 10 sources, including at least four sources that provide a historical treatment of the issue.

## Assessment Rubric for Assignment #1: Topic Paper

**15 Points**

	<b>Exceeds expectations (4)</b>	<b>Meets expectations (3)</b>	<b>Approaches expectations (2)</b>	<b>Falls below expectations (1)</b>
<b>Statement of Topic (20%)</b>	Offers a clear statement of issue of interest. Focuses on a specific component of a larger debate. Describes topic in clear and accurate terms.	Offers a clear statement of topic, but lacks focus and/or attempts to cover too much ground.	Offers neither a clear nor focused statement of interest.	Offers neither a clear nor focused statement of interest and makes inaccurate claims.
<b>Exploration of Debate (25%)</b>	Addresses succinctly the questions of where the issue is visible, who is involved, what are the competing perspectives, and what is at stake. Refers to relevant texts to ground characterizations. Presents topic overview in a clear, accurate, and bias-free manner.	Offers a clear exploration of a specific issue of debate of interest. Refers to relevant texts to ground overview. Author reveals clear bias, choosing sides or offering policy prescriptions. Cites and makes use of 4 sources.	Exploration of issue is vague or too broad. Author takes sides. Uses fewer than 4 sources, or cites 4 sources but does not make significant use of them.	Exploration of issue is unclear or inaccurate. Author does not refer to specific texts to ground overview and writes with clear bias. Does not cite or make use of appropriate sources.
<b>Use of Sources (10%)</b>	Cites and makes use of at least 4 high quality sources.	Cites and makes use of at least 4 sources, one or more of which may be of dubious quality.	Cites and makes use of 3 sources.	Cites and makes use fewer than 3 sources.
<b>Statement of Research Question (25%)</b>	Moves beyond the issue at hand and raises at least 3 meaningful questions that stem from the texts.	Raises two meaningful questions to guide future inquiry.	Raises only one meaningful question.	Raises questions that do not stem from the readings or hold potential of generating future research, or poses no questions.
<b>Proposed bibliography</b>	Provides a proposed bibliography of at least 10 high quality sources, including at least four sources that provide a historical treatment of the issue.	Provides a proposed bibliography of at least 10 sources, one or more of which may be of poor quality, or provides fewer than four sources that provide a historical treatment of the issue.	Provides a proposed bibliography of fewer than 10 sources.	Fails to include a proposed bibliography.
<b>Mechanics (10%)</b>	The essay is nearly error free and comports with APA guidelines.	The paper has some errors.	The paper has numerous errors.	The paper is sloppy and appears not to have been proofread.

## **Assignment #2: Literature Review**

**25 Points**

### **Rationale**

Much of successful academic writing is based, in part, on the careful reading of secondary and primary source literature. Rather than summarizing the key points and arguments of a variety of authors, the goal of this exercise is to synthesize a body of scholarship.

### **Tasks**

1. In 6-7 pages, address the following questions in a well-crafted, compelling essay.
  - a. How has thinking on your chosen topic developed over time?
  - b. How do you account for these shifts?
  - c. In what ways do disciplinary conventions shape authors' analyses?
  - d. What are the main points of agreement and disagreement?
  - e. Where do you see authors engaging one another in scholarly discourse?
2. Drawing upon this body of literature, pose at least three questions that will motivate your future inquiry. Examine these questions, explicating how they grow out of the examined literature and exploring their larger significance. What will these questions help you figure out that we do not already know?
3. You must discuss and cite at least 10 approved sources, at least four of which are historical.

## Assessment Rubric for Assignment #2: Literature Review

**25 Points**

	<b>Exceeds expectations (4)</b>	<b>Meets expectations (3)</b>	<b>Approaches expectations (2)</b>	<b>Falls below expectations (1)</b>
<b>Presentation of Literature and Idea Development (60%)</b>	Examines and properly cites 10 sources, at least 4 of which are historical. Creates conversations across texts, thinking about the works as a cohesive body of literature. Rather than summarizing each work one by one, the author finds meaningful ways to synthesize the readings. Incorporates specific evidence from texts and offers an analysis. Considers the role of disciplinary conventions and links these observations to essay's larger idea. Through an exploration of this body of literature, the author generates a cohesive, logical, and compelling idea that is woven throughout the review.	Examines and properly cites 10 sources, at least four of which are historical. The author attempts to generate a larger, original idea but this idea is not substantiated all the way throughout the essay or is separate from a discussion of the texts. Considers disciplinary conventions, but does not link these observations to a larger idea. Uses some quotes, but may not offer thorough analysis.	Examines 10 sources, at least 4 of which are historical. Rather than generating a larger idea and moving beyond the texts, the author summarizes each work. Does not consider the role of disciplinary conventions. Provides some evidence, but offers little analysis.	Examines fewer than 10 sources. Citations may be incorrect. Author offers only summaries. Presentation of authors' views may be inaccurate or incorrect. Does not consider the role of disciplinary conventions. Does not provide significant evidence to support claims. Does not provide analysis.
<b>Future Research Questions (30%)</b>	Clearly states and explicates three specific questions to motivate further research. The questions are a clear outgrowth of the literature discussed.	States three questions. Questions are too broad and/or are not fully explicated. Questions flow from previous discussion of literature.	Offers three vague questions. Neither clearly nor fully explicates significance or implications of questions. Questions only partially flow from discussion of scholarship.	Offers fewer than three questions. Questions are vague and may not be explicated. Questions do not flow from discussion of scholarship.
<b>Mechanics (10%)</b>	The essay is nearly error free.	The paper has some errors.	The paper has numerous errors.	The paper is sloppy and appears not to have been proofread.

## Assignment#4: Research Essay

### Required Performance

40 Points

#### Rationale

Educational issues assume center stage in the political arena, animating the Left and the Right. Questions surrounding accountability, teacher quality, measurement, standards and many others shape today's educational policy discourse. These are not new issues. Instead, educators and others have been asking and answering similar questions in various ways for over a century. In this culminating assignment, students will historicize a current educational debate. The goal of this essay is to use the past to intervene in a current debate.

#### Tasks

1. Write a 12-15 page essay that historicizes a current educational debate, paying close attention to the ways in which social and political forces have shaped this issue.
2. Begin by offering a clear and succinct picture of a current educational issue.
  - a. Where does this debate unfold?
  - b. Who is involved?
  - c. What is at stake?
3. Consider how and in what ways an historical inquiry might provide a new way of thinking about this debate and its underlying issues.
4. Explore the history of this issue calling attention to key points of continuity and change over time.
  - a. You must use scholarly evidence in the form of quotations to support your points.
  - b. Rather than offering a summary of past events – a textbook account, for instance – your task is to offer an analysis of these events.
    - i. Why did they unfold as they did?
    - ii. How do you account for this?
    - iii. What is the larger significance of this past educational debate?
5. Consider the ways in which the historical moments examined cast fresh light on the current debate.
  - a. How has this debate changed shape over time?
  - b. How do you account for this historical persistence?
  - c. In what ways does this historical knowledge recast the debate or illuminate enduring underlying tensions?
  - d. What did you learn about the social and political functions of schooling from this inquiry?

## Assessment Rubric for Assignment #4: Research Essay

**40 Points**

	<b>Exceeds expectations (4)</b>	<b>Meets expectations (3)</b>	<b>Approaches expectations (2)</b>	<b>Falls below expectations (1)</b>
<b>Argument and Idea Development (30%)</b>	Presents a clear and specific educational issue to explore. Makes a compelling case for examining historical precedents. Generates a clear and compelling idea throughout the essay. The narrative moves from one point to the next logically.	Presents a clear and specific educational issue to explore. Examines historical precedents, but does not make a clear case for doing so. The narrative follows a logical sequence but it may weaken in certain sections. Crafts a general idea, but does not develop it fully.	Presents an overarching topic to explore, but the issue is vague or too large. Does not examine historical precedents. Lacks a clear logic. Offers claims but fails to generate an overarching idea.	Topic is vague or unclear. Offers summaries of events and texts but does not provide an analysis or craft an original idea. Lacks a discernible logic.
<b>Historical Inquiry (30%)</b>	Accurately examines specific historical eras and developments through the use of evidence. Offers a careful analysis of evidence, moving beyond a summary. Uses at least 10 sources. Uses quotes from other scholarship to develop and shade the essay's ideas.	Examines historical eras and developments. Uses at least 10 sources. Provides evidence, but does not fully analyze all pieces introduced. Larger idea of the essay is only tangentially related to evidence introduced.	Offers a partial or incomplete exploration of historical eras and developments. Uses some evidence, but leaves it largely unexamined. Does not use and/or incorrectly cites 10 sources. Relies on summary rather than analysis.	Examination of history is partial or inaccurate. Does not use evidence to substantiate claims. Does not use 10 sources. Unclear how history relates to essay's larger idea.
<b>Conclusions: The Intersection of History &amp; Policy (30%)</b>	Considers the ways in which history and historical developments inform policy surrounding a particular educational issue. Examines moments of continuity and change. Uses the history presented to offer fresh insights surrounding a current educational issue. Examines the significance of the essay's idea in compelling and meaningful ways.	Considers the connections between the past and present but does not consider implications of such connections. Attempts to use history to cast fresh light on policy, but claims need to be developed more fully to be compelling or clear. Needs to link these observations to larger idea with greater care.	Considers connections between past and present but does not consider larger implications. Does not use history to make fresh observations about current issue. Connections to larger idea are vague.	Does not consider the connections between the past and present. Does not use historical inquiry to make fresh observations about current issue. Does not generate a larger idea and examine its significance.
<b>Mechanics (10%)</b>	The essay is nearly error free.	The paper has some errors.	The paper has numerous errors.	The paper is sloppy and appears not to have been proofread.



## Assessment Rubric for Class Participation

**20 Points**

	<b>Exceeds expectations (4)</b>	<b>Meets expectations (3)</b>	<b>Approaches expectations (2)</b>	<b>Falls below expectations (1)</b>
<b>Attendance (30%)</b>	Exemplary attendance and tardies	Near perfect attendance, few tardies	Occasional (2-3) absences and/or tardies	Frequent absences and/or tardies
<b>Quality of Questions and Interaction (20%)</b>	Most queries are specific and on point. Deeply involved in class dialogue. Challenges ideas and seeks meaning.	Often has specific queries, stays involved in class dialogue, though sometimes tentative or off-base.	Asks questions about deadlines, procedures, directions or for help with little specificity. Infrequently discusses ideas.	Rarely asks questions of substance.
<b>Effort (20%)</b>	Volunteers as appropriate and often leads in group settings. Engages and brings out the best in others.	Willingly participates with instructor and classmates. Engages others.	Reluctantly participates when asked. Seeks easiest duties in groups. Tolerates others.	Actively avoids involvement when possible. Complains about others. Uses large set of excuses.
<b>Demonstration of preparation for class (30%)</b>	Demonstrates preparation regularly by referring to previous learning, text and other sources to contribute to class discussion and is prepared for each and every class.	Demonstrates preparation regularly by referring to previous learning, text and other sources to contribute to class discussion.	Demonstrates periodic preparation and readiness for class.	Rarely demonstrates readiness for class.