Course Outline for Project SMART 2005

I. <u>COURSE NUMBER AND CREDIT</u>: EDU 505 - 3 SH

II. <u>COURSE TITLE</u>: What kind of teaching matters? Looking at the impacts of our practice on the lives of our students

III. <u>COURSE DESCRIPTION</u>: Participants will examine performance data on their students from the 2004-5 academic year in a core curriculum area, disaggregating data for subgroups, and deriving implications for their curriculum and instruction focused on equity-based teaching. They will consider the role of this professional development program in light of their own professional experiences, in relation to the experiences of their colleagues, and within the scope of the School of Education's Conceptual Framework, the NYS Learning Standards, NCLB, and national professional development guidelines.

IV. <u>PREREQUISITES</u>: Acceptance in Project SMART for 2005.

V. <u>JUSTIFICATION FOR COURSE</u>:

This course is part of Project SMART, 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 teachers from Oswego County schools, the Syracuse City schools, and New York City schools, 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. Teachers will use this reflective process to plan for the upcoming year. Teachers will bring data on these topics and will have conversations about intended and unintended consequences of high stakes testing, disaggregating performance data, and developing assessment tasks to get at what they set as important goals for their students' learning. Teachers will examine and perhaps develop alternative forms of assessment that empower teachers and students to examine work to represent self-directed learning.

VI.   <u>COURSE OBJECTIVES:</u> As a result of taking this course, participants will be able to:

1. Disaggregate performance data for subgroup performance on state-wide and district assessments in a core curriculum area, and identify strategies for enhancing achievement of under-performing groups.

2. Develop, identify, pilot authentic assessment tasks that provide data about the impact of curriculum they have implemented and/or will implement to assess student progress.

3. Analyze performance data on their students and identify areas to revise curriculum and instruction to enhance performance with all subgroups.

4. Based on analysis of data on student learning, plan instruction and curriculum activities for the upcoming year to strengthen student learning in one or more core curricular areas.

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 facilitator training orientation (for new participants) or update (for continuing participants) – research, observation, facilitation skills around the five areas of disparity. For those already GESA facilitators—focus is on deepening facilitation skills, increasing repertoire of awareness activities about anti-bias teaching, and increasing knowledge about the research base for GESA.

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.

4. Teachers reflect and report on their own learning in the area of assessment, curriculum and instruction, and formulate professional development goals and an action plan for the upcoming year.

VIII.   METHODS OF INSTRUCTION: Readings, team discussion, data analysis, cross district dialogues, team sharing.

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) learn more about the GESA professional development model and activities; (3) complete a team report on disaggregated student performance data and an action plan for curriculum, instruction, and professional development.

X.   MEANS OF EVALUATION: 33% review, reflect upon, and share past curriculum, instruction, and professional development activities in light of new information; 33%

planning for upcoming curriculum, instruction and professional development activities; 33% attendance and participation.

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 T/LQP grant to the Center for Interdisciplinary Educational Studies at SUNY Oswego.

XI.   FACULTY REQUIREMENTS: The course will be instructed by an interdisciplinary team of teacher educators, Project SMART teachers, and consultants involved in Project SMART.

XII.   BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Airasian, P. (1994). *Classroom assessment*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Anastasi, A. (1997). (7th ed.). *Psychological testing*. New York: Prentice Hall.

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.

Blake, P. J. (1998). *Testing, friend and foe?: The theory and practice of assessment and testing*. London: Falmer.

Bloom, B. S., Englehart, M. B., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals; Handbook 1: The cognitive domain*. New York: Longman. (classic).

Boggs, H. (1996). Launching school change through teacher study groups: An action research project. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Mid-Western Education Research Association, Chicago, IL Octobr 2-5, 1996. ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 402 286.

Burnaford, G., Fischer, J., Hobson, D. (Eds). (2001). *Teachers doing research: The power of action through inquiry.* Second Edition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Cobb, C. (2003) Effective instruction begins with purposeful assessments. *The Reading Teacher,* 57 (4), 386-388.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. L. (1998) *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Curren, R. R. (1995). Coercion and the ethics of grading and testing. *Educational Theory*, 45, 4, 425-441.

Delett, J. S., Barhnardt, S., & Kevorikian, J. A. (2001). A framework for portfolio assessment in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 48* (6). 559-568.

Demers, C. (2000). Beyond paper and pencil assessment. *Science and Children, 38* (2), 24.

Donegan, M., & Trepanier-Street, M. (1998). Teacher and parent views on standardized testing: A cross-cultural comparison of the uses and influencing factors. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 13 (1), 85. 29-60.

Duggan, S. & Gott, R. (2002) Problems with the assessment of performance in practical science: Which way now? *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 32 (2), 183-201.

Fewster, S. & MacMillan, P. D. (May/June 2002). School-based evidence for the validity of curriculum-based measurement of reading and writing. *Remedial and Special Education 23*(3), 149-56.

Gallagher, J. (1998). *Classroom assessment for teachers*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Gifford, B. R., & O'Connor, M. C. (Eds.). (1992). *Changing assessments: Alternative views of aptitude, achievement and instruction*. Boston: Kluwer.

Gipps, C. V. (1999). Socio-cultural aspects of assessment. *Review of Research in Education*. 24.

Gipps, C. V. (1994). *Beyond testing*. London: Falmer.

Goldstein, H. (2001). Using pupil performance data for judging schools and teachers: Scope and limitations. *British Educational Journal, 27* (4), 433-442.

Grayson, D. A. & Martin, M. D. (1997). *Generating expectations for student achievement: An equitable approach to educational excellence*. Canyon Lake, CA: Graymill.

Madaus, G. F., & O'Dwyer, L. M. (1999). A *short* history of performance assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan (May)*. 688-695.

Meier, D. (2000). *Will standards save public education?* Boston: Beacon.

Meisels, S. J., DiPrima, D., *Nicholson*, J., & Atkins-Burnett, S. (2001). Parental reactions to authentic performance assessment. *Psychology and behavioral Sciences Collection, 7* (1), 1-24.

Murrell, Jr. P. C. (2001). The community teacher: A new framework for effective urban teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

Payne, R. K. (1998). *A framework for understanding poverty*. Revised Edition. Highlands, Texas: RFT Publishing Company.

Popham, W. J. (2004). Why assessment illiteracy is professional suicide. *Education Week, 62* (1), 82.

Scott, S. J. (2001). A task-centered *approach* to performance-based assessments. *General Music Today*, *14 (3), 10-14.*

Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, 26 (7), 4-14.

Stefanou, C., & Parkes, J. (2003). Effects of classroom assessment on student motivation in fifth-grade science. *Journal of Educational Research,* 96, (3), 152-163.

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.

Wiggins, G. P. (1998). *Educative assessment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wiggins, G. P. (1993). *Assessing student performance: Exploring the purpose and limits of testing*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wilson, S. M. & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of research on contemporary professional development. Pp. 173-209. *Review of Research in Education* (24). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.