GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

EDUC 850 001: The Study of Teaching
3 credits, Spring 2016, CRN 11506
Wednesdays, 4:30 – 7:10, Aquia 219

Nancy Holincheck, Ph.D., NBCT
3:30-4:30 Wednesdays or by appointment
2507 Thompson Hall
703-993-8136
nholinch@gmu.edu

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 assess effectiveness.

Prerequisite: EDRS 810

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, NY: Springer.

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

Related resources
American Psychological Association (2001). Publication manual of the American Psychological
    Association 6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

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*, 213-238.
    http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543061002213

Barr, R. (1988). Conditions influencing content taught in nine fourth-grade mathematics classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal*, *88*, 387-411. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/461546

Black, P. J., & William, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy, and Practice*, *5*(1), 7-73. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement, in M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Clark, C. M., & Peterson, P. L. (1986). Teachers' thought processes, in M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research 77*, 113-143. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/003465430298563

Dannenberg, M. (2014). *Ten words to better teacher preparation programs: Reward the good, improve the middle, and transform the bad*. Washington, DC: Education Reform Now.

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.

Gage, N. (1989). The paradigm wars and their aftermath: A "historical" sketch of research on teaching since 1989. *Educational Researcher*, *18*(4), 4-10.

Goddard, R. D., & Goddard, Y. L. (2001). A multilevel analysis of teacher and collective efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17,* 807-818. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00032-4

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*, 81-112. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

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

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. http://dx.doi.org/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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2005.00498.x

Pagliaro, M. M. (2011). *Exemplary classroom questioning: Practices to promote thinking and learning*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Porter, A. C. (2002). Measuring the content of instruction: Uses in research and practice. *Educational Researcher, 31*(7), 3-14. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X031007003

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. (1986). Teaching functions. In M. Wittrock (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* 3rd ed.). New York, NY: 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*, 454-499. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0034654307310317

Shavelson, R. J., & Stern, P. (1981). Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgments, decisions and behavior. *Review of Educational Research*, *51*, 455-98. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1170362

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, *15*(2), 4-14. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004

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. (2005). Measure for measure. *Washington Monthly*, *37*(10-11), 26-31.

Tough. P. (September 5, 2012). *Teachers aren't the problem*. Retrieved from http://www.salon.com/2012/09/05/teachers_arent_the_problem/singleton/

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68,* 202-248. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543068002202

Tyler, L. (2010, January 26). Measuring teaching effectiveness. *Education Week*. *29*(19), 18-19

Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., Keeling, D., Schunck, J., Palcisco, A., & Morgan, K. (2009). The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness. *New Teacher Project*.

White, T. (2014). *Adding eyes: The rise, rewards, and risks of multi-rater teacher observation systems*. Retrieved from ERIC Database (ED556494).

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

Recommended Text:

American Psychological Association. (2009). *Publication manual*. 6th ed., Washington, DC: Author.

Additional readings posted on our Blackboard course:
https://mymasonportal.gmu.edu/

Some Relevant Websites:

This is the website for Division K of the American Educational Research Association. Division K is devoted to research on Teaching and Teacher Education:
http://www.aera.net/AboutAERA/MemberConstituents/Divisions/TeachingTeacherEducationK/tabid/11141/Default.aspx

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

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND ASSIGNMENTS

Nature of 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 online Blackboard course framework throughout the course; the articles are posted there for you to read in advance of our discussions.

Course Assignments

	Points
Class Participation & Professionalism	20
Development of Research Proposal *Task 1: 10* *Task 2: 20*	30
Research Proposal	50
Total Points	**100**

1. **Participation & Professionalism (20%)**
   Students will be asked to work individually or in small groups in class assignments throughout the semester. Students will also be asked to participate in online Blackboard Discussions outside of class time. Because of the importance of lecture and discussion to your total learning experience, you are strongly encouraged to both attend and participate in class regularly. Attendance, punctuality, preparation, and active contribution to small and large group efforts are essential. These elements of your behavior will reflect the professional attitude implied in the course goals and will account for 20% of your course grade. Students who must miss a class must notify the instructor (preferably in advance) and are responsible for completing all assignments and readings for the next class.

2. **Research Proposal & Development Tasks:** There is only one course product: a well-integrated research proposal. You will have intermediate assignments (Tasks 1 & 2) intended to prepare you for writing the proposal. In your research proposal you should identify a researchable problem in your area of study, (e.g. content area teaching, media and technology, diverse classrooms, etc.) and prepare a literature review of the relevant research to accompany the proposal to conduct your 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, to identify the next best research question, and to practice writing a research proposal.

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

Note: See the rubric on page 10 for how your instructor will be reviewing these papers. As you review your research studies, please use the following format:
   1. The nature of the problem
   2. The subjects/participants studied
   3. The methods used to conduct the study (data collection & data analysis)
   4. The findings
   5. The conclusions drawn by the researcher(s) or implications for practice

The required Academic Research Article Review Chart (for Task #2) and the optional Literature Synthesis Chart are intended to help you in your thinking about the current research. It is helpful to understand how the methods used in the literature can impact the findings of the study. The importance and value of the research studies you read is heavily influenced by the nature of the methods used in the study. As novice education researchers, you are called on to critique the literature you consume, while also broadening and deepening your understanding of academic research methods in education. Using the charts provided and taking the time to reflect on the articles and how they are connected will help strengthen your literature review and your methods section.

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, provide 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. You are not expected to break new ground, but your problem must be grounded in the extant literature. Consider this your first draft of the introduction of your paper. ***Due: No later than March 9***

Task #2: For this second assignment, provide an Academic Research Article Review chart of the 6 or more studies you are considering for your final paper. ***Please use the table provided on blackboard***, Follow APA 6 guidelines for the reference format. ***Due: No later than March 30***

Task #3: A complete proposal for a Study of Teaching. A well-integrated review of the literature in support of a researchable problem/topic. 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: no later than May 4***

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 experiences 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 the 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/]

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
Professional dispositions
    Students are expected to exhibit professional behaviors and dispositions at all times.

Core values commitment
    The College of Education and Human Development is committed to *Social justice, Innovation, Research-based practice, Ethical leadership, and Collaboration.* Students are expected to adhere to these principles. [See http://cehd.gmu.edu/values]

Graduate school of education
    For additional information on the College of Education and Human Development, Graduate School of Education, please visit our website [See http://gse.gmu.edu/]

Proposed Class Schedule:

Date	Class Topic	Readings & Assignments due for class date *All readings (except those marked TEXT) available on Blackboard*
Jan. 20 **Week 1**	Introductions, syllabus, background for the course Art or Science?	Read: • The Widget Effect • Models and Predictors • Dannenberg • Adding Eyes: Multi-rater teacher observation systems
Jan 27 **Week 2**	Positivism, Nate Gage, and the foundations of research on teaching	Read: • TEXT: Gage, pp. 11-40 • Floden • Gates: Learning about teaching • Measuring teaching effectiveness
Feb 3 **Week 3**	Can teaching be measured?	Read: • TEXT: Hattie, pp. 1-38 • Fenstermacher and Richardson • Rust
Feb 10 **Week 4**	Quantitative or Qualitative?	Read: • TEXT: Gage, pp. 41-60 • Crawford & Impara • Eisenhart
Feb 17 **Week 5**	Good Teachers…	Read: • TEXT: Hattie, pp. 108-128 • *Students' Voices: What Makes a Great Teacher?* • Naison • *How Mrs. Grady Transformed Olly Neal* • Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy
Feb 24 **Week 6**	Curriculum and Methods	Read: • TEXT: Hattie, pp. 129-160 and 200-235 • *Raising the Bar* • *Effective Learning Techniques*
Mar 2 **Week 7**	What Teachers Do: Teacher Behavior	Read: • TEXT: Gage, pp. 61-84 • *Time and Learning* • *Eight Effective Practices…* • Rosenshine and Stevens
Mar 9 **Week 8**		**Spring Break** *Task 1 due to Blackboard by 11:59 pm on 3/9*

Mar 16 **Week** **9**	What Teachers Do: Teacher Behavior	Read: • Brophy and Good • *Teacher Praise* • Stuhlman, et al.
Mar 23 **Week** **10**	Summarizing Teacher Behavior	Read: • TEXT: Hattie, pp. 161-236 • Pianta • Learner-centered… • Silva *On the clock* • Gates: *Ensuring Fair and Reliable Measures…*
Mar 30 **Week** **11**	It's the Decisions They Make: Teacher Thoughts/Cognitions	Read: • Clark and Peterson • Shavelson and Stern • Barr *Tentative plan is to meet asynchronously online this week. Task #2 due today, submit to Blackboard by 11:59 pm on 3/30*
Apr 6 **Week** **12**	You Can't Teach What You Don't Know: Teacher Content Knowledge	Read: • TEXT: Gage, pp. 85-99 • Shulman • Wilson, Shulman, and Richert • Porter
Apr 13 **Week** **13**	Teachers' Effects? You Have to Study the Students!	Read: • TEXT: Hattie, pp. 39-60 • Both Sanders documents • Chetty et al. • Corcoran and Goldhaber
Apr 20 **Week** **14**	Inside the forming paradigm	Read: • ASA report • Pivovarova, et al. • *Fixing Teacher Observations* • *Gathering feedback for teaching* • *Problems with the use of student test scores*
Apr 27 **Week** **15**	Well, actually, its multivariate, but we need new hypotheses and new forms of research	Read: • TEXT: Hattie, chapter 11 • TEXT: Gage, chapter 8 • Seidel and Shavelson • *Why students should grade teachers* • *Evaluating teacher effectiveness*
May 4 **Week** **16**		*Final Paper due* *Please submit to Blackboard by 11:59 pm on 5/4*

Rubric for Judging Research on Teaching Proposals

	Accomplished	*Basic*	*Unsatisfactory*
Nature of 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
Literature review	The literature review is well-integrated with the logic within each set of studies tight and the transitions from one theme or 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 participants	Participants are consistent with previous research and are appropriate for the problem under study, or if the participants represent a new group, the rationale for their inclusion is clearly made.	Participants are consistent with previous research and are appropriate for the problem under study.	Participants are inconsistent with previous research or no explanations are offered for studying a different set of participants.
The proposed data collection & analysis 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.
Quality of writing	The writing is clear. The logic of the argument flows easily. APA guidelines are closely followed and few errors are evident.	The writing is inconsistent with periodic episodes of clarity and logic. APA guidelines are not closely followed.	The writing lacks a clear and convincing tone. APA guidelines are not closely followed.