

**EDIS 8810: Policy Perspectives on Teaching and Teacher Education** 3 Credit Hours

Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education Spring 2014

January 13-April 29, 2014

Wednesdays, 3:30 PM-6:00 PM

**Instructor**

Peter Youngs, Associate Professor Office Hours: Wed, 3:00 to 5:00 pm

Office: 324 Bavaro Hall and by appointment

Email: pay2n@virginia.edu

Phone: (434)924-1752

**Description**

This course examines questions about the nature of teacher quality and how policies affect teacher quality. We will ask how policies affect teachers as college students who could decide to enter teaching, as students enrolled in a preparation program or pathway, as graduates seeking initial teacher licensure, as licensed teachers seeking jobs, as novice teachers, as tenured teachers, or as teachers who could be rewarded, honored, or dismissed.

In our readings, you will find many definitions of teacher quality. Each is valued by its own advocates and each is affected by policies. Some policies may improve one version of quality but reduce another. We will examine policies that affect prospective teachers and/or teachers across all of their career stages to see how policies influence teacher quality.

We will also examine different varieties of scholarship that address policy questions and ask how these different genres help us answer our practical questions. The weekly readings will differ in the extent to which they are conceptual, empirical, dispassionate or passionate. As we read these, you will need to think about the merits of these different approaches to studying the question of policy and teacher quality.

**Instructional Methods**

This course will be run as a seminar featuring brief presentations and class discussions.

**Course Texts**

All of the papers you will read are available as PDF or Word files on Collab. There is a folder for each weekly topic. Many of these papers are quite statistical because that is becoming the nature of policy research. To help you understand these papers, I include optional articles that provide explanations of some of the statistical concepts we will confront. These materials are not required but may help you to understand the required material (depending on your background).

There are no required books for this course. Purchasing the following book is optional:

Darling-Hammond, L., French, J., & Garcia-Lopez, S.P. (Eds.). (2002). *Learning to teach for social justice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

**Course Schedule**

**Tue. Jan. 14th – Orientation to the Course**

*Required:*

Cohen, D.K. (2010). Teacher quality: An American educational dilemma. In M.M. Kennedy (Ed.), *Teacher assessment and the quest for teacher quality* (pp.375-401). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Harris, D.N., & Rutledge, S.A. (2010). Models and predictors of teacher effectiveness: A comparison of research about teaching and other occupations. *Teachers College Record, 112*(3), 914-960.

**Tue. Jan. 21st – Recruitment and Teacher Quality**

*Required:*

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.

Balter, D., & Duncombe, B. (2008). Recruiting highly qualified teachers: Do district recruitment practices matter? *Public Finance Review, 36*(1), 33-62.

Cannata, M. (2010). Understanding the teacher job search process: Espoused preferences and preferences in use. *Teachers College Record, 112*(12), 2889-2934.

**Tue. Jan. 28th – Teacher Education and Teacher Quality**

*Required:*

Kennedy, M.M. (2008). Contributions of qualitative research to research on teacher qualifications. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 30*(4), 344-367.

Borko, H., Peressini, D., Romagnano, L., Knuth, E., Willis-Yorker, C., Wooley, C., Hovermill, J., & Masarik, K. (2000). Teacher education does matter: A situative view of learning to teach secondary mathematics. *Educational Psychologist, 35*(3), 193-206.

Grossman, P.L., Valencia, S.W., Evans, K., Thompson, C., Martin, S., & Place, S. (2000). Transitions into teaching: Learning to teach writing in teacher education and beyond. *Journal of Literacy Research, 32*(4), 631-662.

Brouwer, N., & Korthagen, F. (2005). Can teacher education make a difference? *American Educational Research Journal, 42*(1), 153-224.

*Optional:*

Boyd, D., Grossman, P.L., Hammerness, K., Lankford, R.H., Loeb, S., McDonald, M., Reininger, M., Ronfeldt, M., & Wyckoff, J. (2008). Surveying the landscape of teacher education in New York Cioty: Constrained variation and the challenge of innovation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 30*(4), 319-343.

**Tue. Feb. 4th – Credentials and Qualifications to Teach**

*Required:*

Boyd, D.J., Grossman, P.L., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2009). Teacher preparation and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 31*(4), 416-440.

Clark, M.A., Chiang, H.S., Silva, T., McConnell, S., Sonnenfeld, K., Erbe, A., Puma, M., & Warner, E. (2013). *The effectiveness of secondary math teachers from Teach For America and the Teaching Fellows Programs* (NCEE 2013-4015). Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Nye, B., Konstantopoulos, S., & Hedges, L.V. (2004). How large are teacher effects? *Educational* *Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 26*(3), 237-257.

*Optional:*

Constantine, J., Player, D., Silva, T., Hallgren, K., Grider, M., Deke, J., & Warner, E. (2009). *An evaluation of teachers trained through different routes to certification.* Final report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.

**Tue. Feb. 11th – Licensure Exams and Teacher Quality**

*Required:*

Boyd, D., Goldhaber, D., Lankford, H., & Wyckoff, J. (2007). The effect of certification and preparation on teacher quality. *Future of Children, 17*(1), 45-68.

Clotfelter, C.T., Ladd, H.F., & Vigdor, J.L. (2007). Teacher credentials and student achievement: Longitudinal analysis with student fixed effects. *Economics of Education Review, 26*(6), 673-682.

Goldhaber, D. (2007). Everyone’s doing it, but what does teacher testing tell us about teacher effectiveness? *Journal of Human Resources, 42*(4), 765-794.

*Optional:*

Wilson, S.M., & Youngs, P. (2005). Research on accountability processes in teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp.591-643). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Angrist, J.D., & Guryan, J. (2008). Does teacher testing raise teacher quality? Evidence from state certification requirements. *Economics of Education Review, 28*(5), 483-503.

**Tue. Feb. 18th – District Teacher Assignment Practices**

*Required:*

Levin, J., Mulhern, J., & Schunck, J. (2005). *Unintended consequences: The case for reforming staffing rules in urban teachers union contracts.* The New Teacher Project. Retrieved October 1, 2013 from http://www.tntp.org/newreport/TNTP%20Unintended%20Consequences.pdf.

Cohen-Vogel, L., Feng, L., & Osborne-Lampkin, L. (2013). Seniority provisions in collective bargaining agreements and the “Teacher Quality Gap.” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 35*(3), 324-343.

Liu, E., & Johnson, S.M. (2006). New teachers' experiences of hiring: Late, rushed, and information-poor. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 42*(3), 324-360.

*Optional:*

Anzia, S.F., & Moe, T.M. (2011). *Collective bargaining, transfer rights, and disadvantaged* *schools*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Koski, W.S., & Horng, E.L. (2007). Facilitating the teacher quality gap? Collective bargaining agreements, teacher hiring and transfer rules, and teacher assignment among schools in California. *Education Finance and Policy, 2*(3), 262-300.

**Tue. Feb. 25th – Allocation of Teachers to Schools and Students**

*Required:*

Lankford, H., Loeb. S., & Wyckoff, J. (2002). Teacher sorting and the plight of urban schools: A descriptive analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*(1), 37-62.

Ingersoll, R.M., & Perda, D. (2010). Is the supply of mathematics and science teachers sufficient? *American Educational Research Journal, 47*(3), 563-594.

Gross, B., DeArmond, M., & Goldhaber, D. (2010). Seniority rules: Do staffing reforms help redistribute teacher quality and reduce teacher turnover? Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education.

**Tue. March 4th – Preparing Teachers to Work With Diverse Students**

*Required:*

Ladson-Billings, G.J. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. *Review of Research in Education, 24,* 211-247.

Darling-Hammond, L., French, J., & Garcia-Lopez, S.P. (Eds.). (2002). *Learning to teach for social justice.* New York: Teachers College Press. Chapters to be assigned.

*Optional:*

Zeichner, K. (1992). Educating teachers for cultural diversity. NCRTL Special Report. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

**Tue. March 11th – Spring Recess**

**Tue. March 18th – Student Presentations**

**Tue. March 25th – Beginning Teacher Induction**

*Required:*

Smith, T.M., & Ingersoll, R.M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(3), 681-714.

Glazerman, S., Isenberg, E., Dolfin, S., Bleeker, M., Johnson, A., Grider, M., Jacobus, M. & Ali, M. (2010). *Impacts of Comprehensive Teacher Induction: Final Results from a Randomized Controlled Study*. *Executive Summary.* (pp.xxiii-xxxvii). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.

Pogodzinski, B., Youngs, P., & Frank, K. (2013). Collegial climate and novice teachers’ intent to remain teaching. *American Journal of Education, 120*(1), 27-54.

*Optional:*

Ingersoll, R.M., & Strong, M. (2012). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 81*(2), 201-233.

Achinstein, B., & Barrett, A. (2004). (Re)framing classroom contexts: How new teachers and mentors view diverse learners and challenges of practice. *Teachers College Record, 106*(4), 716-746.

Youngs, P. (2007). How elementary principals’ beliefs and actions influence new teachers’ induction experiences. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(2), 101-137.

**Tue. April 1st – Professional Development**

*Required:*

Ball, D.L., & Cohen, D.K. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the Learning Profession: Handbook of Policy and Practice* (pp.3-32). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Desimone, L., Porter, A.C., Garet, M., Yoon, K.S., & Birman, B. (2002). Effects of professional development on teachers’ instruction. Results from a three-year study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *24*(2), 81-112.

Coburn, C.E., & Russell, J. (2008). District policy and teachers' social networks. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 30*(3), 203-235.

*Optional:*

Fennema, E., Carpenter, T.P., Franke, M.L., Levi, L., Jacobs, V., & Empson, S.B. (1996). A longitudinal study of learning to use children’s thinking in mathematics instruction. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 27*(4), 403-434.

Newmann, F.M., King, M.B., & Youngs, P. (2000). Professional development that addresses school capacity: Lessons from urban elementary schools. *American Journal of Education, 108*(4), 259-299.

Desimone, L.M. (2008). Improving impact studies of teachers’ professional development: Toward better conceptualization and measures. *Educational Researcher, 38*(3), 181-199.

**Tue. April 8th – No Child Left Behind and Teacher Quality**

*Required:*

Dee, T., & Jacob, B. (2010). Evaluating NCLB. *Education Next, 10*(3), 54-61.

Hamilton, L., & Stecher, B. (2004). Responding effectively to test-based accountability. *Phi Delta Kappan, 85*(8), 578-583.

Clotfelter, C.T., Ladd, H.F., Vigdor, J.L., & Diaz, R. A. (2004). Do school accountability systems make it more difficult for low-performing schools to attract and retain high-quality teachers? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 23*(2), 251-271.

Smith, T.M., Desimone, L.M., & Ueno, K. (2005). "Highly qualified" to do what? The relationship between NCLB teacher quality mandates and the use of reform-oriented instruction in middle school mathematics. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 27*(1), 75-109.

**Tue. April 15th – National Board for Professional Teaching Standards**

*Required:*

Sato, M., Wei, R.C., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). Improving teachers’ assessment practices through professional development: The case of National Board Certification. *American Education Research Journal, 45*(3), 669-700.

Frank, K.A., Sykes, G., Anagnostopoulos, D., Cannata, M., Chard, L., Krause, A., & McCrory, R. (2008). Extended influence: National Board Certified Teachers as help providers. *Educational Evaluation, and Policy Analysis, 30*(1), 3-30.

Harris, D.N., & Sass, T.R. (2009). The effects of NBPTS-certified teachers on student achievement. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *28*(1), 55-80.

*Optional:*

Goldhaber, D., & Anthony, E. (2007). Can teacher quality be effectively assessed? National Board Certification as a signal of effective teaching. *Review of Economics and Statistics, 89*(1),134-150.

Anagnostopoulos, D., Sykes, G., McCrory, R., Cannata, M., & Frank, K. (2010). Dollars, distinction or duty: The meaning of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards for teachers’ work and collegial relations. *American Journal of Education, 116*(3), 337-369.

**Tue. April 22nd – Teacher Evaluation: Classroom Observations and Student Surveys**

*Required:*

Pianta, R., & Hamre, B.K. (2009). Conceptualization, measurement, and improvement of classroom processes: Standardized observation can leverage capacity. *Educational Researcher, 38*(2), 109-119.

Hill, H.C., & Grossman, P. (2013). Learning from teacher observations: Challenges and opportunities posed by new teacher evaluation systems. *Harvard Educational Review, 83*(2), 371-384.

Measures of Effective Teaching Project. (2010). *Learning about teaching: Initial findings from the Measures of Effective Teaching Project.* Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

*Optional:*

Measures of Effective Teaching Project. (2012). *Gathering feedback from teaching: Combining high-quality observations with student surveys and achievement gains.* Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Youngs, P. (2013). *Using teacher evaluation reform and professional development to support Common Core assessments.* Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

**Tue. April 29th – Teacher Evaluation: Value-Added Measures (VAMs)**

*Required:*

Harris, D.N., & McCaffrey, D. (2010). Valued-added: Assessing teachers’ contributions to student achievement. In M. Kennedy (Ed.), *Teacher assessment and teacher quality: A handbook* (pp.251-282). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kane, T.J., McCaffrey, D.F., Miller, T., & Staiger, D.O. (2013). *Have we identified effective teachers? Validating measures of effective teaching using random assignment.* Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Measures of Effective Teaching Project.

Institute of Education Sciences. (2012). *Learning from recent advances in measuring teacher effectiveness.* Washington, DC: Author.

*Optional:*

Papay, J.P. (2012). Refocusing the debate: Assessing the purposes and tools of teacher evaluation. *Harvard Educational Review, 82*(1), 123-141.

**May 6 – Final Papers Due**

**----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**Grading**

Students in EDIS 8810 are expected to complete all assignments and will be graded according to the following scale:

Attendance and Participation 10%

Leading Discussion (one reading) 10%

Short Analysis Papers 15%

Policy Document Analysis 25%

Final Paper 40%

Grade Distribution

94-100 = A 84-86 = B

90-93 = A- 80-83 = B-

87-89 = B+

Rubrics will be used to assess written assignments according to the following criteria: consistency with assignment; thoughtfulness of response; effectiveness of argument; and clarity of communication. You will receive the rubrics in class well before the assignments are due.

Class participation will be evaluated on the following criteria: demonstrated mastery of the reading, thoughtfulness of contributions (including questions), and respectful consideration of and response to others’ comments/questions.

The assessment of your class facilitation will be based on the comprehensiveness of your presentation, its clarity, and your efforts to invoke student participation when you lead the class discussion.

**Assessments**

**Attendance/Class Participation:** You are expected to be present and prepared to participate in class each week. If an extenuating circumstance prevents you from attending class, you should notify me by phone or e-mail and communicate with myself and another student about what happened in the class you missed. Attendance and class participation will count as 10% of your course grade. Note! The 10% is not automatic. If you come to class and do not participate on a regular basis, do not expect to receive the full 10%.

**Leading Discussion.** Each student is expected to lead the class’s discussion of one class reading. This will consist of the following: introducing key topics and issues to the class and leading a discussion centered on questions intended to highlight themes from the reading**.** Each student is responsible for turning in a typed outline (from their respective reading) that indicates themes, probing questions, and methods designed to engage colleagues. You are encouraged to use creative classroom activities to highlight themes and ideas about the readings. However, your creativity should not overshadow the essence of the readings. I strongly encourage you to think creatively about how to carry out these activities. Leading discussion will constitute 10% of the grade for the course.

**Short Analysis Papers:** These are 3- to 4-page papers in which you summarize an author’s argument and how she supports it and develop an original thesis in relation to the author’s main point(s). You must turn in two (2) short analysis papers during the semester; you should turn each paper in by 12:00 noon on the Tuesday that the reading in question is assigned. These will count as 15% of your course grade.

**Teacher Policy Document Analysis/Presentation:** You will be required to work alone or with 1 other student to analyze a teacher policy document. This will involve writing a 5- to 7-page analysis of the document and making a presentation to the class based on your analysis. “Policy documents” include a) formal written federal, state, district, university, or school statements of particular policies; b) excerpts from government hearings about policies; c) press releases; d) speeches; e) news reports; f) research briefs; and/or g) videos. You will present the document to our class and facilitate an activity or discussion that engages the class in examining the policy in light of the ideas/frameworks offered in course readings. The presentation and paper combined will count as 25% of your course grade.

**Final Paper:** For the final paper, you will establish a definition of teacher quality and examine strategies for improving that particular aspect of teacher quality. This paper will review literature to make an evidence-based argument about how to improve teacher quality. You can examine any aspect of teacher quality that most interests you. An overview and plan for this paper will be due in March. The final paper is due in May. The final paper will count as 40% of your course grade.

**APA Style:** In general, writers in education use the APA style of citation; see the APA publication manual or any mainstream education journal for particular examples. In addition, some scholars in education use Chicago style, including historians and some comparative education researchers. If you would prefer to use Chicago style for your EDIS 8810 assignments, please consult with me.

**University Email Policy**

Students are expected to activate and then check their official U.Va. email addresses on a frequent and consistent basis to remain informed of University communications, as certain communications may be time sensitive. Students who fail to check their email on a regular basis are responsible for any resulting consequences.

**University of Virginia Honor System**

All work should be pledged in the spirit of the Honor System of the University of Virginia.The instructor will indicate which assignments and activities are to be done individually and which permit collaboration. The following pledge should be written out at the end of all quizzes, examinations, individual assignments and papers: “I pledge that I have neither given nor received help on this examination (quiz, assignment, etc.)”. The pledge must be signed by the student. For more information please visit <http://www.virginia.edu/honor/>.

**Working Assumptions for the Course**

1. We will respect one another. Our beliefs, values, and ideas often differ from one another because we draw from different life experiences. In this class, we will discuss, question, and challenge ideas, but we need to be careful not to attack individuals or to create an unsafe, unproductive space.

2. We will challenge our own beliefs, values, and ideas. We need to be open to challenging our own prejudices, assumptions, and interpretations. We also need to expect to discuss things we often do not discuss in public, but still feel strongly about. It is alright to feel uncomfortable when we do so.

3. We are here for a positive educational experience. Please ask questions, share your thoughts, and make this class meaningful for yourself.

**Special Needs**

It is the policy of the University of Virginia to accommodate students with disabilities in accordance with federal and state laws. Any student with a disability who needs accommodation (e.g., in arrangements for seating, extended time for examinations, or note-taking, etc.),should contact the Learning Needs and Evaluation Center (LNEC) and provide them with appropriate medical or psychological documentation of his/her condition. Once accommodations are approved, it is the student’s responsibility to follow up with the instructor about logistics and implementation of accommodations.

If students have difficulty accessing any part of the course materials or activities for this class, they should contact the instructor immediately. Accommodations for test taking should be arranged at least 14 business days in advance of the date of the test(s). Students with disabilities are encouraged to contact the LNEC*:* 434-243-5180/Voice, 434-465-6579/Video Phone, 434-243-5188/Fax. For more information, visit the U.Va. Special Needs website at <http://www.virginia.edu/studenthealth/lnec.html>.