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**Catalog Course Description**

This course is designed for Master’s candidates to explore both historic and contemporary perspectives in cross cultural education contexts. Education opportunities, achievement and career gaps, and socioeconomic outcomes will be examined. Utilizing a cultural and systemic perspective, the course looks at how education institutions and sociohistoric contexts interact to produce differentiated outcomes. Exemplary programs that are both culturally relevant and based on social justice are researched, compared and used for designing curriculum.

Prerequisite: Current enrollment in the Curriculum and Instruction Master’s program.

**Program Learning Outcomes**

|  |
| --- |
| LO1. Summarize and critique historical and contemporary perspectives regarding cultural diversity. |
| LO2. Analyze and explain the impact of cultural and cross-cultural variables on communication styles, learning and educational outcomes. |
| LO3. Describe and interpret the impact of phonology, syntax and semantics on English Language Learners’ language development and production.  |
| LO4. Design and conduct theoretically grounded qualitative and quantitative research and assessments; report and interpret results. |
| LO5. Design, implement and assess culturally responsive practices and educational environments to improve learning for all students. |
| LO6. Demonstrate evidence-based ethical decision-making aligned with goals of educational justice.  |

**Course Objectives/Outcomes**

Upon successful completion of this course, the candidate will be able to:

1. LO1. Summarize and critique historical and contemporary perspectives regarding cultural diversity.
2. LO2. Analyze and explain the impact of cultural and cross-cultural variables on communication styles, learning and educational outcomes.
3. LO5. Design, implement and assess culturally responsive practices and educational environments to improve learning for all students.

**Outcomes/Assignment Matrix for EDUC 646**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Relevant Learning Experience | Signature Assignment Criteria |
| **LO1. Summarize and critique historical and contemporary perspectives regarding cultural diversity** | * **- Threaded Discussions**

**- Text Readings & Responses** | **Threaded Discussions Based on Web-sites**1. 1. Review of 5 links within each selected site;
2. 2. Substantive Commentary
3. 3. Substantive Response

**Text Readings & Responses**1. Seminal Theory Paraphrased & Quoted 2. Guided Discussion & Application to Practice1. 3. Research & Practice Ideas Highlighted
 |
| **LO2. Analyze and explain the impact of cultural and cross-cultural variables on communication styles, learning and educational outcomes.** | **- Web-site Reviews****- Text Readings & Responses****- Literature Review****- Professional Engagement** | **Professional Engagement**1. Notebook Organized;2. Theoretical Comment Section reflects class notes;3. Curriculum Design Section Ideas Reflect Class Work;4. Readings Section Reflects notes as per class discussion;5. Resources Section Reflects class work and relevant notes re Curriculum Project.**Literature Review**1. Coherent Body of Texts Selected to Complement C. Project Focus2. Summary of Research & Practical Ideas3. Summary of Theory |
| **LO5. Design, implement and assess culturally responsive practices and educational environments to improve learning for all students.** | * **- Curriculum Project**
* **- Literature Review**
 | **Curriculum Project**1. Three-week textual engagement project2. Strategic Processing & Responses Structured for K-12 students3. Culturally Responsive Teaching Assessed |

**Candidate Assessment**

1. Three Threaded Discussions as per Rubric: 5 points each

 **15 points total**

2. Text Readings as per rubric: 7 @ 5 points each

 **35 points total**

3. Multicultural Curriculum Project & Presentation as per rubric

 **20 points total**

4. Literature Review (for Curriculum Project) as per rubric

 **20 points total**

5. Professional Engagement

 **10 points**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Major Criteria ForMulticultural Curriculum Project: We will critique either a specific curricular emphasis within our curriculum OR some general principles on which our current curricular practices might be critiqued. The final version of the project and approach is flexible. Specifics are *suggested* below … | **A Range**: Work in this category is exemplary, often surpassing standards and outlined criteria.  A  | **B Range**: Work in this category is very good, fulfilling most outlined criteria. One or two elements of each major criteria may not be present or are inexactly fulfilled. B  | **C/D Range**: Work in this category reflects inconsistent attention to outlined criteria as well as class explanations. Two or more elements of each major criterion are omitted or fulfilled incompletely or inexactly. C  |
| Three-week textual engagement project | - one particular aspect of your curriculum is considered in terms of (a) texts and materials, (b) activities, (c) assessments;- a range of basic new materials might be outlined along with activities, materials and informal assessments for a one-to-three-week unit;- suggestions for ***adapting*** current curricular practices might be suggested in regard to activities, materials and informal assessments for a one-to-three-week unit;- a formal critique might be undertaken by (a) highlighting current activities, materials and informal assessments, (b) which are then considered in light of 6 to 7 key points made by 3 different texts we have considered. |  |  |
| **Strategic Processing & Responses Structured for K-12 students** | - some differing reading strategies/activities and/or materials might be suggested as an alternative to those currently being employed;- some differing writing strategies/activities might be suggested as an alternative to those currently being employed;- varied assignments and discussion activities might be considered; |  |  |
| **Culturally Responsive Teaching Assessed** | - varying informal approaches to assessment might be considered in light of the curricular modifications being pursued;- students’ discussions, small-group activities, paired work and informal writing might be considered as valid assessments;- art projects, varied writing projects, drama projects, community projects might be suggested as valid alternatives to assessment(s)- varied media through which students might demonstrate “comprehension” can be considered. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Major Criteria Threaded Discussions: Candidates will review three web-sites in accordance with outlined criteria. Ideas from theory, research & practice will be gleaned. Candidates will peruse each site to (a) draw ideas for curriculum implementation, (b) highlight key points of theory, and (c) make connections to professional practice. | **A Range**: Work in this category is exemplary, often surpassing standards and outlined criteria.  A  | **B Range**: Work in this category is very good, fulfilling most outlined criteria. One or two elements of each major criteria may not be present or are inexactly fulfilled. B  | **C/D Range**: Work in this category reflects inconsistent attention to outlined criteria as well as class explanations. Two or more elements of each major criteria are omitted or fulfilled incompletely or inexactly. C  |
| 1. Review of 5 links within each selected site | - an introductory statement offers a (a) rationale of choice of site to be reviewed, and (b) an overview of the site’s key points.- each link/location within site is copy/pasted into response so that colleagues can find that location within site;- three to five sentences are written about each link: points of theory highlighted, points of research highlighted, points of practice highlighted, and ideas related to curricular implementation highlighted. |  |  |
| **2. Substantive Commentary** | - analogous professional experiences are referred to;- Commentary indicates how candidates’ world view and/or professional stance is enlarged by material reviewed;- Candidate comments about how material reviewed affords a renewed insight about the socio-cultural and political contexts of K-12 students;- Candidate comments on how education policy does or does not reflect core elements of material reviewed and how such inclusion or oversight might impact culturally and linguistically diverse students. |  |  |
| **3. Substantive Response** | - Within three days of assigned due date for original posting, each candidate will respond to two colleagues’ postings by (a) genuinely  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Major Criteria Literature Review: coherent written expression, grammatical correctness, formatting, all elements of mechanical correctness, and adherence to APA-style writing inherently embedded within all criteria. | **A Range**: Work in this category is exemplary, often surpassing standards and outlined criteria.  A  | **B Range**: Work in this category is very good, fulfilling most outlined criteria. One or two elements of each major criteria may not be present or are inexactly fulfilled. B  | **C/D Range**: Work in this category reflects inconsistent attention to outlined criteria as well as class explanations. Two or more elements of each major criteria are omitted or fulfilled incompletely. C  |
| 1. Coherent Body of Texts Selected to Complement Curriculum Project Focus | ***For first page,***- a one-paragraph rationale explains why particular “texts” (articles and books) have been selected – i.e. how the core ideas of selected texts link to Curriculum Project content & structure;- one paragraph summarizes a body of core practical ideas drawn from reference-list texts;- one paragraph summarizes core research ideas drawn from reference-list texts;- one or two paragraphs summarize key theoretical principles, or broad general principles. |  |  |
| **2. Summary of Research & Practical Ideas** |

|  |
| --- |
| - about two pages of the literature review focus on a summary of the key details of research studies: populations, research foci, findings, and data employed in various studies of reference list;- about two pages of the literature review pointedly discuss the range of practical literacy activities outlined in the curriculum project and how these ideas are connected to specific texts itemized in the reference list- 3+ peer-refereed research studies are presented and connected to the researchable question: those articles or books raise questions that are similar to those of the writer- 5+ pedagogical books or articles based on teaching ideas are summarized and connected with the Curr. Unit Project;- APA citations format respected throughout text. |

 |  |  |
| **3. Summary of Theory** | - about four pages of the literature review focus on a discussion about and/or emphasis on how & why the various theoretical points have value and significance for the curriculum project focus; - these “pages” will likely amount to about 12 (twelve) differing paragraphs that are distributed throughout this project;- specific connections explained between features/ideas of the curriculum project & certain theoretical ideas. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Curriculum Project | **A Range**: Work in this category is exemplary, often surpassing standards and outlined criteria.  A  | **B Range**: Work in this category is very good, fulfilling most outlined criteria. One or two elements of each major criteria may not be present or are inexactly fulfilled. B  | **C/D Range**: Work in this category reflects inconsistent attention to outlined criteria as well as class explanations. Two or more elements of each major criteria are omitted or fulfilled incompletely. C  |
| 1. Three-week textual engagement project. | - a thematic focus unites 3 weeks of instruction;- “about” 30 pages of reading for a non-fiction text, or about 50 pages of reading for a fiction text are selected;- 3 weeks of instruction emphasize about 5 to 7 key ideas linked to one overall theme;- varying “texts” can be employed, featuring poetry, visual texts, music texts, and other media to complement the core text & core thematic focus |  |  |
| **2. Strategic Processing & Responses Structured for K-12 students** |

|  |
| --- |
| - varying culturally respectful discussion strategies are employed to guide students’ engagements with textual material;- varying guided reading and culturally respectful comprehension & exploratory strategies are employed to guide students’ engagement with textual material;- varying writing activities are employed to guide students’ (a) expression of ideas and (b) shaping of a final project that facilitates their coherent appreciation for the ideas of the text(s) on which the unit is based;- varying visual processing and response frames are used to elicit students’ engagements with varying levels of ideas in the text(s) around which the unit is based |

 |  |  |
| **3. Culturally Responsive Teaching Assessed** | - three informal assessments are designed to “tap into” students’ culturally-based responses to text;- one completed rubric is designed to assess students’ final project for unit;- students’ culturally respectful listening & discussion assessed;- students’ respectfully engaged responses assessed in light of their “colleagues’” perspectives. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Text Reading & Responses | **A Range**: Work in this category is exemplary, often surpassing standards and outlined criteria.  A  | **B Range**: Work in this category is very good, fulfilling most outlined criteria. One or two elements of each major criteria may not be present or are inexactly fulfilled. B  | **C/D Range**: Work in this category reflects inconsistent attention to outlined criteria as well as class explanations. Two or more elements of each major criteria are omitted or fulfilled incompletely. C  |
| 1. Seminal Theory Paraphrased & Quoted | - 3 key quotes selected from each chapter or article read;- each key quote discussed from candidate’s professional perspective in terms of alignment with practice, sound general principles and ideas for implementation;- key quote Introduced with background commentary, and “delivered” or embedded within textual response using a key introductory phrase |  |  |
| **2. Guided Discussion & Application to Practice** |

|  |
| --- |
| - Choosing 3 quotes from range of text chapter/segment;- Commenting on (a) why text segments were chosen,  (b) how each text segment relates to varying aspects of professional practice: i.e. [i] reflective stances about teaching, [ii] policies within school, district, & at large - either statewide or nationally, and [iii] how text segments connect to a specific considerations about professional practice.- A genuinely engaging range of questions are raised for discussion - varying approaches to such discussion may be employed - paired, small-group, at-large, and discussion is facilitated for about 15ish minutes |

 |  |  |
| **3. Research & Practice Ideas Highlighted** | - using a response framework (last page of this syllabus) students will accompany response with a brief annotated set of notes;- specific thoughts expressed about how varying text-based ideas might be researched;- specific thoughts expressed about how varying practical adaptations may be introduced within candidates’ current curricular practices/materials. |  |  |

Professional Engagement - (10 points)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Major Criteria ForProfessional Engagement | **A Range**: Work in this category is exemplary, often surpassing standards and outlined criteria. A | **B Range**: Work in this category is very good, fulfilling most outlined criteria. One or two elements of each major criteria may not be present or are inexactly fulfilled.B | **C/D Range**: Work in this category reflects inconsistent attention to outlined criteria as well as class explanations. Two or more elements of each major criterion are omitted or fulfilled incompletely or inexactly. C  |
| Attendance & Notes | - candidates are cognitively, aesthetically, and physically “present” for elements of class activities, readings, and work on core journals analysis, case-study profile, leadership project, and theoretical synthesis model ;- candidates’ class work reflects sensitive listening and respect for professor and colleagues’ presentations, questions, and discussion;- ***notes are taken in each class*** relative to presentations, assignment explanations, strategies, and leadership dimensions. |  |  |
| **Preparation** | - Candidates complete ***assigned readings***, class activities, and work toward ***range of projects*** in accordance with Course Calendar details & rubric elements;- Candidates’ presentations are made in accordance with outlined criteria and class discussions/suggestions;- Various ***assigned responses to range of texts***, are completed with conscientious attention to assigned details and in-class guidelines. |  |  |
| **Professionalism** | - Candidates’ interact with one another in class, throughout collaborative meetings out of class, and via any web-site postings with respect;- Disagreements and varying viewpoints are expressed with respect for positions of others;- In-class decorum is maintained;- Cell phones, I-Pods, and other devices do not intrude on respectful attention and engagement of candidates. |  |  |

**NOTE: Professional Engagement is embedded in all of the assigned elements for the course. Thus, absence of fulfillment of any of the course elements will result in loss of full credit for assigned work.**

**Required Readings**

Ayers, W., Hunt, J. & Quin, T. (Eds.). (1998). *Teaching for social justice*. New York: Teachers

College Press.

Scanlon, M. & Lopez, F.A. (2014). *Leadership for culturally and linguistically responsive*

*schools*. New York: Routledge. ISBN: 978-0415710299

Canestrari, A. & Marlowe, B. (Eds.). (2010). *Educational foundations: An anthology of critical*

*readings.* Los Angeles: Sage.

**Suggested Resources**:

Delpit, L. (2002). *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the*

*classroom*. New York: The New Press.

Gruwell, E. (1999). *Freedom Writers*. New York: Broadway Books.

Kozol. J. (2005). *The shame of a nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in*

*America*. New York: Crown Publishers.

McLaren, P. ( 1997). *Revolutionary multiculturalism: Pedagogies of dissent for the new*

*millennium.* Boulder: Westview Press, a division of HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.

McCarty, T. (2002). *A place to be Navajo: Rough Rock and the struggle for self-*

*determination in Indigenous schooling*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sleeter, C. (2005). *Unstandardizing curriculum*. New York: Teacher’s College Press.

Tatum, B. D. (1997). *“Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?”* New

York: Basic Books.

Rios, F. (1996). *Teacher Thinking in Cultural Contexts*. Albany: State University of New

York Press.

**Grading System/Scale**

**Evaluation of your work will be based on the following criteria:**

**A/4.0:** All assignments are complete, on time, thorough, well edited, and exceed stated course requirements. All written work shows superior graduate level quality in expression, attention to detail, evidence of originality, organization and reflection. Learning is demonstrated by careful preparation for class, and thoughtful contributions as an individual and group member.

**A-/3.7:** All assignments are complete, on time, thorough, well edited, and exceed stated course requirements. All written work shows superior graduate level quality in expression, evidence of originality, organization and reflection. Learning is demonstrated by preparation for class, and thoughtful contributions as an individual and group member.

**B+/3.3:** All assignments are complete, edited, and at least meet all stated course requirements. All written work shows graduate level quality in expression, organization and reflection. Learning is demonstrated by preparation for class, and thoughtful contributions as an individual and group member.

**B/3.0:** All assignments are complete, edited, and at least meet all stated course requirements. All written work shows graduate level quality in organization and reflection. Learning is demonstrated by preparation for class, and contributions as an individual and group member.

* **It is important to realize that grades below 3.0 indicate a problem. The cumulative grade point average must remain at 3.0 or higher, so grades lower than this can affect your degree and/or credential receipt.**

**B-/2.7:** All assignments are complete, edited, and meet most stated course requirements. Written work is slightly below graduate level quality. Preparation for class, and contributions as an individual and group member are slightly below an acceptable level.

* Student should arrange conferences with the professor and advisor to discuss it.

**C+/2.3:** All assignments are complete and some meet most stated course requirements. Written work is below expected graduate level quality. Preparations for class and contributions as an individual and group member are slightly below an acceptable level.

* Student should arrange conference with the professor; and a conference with the advisor is **required.**

**C/2.0:** Assignments are complete but do not meet stated course requirements. Written work is well below expected graduate level quality.

* A meeting with the professor should be arranged; and a meeting with the advisor is **required.**  The professor will notify the advisor of the grade.

**Course Policies & Expectations**

**Evaluation, Assessment, and Grading**

A grade and narrative feedback will be provided on all assignments. As well as your successful completion of assignments, you are asked to demonstrate the following professional responsibilities:

* Being a self-disciplined “active” listener rather than a “side-bar” conversationalist.
* Being prepared: written work, oral presentations & willingness to participate in activities.
* Attending class and completing make up work if you must miss any class or need to leave early (see page of notes on make ups).
* Respecting other people.
* Understanding that in everything you do or say, you are modeling values, attitudes, and behaviors that impact the lives of others.
* Being “on purpose” (i.e. coming to class with an attitude of wanting to contribute to the learning of everyone and being responsible for creating dynamic, worthwhile evenings).
* Late work may result in one point grade deduction per day late – after one week, late assignments may not be accepted.

**Academic Honesty**

All students are expected to demonstrate integrity and honesty in completion of class assignments. Students must give credit to appropriate sources utilized in their work. Plagiarism can result in dismissal from the University.

Academic honesty stands at the center of intellectual pursuits in the academic community. Faculty and student scholarship in all forms, individual and collaborative, expresses our understanding and esteem for intellectual honesty. Nurturing and sustaining a climate of honesty are the responsibilities of every member of the community. The academic policy statement includes standards of academic honesty, obligations and responsibilities of the members of the academic community for cultivating a climate of academic honesty, violations of academic honesty, and procedures for addressing academic dishonesty. **(For complete text of student responsibility please see the University of Redlands Catalog under Academic Standards)**

**Assignments, Presentations, and Facilitation**

**Late Work**

Any work that is turned in late may earn one half a letter grade less, unless prior approval has been granted (i.e. a 4.0 would become an 3.7, etc.) All late work must be pre-approved. If an incomplete grade for the course is requested (for an extenuating circumstance) a written plan defining requirements and specifying new deadlines will need to be developed and signed by the student and the instructor. Only work that is turned in on time will have comments, rubric and option for rewrites. Late work will be recorded as is and have rubric grading only.

**Classroom and Cultural References**

Alexie, S. (1993). *The Lone Ranger and Tonto fistfight in heaven*. New York: The

 Atlantic Monthly Press.

Christiansen, L. (2000). *Reading, writing and rising up: Teaching about social justice*

*and the power of the written word*. Milwaukee: Rethinking Schools LTD.

Christiansen, L. & Karp, S. (2003). *Rethinking school reform: Views from the classroom.*

Milwaukee: Rethinking Schools LTD.

 Codell, E. (1999). *Educating Esmé: Diary of a teacher’s first year*. Chapel Hill, North

Carolina: Algonquin Books.

Delpit, L. (2002). *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the*

*classroom*. New York: The New Press.

 Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people’s children: Cultural conflicts in the classroom.* New

 York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc.

 Fine, M., Weis, L., Powell, L., & Mun Wong, L. (Eds.). (1997*). Off white: Readings on*

 *race, power, and society.* New York: Routledge.

 Foster, M. (1997). *Black teachers on teaching.* New York: The New Press.

Freire, A. & Macedo, D. (1998). *The Paulo Friere reader.* New York: The Continuum

 PublishingCompany.

Freire, P. (1993). Pedagogy of the oppressed. In M. Ramos (Ed. and Trans.) *Pedagogy*

 *of the oppressed.* New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.

Gruwell, E. (1999). *The Freedom Writers diary: How a teacher and 150 teens used*

*writing to change themselves and the world around them*. New York: Broadway books. (Movie out early 2007, documentary also available.)

Kohl, H. (1994). *I won’t learn from you: And other thoughts on creative maladjusment.*

New York: The New Press.

McLaren, P. ( 1997). *Revolutionary multiculturalism: Pedagogies of dissent for the*

*new millennium.* Boulder: Westview Press, a division of HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.

Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities.*

New York: Teacher’s College Press.

Oakes, J. & Lipton, M. (2006). *Teaching to change the world*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Paley, V. (1994). *White teacher.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Payne, R. (1996). *A framework for understanding poverty*. Highlands, Texas:

aha!Process, Inc.

Rios, F. (1996). *Teacher Thinking in Cultural Contexts*. Albany: State University of New

York Press.

Sleeter, C. (2001). *Culture, difference and power*. CDRom. New York:

 Teacher’s College Press.

**Curriculum examples and websites**

ADL Anti-bias curriculum guide

<http://www.21stcenturyschools.com/Critical_Pedagogy.html>

- basic information on writers in the field of critical pedagogy, plus more websites

[http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/courses/ed253a/dk/ML&CP.htm](http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/courses/ed253a/dk/ML%26CP.htm)

- UCLA professor on media, technology and critical pedagogy

<http://www.nameorg.org/>

- National Association for Multicultural Education

- resources and conferences on critical pedagogy and cultural relevance in practice at all levels of education as multicultural education practice

<http://www.rethinkingschools.org/>

- Rethinking Schools publications and social activism in education

**Cross cultural and conceptual Bibliography**

Aguilar, T. & Pohan, C. (1996). Using a constructivist approach to challenge preservice

teachers’ thinking about diversity in education. In Rios, F. (Ed). *Teacher thinking in cultural contexts* (pp. 260-281). New York: State University of New York Press.

Artiles, A. (1996). Teacher thinking in urban schools: The need for a contextualized research

agenda. In Rios, F. (Ed). *Teacher thinking in cultural contexts* (pp. 23 - 52). New York: State University of New York Press.

Banks, C., & Banks, J. (1993). *Multicultural education: issues and perspectives*.

 Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. (1992). Multicultural education: Nature, challenges, and opportunities. In Diaz, C.

(Ed.). *Multicultural education for the 21st century.* (pp. 23-37). Washington, D.C.: National Education Association of the United States.

Banks, J. (1994). *Multiethnic education.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Banks, J., & Banks, C. (Eds.). (1995). *Handbook of research on multicultural education*.

 New York: Macmillan Publishing, USA, Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Bennett, C. (1995). *Comprehensive multicultural education theory and practice.* Needham

 Heights: Allyn & Bacon.

Chomsky, N. (2000). *Chomsky on miseducation*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Cobb, J.J. (1992). *Adolescence: Continuity, Change and Diversity.* Mt. View, California:

Mayfield Publishing Company.

Clark, C., & O’Donnell, J. (Eds.). (1999). *Becoming and unbecoming white: Owning and*

 *disowning a racial identity*. Wesport: Bergin and Garvey.

Crawford, J. (1995). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory and practice*. (3rd ed.).

 Los Angeles: Bilingual Education Services, Incorporated.

Cummins, J. (1996*). Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse*

 *society.* Ontario: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York*:*

HarperCollins Publishers.

Darling Hammond, L. (1996). *What matters most: A competent teacher for every child*. Phi

 Delta Kappan, November, pp. 193 - 200.

Diaz, C. (Ed.). (1992). *Multicultural education for the 21st century*. Washington, D.C.:

 National Education Association of the United States.

Edelman, M. W. (1999). *Lanterns: A memoir of mentors.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Eisner, E. (1998). *The kind of schools we need: Personal essays*. Portsmouth, NH:

 Heinemann.

Fine, M., Weis, L., Powell, L., & Mun Wong, L. (Eds.). (1997*). Off white: Readings on*

 *race, power, and society.* New York: Routledge.

Freire, P. (1993). Pedagogy of the oppressed. In M. Ramos (Ed. and Trans.) *Pedagogy of*

 *the oppressed.* New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform.* Bristol: The

 Falmer Press.

Gillette, M. (1996). Resistance and rethinking: White student teachers in predominantly

African-American schools. In Rios, F. (Ed). *Teacher thinking in cultural contexts* (pp. 104-128). New York: State University of New York Press.

Gilligan, C., Ph.D. (1993). *In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women’s Development.* Harvard

University Press: London, England.

Gollnick, D., & Chinn, P. (1994). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society*. New

York: Merrill, Macmillan College Publishing Company, Inc.

Grant, C. (1997). Challenging the myths about multicultural education. in Schultz, F. (Ed.).

*Education*. (pp. 185-189). Guilford: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill.

Grant, C., & Gomez, M. (1996). *Making schooling multicultural: Campus and classroom.*

Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Grant, C., & Sleeter, C. (1998). *Turning on learning: Five approaches for multicultural*

*teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability*. (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

hooks, bell. (1994*). Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New

York: Routledge.

Houston, W. (Ed.). (1990). *Handbook of research on teacher education*. New York:

Macmillan Publishing Company.

Hunter-Gault, C. (1992*). In my place*. New York: Vintage Books.

Janesick, V. (1998*). “Stretching” exercises for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks:

SAGE Publications.

King, J. (1991). *Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers*.

The Journal of Negro Education. 60: 133-146.

Kleinfeld, J., & Yerian, S. (Eds.). (1995). *Gender tales: Tensions in the schools*. New

York: St. Martin’s Press.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities*. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

McDonald, V. (2003). *Two worlds: An ethnographic study of teacher multicultural frameworks*. San Diego.

Unpublished dissertation.

McLaren, P. ( 1997b). *Decentering whiteness: In search of a revolutionary multiculturalism*.

Multicultural Education. Fall: 4-11.

Mitelman, B. (Ed). (1998, Sept./Oct.). *ADL On the frontline.* (Available from The Anti-

Defamation League of B’Nai B’rith, 823 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017).

Montecinos, C. & Tidwell, D. (1996). Teachers’ choices for infusing multicultural content:

Assimilating multicultural practices into schemata for instruction in the content area. In Rios, F. (Ed). *Teacher thinking in cultural contexts*. (pp. 210-236). New York: State University of New York Press.

New, C. (1996). Teacher thinking and perceptions of African American male achievement in

the classroom. In Rios, F. (Ed). *Teacher thinking in cultural contexts*. (pp. 85-103). New York: State University of New York Press.

Nieto, S. (1996). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*.

(2nd ed.). New York: Longman Publishers.

Pipher, M., Ph.D. (1994) *Reviving Ophelia: Saving The Selves of Adolescent Girls*. Ballatine

Books: New York, NY.

Poplin, M. & Weeres. J. (1994). *Voices from the inside.* (4th ed.). Claremont, CA: The

Institute for Education in Transformation at The Claremont Graduate School.

Ray, P. & Anderson, S. R. (2000). *The Cultural Creatives.* New York: Harmony Books.

Rios, F. (Ed.). (1996). *Teacher thinking in cultural contexts.* New York: State University

of New York Press.

Rodriguez, R. (1982). *Hunger of memory: The education of Richard Rodriguez.* New York:

Bantam Books.

Schultz, F. (Ed.). (1997*). Education*. Guilford: Dushkin/McGraw -Hill.

Sirotnik, K. (1990). Society, schooling, teaching and preparing to teach. In Goodlad, J., Sirotnik, K. & Soder, R.

(Eds.), *The moral dimensions of teaching*. (pp. 296-327). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sleeter, C. (1991). *Empowerment through multicultural education.* Albany, New York: State University of New

York Press.

Sleeter, C., & Grant, C. (1999*). Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and*

*gender*. (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River: Merrill, an imprint of Macmillan Publishing Company.

Spring, J. (1994*). The American School 1642-1993.* New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.

Stalvey, L. (1989). *The education of a WASP*. Madison; The University of Wisconsin

Press.

Starke, L. (Ed). (2001). *State of the World 2001: A Worldwatch Institute report on progress*

*toward a sustainable society*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. Boston: Little,

Brown and Company.

Tannen, D. (1998*). The argument culture: Moving from debate to dialogue*. New York:

Random House.

Tatum, B. (1997). *“Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?”: And other*

*conversations about race.* New York: Basic Books.

Tremmel, R. (1993*). Zen and the art of reflective practice in teacher education.* Harvard

Educational Review. Vol. 63. No. 4, Winter, 434-458.

Van Diijk, T. (1987 ).  *Communicating racism: Ethnic prejudice in thought and talk.*

London: SAGE Publications.

West, C. (1994*). Race matters*. New York: Vintage Press.

Zeichner, K. & Gore, J. (1990). Teacher Socialization. In Houston, W. (Ed.). *Handbook of*

*research on teacher education.* (pp. 329-347). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Ziegler, C. (1999, April*). Images of teachers: Preservice teachers’ views*. Paper presented

at the meeting of the American Education Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

**Text Reading & Presentation Schedule**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Calendar Dates** | **Texts:** **Chapters:****Facilitator(s)** |
| **Week 1:**  | No readings due … reading schedule assigned here. |
| **Week 2:**  | **Canestrari & Marlowe**: Chapter 3**Sleeter:** Chapter 1: **Choice from Ayers:**  C 1 or 2 or 3:Notes:    |
| **Week 3:**  | **Canestrari & Marlowe**: Chapter 6 **Sleeter:** Chapter 2: **Choice from Ayers:**  C4 or 5 or 6  |
| **Week 4:**  | **Canestrari & Marlowe**:Chapter 9**Sleeter:** Chapter 3: **Choice from Ayers:**  C 7 or 8 or 9  |
| **Week 5:**  | **Canestrari & Marlowe**: Chapter 12**Sleeter:** Chapter 4**Choice from Ayers:**  C 10 or 11 or 12  |
| **Week 6:**  | **Canestrari & Marlowe**: Chapter 16**Sleeter:** Chapter 5:**Choice from Ayers:**  C 13 or 14 or 15  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Week 7:** **Week 8:**  | **Canestrari & Marlowe**: Chapter 20**Sleeter:** Chapter 6**Choice from Ayers:**  C 13 or 14 or 15:  |
| **Canestrari & Marlowe**: Chapter 21**Sleeter:** Chapter 7**Choice from Ayers:**  C 19 or 20 or 21  |
| **Week 9:**  | Focus on Web-site Reviews and Curriculum Project |
| **Week 10:**  | Peer-refereed article-1 annotation and critique 1 due – in class work;Curriculum Unit Presentations |
| **Week 11:**  | Peer-refereed article-2 annotations and critique 1 due – in class work;Curriculum Unit Presentations |
| **Week 12:**  | Peer-refereed article-3 annotation and critique 1 due – in class work;Curriculum Unit Presentations |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1st Key quote:    | 1. Practical Idea:
2.
3. Theoretical Idea/General Principle:

 \_\_\_\_1. Research Connection:

 \_\_\_\_ |
| 2nd Key quote:    | 1. Practical Idea:
2.
3. Theoretical Idea/General Principle:

 \_\_\_\_1. Research Connection:

 \_\_\_\_ |
| 3rd key quote:    | 1. Practical Idea:
2.

Theoretical Idea/General Principle:  \_\_\_\_Research Connection:  \_\_\_\_ |