



LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

Preparing people to lead extraordinary lives

CIEP 523: School Improvement and Curriculum Reform

School of Education, Loyola University Chicago

Spring 2020

Instructor Information

Name: Charles Tocci, Ed.D.

Email: ctocci@luc.edu

Office: LT 1120

Office hours: Before and after class; by
appointment

Session Information

Class meets Thursday from 7-9:30pm

Office hours: Before and after class; by appointment

Session Description

This course develops candidates' understandings of school improvement and curriculum reform. It examines school reform models, school-based reform strategies, and curriculum reform strategies intended to improve teaching and learning in schools. The course considers the development of reform models and strategies over time, but focuses on contemporary reform efforts. Candidates analyze multiple perspectives on educational reform and the contextual factors that affect it. The course emphasizes analysis of current research on school and curriculum reform and assesses the implications for improving student learning and achievement.

Required Readings

- Readings and resources will be posted on the Sakai site for the course.

Course Objectives

Students will be able to demonstrate:

- an understanding of school improvement and curriculum reform vocabulary.
- how examining multiple perspectives of school reform leads to a deep-level knowledge of the access and the opportunity for improvement.
- effective communication skills by presenting clear and concise text and research syntheses in spoken and written formats that explain school improvement and

curriculum reform issues.

- how school improvement and curriculum reform are linked to a deep understanding of social justice and diversity issues in education.
- how curriculum reform can lead to school improvement.
- an understanding of school reform models and strategies and their impact on teaching and learning.

Smart Evaluation

Towards the end of the course, students will receive an email from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness reminding them to provide feedback on the course. They will receive consistent reminders throughout the period when the evaluation is open, and the reminders will stop once they have completed the evaluation.

- The evaluation is completely anonymous. When the results are released, instructors and departments will not be able to tell which student provided the individual feedback.
- Because it is anonymous and the results are not released to faculty or departments until after grades have been submitted, the feedback will not impact a student's grade.

Grading and Assessment

General Evaluation Criteria

- Complete and submit work in a timely fashion. Assignments submitted after the class period on the due date will be subject to a lower grade.
- All assignments need to be typed and double-spaced with 1" margins in 12-point font. Please be sure to include your identifying information. Some assignments will need to be submitted electronically via LiveText. Those are indicated below.
- Students are expected to follow the guidelines of the APA (6th edition) for citations and references.

Assignments - Each of the following assignments has a rubric with specific criteria posted on Sakai under "Assignments."

Participation (20 points) – Students are expected to attend all class sessions. In the event that you cannot attend a session, please notify me in advance if possible. Students are expected to read and discuss assigned readings, as well as participate in all class activities.

Discussion Facilitation (20 points) - Students will have the opportunity to lead a class discussion. Students will be assigned an evening where they will facilitate or co-facilitate the discussion of an assigned reading. This will include submitting a 500-750 word summary of the assigned readings and 4-6 discussion questions. The summary and questions should be submitted to the instructor at the start of class. As you facilitate, you will need to pose questions, promote dialogue, and offer your analysis and critique of the reading(s).

Annotated Bibliography (40 points) – Students will produce an annotated bibliography on a subject-specific curriculum reform strategy or broader curriculum reform strategy focused on improving learning in a particular academic discipline. Students will summarize and critique 6-8 research articles in their area of interest. Students should offer a summary of each article by describing the topic of the research/research question(s), the research design and the findings of the study. After the summary, students should provide an analysis of each article using the following questions to guide that analysis:

- Did the author clearly articulate the problem and pose research questions aimed at addressing it?
- Were the research methods used to study the problem appropriate?
- Did the author provide sufficient evidence to support his or her conclusions?
- What are the significant strengths and weaknesses of the research article?
- How does this article contribute to the research on your topic?

Students should follow the APA (7th edition) guidelines for annotated bibliographies. Additional sources and guidance on writing annotated bibliographies can be found at the following sites:

- <http://www.library.cornell.edu/olinuris/ref/research/skill28.htm>
- <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/614/1/>
- http://www.unc.edu/depts/wcweb/handouts/annotated_bibliographies.html

**SUBMIT THIS PROJECT ON LIVETEXT AS AN ATTACHMENT.*

Presentation of Annotated Bibliography (20 points) – Students will present a summary of their findings on the topic of their annotated bibliography. Using PowerPoint, other presentation software or an internet-based program, students will present their findings. Students should prepare informative handouts to accompany their presentations (CF 5).

**SUBMIT THIS PROJECT ON LIVETEXT AS AN ATTACHMENT OR PROVIDE A URL.*

Curriculum Reform Research Paper (60 points) – Students will produce a 12-15 page research paper based (including references) on their annotated bibliography and interviews with 3 teachers involved in a particular subject-specific reform effort. Students will develop an interview protocol from their bibliography and interview at least 3 teachers from different schools with different populations. Interviews should be at least 30 minutes in length. The paper should give an overview of the curriculum reform effort, a review of the literature focused on this reform effort, and the application of this reform effort evidenced by the teacher interviews conducted (CF 2).

**SUBMIT THIS PROJECT ON LIVETEXT AS AN ATTACHMENT.*

Synthesis Paper (40 points) – Students will write a 1,500-2,000 word essay analyzing the relationship between school improvement and curriculum reform and their impact on teaching in learning. The essay should also address how school improvement and curriculum reform are linked to social justice and diversity issues in education.

**SUBMIT THIS PROJECT ON LIVETEXT AS AN ATTACHMENT.*

Course Grades

There are a total of 200 points possible in this course. The grading scale is as follows:

- A (93 – 100%), A- (90 - 92%),
- B+ (87 – 89%), B (83 – 86%), B- (80 – 82%),
- C+ (77 – 79%), C (73 – 76%), C- (70 – 72%),
- D+ (67 – 69%), D (63 – 66%), D- (60 – 62%),
- F (59% and below)

LiveText

All students, *except those who are non-degree*, must have access to LiveText to complete the benchmark assessments aligned to the Conceptual Framework Standards and all other accreditation, school-wide and/or program-wide related assessments. You can access more information on LiveText here: [LiveText](#).

School of Education Policies and Information

Conceptual Framework Standards

The School of Education at Loyola University Chicago, a Jesuit and Catholic urban university, supports the Jesuit ideal of knowledge in the service of humanity. SOE's Conceptual Framework (CF)—***Social Action through Education***—is exemplified by our endeavor to advance professional education in the service of social justice, engaged with Chicago, the nation, and the world. To achieve this vision, the School of Education participates in the discovery, development, demonstration, and dissemination of professional knowledge and practice within a context of ethics, service to others, and social justice. We fulfill this mission by preparing professionals to serve as teachers, administrators, psychologists, and researchers; by conducting research on issues of professional practice and social justice; and by partnering with schools and community agencies to enhance life-long learning in the Chicago area.

Specifically grounded in the Conceptual Framework: *Social Action through Education*, this module focuses on the individualized learning needs of diverse students in urban schools, emphasizing the role of the teacher in making educational decisions and advocating for students. Candidates must utilize current literature in bilingual, special, and literacy education to critically evaluate practices and apply knowledge and skills with diverse students.

The School's complete **Conceptual Framework** can be found at the following link:

<http://luc.edu/education/syllabus-addendum/>

See the following link for the full policy on the School of Education's **Electronic Communication Policies and Guidelines**: <http://luc.edu/education/syllabus-addendum/>

University Policies and Information

See the following link for the policies related to Loyola University Chicago and the School of Education on the important matters of **Academic Honesty, Accessibility and EthicsLine Reporting**: <http://luc.edu/education/syllabus-addendum/>

Recommended Readings

School Improvement and Reform

Cicchinelli, L., Dean, C., Galvin, M., Goodwin, B. & Parsley, D. (2006). *Success in Sight: A comprehensive approach to school improvement*. Denver: McREL. Retrieved January 18, 2010, from <http://www.mcrel.org/product/253/>.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). No child left behind and high school reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 76(4), 642-667.

Folly, L. C. (2007). Making high school reform work. *American School Board Journal*, 194(10), 32-34.

Hubbard, L., Mehan, H., & Stein, M. (2006). *Reforming as learning: School reform, organizational culture, and community politics in San Diego*. NY: Routledge.

Michael, G. & A. M. Hyde. (2007). What is the value of public school accountability? *Educational Theory*, 57(4), 489-507.

Merenbloom, E. Y., & Kalina, B. A. (2006). *Making creative schedules work in middle and high schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2000). *Characteristics of the 100 largest public elementary and secondary school districts in the United States: 1998-1999 (NCES 2000-345)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Peterson, A. (2002). Teacher stories: School reform's missing link. *The Voice*. 7(3). Retrieved March 27, 2008 from <http://www.nwp.org/cs/public/print/resource/366>

Peterson, P.L., McCarthy, S.J., & Elmore, R.F. (1996). Learning from school restructuring. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(1), 119-153.

Schneider, B. L., & Keesler, V. A. (2007). School reform: Transforming education into a scientific enterprise. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33, 197-217.

Strahan, D. (2003). Promoting a collaborative professional culture in three elementary schools that have beaten the odds. *The Elementary School Journal*, 104(2), 127-146.

Williams, B. ed. (2004). *Closing the achievement gap: A vision for changing beliefs and practices (2nd Ed.)*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Communities and School Reform

Mediratta, K., Shah, S., McAlister, S., Fruchter, N., Mokhtar, C., & Lookwood, D. (2008). *Organizing communities, stronger schools: A preview of research findings*. Retrieved January 18, 2010, from http://www.annenberginstitute.org/WeDo/Mott_Media.php

Bryk, A.S., Bender Sebring, P., Kerbow, D., Rollow, S. & Easton, J.Q. (2001). *Charting Chicago school reform: Democratic localism as a leverage for change*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

High-stakes Testing

Diamond, J. B. (2007). Where the rubber meets the road: Rethinking the connection between high-stakes testing policy and classroom instruction. *Sociology of Education*, 80(4), 285-313.

Dodson, A. P. (2007). Damage: How high-stakes testing corrupts America's schools. *Issues in Higher Education*, 24(16), 28.

School Choice

Adnett, N., & Davies, P. (2005). Competition between or within schools? re-assessing school choice. *Education Economics*, 13(1), 109-121.

Anderson, A. L. (2005). The charter school initiative as a case of back to the future. *Educational Foundations*, 19(1-2), 33-50.

Center on Reinventing Public Education. (2007). *Inside charter schools: A systematic look at our nation's charter schools, project update*. Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education, University of Washington.

Ferrero, D. J. (2004). Why choice is good for teachers. *Education Next*, 4(1), 56-61.

Hausman, C., & Brown, P. M. (2002). Curricular and instructional differentiation in magnet schools: Market driven or institutionally entrenched? *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 17(3), 256-276.

McDermott, P., Rothenberg, J. J., & Baker, K. (2006). Lessons learned from the first year of an urban charter school. *The Educational Forum*, 70(4), 352-362.

Paquette, J. (2005). Democratic education and school choice revisited. *American Journal of Education*, 111(4), 609-616.

Raywid, M. A. (1990). Successful schools of choice: Cottage industry benefits in large systems. *Educational Policy*, 4(2), 93-108.

Rossell, C. H. (2005). Magnet schools: No longer famous, but still intact. *Education Next*, 5(2), 44-49.

Standards-based Reform

Albert Shanker Institute. (1999). *Standards-based education reform: Teachers' and principals' perspectives*. Washington, DC.

Elmore, R.F. (2002). *Bridging the gap between standards and achievement: The imperative for professional development in education*. Washington, DC: Albert Shanker Institute.

Giles, C. & Hargreaves, A. (2006). The sustainability of innovative schools as learning organizations and professional learning communities during standardized reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(1), 124-156.

Harris, D.N. & Herrington, C.D. (2006). Accountability standards and the growing achievement gap: Lessons from the past half-century. *American Journal of Education*, 112, 209-238.

Single-Sex Schools

Bracy, G. W. (2007). The success of single-sex education is still unproven. *Education Digest*, 72(6), 22-26.

Georgetown Journal of Gender and the Law. (2007). Single-sex education. *Annual Review*, 8(2), 483-503.

Spielhagen, F. R. (2006). How tweens view single-sex classes. *Educational Leadership*, 63(7), 68-69.

Small Schools

Ferris, J. S., & West, E. G. (2002). Economies of scale, school violence, and the optimal size of schools. Carleton Economic Paper 02-01. Retrieved January 18, 2010, from <http://ideas.repec.org/p/car/carecp/02-01.html>

Green, G., & Stevens, W. (1988). What research says about small schools, *Rural Educators*, 10(1), 9-14.

Haller, E. J. (1992). High school size and student indiscipline: Another aspect of the school consolidation issue? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14, 145-156.

Oxley, D. (2005). Small learning communities: Extending and improving practice. *Principal Leadership*, 6(3), 44-48.

Wasley, P., Fine, M., King, S. P., Powell, L. C., Holland, N. E., Gladden, R. M., & Mosak, E. (2000). *Small schools: Great strides. A study of new small schools in Chicago*. New York: Bank Street College of Education.

Social Justice and Educational Reform

Baines, L., & Foster, H. (2006). A school for the common good. *Educational Horizons*, 84, 4-12.

Kim, J. S. & Sunderman, G. L. (2005). Measuring academic performance under NCLB: Implications for educational equity. *Educational Researcher*, 34(5), 3-13.

Kraft, M. (2007). Toward a school-wide model of teaching for social justice: An examination of the best practices of two small public schools. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40(1), 77-86.

Curriculum Reform

Barnes, F.D. (2004). *Inquiry and action: Making school improvement part of daily practice*. Providence, RI: Annenberg Institute for School Reform. Retrieved January 18, 2010, from <http://www.annenberginstitute.org/Products/InquiryAction.php>

Gamoran, A. (1997). Curriculum change as a reform strategy: Lessons from the United States and Scotland. *Teachers College Record*, 98(4), 608-628.

Kliebard, H. (2002). *Changing course: American curriculum reform in the 20th century*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Macdonald, D. (2003). Curriculum change and the post-modern world: Is the school curriculum-reform movement an anachronism? *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 35 (2) 139-149.

Mooney, N.J. & Mausbach, A.T. (2008). *Align the Design: A Blueprint for School Improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Schmoker, M. (2004). Tipping point: From feckless reform to substantive instructional improvement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(6), 424-432.

Spillane, J.P. & Jennings, N.E. (1997). Aligned instructional policy and ambitious pedagogy: Exploring instructional reform from the classroom perspective. *Teachers College Record*, 98(3), 449-481.

Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (2007). *Schooling by design: Mission, action, and achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wineburg, S. & Grossman, P. (2000). *Interdisciplinary curriculum: Challenges to implementation*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Literacy Curriculum Reform

Allington, R. L. (2006). *What really matters for struggling readers: Designing research-based programs*(2nd Ed.).Boston:PearsonEducation.

Shanahan, T, & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), 40-59.

Scripted Curriculum

Borman, G. D., & Hewes, G. M. (2003). The long-term effects and cost-effectiveness of Success for All. *Education Evaluation Policy Analysis*, 24, 243-66.

Ede, A. (2000). Scripted curriculum: Is it a prescription for success? *Childhood Education*. 83(1) 29-34.

Pogrow, S. (2002, February) Success for All is a failure. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(6), 463-468.

Slavin, R. & Madden, N. (2000) Research on achievement outcomes of Success for All: A summary and response to critics. Phi Delta Kappan, 82(1), 38-66.

Other Resources

Annenberg Institute for School Reform: <http://www.annenberginstitute.org/> Annenberg Institute for School Reform - Tools for School-Improvement Planning:

http://www.annenberginstitute.org/Tools/using_data/surveys/tool.php

Coalition of Essential Schools: <http://www.essentialschools.org/>

The Consortium on Chicago School Research: <http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/content/index.php>

EdFocus Initiative - School reform through focus on curriculum and instructional reform: