

Curricula in Higher Education/HIED 548
Spring 2012
Mondays 2:30 - 5:30 pm
Rackley, Room 403

INSTRUCTOR: Dorothy H. Evensen, Professor of Education
COURSE ASSISTANT: Karla Loya-Suarez
OFFICE PHONE: (814) 863-2691
EMAIL: dhd2@psu.edu; ki15146@psu.edu
OFFICE HOURS: By appointment

OVERVIEW OF THE COURSE:

The course is designed for individuals who expect to plan, design, evaluate, and/or study learning experiences (inside and outside the classroom) in higher education. To enhance your work as a faculty member, instructor, or administrator in academic or student affairs, we will explore practices, theories, and research related to course and program planning, development, and implementation; teaching; student learning; student assessment and institutional quality assurance; faculty and administrators' roles and responsibilities related to curricula; curricular innovation; and curricular change.

During the term we will consider key questions facing higher education institutions and educators in the United States, focusing primarily, but not exclusively, on undergraduate curricula in two- and four-year colleges. Our discussions of and interactions with curricula will be multidimensional, following, as a starting point, the definition of curriculum as an *academic plan* (Lattuca & Stark, 2009) that requires deliberate decisions about educational goals, content, instructional materials and methods, and assessment within sociocultural and organizational contexts. Over the semester, we will examine various ideas about beliefs undergirding particular purposes of higher education and the implications of those beliefs for curricular content, teaching, and student outcomes. We will also read and discuss theories about how people learn, and think about how these theories affect curricula design and decision-making. Throughout the term, we will reflect on social and political implications of such work. We'll also analyze the process of curricular planning and change, considering the influences of institutional missions, faculty beliefs, academic fields, diverse learners, and economic forces that affect higher education curricula in the U.S.

Course Objectives:

The primary goals of this course are to enhance your understanding of curricular decision making and your discursive capabilities of participating within communities that engage in such work.

This course will also help you to:

- identify and evaluate the varied assumptions and epistemologies that have shaped American postsecondary curricula in the past and present;
- understand curricular components such as general education, the major, and their historical evolution;
- understand the roles of faculty and administrators in developing curricula and how these vary in different types of institutions;
- understand disciplinary and professional influences on curricular planning and instruction;
- develop a basic understanding of key theories of learning and their main assumptions;
- understand the potential impact of various types of instruction and instructional environments on students' learning and development;
- examine assumptions, processes, and implications of various kinds of assessment and evaluation processes at the course, program, and institutional level;
- understand the scope, processes, and complexity of decision-making about postsecondary curricula; a
- analyze and evaluate curricula at the course, program, and college level;
- critically review historical and contemporary commentary on the curriculum.

TEXTS AND REQUIRED READINGS:

Texts:

Required:

- Lattuca, L. R., and Stark, J. S. (2009). *Shaping the College Curriculum: Academic Plans in Context*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (NB: DO NOT PURCHASE 1997 Edition)
- Shavelson, R. J. (2010). *Measuring College Learning Responsibly: Accountability in a New Era*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- One additional book on HIED.

OPTIONAL:

- Phillips, D. C., & Soltis, J. F. (2009). *Perspectives on learning* (5th ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Additional Readings: all on ANGEL

EXPECTATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS:

Class Participation: Our class time will be divided into three segments.

Class Discussion: The new topic portion of the class will involve a 75-minute instructor presentation/whole group discussion of the designated topic by way of the assigned readings. To participate effectively, you will need to read, work to interpret, and learn to critically assess the arguments, practices, theories, and ideas presented in the assigned texts. The reading strategies of noting key points, posing questions, and connecting ideas and concepts as you read will help you prepare to actively participate in class. You should come to each class discussion session with notes that represent your preparation. More will be said about this requirement during our first class.

Group Task Force Activities: As a way of more directly interacting/transacting with the topic of each week, you will be divided into small groups and assigned an “adopted” postsecondary institution. Groups will meet each week for one hour and will be “tasked” with analyzing their respective institutions with respect to the way each is dealing with aspects of the topic under study. Groups will be given guiding questions to facilitate their analyses and will compose a report that synthesizes their work. This report (in the form of a memo) will be due by 6 p.m. each Tuesday.

Previous class wrap-up: During the first 15 minutes class we will summarize the group work from the previous week and briefly discuss “issues” raised in the task group reports.

Class participation will contribute 40 percent of your final grade (15 percent for discussion/25 percent for group work).

Written Assignments: There will be three (mostly) individually-completed writing assignments.

Mid-term assignment. The first half of the class introduces us to the breadth of perspectives that inform cooperating/competing ideas and practices related to the area of curriculum. One of these areas concerns *learning*. The first assignment draws upon an array of voices and asks you to devise a way of analytically representing individual texts while at the same time finding a way to represent the relationships among them. From these outlines/graphic representations you will synthesize these with your own (previously held; maintained; abandoned) understandings of human learning (especially learning within institutions and experiences associated with higher education). This paper should be no fewer than five, no more than 8 manuscript pages and should follow APA style.

Book Review Assignment. Each group will select (from a provided list) a published book that represents “new voices” that take up positions about the current “state” of higher education in the United States. This position must include some commentary on the state of curriculum. Task force groups will search for formal peer critiques/reviews of these books and collectively analyze the bases of the reviewers’ critique, their consideration of alternative perspectives, and their overall effectiveness in providing support or challenges to the authors’ theses. Once these analyses are completed (in class), each group member will compose a 1,000 word review of the book suitable for publication in a higher education or popular press outlet. Books will be assigned on March 26th and analyses/reviews will be due on **April 23rd**.

Final assignment. Your final assignment is a take-home exam that will be distributed on Monday, April 23 and **due on Monday, April 30 by noontime.** The exam (patterned as a mini-version of our HIED Qualifying Exam) will require you to analyze a case or policy document concerning higher education curricula. Your exam response must demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of the ideas, theories, concepts, and research literature we have read, discussed, and analyzed throughout the course. It may be no longer than 10 manuscript pages in length, excluding the title page, references, and any figures or appendices. **The final exam will contribute 30 percent of your final grade.**

DUE DATES:

All assignments for the course are due on the dates posted below and in this syllabus. If you have a pressing commitment, you must negotiate an alternative date with me *in advance* of the due date. Late assignments will not be accepted. Deferred grades for the course (incompletes) will be awarded under extraordinary circumstances; you must discuss the need for a deferred grade with me in advance. Due dates for deferred projects will be determined through discussion.

Requirements

<u>Requirements</u>	<u>Due Dates</u>	<u>% of Grade</u>
Participation	ongoing	40%
Midterm assignment (learning)	March 12	20%
Group analyses/book reviews	April 23	10%
Final assignment/exam	April 30	30%

Grading Scale: The scale used for determining final course grades will be:

A	3.6-4.0	96-100
A-	3.1-3.5	90-95
B+	2.6-3.0	87-89
B	2.1-2.5	83-86
C	1.6-2.0	73-79
D	1.1-1.5	65-72
F	0-1.0	below 65

LAPTOP COMPUTER AND CELL/SMART PHONE POLICY:

For the group segment of the class, it will be necessary to have a laptop computer. Groups will consist of 4-5 individuals, so 2-3 laptops should be available. During the discussion segment of the class there will be no need to have laptops open. Rather, each student should come to class with a print-out of his/her notes (preferably a one-page summary along with any notes made on or as a supplement to individual readings) and, if desired, a notebook or paper on which to jot down ideas/brief notes. If Powerpoint slides are used during class, they will be made available immediately after the class. Students are encouraged to take some time AFTER class (a half hour to an hour) to synthesize notes and keep electronically.

No other forms of electronic devices are permitted in class.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY:

All students are expected to comply with University Policy on Academic Integrity (go to <http://www.ed.psu.edu/educ/current-students/academic-integrity/>). Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, falsifying or fabricating information, plagiarizing the work of others, facilitating or failing to report acts of academic dishonesty by others, submitting work done by another as your own, submitting work done for another purpose to fulfill the requirements of a course, or tampering with the academic work of other students. If you are unsure what constitutes a violation of academic integrity, please talk with me!

SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS:

Students with documented disabilities that affect their ability to participate fully in the course or who require special accommodations are encouraged to speak with me so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

TOPICS AND READING ASSIGNMENTS BY CLASS SESSION

CLASS 1	January 9	Introduction to Curricula in Higher Education
----------------	------------------	--

Text:

Lattuca & Stark: Chapter 1, Defining Curriculum: An Academic Plan (2009)

ANGEL:

Penrose, A. M., & Geisler, C. (1994). Reading and writing without authority. *College Composition and Communication*, 45(4), 505-520.

No Class	January 16	Martin Luther King Day
-----------------	-------------------	-------------------------------

PLEASE WORK ON READINGS FOR JANUARY 23 CLASS SESSION

Class 2	January 23	Sociocultural Influences: Curriculum and Beliefs
----------------	-------------------	---

ANGEL:

Willis, J. W. (2007). History and the Context of Paradigm Development. In *Foundations of Qualitative Research: Interpretive and Critical Approaches*, (pp. 27-65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Best, S. & Kellner, D. (1997). The Time of the Posts. In *The Postmodern Turn*, (pp. 3 – 37). New York: The Guilford Press.

Reuben, J. A. (1996). Chapter 1: The Unity of Truth. In *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality* (p. 17-35). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reuben, J. A. (1996). Chapter 2: Science and Religion Reconsidered. In *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality* (p. 36-60). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rorty, R. (1998). Afterword: Pragmatism, Pluralism, and Postmodernism. In *Philosophy and Social Hope* (p 262-277). NY: Penguin Books.

Kuhn, T. S. (1996). The Route to Normal Science. In *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (3rd ed.), (pp.10-22). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kuhn, T. S. (1996). Normal Science as Puzzle-Solving. In *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (3rd ed.), (pp.35-42). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

CLASS 3	January 30	Curricular Purposes and Content: Curriculum for What?
----------------	-------------------	--

Text:

Lattuca & Stark: Chapter 2, External Influences: Sociocultural Context

ANGEL:

Dewey, J (1936). Rationality in education. *The Social Frontier*, 3 (21), 71-73.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. Chapter 14: The nature of subject matter.

Dewey, J (1936). President Hutchins' proposal to remake higher education. *The Social Frontier*, 3 (22), 103-104.

Hutchins, R. M (1936). Grammar, rhetoric, and Mr. Dewey. *The Social Frontier*, 3 (23), 137-139.

Hutchins, R. M. (1936). The dilemmas of the higher learning. In *The higher learning in America*, (pp. 33-58). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hutchins, R. M. (1936). General Education. In *The higher learning in America*, (pp. 59-87). New Haven: Yale University Press.

The Harvard Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society. (1945). Theory of general education. In *General education in a free society: Report of the Harvard Committee* (pp. 42-78). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Miller, G. E. (1988). The Classical Curriculum Confronts Democracy. In *The Meaning of General Education: The Emergence of a Curricular Paradigm* (pp. 8-32). New York: Teachers College Press.

CLASS 4	February 6	Curricular Purposes and Content: Curricula for Whom?
----------------	-------------------	---

ANGEL

Bloom, A. (1987). Introduction: Our virtue. In *The closing of the American mind* (p. 25-43). New York: Simon and Schuster.

Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, Group Identity, and Citizenship Education in a Global Age. *Educational Researcher*, 37 (3), 129-139.

D. Giroux, H. A. & Giroux, S. S. (2004). Race, rhetoric, and the context over civic education. In *Take Back Higher Education: Race, Youth, and the Crisis of Democracy in the Post-Civil Rights Era* (pp. 129-167). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). Citizens of the world. *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education* (pp. 50-84). Cambridge, MA: Harvard.

CLASS 5 February 13 Organizational Contexts
--

Text:

Lattuca & Stark: Chapter 3, Internal Influences: College and University Contexts
 Chapter 9, Administering Academic Plans

Cross, H. C. & Goldenberg, E. N. (2009). Setting the stage: The changing complexion of postsecondary instruction. In *Off-Track Profs: Nontenured Teachers in Higher Education* (pp. 13-34). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chronicle of Higher Education Special Report on For Profit Education (see multiple articles in single file)

Wilson, R. (2009, October 23). 'Chronicle' Survey Yields a Rare Look into Adjuncts' Work Lives. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A12-A13.

American Association of University Professors (2010). Tenure and Teaching Intensive Appointments. AAUP Bulletin, September 2010. Washington, DC: AAUP

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (2010). How Boards Oversee Educational Quality: A Report on a Survey on Boards and the Assessment of Student Learning. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

CLASS 6 February 20 Creating Academic Plans: Disciplinary and Other Influences

Text:

Lattuca & Stark: Chapter 4, Internal Influences: Academic Fields
 Chapter 5, Creating Academic Plans

ANGEL:

Allen, I.E., & Seaman, J. (2010). Learning on Demand: Online Education in the United States, 2009. Boston: Babson Survey Research Group.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). Backward design. In, *Understanding by design* (expanded 2nd ed.) (pp. 13-34). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Nelson Laird, T. F., Shoup, R., Kuh, G. D. & Schwarz, M. J. (2008). The Effects of Discipline on Deep Approaches to Student Learning and College Outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 49, 469-494.

Brint, S., Cantwell, A. M., and Hanneman, R. A. (2008). The Two Cultures of Undergraduate Academic Engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, 49, 383-402.

CLASS 7 February 27 Learning, Part I: Learner as Individual
--

Course Text:

Lattuca & Stark: Chapter 6, Learners

Hodge, D. C., Baxter Magolda, M. B., & Haynes, C. A. (2009). Engaged Learning: Enabling Self-Authorship and Effective Practice. *Liberal Education*, 95 (4), 16-23.

NO CLASS	March 6	Spring Break
-----------------	----------------	---------------------

CLASS 8	March 12	Learning, Part II: The Learner in Context
----------------	-----------------	--

Assignment 1: Reflection on Learning due by 9 a.m.

ANGEL:

- Bruffee, K. A. (1999). Collaboration, conversation, and reacculturation. In *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge* (pp. 3-20). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Bruffee, K. A. (1999). Education as Conversation. In *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge* (pp. 133- 148). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Griffin, M. (2011). Developing deliberative minds: Piaget, Vygotsky and the deliberative democratic citizen. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 7, xxx.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.
- Rose, M. (1989). The Politics of Remediation. *Lives on the Boundary: A Moving Account of the Struggles and Achievements of America's Educationally Underprepared* (pp. 167-204). NY: Penguin Books.
- Salomon, G., & Perkins, D. (1998). Individual and social aspects of learning. *Review of Research in Education*, 23, 1-24.

CLASS 9	March 19	Instructional Processes
----------------	-----------------	--------------------------------

Text:

Lattuca & Stark: Chapter 7, Instructional Processes

ANGEL:

- Beichner, R. J. Saul, J. M., Abbott, D. S., Morse, J. J., Deardorff, D.L., Allain, R. J., Bonham, S. W., Dancy, M. H., & Risley, J. S. The Student-Centered Activities for Large Enrollment Undergraduate Programs (SCALE-UP) Project. Retrieved December 21, 2009 from http://www.compadre.org/PER/per_reviews/media/volume1/SCALE-UP-2007.pdf
- Beichner, R. J. (2008). The SCALE-UP Project: A Student-Centered, Active Learning Environment for Undergraduate Programs. Invited white paper for the National Academy of Sciences.
- Middendorf, J & Pace, D. (2004). Decoding the disciplines: A model for helping students learn disciplinary ways of thinking. In D. Pace & J. Middendorf (Eds.), *Decoding the Disciplines: Helping Students Learn Disciplinary Ways of Thinking* (pp. 1-12). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, Vol. 98. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pace, D. (2004). Decoding the reading of history: An example of the process. In D. Pace & J. Middendorf (Eds.), *Decoding the Disciplines: Helping Students Learn Disciplinary Ways of Thinking* (pp. 13-21). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, Vol. 98. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Phillips & Soltis (2009). *Perspectives on learning*. Chapter 8: Transfer of Learning.

Prince, M. J. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 93 (3), 223-231.

CLASS 10	March 26	Overview of Accountability and Assessment
-----------------	-----------------	--

Texts:

Shavelson: Chapter 2, A Framework for Assessing Student Learning (pp. 8-20)
Shavelson: Chapter 3, A Brief History of Student Learning Assessment (pp. 21-43)
Shavelson: Chapter 7, Accountability: A Delicate Instrument (pp. 121-132)

ANGEL:

American Association of Colleges and Universities (2009). The VALUE Project Overview. *Peer Review*, 11 (1), pp. 4-7.

Kuh, G. & Ikenberry, S. (2009). *More Than You Think, Less Than We Need: Learning Outcomes Assessment in American Higher Education* (Abridged Version). National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment.

Miller, M. A. (2006, September 22). The legitimacy of assessment. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(5), B24. Retrieved November 22, 2006, from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v53/i05/05b02401.htm>

Basken, P. (2008, April 18). "Electronic Portfolios May Answer Call for More Accountability," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A30-31.

CLASS 11	April 2	Accountability and Assessment, Part II
-----------------	----------------	---

Text:

Lattuca & Stark: Chapter 8, Evaluating and Adjusting Academic Plans
Shavelson: Remainder of book

ANGEL Class session folder

Olin College of Engineering Case Study – 4 documents

Electronic Reserves:

Huba, M. E., & Freed, J. E. (2000). Experiencing a paradigm shift through assessment. In M. E. Huba & J. E. Freed, *Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning* (pp. 1-31). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

CLASS 12	April 9	Present and Future Faculty: Instructional Development
-----------------	----------------	--

ANGEL:

Jaschik, S. (2010, November 8). Constant Curricular Change. Insider Higher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/layout/set/print/news/2010/11/08/pod>

Mangan, K. (2010, September 2). Texas A&M System Will Rate Professors Based on Their Bottom-Line Value. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved 9.7.10 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Texas-A-M-System-Will-Rate/124280>.

Glenn, D. (2010, April 25). Rating Your Professors: Scholars Test Improved Course Evaluation. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved 4.27.10 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Evaluations-That-make-the/65226/>

Henderson, C., Finkelstein, N. & Beach A. (2009). Beyond Dissemination in College Science Teaching: An Introduction to Four Core Change Strategies. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 39 (5), 18-25.

Kember, D. (2009). Promoting student-centered forms of learning across an entire university. *Higher Education*, 58(1), 1-13.

Gaff, J. G. (2002). The disconnect between graduate education and faculty realities. *Liberal Education*, 88(3), 6-13.

Pruitt-Logan, A. S., & Gaff, J. G. (2004). Preparing future faculty: Changing the culture of doctoral education (pp. 177-193). In D. H. Wulff & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Paths to the Professoriate: Strategies for Enriching the Preparation of Future Faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Class 13	April 18	Curricular Change
-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Text:

Lattuca & Stark: Chapter 10, Models and Strategies for Curricular Change

ANGEL:

The Yale Report of 1828.

Schneider, A. (1999, February 19). When revising a curriculum, strategy may trump pedagogy. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A14-A16. Retrieved January 11, 2009 from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v45/i24/24a01401.htm>

Schön, D. A. (1987). An experiment in curriculum reform. In *Educating the reflective practitioner*. Pp. xxx, San Francisco: JosseyBass.

Tierney, W. G. (1989). Institutional topography: The curriculum. In *Curricular landscapes: Democratic vistas, transformative leadership in higher education*. Praeger.

Walters, E. (2002). Institutional Commitment to Diversity and Multiculturalism through Institutional Transformation: A Case Study of Olivet College. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 3 (4), 333-350.

Class 14	April 23	New Voices on Higher Education
-----------------	-----------------	---------------------------------------

Final group writing assignment and book review due at class time.

Class jigsaw.

April 30: Final paper due at noon (hard AND electronic copy)