

Education 164: Urban Education Summer 2014

Lecturer: Alisun Thompson, Ph.D

Email: alisun@ucsc.edu

Teaching Assistant: Kirsten Standeven

Email: kstandev@ucsc.edu

Time: T/Th 9:00-12:30

Location: Baskin Engineering RM. 372

Office Hours: Tues. 12:30 – 1:30 & by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Education is considered by many to be one of the most effective and viable routes to upward mobility in the US. An educated citizenry is seen as essential to the maintenance of democracy. However, access to public education has not always been available to all segments of our society. Groups and individuals have at various times in our nation's history been denied access to education on the basis of race, class, gender, and religion. As a result, the demand for access to educational opportunities has become a critical part of the ongoing struggle for civil rights in the US. Even as access to public schools has increased, inequality between ethnic groups, both with respect to the quality of education they receive and their academic performance has endured. Despite concerted efforts to promote equality, the educational experiences of various ethnic groups, particularly those in urban sectors of the US, have not been equitable.

The course relies heavily on literature that examines the links between schools and the social order—the social, economic and political factors that have shaped conditions in urban schools. For example, *the socioeconomic context of urban schools* provides an important examination of *the role of schooling in a stratified, capitalist society* and provides the theoretical grounding for the course. Theories of race/ethnicity, class, gender, and culture will be utilized as frameworks through which to explore the development and current conditions of the urban school. In particular, connections between schooling outcomes and social and economic shifts in the inner city will be explored. The course also explores *the lives of young people living in urban areas*, drawing from rich ethnographic examinations of the lives of marginalized youth. We learn, from the perspective of students, how urban schools are failing them and where there is hope and opportunities for success.

Assignments and Grading

Your grade will be weighted according to these parameters:

15%	Attendance & Participation
35%	Reading Responses & Group Presentation
50%	Written Work

1. **Class attendance, preparation and participation** (15%) As we have so few class periods together, your attendance at, preparation for, and participation in every class are vital. We will discuss material in pairs, small groups and as a whole class, so please be fully prepared. Missing more than one class (including excused absences) will result in a lower grade. If you do miss class, it is your responsibility to get information that you missed from a classmate

and complete all assignments on time. NOTE: If you miss more than 2 classes, your course standing will come under review and may result in a non-passing final grade.

2. **Reading Responses and Group Presentation** (35%)

Reading Response Blog

You will keep a reading response blog on eCommons and post responses for all the readings we do in class. The reading responses are intended to give you a chance to grapple with the readings and prepare you for class discussion. Please post your responses by 7pm, the night before class and read the responses of at least one other member of your group. Guidelines for the reading responses and a holistic rubric for grading are at the end of the syllabus. You do not need to post a reading response for the class you are giving your group presentation.

Group Presentations

In a small group, you will do a presentation or lead an activity that relates to the readings and topics for the class. Topics are assigned but how you present the material is entirely up to you. You will sign-up for a topic and it is your responsibility to meet with your group to prepare the presentation. Resources for the topics are in the "Syllabus & Resources" folder on eCommons.

3. **Written Work** (50%) You will write 3 papers: 2 shorter papers (3-4 pages, double spaced) and 1 longer paper (5-7 pages, double spaced).

Paper 1 *Autoethnography of Schooling*

Your first paper will be a personal account of your educational upbringing. Using concepts learned in the course relating to socioeconomic context of education, the paper will examine how issues of race and class affected your high school experience, whether it was urban, suburban or rural. The paper must include demographic and historical data on the particular high school you attended and a discussion of the topics addressed in class. The paper must draw from at least 2 of the class readings as points of comparison and contrast in analyzing educational opportunity based on your personal experience. This paper should be (a) reflective by looking back at your experience through the lens of the course topics and (b) critical by examining your experience based on issues of race and class.

Due Friday Aug. 8 (uploaded to eCommons)

Paper 2 *Textual Analysis*

Your second paper will be a reflective analysis of a text (or texts) from weeks 3 or 4. You will choose a text (or texts) and write an essay in which you explicate its meaning, interpret its significance, and connect it to the course themes. The essays will be evaluated based on the level of analysis and organization of writing. A holistic rubric for scoring is posted on eCommons, please review it before you write your essay.

Due Friday Aug. 22 (upload to eCommons)

Paper 3 *Archeology of Thinking*

Your final paper for the class should address this question: How have your notions of urban education been challenged and/or developed by this course? You can choose to broadly examine your learning in the course (across topics) or focus on a specific topic to examine. This paper requires you to focus on the theories and readings that were most influential to you as a learner and discuss how they impacted your thinking. While this paper invites a reflective tone, it should incorporate at least 4 readings and/or films, be based on one or more topics covered in class, and be organized around a clear and compelling thesis.

Due Friday Aug. 29th (upload to eCommons)

Evaluation of Written Work

Papers will be graded based on clarity of ideas, complete answers to questions, connection of analysis to course readings and quality of writing. Well-expressed writing that answers the question/addresses the issue in an articulate way and with reference to the readings will receive top marks. You must have a thesis idea and you must support and prove your thesis with evidence from the course material. Drawing on additional references and materials appropriately and effectively may boost your marks but omitting the course readings will negatively influence your grade. In all papers - please be clear on what your point is – make sure you make a point and that you support it with evidence and analysis from the reports and readings. Plan your papers well. Please use the rubric provided to guide the development of your papers.

Class Meeting Schedule

Week 1 Social and Economic Contexts of Urban Education

Class One: Tues. July 29

READING DUE

Kozol (2005) *Still Separate, Still Unequal: America's Educational Apartheid*

Class Two: Thurs. July 31

Ghettoization and Poverty

READING DUE

Wilson (2011) *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor*

Anyon (2005) What "counts" as educational policy? Notes toward a new paradigm. *Harvard Educational Review*, 75(1), 65-88.

In Class: *Unnatural Causes: Place Matters* (DVD 6245)

Group Presentation: The Health Gap

Week 2 Framing the Poor: Deficit Thinking & Community Wealth

Class Three: Tues. Aug. 5

READING DUE

ALL READ

Kim, S. H., Carvalho, J. P., & Davis, A. C. (2010). Talking about poverty: News framing of who is responsible for causing and fixing the problem. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 87(3-4), 563-581.

Gorski (2011). Unlearning deficit ideology and the scornful gaze: Thoughts on authenticating the class discourse in education

SHARED TEXTS

Gorski (2006) The Classist Underpinning of Ruby Payne

Whitman (2008) The New Paternalism in Urban Schools

Group Presentation: "No Excuses" charter schools

Class Four: Thurs. Aug. 7

READING DUE

Yosso (2005) Whose Culture has Capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth

Group Presentations: Funds of Knowledge

Week 3 Schools as Sites of Oppression

Class Five: Tues. Aug. 12

Race, Discipline, and the School to Prison Pipeline

READING DUE

ALL READ

Noguera, P. (2003). Schools, prisons, and social implications of punishment: Rethinking disciplinary practices. *Theory into Practice*, 42(4), 341-350.

SHARED TEXTS

Ferguson, A. (2001). Naughty by Nature in *Bad boys: Public schools in the making of black masculinity*. University of Michigan Press.

Gregory, Nygreen & Moran (2006) The Discipline Gap and the Normalization of Failure

Group Presentation: Restorative Justice

Class Six: Thurs. Aug. 14

Segregation, Tracking & the Reproduction of Inequality

SHARED TEXTS

Fine, M., Burns, A., Payne, Y., & Torre, M. E. (2004). Civics lessons: The color and class of betrayal.

Oakes, J. (1982). The reproduction of inequity: The content of secondary school tracking. *The Urban Review*, 14(2), 107-120.

Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work

In class: Off-Track (VT7887)

Group Presentation: Tracking/Detracking Debate

Week 4 Identity & Schooling

Class Seven: Tues. Aug. 19

READING DUE

ALL READ

Brown & Rodriguez (2009). School and the co-construction of dropout. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 22(2), 221-242.

Group Presentation: The California Drop-out Project

Class Eight: Thurs. Aug. 21

READING DUE

SHARED TEXTS

Conchas (2001). Structuring failure and success: Understanding the variability in Latino school engagement. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(3), p. 471-504

Carter (2008). Achievement as resistance: The development of a Critical Race achievement ideology among black achievers. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(3), p. 466-497

Malagon & Alvarez (2010). Scholarship girls aren't the only Chicanas who go to college: Former Chicana continuation High School students disrupting the educational achievement binary. *Harvard Educational Review*, 80(2), pg 149-173.

Week 5 Hope and Action

Class Nine: Tues. Aug. 26

READING DUE

Duncan-Andrade (2007) *Gangstas, wankstas, and ridas: defining, developing, and supporting effective teachers in urban schools*

Group Presentation: Roses in Concrete

Class Ten: Thurs. Aug. 28

READING DUE

ALL READ

Duncan-Andrade, J. M. (2009). Note to educators: Hope required when growing roses in concrete. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(2), 181-194

SHARED TEXTS

Brown (2010). ARISE to the challenge: Partnering with urban youth to improve educational research and learning. *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education*, 7(1), 4-14.

Nygreen, K. (2010). From voicing your opinion to politicised voice: a youth-led social justice class at an urban continuation high school. *Ethnography and Education*, 5(3), 245-260.

McIntyre, A. (2000). Constructing meaning about violence, school, and community: Participatory action research with urban youth. *The Urban Review*, 32(2), 123-154.

Suggested format for Reading Response

1. Key arguments/claims: What are the central claims or arguments advanced in the reading? What kinds of positions are being taken?
2. Connections: Can you connect the text to personal experience? Other readings? Issues or current debates in education?
3. Issues, problems, questions, doubts, and criticisms: Note any problems or concerns, questions or criticisms that you have about the reading this week.

Blog Evaluation

A (18-20)

The blog is complete with reading responses covering all of the weeks/readings. The responses are insightful and engage analytically and critically with the texts.

B (16-17)

The blog is mostly complete but may be missing one response. Responses are thoughtful, comprised of analysis and reflection more than summarizing.

C (15)

The blog is missing more than one entry and is less thorough. Responses are primarily summaries and do not engage reflectively with the texts.

D (12)

The blog is missing 4 or more entries.

Textual Analysis Rubric

A 18-20 points

The author interprets, analyzes and reflects critically on the text(s). The author uses quotes from the text(s), interpreting them fully and linking them to the analysis. The writing is well organized with a clearly defined thesis and well-developed argumentation that is fully supported by textual evidence. The writing is generally free from mechanical errors and conforms to the specifications of the assignment.

B 16-17

The author interprets the text(s) but engages in less analysis and reflection. The author uses quotes from the text(s) but does not always interpret them fully or link them to the analysis. The writing is easy to follow but may lack a clearly defined thesis and well-developed argumentation. The writing is generally free from mechanical errors and conforms to the specifications of the assignment.

C 14-15

The author primarily engages in description or summary and there is minimal analysis. The writing may lack a clearly defined thesis, and argumentation is under-developed. The writing include few if any quotes or references from the text(s) and their significance is not explained in the context of the paper. The writing may include some mechanical errors and does not conform to the specifications of the assignment.

D 13-12

The paper does not demonstrate engagement with the course texts. Writing is not adequately organized and lacks analysis. Discussion of theories may not be accurate.