

Using Curricular Cultures to Engage Middle School Thinkers

This We Believe Characteristics

- *High expectations for all members of the learning community*
- *Students and teachers engaged in active learning*
- *Curriculum that is relevant, challenging, integrative, and exploratory*
- *Multiple learning and teaching approaches that respond to their diversity*
- *Assessment and evaluation programs that promote quality learning*

By Lisa Schnuit

When I first started teaching back in the 1970s, I thought “curriculum” was the information that state and local curriculum guides told me to teach at specific grade levels. Transmission of that information was left up to me as the educator. In the absence of state mandated grade level tests, I felt no pressure from looming deadlines. I felt free to be creative. So, if a few concepts were not covered by the end of the year, I did not worry. I knew the curriculum was cyclic. Then things changed. State-specific testing began in earnest, I taught and I learned, and my truths modified.

Almost 30 years later, I am a curriculum specialist at Charles Erwin Middle School in Salisbury, North Carolina, and I also teach graduate students at Catawba College in Salisbury. When I begin each semester of my curriculum course, I question my students to find that the concept of “curriculum content” has not changed in all these years. State curriculum guides are still the stone tablets of the early 21st century. But one change has been monumental—full coverage of each curricular objective has often supplanted teachers’ desire to teach creatively and engagingly.

Goodlad conducted a study of 1,000 classrooms and found there was an “extraordinary sameness” in lesson structure. The prevailing pattern was lecturing, questioning, monitoring, and quizzing (1984, p. 249). That same structure appeared in the 1990s when 75% to 85% of classrooms still maintained a

“teacher-centered landscape” (Cuban, 1993, p. 14). Cuban did see an increase in cooperative learning and problem- or project-based activities, but he concluded that most teachers limit students’ participation in curriculum, denying them full partnership in the planning of content and in the choice of learning activities. With so much information to teach, a frenzy to “cover the material” has pressured many middle school teachers to use a didactic teaching format for imparting the subject material. Even though research has shown positive outcomes for student-centered learning, and even though a huge number of middle level students are not engaged by traditional pedagogical methods, many middle level teachers feel they have to teach every objective as efficiently as possible to get it all in. For that reason, the recurring mantra too often remains: “Get out your pens and paper, someone turn on the overhead projector, we’ll be taking notes again today.”



PHOTO COURTESY OF LISA SCHNUIT

Changing the curricular culture in a classroom can greatly reduce sitting in rows and taking notes.

Lisa Schnuit is a curriculum specialist at Erwin Middle School in Salisbury, North Carolina, and a teacher in the graduate program at Catawba College in Salisbury, North Carolina. E-mail: schnuit@aol.com

The Concept of Curricular Cultures

Borrowing a term used by Joseph (2000), “culture” is a different way of thinking about curriculum. This way of thinking reshapes both the “what” and the “how” of curriculum. Using the curriculum-as-culture model, teachers involved in this curricular project felt the freedom to have students create rather than merely display knowledge. They found ways to satisfy state curricular objectives as minimal accomplishment, with student-created understandings far surpassing that level as the norm.

This article presents case studies of middle school science and social studies teachers who used three different curricular cultures to teach units in their subject areas. The teachers participating in the study are aptly described as hard working and successful in terms of satisfactory performance of their students on state assessments over time in the tested areas of reading and math. These teachers, along with other teachers at Erwin Middle School, contributed to our North Carolina End of Grade Tests in reading and math. Figure 1 displays a compilation of proficiency scores earned by Erwin students in recent years.

Scores steadily progressing upward are traditional at Erwin Middle School. Between 2004 and 2005 when our featured teachers first taught using the curricular cultures methodology, the school maintained this tradition. Moreover, as our first adopters were using these cultures of curriculum for a second time, additional teachers chose this approach to teach specific units during 2005-2006.

To support these teachers in their quest, they and I read and discussed many books, journal articles, and Web sites that described different approaches to curricular planning. Favorite works that inspired instructional evolution and guided action research were “Reforming all the Time” (Brickman, 2003) and *The Cultures of Curriculum* edited by Pinar (2000). We read these works and discussed applications. Three cultures were selected for implementation. We met after each trial and discussed the experiences of that lesson. Finally, each teacher engaged in action research by creating a culture of curriculum in her classroom, using it to teach a familiar unit, and then comparing the results with the results she was accustomed to gleaning from years past. These portrayals are specific, but applications are limitless. I hope, through examination of these teachers’ collective experiences, that other teachers are challenged to use curricular cultures in their classrooms.

The Culture of Constructivism

Research

The culture of constructivism functions as a metaphor that describes a total environment where teachers share the responsibility for what is learned with students. Its historic champions include Dewey, Montessori, Piaget, and Bruner, to name a few. More recently, Gagnon and Collay (2005) have described learning as that which is “the result of mental construction.” The process looks to the “centrality of the learner” (Windschitl, 2000), who puts known and new information together to “construct unique understandings.” Assessment is integrated into the learning process so students can assess their progress and, ultimately, their own learning (Hein & Appleman, 1996). A constructed product demonstrates new and complex understandings in students and becomes the object of assessment, rather than the standard test model. This is a distinctive shift from the “teacher as knowledge transmitter/passive student as receptor” model still so much a part of current school pedagogy.

These teachers found ways to satisfy state curricular objectives as minimal accomplishments, with student-created understandings far surpassing that level as the norm.

Setting the Stage

Jane describes herself as a “control freak,” afraid to “let go” even a little in the learning process of her social studies students. Even so, she agreed to revamp what had become over the past several years a passive learning experience for her students. After researching and discussing the work of constructivist theorists and practitioners, she chose this approach for her unit on the American Civil War. She did this by building a culture of constructivism in her class to facilitate students’ active involvement with their own learning.

This was uncomfortable at first for Jane because her usual neat lesson plans

Figure 1
Erwin Middle School
Proficiency Scores

	Reading	Math
2003	84.8	84.9
2004	90.3	86.9
2005	93.5	92.2

would not work. Each day's activity depended on the unfolding of the day before. Furthermore, her students did not know what to make of this change in lesson organization. They were programmed to expect a list of learning objectives that dealt with specific answers to specific, pre-ordained questions. They were also prepared to expect an objective test on which they would demonstrate that they had learned all the "right" facts. What Jane had in mind was nothing like that. She explained to her students that this classroom environment would be viewed as a "culture of construction." For the foreseeable future, she wanted students to mentally grab their hard hats as they entered her door. Everything that students did during this unit would be geared toward the construction of new knowledge, built on the foundation of knowledge already known.

Part One

Starting with a big class discussion on known issues, facts, or concepts, and even misconceptions about the American Civil War, students volunteered what they knew, and these items were recorded on a large class poster. During the following session, students generated questions about any of the things on the poster. Jane dealt with complexity by steering student questions toward higher order thinking. As the students began to see the format she was fostering, they were able to do this on their own. One of the first questions asked was, "How many men were killed during the Civil War?" She worked with this student and his question until it became, "What were the major causes of death for the Yankees and the Rebels during the Civil War, and were there differences and similarities between the two sides? If so, why were there differences?" After this session, Jane had each student write the three questions that interested him or her the most. She then grouped students according to common interests.

Part Two

After questions and groups were identified, Jane found herself excited about the diversity in learning that was about to take place. She realized, however, that certain common understandings were needed before the group research process could productively begin. So, at that point Jane spent some initial time explaining how to work in a constructivist culture for learning the answers to complex questions. She concluded her "lead role" by setting up a flexible timeline for the whole project.

Part Three

Throughout the main body of their study, students were busy, busy, busy. Groups started with an initial meeting to decide which construction "product" they were interested in creating to display that which they had learned. Ideas ranged from posters, puppetry, plays, and poetry books to models and multimedia presentations. As groups were ready with plans, Jane circulated among them and began a negotiating phase. Jane looked to see if the plans provided for (a) the involvement of each group member, (b) a plausible design, (c) a projected list of the materials and equipment needed, and (d) a rubric for the assessment portion. Once those elements were determined for each group, Jane acted as materials gatherer (when possible), facilitator, monitor, cheerleader, and consultant. She reported being totally drawn into her students' enthusiasm. Some groups decided to create computer presentations using the research section of the library and Hyperstudio software. They created cards on famous battles and war flags, which they narrated as they displayed their finished products to the class using the overhead projector. Another group created a puppet show and presented it. Several groups made posters. These depicted the Salisbury Prison, medical ailments and procedures of the time, weapons used, and uniforms. The group that worked on the uniforms made a life-sized figure of a soldier and put him in appropriate construction paper clothing while describing Yankee and Rebel garments. Another group wrote poetry and presented it from opposing sides of the room; one side spoke about William Tecumseh Sherman and the other about Thomas Jonathan "Stonewall" Jackson. Jane said that she felt her classroom come alive during those weeks. She assisted her students by helping to solve glitches (including the accommodation of a student who eventually needed to work independently), but also found time for just sitting among groups (with a grin on her face) as she witnessed the students doing the hard work of learning.

Part Four

Finally, the construction phase was completed. As each group finished, Jane sat down and looked with them at their assessment rubric. She asked them to evaluate themselves on the research and product. As classically happens, students nearly always assessed themselves more strictly than did she. Jane enjoyed her ability to dialogue with her students on each project and to discuss with them the notion that

their activities characterized most human endeavors outside the classroom. This culture would challenge students to create understandings for the complex questions that they would encounter throughout their lives.

Each group then presented its product to the class. Students took notes based on the findings shared. Findings were compiled by Jane and displayed beside the questions on the original class poster. At that point Jane could have taken the notes and findings to generate any number of assessments for the whole class. In the case of this unit, she had students use notes from their own project together with notes they had taken from any one of the other projects to produce an essay relating the two. She assessed and displayed finished essays around the room with pieces of artwork that students had generated for their presentations.

Summary

As she walked about the room she listened for the reactions of her students to this style of learning. At first they were not happy because they could not choose with whom they would work (sound familiar?). Getting into the project, however, revealed many positive snippets of conversation. Erin, a bright and effervescent student, said, "Could we do all the rest of our units this way?" Thoughtful Charlotte said, "We aren't listening to a lecture, we're actually totally involved in finding out about the Civil War." Julianna asked her teacher if she and her partner could work in the hall to practice a poem. Stepping out in the hall a bit later she saw the girls choreographing their original poem to synchronous motions. Blake said, "It's social studies, but I don't feel sleepy!"

Students took the curriculum, lived in a culture of construction, and came up with new understandings. Jane found those understandings handled every major objective of her traditional study. She and her students learned much more about the Civil War than she was able to "transmit" before. More importantly, there was joy in the learning constructed, a joy she was deeply delighted to see. Such strongly positive student reaction motivated Jane to create a step-by-step plan of this unit, which can be found in Figure 2.

The Culture of Democracy

Research

Related to a culture of construction is a culture of democracy. It rests on the goal of public schools in

this nation to foster an environment for students who will function productively in a democratic society. In his book *Minding American Education*, Brickman (2003) discussed the type of education that is needed in the United States and the education that he sees at this time. He says that the fabrication of curriculum that is decided before students enter the classroom door is the "death of thinking." He talks about this form of education producing for students a "bland pudding" made for passive absorption. However, a culture of shared authority and responsibility, both democratic ideals, focuses on decision making suitable for all in the community. This, in turn, creates a setting where motivation is high and sustained over time through discovery and

Figure 2
Constructivist Teaching Project: Civil War

STEP ONE

Have students brainstorm all that they know about the Civil War. Record student responses on a large piece of chart paper. Then have students generate questions that they have about any of the topics listed. Record questions with the related topics. Be ready to help modify student questions to encourage higher order thinking levels. For example a student might ask, "How many soldiers were killed during the Civil War?" This could be rephrased to say, "How many soldiers died in the war and what were the leading causes of death?" "How does this compare between Northern soldiers and Southern?" After looking at the recorded topics and questions, students write the three questions that interest them the most and give those to the teacher.

STEP TWO

That evening the teacher places students into groups based on their common interests. The next day the composition of groups is announced and work areas are set. Before breaking into groups, everyone is told about the project to come. A flexible timeline is given and the activities to be completed in that time are discussed. These activities include research, construction of a reasonable presentation "product," and the generation of a rubric that will contain assessments of: participation per group member, quality and type of product to be constructed, and a presentation plan. As groups complete the draft stage of this rubric, they will notify the teacher, who will come to their area and negotiate the final form of each rubric.

STEP THREE

Once the negotiation is complete, the group's status is "go." At that point the teacher circulates from group to group while the research and construction is done. The teacher acts as materials gatherer, facilitator, monitor, cheerleader, and consultant. When the construction phase is completed, the teacher sits down to look with the group at their assessment rubric. The students are asked to evaluate themselves on the research and the product. The full class will evaluate the presentation of each group based on the presentation rubrics.

STEP FOUR

Each group presents its product to the class. Students take notes based on the findings shared. Products are displayed with original questions around the room.

For a general assessment, students use notes from their own project together with notes they have taken from any one of the other projects, to produce an essay relating the two. Finished essays are assessed by the teacher and are also displayed in the room.

joint problem solving (Mikel, 2000). This participatory engagement in the classroom develops the citizens of this environment into a “little public” according to Garrison (2003). It is then a small jump for these citizens of “little publics” within the school to become decision makers in other “little publics” such as churches, clubs, and civic groups. As students become active participants in the democratic culture of curriculum, they move on to participating in “larger publics” such as city, state, or national governments. These lists go on and on as students gain the sense of personal efficacy that comes from classroom cultures of democracy.

Given such a democratic framework, the roles of teacher and student shift. The teacher’s role (Mikel, 2000) is facilitation, guidance, support and encouragement, coordination, and final arbitration. He goes on to say that this is true “by virtue of their being adults, their professional qualifications, and their status as the agents of the overseeing school authority” (p. 122). Even within this “circumscribed democracy,” authority and relationships can be significantly altered from the norm (Mikel, 2000, p. 122). Students in this culture take an active role as “citizen” of the classroom community to negotiate the determination of content and the processes of learning for the benefit of themselves and simultaneously that of their peers. In this culture the teacher takes on the role of citizen with one vote, just as each student is a citizen with one vote.

Setting the Stage

Angela said that she adopted this culture because it was so foreign to her that it was intriguing. She tried it in her sixth grade classroom as she and her students were about to study the cycling of matter through plant composers and decomposers. The science unit needed coverage, but that was where the framework of traditional education ended. To kick off this new study and create this culture in her classroom, Angela and her students talked about the meaning of democracy. She gave her students the meaning of the word from the ancient Greek root of the term, “demos” as “rule by the many.”

Part One

After students and she discussed the concept, she had them answer privately three organizing levels of questions: (a) How do plants impact my world? (b) What questions or concerns do I have about plants? and (c) What questions or concerns do I have about the way plants impact the world? Small groups

formed to compile both self-focused and more widely cast questions. However, students were not compelled to share self-focused questions or concerns. Each group charted common questions but noted unique questions as well. Charts were then posted on the classroom walls where students and Angela used them to develop categories under which common questions were grouped. Using a popular vote method, students and Angela selected all of the categories of personal interest, often voting for three or four. Categories emerged such as “Plants Around the World,” “Plant Growth Cycles,” and “Endangered Plant Species.” When all votes had been cast and tallied, the class had their first study topic. Angela announced, “Our first unit has been chosen—How Plant Cycles Are Used by Humans!”

Part Two

They next initiated the critical phase of carving out the structure that was to be a unit-long curriculum based on the citizens’ collective interest about the plant kingdom. First, they selected the self and world questions that were found in the “plant use” category. For each question they described learning activities and learning outcomes, which were “negotiated” with Angela against official school, system, and state mandates. They decided that it was important to gain knowledge about uses of plant matter by humans under the categories of nutrients, medicines, building materials, and product manufacture. In terms of skills to develop, they chose research, writing, critical thinking, communication, and computer skills. As a full class they constructed several daily work rubrics including these learning categories, and then honed them to one rubric by popular vote.

Part Three

Small groups formed as students chose “specialty areas” for which to be responsible. By majority vote, with Angela each group developed a group-specific rubric by which they assessed their own and



Students organize information for a poster presentation.

PHOTO COURTESY OF LISA SCHNITT

each other's learning goals and achievements as the curriculum unfolded from day to day. Angela was aware that she needed to keep a delicate balance between those students whose voices are typically heard in the classroom and those whose voices normally are not. Therefore, as she went from group to group, she was constantly calibrating involvement and participating in democratic group decision making as students considered alternate pathways for group activities.

Each group decided upon a project, including a mode for communicating their findings: PowerPoint, essays, three-dimensional models, or posters. Angela was not surprised to have many groups choose to present their research through posters and discussion. She knew that this medium for presentation is comfortable for middle school students, so her perceived objective was to help students make the highest quality posters possible. These ranged from plant to medicine flow charts, to graphs showing plant products' varieties of uses in the U.S. (tobacco and cotton were popular), to plant sources of food for human consumption. A few groups did plant models to show uses of common plants during the different phases of their life cycles. One group researched the uses of bamboo at the shoot, green, and dried stages of its life cycle. Another demonstrated how cotton was turned into cloth.

Part Four

Angela carried with her the class-approved rubrics for daily learning goals for formative status assessments as she circulated. She made notations based on observations of individual student performance within the categories that the class voted as important. She did this as a customary activity Monday through Thursday. On Fridays Angela gave feedback to all students regarding the level of work of the past four days, the direction for the next four days, and specific vignettes from the various group activities just completed. The students responded exceptionally well to wrap-up Fridays, enjoying stories Angela shared about them. Finally, specialty groups shared researched products with the class as the unit culminated. All of the students took notes. Then, based on the common core of information that students and Angela voted as necessary for all students, proficiency was eventually evaluated via a pencil and paper test. Each test carried with it a bonus section that students answered based on the findings of their individual groups.

Summary

Did all of the students come away with the same knowledge as a result of the first unit? No; Angela was excited to find that each student learned valuable information about plant use by humans that exceeded the core knowledge learned by all. She reported to her colleagues that she was already looking for another opportunity to foster students' self-concept as citizens on yet another study. Although the setup of this study took longer than it would have if she provided the normal diet of lecture, note taking, and text reading, the rewards were worth it. She said that student involvement created a new dynamic between her and her students as fellow learners. They were all "doing" science as one of her students put it. She found that by sharing the responsibility for learning, students and teachers opened a conversation that evolved far beyond the limits of one unit.

Angela was excited to find that each student learned valuable information about plant use by humans that exceeded the core knowledge learned by all.

The Culture of Self and Spirit

Research

In this section I borrow the phrase "self and spirit" from the work of Bravmann (2000), who used this metaphor to describe what others might call holistic teaching. She said the culture of self and spirit creates an environment in which education of the whole child is prized above all else. She states that educators teaching in this culture wish to develop in students "the well-rounded development of the heart, the body, the mind, and the spirit to the end of life-long learning; the desire to develop or retain the goodness, morality, and ethical foundations for leading a righteous life; and the betterment of the immediate community, society, and the world" (p. 83).

Holistic teaching as a movement dates back to the nineteenth century. Champions have included Pestalozzi, Thoreau, Emerson, Alcott, Parker, Dewey, Steiner, and Montessori. Perhaps the most recent and well-known proponent in the United States is Maria Montessori. It was her conviction that education is the art of cultivating moral, emotional, physical, psychological, and spiritual dimensions of

the developing child (Miller, 1990). Montessori schools still flourish in the United States and their holistic application of education is well known and respected. Steiner's Waldorf Schools are increasing in popularity. Dewey put it this way, "teachers need to believe that the learner, not the subject matter, is the center of all teaching and that the child's total growth is the primary objective of teaching. The teachers' job, therefore, is to select worthy experiences for each child that will be both engaging and challenging" (cited in Bravmann, 2000, p. 80).

Setting the Stage

Leslie teaches at a school in which 63% of students qualify for free and reduced lunch. She decided to do her action research using the curricular culture of self and spirit because she feels that every child is more than a future employee; every child's intelligence and abilities are far more complex than his or her scores on End of Grade Tests. She liked the idea of self and spirit because developing a whole classroom culture based on nontraditional teaching would allow her to do more to foster her students' feelings of self-worth. She had been interested in this culture for some time, but was cautious because of time constraints, assessments, and behavior issues. Leslie also felt hesitant about letting students go and discover their learning, afraid that they would miss the "big picture." However, with the diverse students in her classes she was attracted by the possibility of actually touching children's spirits and helping them develop as people. A unit on weather was next on her agenda, so she decided to use this to create a self and spirit culture in her classroom.

Leslie decided to use the curricular culture of self and spirit because she feels that every child's intelligence and abilities are more complex than his or her scores on End of Grade Tests.

Part One

To better compare her traditional teaching style and the culture of self and spirit, Leslie introduced the weather unit by teaching the water cycle first, using her traditional teaching style. She then moved to developing self and spirit to teach atmospheric

phenomena. Leslie asked her students to tell her about weather and its impact on them and their world. She made notes on responses and used them after school to construct small groups of students with common interests and concerns, but differing ability levels. When students came back to class the next day, Leslie introduced groups and centers. She also introduced the culture itself by telling students that for the remainder of the weather unit students were going to work by groups in centers. She told them that she wanted them to learn about weather from the materials at the center as well as to converse and learn things from each other.

Part Two

During this phase Leslie set up the framework in which students received holistic opportunities for learning, while still meeting the objectives for weather from the standard course of study. She showed students the three centers that she had set up in the classroom and drew their attention to some questions that headlined each one. The questions were complex in that they covered core state objectives but also encouraged weather applications that were satisfied through the arts as well as through experimentation and observation. Next she showed students the materials that she had placed at each center to help them in their quest to understand the many applications of each concept. Students were told that each group would spend four days at each center. The fifth day of each week would be given to putting finishing touches on daily journals and providing some extra time in the center for individuals who needed it. She also explained that the assessment for this unit would not be the normal paper and pencil test. She told them to expect to see her as they worked at centers; she would be quietly observing, talking to individuals or groups, making spot checks of daily journals, and asking students to collectively or individually demonstrate some of the things they had done at the center. She reminded them that, as always, she would also be there to keep things running smoothly.

Part Three

During the time that students enjoyed a culture of self and spirit there was lively activity and discussion in Leslie's class. Students who normally did not participate in class were active at the centers. She observed her students working to understand information through all of their senses. She stayed on the move Monday through Thursday each of those three

weeks and assessed students as they were working. She was able to talk with students to see if they really had a clear understanding of what they were learning. On the fifth day each week, students returned to their desks to finish their journals and summarize their findings. For some students this was done orally to meet their individual needs. Fridays also were days when students who wanted to share one of their creations—a poem, a picture, a song—were invited to do so. Before Friday classes were finished, Leslie took the opportunity to give a general assessment to the whole class about what she had seen during that week and prepped students for the shift of centers to start Monday.

Part Four

Students expressed their understandings in ways other than pencil and paper, and many had their first opportunity to share understandings via expressions of individuality. Using authentic assessments including observation, discussion, journal writing, physical movements, painting, drawing, and singing, Leslie determined that students were in possession of core knowledge about weather phenomena that more than satisfied the standard course of study.

True to the major tenets of holistic teaching, some remarkable outcomes were experienced that transcended the knowledge of content. Stacy was not usually into learning or the activities of her class. She could be counted on to be distant, not paying attention, reluctant to answer questions, and not interacting with her peers. While working with shaving cream clouds in one of the centers, however, a profound difference in Stacy surfaced. She was smiling and happy. She did not appear intimidated by the other students and was actually working with her group. This outcome was not limited to Stacy. Leslie saw great things happening with the majority of students who shared some of Stacy's characteristics. Did she have to monitor the shaving cream center closely? Of course, these were middle school students! A few had to sit out for a while before they could rejoin that center. But, was it worth it? Absolutely!

Summary

Leslie was amazed at this whole new set of learners she had. She said that during her teacher-centered transmission of the information on the water cycle, some students had a hard time paying attention and were reluctant to answer questions. On the culminating activity of having students label the

water cycle on a picture, the average proficiency was about 66%. From that experience she moved to a culture of self and spirit in which she was seeing 100% involvement. During the time of this unit, Leslie said that a prospective parent and some colleagues observed in her class and were very impressed with the students' dedication to their own learning. She was also very uplifted with these "new students" and would definitely use a culture of self and spirit again.

There was lively activity and discussion in Leslie's class; students who normally did not participate in class were active at the centers.

Synthesis

The end result of teaching these units using a specific curricular culture was the same in that each teacher described her classes as experiencing "new life." All three finished their units by making plans to use a curricular culture (the same or a new one) as soon as possible. Jane, Angela, and Leslie reported that their outlook on teaching had been re-energized. These teachers all found that the standard course of study objectives were "discovered" along a fascinating student-centered journey that netted deeper and broader knowledge than classes they had taught in the past. On a personal level, these teachers had used reflection and then inquiry to bring about change in their classrooms and by so doing had gotten back in touch with their "call to teach."

For more information on these and other curricular cultures please pick up *Cultures of Curriculum*, edited by Pinar (2000). The book is written by a group of educators who have each become experts on a particular culture through research and application. This article is



A teacher provides feedback on a student team's project design.

PHOTO COURTESY OF USA SCHNUIIT

meant to show how non-experts in each culture were able to adapt their teaching to allow “new” ideas to refresh the fare they offer to their students. If, as a teacher, you find yourself falling into the timeworn pattern of lecture and note taking to deliver your content, I challenge you to try one of these ideas. They are not as hard to manage as you might think because your students will want you to do this again. Student motivation and inspiration for all may return to teaching and learning in an era of high-stakes testing.

References

Bravmann, L. (2000). Developing self and spirit. In W. Pinar (Series Ed.), *Cultures of curriculum* (pp. 73-94). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brickman, M. (2003). Reforming all the time. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82, 1-31.

Cuban, L. (1993). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms 1890-1990* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Gagnon, G. W., & Collay, (2005). *Constructivist learning design*. Retrieved April 21, 2005, from <http://www.prainbow.com/cld/cldp.html>

Garrison, W. A. (2003). Democracy, experience, and education: Promoting a continued capacity for growth. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84, 1-6.

Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hein, M. B., & Appleman, D. (1996). Multiple ways of knowing in literature classrooms. *English Education*, 32(2), 5-22.

Joseph, P. B. (2000). Conceptualizing curriculum. In W. Pinar (Series Ed.), *Cultures of curriculum* (pp. 1-14). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mikel, E. R. (2000). Deliberating democracy. In W. Pinar (Series Ed.), *Cultures of curriculum* (pp. 115-136). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Miller, R. (1990). *What are schools for? A history of holistic education in America*. Brandon, VT: Holistic Education Press.

Pinar, W. (Series Ed.). (2000). *Cultures of curriculum*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Windschitl, M. (2000). Constructing understanding. In W. Pinar (Series Ed.), *Cultures of curriculum* (pp. 95-114). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Using *Middle School Journal* for Professional Development.

To get great ideas for using this article for staff development visit www.nmsa.org and click on “Professional Development” then “Using MSJ for Professional Development,” September 2006 issue.

Mark your calendars!

Middle Level Essentials Conference

A conference providing an in-depth look into topics essential to the success of middle level schools.

February 5-6, 2007 • St. Louis, MO



Janet Allen
*Literacy Across
Content Areas*



Alan November
*Keynote Address
Professional Learning
Communities*



Belinda Williams
*Closing The
Achievement Gap*

A SYMPOSIUM ON MIDDLE LEVEL TEACHER PREPARATION

*Historic Perspectives and Future Directives:
The Evolution of Middle Level Teacher Preparation*

- Standards-based Teacher Preparation Programs
- State Policy, Licensure, and Advocacy
- Research on Middle Level Teacher Preparation

Come share the latest information, trends, and best practices to enhance the quality of middle grades education.

February 9-10, 2007 • Destin, FL



For more information, call **1-800-528-NMSA**, or visit us online at www.nmsa.org