

Grafting: Making Space for International and Comparative Education in a Pre-service Teacher Social Foundations Class

Payal Shah

University of South Carolina, pshah@mailbox.sc.edu

Kara D. Brown

University of South Carolina, BROWNK25@mailbox.sc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://preserve.lehigh.edu/fire>

 Part of the [International and Comparative Education Commons](#), [Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shah, P., & Brown, K. D. (2016). Grafting: Making Space for International and Comparative Education in a Pre-service Teacher Social Foundations Class. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education*, 3(1). Retrieved from <http://preserve.lehigh.edu/fire/vol3/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Lehigh Preserve. It has been accepted for inclusion in FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education by an authorized administrator of Lehigh Preserve. For more information, please contact preserve@lehigh.edu.

Grafting: Making Space for International and Comparative Education in a Pre-service Teacher Social Foundations Class

Abstract

This article contributes to a growing appreciation and understanding of both the ways to include exposure to Comparative and International Education (CIE) in undergraduate teacher education as well as to how students take up and respond creatively to opportunities for comparative exploration. In order to make space for comparative education in the already oversubscribed pre-service teacher's program of study, we (1) explore a strategy to use a required undergraduate social foundations' class for pre-service teachers at a large public university as a platform for comparative education, and (2) share the lessons learned from creating space for students to express their international and comparative curiosities. We open the article by introducing the "grafting" strategy to make space for the comparative; we then turn to the ways we employed a pedagogical tool we call "drawing out" to allow students to make comparative connections by responding to our deliberate, comparative prompts. We found that by embracing the grafting approach we created opportunities for students to make their own conclusions about the value of comparative considerations and to express their organic interest in the international to better understand domestic developments and options.

Keywords

Internationalizing, pre-service teacher education, grafting, comparative education

GRAFTING: MAKING SPACE FOR INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE EDUCATION IN A PRE-SERVICE TEACHER SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS CLASS

Payal P. Shah¹

University of South Carolina, USA

Kara D. Brown

University of South Carolina, USA

Introduction

How is it possible to make space for comparative education in the already oversubscribed pre-service teacher's program of study? Despite the decades of scholarship on the imperative to include more global, international, and comparative components in U.S. teacher training (McDowell, 1977; McGaha & Linder, 2014; Ross, 2007), this urgent curricular priority has yet to transform contemporary teacher preparation programs and to result in broad institutional shifts. Scholars identify the reasons for the stubborn lack of change as linked to the defining features of public teacher-training programs: their overwhelming domestic focus (Dickson, 1967), the lack of curricular space or its being "increasingly crowded" (Patrick, Macqueen, & Reynolds, 2014, p. 472), and the pragmatic focus on teaching skills and content (O'Sullivan, Wolhuter, & Maarman, 2010; Watson & Williams, 1984). These aspects of pre-service teacher programs have contributed to the uneven and widely differing introduction and development of efforts to internationalize teacher education. International and comparative education (ICE) as one focus and field advanced within these broad internationalizing efforts finds its place in this curricular landscape in one or more spaces within teacher preparation: stand-alone ICE classes, study-abroad courses, and/or inclusion of ICE units into existing education courses. In this article, we propose a new pedagogic strategy of "grafting" ICE onto an existing, and for most pre-service teachers, mandatory Social Foundations' course.

We locate our ICE-Social Foundations "tinkering" firmly within the larger project of internationalizing teacher education and working to prepare globally-minded teachers for the 21st century. In this article, we align ourselves with Irma Olmedo and Lesley Harbon's (2010, p. 77) conception of internationalizing teacher education, which means

viewing education from the perspective of a global citizenry, thus not only

¹ *Correspondence: Payal P. Shah, 142 Wardlaw College, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208, E-mail: pshah@mailbox.sc.edu, TEL: 803-777-4462.*

broadening the knowledge base of teachers but also sensitizing them to different perspectives on issues that can affect children, families and communities, and having those perspectives inform the way they teach.

We view “globally competent teaching” (O’Connor & Zeichner, 2011, p. 521), and the work to instill a sense of “global mindedness” (McGara & Linder, 2014, p. 306) in our students, as part of sound preparation for *all* pre- and in-service teachers and as part of a broader effort to cultivate “master teachers of international understanding” (Apple, 1951, p. 193) We agree with Heidi Ross (2007, p. 133) that “the capacity to think and understand transnationally must be part of what we mean when we say teachers are intellectually capable and pedagogically prepared.” At minimum, exposure to international perspectives enhances pre-service teachers’ and administrators’ appreciation “that the problems they face are not unique and that they might benefit and learn from a study of some of the solutions attempted elsewhere” (Watson & Williams, 1984, p. 251). We are also attentive to the value of incorporating comparative education research in Social Foundations classes; we find that drawing attention to a variety of comparative approaches to research design helps to reveal to students the value of the “conscious decision to use comparison and contrast” in educational studies (Adamson, 2012, p. 647).

In this article, we (1) introduce and explore the “grafting” strategy to use a required undergraduate social foundations class for pre-service teachers at a large public university as a platform for comparative education, and (2) share the lessons learned from creating space for students to express their international and comparative curiosities. We, two social foundations professors with academic backgrounds in ICE, open the article by introducing the “grafting” strategy to make space for the comparative and locating it within the literature about internationalizing teacher education, and then turn to the ways we employed a pedagogical tool we call “drawing out” to allow students to make comparative connections by responding to our deliberate, comparative prompts. The grafting and drawing out approach created opportunities for students to make their own conclusions about the value of comparative considerations and to express their organic interest in the international to better understand domestic developments and options.

Perspectives/Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

The familiar concept of “grafting” is drawn from the agricultural and medical sciences to label and help explicate our pedagogical strategies to internationalize teacher education. Grafting, the notion of joining or splicing together two different parts in an effort to strengthen or improve the result, appears in educational literature primarily in critical scholarship focusing on reforms within the K-12 public education system. Scholars particularly use the concept to depict market and corporate reforms in schools. In this vein, Fusarelli and Johnson (2004) discuss the grafting of market-based management techniques on the education system and Cuban (1992) warns “it is dangerous to borrow the methods of improving businesses and to graft them onto the public schools, whose purposes differ from those of corporations” (p.159). Likewise Barbara Finkelstein expresses concern that “Americans...seem ready to do ideological surgery on their public schools—cutting them away from the fate of social justice and political democracy completely and grafting them onto elite corporate, industrial, military and cultural interests” (cited in Giroux & McLaren, 1986, pp. 217-218).

Our thinking about grafting moves it from its use in critiquing K-12 reform to a pedagogical strategy in higher education. We use grafting to conceptualize a way to infuse comparative perspectives onto the existing content of the Social Foundations class. Grafting, we argue, is a particular type of infusing of ICE onto (and into) existing courses in that it draws on the stability

of the class in programs of study and on the natural intersection of these foci on the comparative. Our decision to introduce ICE deliberately into what is generally understood to be a domestic (i.e., U.S.)-focused class initially evoked in us a sense that we had commandeered foundations to serve the interests of international and comparative education. Although ICE is understood and welcomed as a core aspect of foundations at our university and beyond (Kubow & Fossum, 2007; Provenzo, 2008), we sensed that we were extending its reach, albeit for all the right reasons, in the Social Foundations class. Embedded in the commandeering conceptualization, however, was our own unexamined acceptance of the false domestic-international binary and a resulting pedagogy that emphasized thematic international units distinct from domestic-focused ones. Grafting allows us to resolve the international-domestic binary by highlighting the range of relevant examples, case studies, and insights, be they domestic or international.

Our strategy of grafting requires that we embed ICE perspectives consistently across all pedagogical and curricular components of the course. We chose not to follow a possible ICE approach where students engage in an examination of educational issues in a particular country outside the U.S., but instead made available through readings and assignments a “global range of educational experiences...attempting to produce a general understanding of education, schooling, and educational issues and trends” (McDowell, 1977, p. 235). This results in deliberate in- and out-of-class engagements that blend the international with the domestic. For example, we draw curricular attention to both historic and contemporary moments in our analysis of U.S. public education where international influence intertwines with national development. These international moments range, for example, from the trans-Atlantic influence of the Kindergarten concept to the current referencing to global assessments like PISA and TIMSS. In a grafted class, borders are crossed both at the invitation of the instructors and on the initiative of the students.

In an effort to create space for students to have opportunities to graft the domestic on the international and the international on the domestic, we also conceived of this pedagogic approach as a democratic one--one that encouraged more space for students to identify what they understood as important for understanding policies and developments, be it in the domestic or international sphere. As instructors, we wanted to create a platform where students’ “interests, needs, and desires” could help us “make meaning from our shared experience” (Schultz, 2008, p. 15) in a Social Foundations class with grafted ICE perspectives. In practice, this means that we took a democratic turn in our creation of course exercises and assessments that deliberately requested students to ponder comparatively and incorporate the international only when they saw fit. This approach invited students to “draw out” examples and perspectives that they organically and independently saw as relevant for understanding policy developments in the educational sphere. Our goal through these tasks, which we briefly outline in the article, was to cultivate within the students an understanding of the value of comparative examination and analysis.

Positionality and Methods

In order to explore how our pre-service students experienced the “grafting” strategy in a social foundations class, we employed a number of research methods and strategies that we detail below. Before describing our methods, we briefly describe our positionalities vis-à-vis the project, provide details about the undergraduate social foundations course itself, and share insights into the student participants in the course.

Positionality. Given that the activities we implement in our courses and the larger pedagogical and curricular orientations structuring the course are deeply informed by our previous experiences and perspectives, it is important that we introduce and situate ourselves in this

work. Both of us primarily identify as comparativists who approach the nexus of educational, social, and cultural issues from critical, qualitative perspectives. We teach and research issues related to equity, social justice, and marginalization around the world from different perspectives. We both have substantial area studies expertise in our respective regions of specialty—India and Estonia—and both conduct long-term ethnographic research. As professors of educational studies at a flagship research-intensive public university in the southeastern part of the U.S., together we bring over a decade of experience teaching the foundations of education to pre-service, undergraduate teachers in a college of education, in addition to a variety of other foundations-related, comparative education, and inquiry courses.

As scholars and educators, we firmly believe that all research and all thinking is fundamentally comparative in nature. We take seriously the assertion that “deliberative examination of the vital connection between ourselves and others, the socially and historically constructed spaces between us, is what is missing from education” (Ross, 2002, p. 431). This deliberative examination has given us the space to engage with the comparative in our teaching to challenge a false domestic-international binary and its underlying pedagogical orientation. Espousing what we call a “grafting” strategy entails reconceptualizing the comparative as a relational process to allow our students to explore both internal and external comparison. This orientation led us to develop our Foundations course where we use the comparative as a pedagogical tool to not only learn about contextual differences regarding the connection between schools and the community, but as a way to learn *through* comparative activities to more deeply engage with and understand persistent and marginalizing socio-cultural practices as they manifest themselves across contexts, both domestically as well as internationally.

Course Context/Description. Working together, we develop and integrate the “grafting” strategy into three sections of a required undergraduate Social Foundations’ class for pre-service teachers at a large public university. The Social Foundations class complements the students’ methods, subject-related, and practicum coursework. The Foundations class is a discussion-based, analytical writing, and intensive pedagogical experience and one in which instructors have considerable autonomy to shape course content within collectively-agreed upon foundational goals. Additionally, both of us have a commitment to construct a curriculum that challenges the students to consume information across a variety of platforms. Therefore, instead of using a standard foundations textbook, we combine a variety of sources, including scholarly articles, government reports, newspaper articles, documentaries, book chapters, and websites to help students explore thematic units grounded in the history, sociology, anthropology, and philosophy of education. We intersperse PowerPoint lectures with group activities and discussions to deepen student engagement with the topics introduced through the readings. We also engage the students in a variety of assessment activities that focus on analytical analysis and exposure to forms of data (quantitative and qualitative) as well as conceptual mastery of key events, terms, and concepts. This curriculum and pedagogy provides us the flexibility to use a broad array of resources to explore a larger range of issues related to our primary overarching themes of equity and equality of educational opportunity in the U.S. public schools (see Appendix A for a sample of our abridged course syllabus).

Participants. For this article, we draw from three sections of the Foundations of Education course taught during the Spring 2015 semester. As mentioned above, the two of us worked together to develop our course syllabi and construct our class sessions. Each of our sections has between 26-28 students; we draw from a participant pool of 84 students. At the beginning of each semester, we have students fill out a brief informational questionnaire as well

as obtain their permission to use course materials for future research projects. With Foundations serving as a required course for pre-service teachers, our classes are composed of students across different levels (e.g., early childhood, elementary, middle level, and secondary), subject areas (e.g., ELA, math, science, art, music, physical education, social studies), and year of study (i.e., first year through seniors). The population is predominantly female (78%), English monolingual (99%—1 Hindi speaker), and the students have had some experience abroad, mainly in the context of family travel and/or missionary trips (51%).

Methods. This article draws upon two sets of methodological engagements to: 1) reflect on the pedagogical and curricular strategy of “grafting” and provide examples of what it means to “graft” an international and comparative perspective onto a domestically-focused foundations of education course, and 2) gain a sense of how students conceptualize the value of comparative considerations and provide them space to express their organic interest in the international to better understand domestic developments and options.

The development of the “grafting” strategy is a product of many discussions between the two of us in an effort to provide undergraduate pre-service teachers exposure to international and comparative issues. While at first we grappled with how to “fit” ICE thematic units into an already oversubscribed, domestically-focused course, we quickly realized that to avoid “commandeering” the course, we needed to be more deliberate in how we define the comparative and in what ways we introduced international and comparative issues into the class. After many conversations where both of us took detailed observational and reflective notes, we concluded that we naturally used examples from our own internationally-based research and background in ICE to underscore domestically-focused issues. Through these conversations, we realized that ICE could be used in a more subtle, pedagogical manner to help students engage both more broadly and deeply with domestic issues and their transnational manifestations. As the course progressed and we continued to discuss class activities and assessments on a biweekly basis, we came to the conclusion that it would be most beneficial to let the students choose the nature of and extent to which they engaged with the international and comparative perspective to help them explore and understand salient themes. Thus, the students chose when to engage in comparative work and when, and how, to include an international component to the work. This democratic turn, and its implications for the strategy’s “impact,” will be elaborated further on in the discussion section.

In order to gauge how the students experience and conceptualize the value of comparative considerations, we engaged the students in deliberate comparative and reflective exercises in class, in analytical assignments, and on the midterm and final assessments. In addition to a basic informational questionnaire, that included 14 questions and took the students about 15 minutes to complete, at the beginning of the semester, we also distributed a more detailed questionnaire comprised of 6 questions to elicit information on the students’ international and comparative backgrounds mid-semester. We typed up all relevant questionnaires, reflective written assignments, and issue-based questions in transcript form with attention to anonymity, combining data across the three sections and 84 students to comprise our primary data set. We then independently engaged in thematic coding analysis to produce themes and codes, and came together to finalize our analysis and insights.

Data Sources/Evidence

As detailed in the sections above, our strategy of grafting ICE perspectives involves a process of deconstructing a domestic-international binary that begins to more deeply highlight the value of looking comparatively at schooling both at home and abroad to explore core issues related to equity and equality in education. In an effort to create space for students to also have

opportunities to “graft” the domestic on the international and the international on the domestic, we took a democratic turn and created course exercises and assessments that deliberately requested that the student ponder comparatively and incorporate the international when and where they saw fit. The strategy of grafting included informal engagement with ICE perspectives, as well as more formal, but voluntary engagements, to cultivate within the students an understanding of the value of comparative examination and analysis. This results in curricular, in-class, and formal assessment-based engagements that seek to blend the international with the domestic.

Curricular Engagements. We deliberately infuse comparative elements into our course syllabi, drawing upon a variety of resources to provide the students with a broad range of U.S. and international-based illustrations to the themes and issues we select as relevant for understanding American public education. As mentioned above, we are committed to exposing the students to differing modalities of information, and, thus, complement traditional scholarly materials with newspaper articles and op-eds, government and think-tank reports, and documentaries. This variety is meant to help broaden the perspective to which we introduce specific Foundation of Education topics and issues. Further, we draw across multiple disciplines (e.g., history, sociology, economics, and anthropology) and use multiple forms of data (e.g., document analysis, data sets, charts and graphs, and qualitative data) to provide an array of evidence supporting different perspectives on current educational issues. We believe that providing students access to such a range of resources, in a comparative manner, will not only deepen their understanding of the themes and issues in American education, but will also strengthen their ability to critically consume information across different platforms.

An example from our courses that highlight how we graft the comparative and international into our foundations course comes from how we introduce the students to the overarching concepts of the course: equality, equity, and excellence in schooling. In organizing the course, we divide it into two parts. The first half of the course focuses on building an in-depth understanding of the state of U.S. public education, with attention to the themes of challenges to developing and sustaining equality and equity in public education. The second half of the course examines strategies for change and reform as we seek to create greater opportunities for equality and equity in education in the U.S. In the first three weeks of the semester, we engage in a deep exploration of the concepts of equality, equality and excellence in schooling. We approach this examination from a comparative perspective, drawing from global, national and state levels. The students watch the PBS documentary *Time for School* (2009), read an article entitled “What Americans Keep Ignoring about Finland’s School Success,” (Partanen, 2012), read an OECD Policy Brief that discusses the concepts of equity in education using OECD country data comparatively (OECD, 2008), read historical and philosophical scholarly articles from U.S. educational academics, and watch the documentary *Corridor of Shame* (Ferillo, 2005) about school inequity in South Carolina along the I-95 band.

In-Class Engagements. To deepen student engagement with the readings and documentary viewings, we design and infuse exploration of comparative links and case studies in class. These include discussions and exercises that push the students to examine issues related to equality and equity in education. We intend through these in-class engagements to not only deepen their understanding of the main topics in the class, but to also highlight shared and distinct concerns and dynamics across borders. We include here an overview of select examples of these to illustrate our in-class grafting strategy.

One of the goals of the course is to examine rigorously major theories and concepts in the field. As a Social Foundations course, we reserve the majority of the focus on contributions from

the fields of sociology, history, anthropology, and philosophy that would most likely be shared with a non-grafted course, including grammar of schooling, subtractive schooling, social and cultural capital, and funds of knowledge, to name only a few. In our ICE grafted course, we introduce these theories and deliberately bring them to life with select examples from outside the U.S. For example, when introducing labeling theory, we have students consider both the production and consequences of the label “willful defiance” in Los Angeles and the notion of “giftedness” as proposed and explored by Tobin, Wu, and Davidson in *Preschool in Three Cultures* (1989, pp. 24-25). Both examples help to bring to life the cultural production and educational consequences of these labels across borders.

Another illustration of our in-class grafting strategy is how we link our exploration of the purposes of US public schooling with an in-class exploration of PISA data and comparative analysis of school schedules and school structures across the U.S. and Estonia. We begin this exploration by viewing a map of school cleaning borrowed from Dr. Steiner-Khamsi (G. Steiner-Khamsi, personal communication, April 26, 2007), supplemented by photographs of students cleaning schools in Taiwan and India. We discuss the concept of school cleaning and who cleans schools in various contexts, linking back to the political, economic, and socio-cultural purposes of education. The students immediately make connections to the *Time for School* documentary and commented on how the act of children participating in school cleaning may contribute to supporting both economic and political purposes of education. They commented that perhaps because students in the U.S. do not clean their classrooms, they feel less invested in and ownership over their schools. This, they believe, may lessen U.S. student engagement with the school and impact student achievement. Additionally, when discussing children in Japan and India, the students acknowledged how involving students in the cleaning process in schools also may play a role in promoting a more democratic and egalitarian school atmosphere, as opposed to the more hierarchical atmosphere often found in U.S. public schools.

Following this large class discussion, we break the students into groups where they analyze handouts that compare school schedules in Estonia and South Carolina with PISA results. The students immediately concluded that in order to reconcile the PISA results with time in school, more information on how the day was spent was needed. The students had read an article describing Obama’s push for more time in school and a newspaper article detailing the Boston Public Schools’ decision to extend the school day. When asked to discuss their thoughts on these initiatives, the students were clear that increasing quantity of time in school did not necessarily mean quality was improved, drawing upon the PISA scores to support their assertion. Most students noted that they needed to consider such issues as how the year would be divided, what teachers were teaching and how the extra time in school was to be used, and what the overall curriculum emphasized. They gave examples of how in Estonia there were entire periods devoted to the arts and local culture and how in Japan there is more time for physical education. They cited these as positive examples of how the quality of U.S. schools could be improved by extending the school day and engaging in such curricular activities.

A third example of how we use in-class exercises to engage in comparative analysis entails the students debriefing in groups their first analysis assignment, which is described in more detail in the sub-section below. For this assignment, students were asked to engage in a comparative constitutional assignment across two units of their choosing (i.e., two U.S. states, a U.S. state and another country, or two different countries) to help students explore how guarantees for public education are expressed similarly and differently across different contexts. In class, we ask the students to reflect on the value of the comparative perspective and how notions of equity and

equality are expressed at the constitutional level. We gave the students a handout to guide their discussion whereby we ask them to specify data about their units of comparison and compare their data to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The handout also included questions to discuss as a group. These questions asked the students to consider what it means for countries/states to realize their constitutional guarantees and what kinds of resources are needed for such realization. The students also considered in what ways comparison did or did not help facilitate an understanding of the concepts of equity and equality of educational opportunity.

Formal Assessment Based Engagements. In addition to out-of-class readings and viewings and in-class activities, we also applied our grafting strategy to formal assessment activities. Examples of assessment-based engagements included an analysis assignment and short essay question on the midterm. Both of these activities were geared towards supporting the students to deepen their engagement with comparative activities as well as to provide them an opportunity to express their organic interest in the international to better understand domestic developments and options.

As briefly mentioned above, the students' first analysis assignment has them engage in a modest comparative research project (see CB for assignment). This assignment builds upon the emphasis in the initial weeks of the semester on differing governmental commitments to, and provisions of, public education. To begin this exploration, we have the students examine the constitutional guarantee for education/schooling. The goal of this assignment is to draw attention to and appreciate the ways geography, historical periods, and political philosophies, among other factors, help to shape guarantees for public education. Partly inspired by research by Heymann, Raub, and Cassola (2014) on educational guarantees within constitutions, we asked students to select two comparative units: two U.S. states, a U.S. state and another country, or two different countries. To enable them to gain familiarity with the actual constitutions, we had them select and copy the relevant passages of these two unit's constitutions. We then had the students review the two units to interrogate the constitutional guarantees in *each* of these units regarding education. In their analysis, they had to reflect on: (1) the year of each of the constitutions; (2) the *kind* of schooling/education is guaranteed to citizens; (3) what struck them as they read both of these constitutions—are they similar, different, in which ways? And, how did the constitutions address the realization of these guarantees?; and finally 4) the students reflected on how they conducted this research (e.g., Why did they select these countries/states? How did they search for the constitutions? And, what questions did this prompt reflection raise for them?).

A second illustration of our grafting technique comes from a short essay question on the midterm exam. In this question, we sought to provide the students with an opportunity to reflect on a compelling or meaningful comparison that we engaged in in class. We asked the students to take one example from the first half of the semester readings or material that was comparative in some way, such as a class reading or documentary film like *Time for School*, Lareau's (2005) comparison of the Colton and Prescott families, Schultz's (2008) comparison of his own schooling and that at Carr Elementary, and share two understandings and/or findings gained from looking and/or analyzing the material comparatively.

Results/Findings

As a result of these deliberate, comparative curricular and pedagogical strategies, we found that students were able to articulate an understanding of the purpose of engaging in the comparative process, reveal the insights they gained from engaging in comparative analysis, and reflect on the processes of 'doing' comparative analysis. Overall, we observed that our students had an inclination to look abroad in order to better understand the U.S. school system and to imagine new

possibilities for education. We also found that students began to develop an appreciation of the strengths and weaknesses of engaging in comparative analysis in education.

Purposes of Engaging Comparatively. When asked to reflect on how engaging in comparative analysis (domestically, internationally, or domestic-international comparisons) shaped potential understanding of the concepts of equity and equality of opportunity, the students seemed to agree that comparisons were useful in helping to learn about other contexts and to put educational issues in a broader perspective. In particular, students felt that it furthered their appreciation of how countries prioritize differently what is important regarding education. One student remarked that comparing countries “helps us understand what other countries think is important for education, such as what is necessary and what should be included in their educational system.” Another student commented that, “comparison helps us to see where certain countries stand with their fulfillment of their educational guarantee.” Students also noted that engaging in comparative analysis helped them learn from other contexts. For example, one student asserted that comparative analysis revealed that,

there are places in the world where education ‘works,’ meaning equity is a focus of the system. By comparing the legislature of successful educational systems with those that don’t work as well, we can draw conclusions or ‘why’ things are not working and what citizens/governments can do to fix those problems.

Finally, students felt that comparative analysis helped to broaden their understanding of the abstract concepts of equity and equality. They stated that comparing across countries provided them a more complete picture of the strengths and weaknesses of a system when it came to supporting notions of equity and equality, as opposed to learning about these issues from only a “one-sided view.”

Revelations/Insights from Engaging in Comparative Analysis. In addition to learning about other contexts and educational circumstances, the students described gaining important insights related to understanding the concepts of equity and equality from engaging in comparative analysis. These insights included: recognition that the particularities of context and circumstance matter when it comes to realizing educational guarantees and supporting the notions of equality and equity in education; the emergence of a global perspective in terms of a shared commitment to equality and equity of opportunity; and the idea of education as a fundamental human right - that there is a real need across contexts to define what quality education means and what it looks like, and that there is a distinction between countries and states aspiring to provide equity and equality of opportunity as part of their educational guarantee and their realization of these guarantees.

Drawing from the constitutional analysis assignment and their viewing of the documentaries *Time for School* and *Corridor of Shame*, the students gained a deeper understanding of the barriers to realizing constitutional aspirations. They commented that while many of the barriers to achieving equity and equality of opportunity were similar across contexts, the specific contexts and circumstances of each country mattered. For example, many students noted that funding was a major barrier to realizing constitutional guarantees: “countries need financial backing... to realize their constitutional guarantee for education”, “all of them, [countries] need financial support since education is free”, and in Texas and South Carolina “funding is a barrier to realizing guarantees.”

However, students also noted that the realization of constitutional guarantees is dependent upon states/nations recognizing their particular problems:

They [the countries] realize that the education of their people is important for success, and that it should be protected. The countries need to know what needs to be protected, and they must know and have a way to implement the protections. Family issues, financial issues, and religious issues. For example, in the documentary *Time for School*, the girl [in India] wanting to go to school fell behind because she had to help out her family and ultimately had to drop out of school.

Another student commented that,

It is important that the constitutional government creates programs to put their ideals in place. To do this they must recognize social, religious, and financial issues within their country or state. For example, religion in Afghanistan prevents women from going to school safely.

In a comparison between Afghanistan and South Carolina, a student stated that, “the desire to learn means to make up funding, and people in power need to allocate funding appropriately. In Afghanistan this means funding to address war and gender roles, and in South Carolina funding towards lower income areas.”

Other students remarked that learning, or policy borrowing/lending, can be supported by understanding how common issues are addressed in different contexts. For instance, one student noted that,

In order for the countries/states to realize their guarantees, first they need to develop a plan then figure out how they will pay for that plan. The biggest issue would be the financial issue because it can often be hard to get funding. Ohio lays out a fairly good plan for school boards and how funding would be acquired; some of these ideas could be adopted in other countries/states.

In addition to recognizing the importance of local contexts and circumstances, the students’ articulations also reveal their recognition of a global perspective—one that reveals a shared commitment to equality and equity, to free primary education, and to the recognition of education as a human right. Students emphatically emphasized that education is a moral responsibility for all states/countries, as evidenced in the following comment: “There is a strong moral will for education, but it is not carried out in reality.” However, many of the students also conclude that equality and equity of opportunity are persistent issues sought and valued across contexts, but more often not realized:

All these different constitutions show that the idea of education equity and equality are neither unique nor uncommon. These documents all claim to guarantee quality education to all, but in very few cases that is actually true.

According to another student, “I believe that these comparisons show just how nonexistent equity and equality are in education”. Similarly, a peer noted that,

many places have the aspirational goal for free education, but do not have a plan to reach that goal. ‘Institutions for learning’ is mentioned in all constitutions and are outlined; however, a clear plan is not outlined or put into action.

Students also concluded that part of the failure to achieve this global value of equity and equality of education is due to a lack of clarity on what constitutes quality education. One student

noted that most nations and states “all offer a ‘free’ education, but do not specify the quality of ‘free’ education.” Another student commented that,

For each of our states and countries, they all state free primary and secondary public education... for most states in the U.S., free education is offered; however, quality is not specified. Another issue is who sets the bare minimum?...They use the word “guarantee”, but what does it mean? Ex[ample]: just because something is guaranteed does not mean its feasible.

Likewise,

In some cases it is hard to say exactly what realizing the guarantee would mean due to the vague nature of the guarantees. For instance, Thailand guarantees education up to ‘the quality.’ What does that even mean?

Finally, to help explain the disconnect between constitutional aspirations and the realization of these guarantees on the ground, several students (n= 18) referred back to the concepts of will and capacity as they related to understanding the purposes of schooling. Students stated that in order to realize their constitutional guarantees there was a need for both political will and political capacity:

there must be funding, a standard for basic knowledge, a state board, separation of church and state, and ways to enforce school attendance [capacity]. You need political cooperation and inclusion [will].

Similarly, another student wrote:

For any country or state, it is important to follow what is laid out in their constitution... political and financially they should realize the moral responsibility to education for future citizens and leaders.

Likewise, another student emphasized that, “people in power need to be willing to allocate money to education.” The students’ articulations revealed that comparative engagements not only deepened their understanding of the concepts of equity and equality that underpin this course, but also revealed to them the complexities inherent in analyzing the application of these concepts.

Doing the Comparison. Both instructors opened the course with an invitation for the students to consider the reasons and potential benefits of thinking comparatively. We encouraged comparative thinking within and across the domestic and international levels with room for students to “draw out” cases, examples, and evidence from either (or both) of these sources they found relevant. Student reflections on the constitution analysis assignment revealed the challenges and potential benefits of thinking comparatively.

First, we found that the majority of students, when prompted to engage in comparative work, voluntarily opted to incorporate an international perspective. As mentioned earlier in the article, one of the first assignments in this ICE grafted class was to compare the ways the constitutions of two units (i.e., two U.S. states, a state and another country, or two countries) addressed schooling. We found that 64% (n= 54) of the students opted for an international unit to compare for this assignment with a majority of these students comparing two countries. Students’ interests clustered around particular countries with half of one class’ country-to-country comparisons involving Italy, South Korea, or Iraq and the majority of the U.S. state-to-country comparisons focusing on South Carolina and another country. An additional example of the overwhelming openness of the undergraduate students to take up the global and comparative

surfaced in an end-of-term, anonymous survey. In response to the question “If an undergraduate course primarily focusing on educational issues internationally were available at X, would you be interested in enrolling?,” 80% of the students responded favorably. Notably, the favorable responses were expressed equally by those who had some type of international experience and those who had never left the U.S.

The second finding, connected with engaging in the comparative process, concerned the challenges that arose for students specifically comparing countries with different development levels and making sense of vague language in international documents. Once engaged in comparing countries’ constitutions, students found that vastly different countries and conditions (both internationally and in the U.S.) made comparisons challenging. When we broke students into small groups to discuss their findings from the constitutional comparison assignment, they noted both orally and in writing that comparison might be most meaningful within, rather than across, similarly developed/developing countries. To facilitate these comparisons, one group suggested that it would be more appropriate to compare the “lower achieving” (e.g., Honduras and Peru) with each other. One student group raised the issue of the integrity of the comparative process when including a range of different countries: “I think comparative studies are difficult because it may be unfair to compare nations with unequal resources...many factors would be relevant when comparing these countries and their educational systems such as finance, style of government, etc.” Students across all three classes recognized that comparative work, at least within the course assignment to compare constitutions, was challenging though there was value to considering the range of conditions and contexts across these disparate groups. One group for example, in their focus on the comparative will and capacity of two countries, made the following conclusion: “It is difficult to compare these two countries because of their vast differences. Norway has both the will and capacity to provide equal, equitable education. Afghanistan, on the other hand, appears to have less will and capacity. This shows up in the reality of a constitutional guarantee.”

An additional challenge that participants noted in the comparative process concerned wording and the language of constitutions. The students noted that the documents were generally “vague” and they needed to further explore normative terms like “free,” “equal,” “education,” and “good” to gain a deeper meaning and sense of what kind of guarantees states offered. One student reflected on the absence of shared understandings or expressions of key qualities describing education, “There is no standard definition for global equity or equality, and a ‘good’ education has a different meaning around the world. Because all school systems are so different, and values can vary so much, comparing these constitutions can be difficult.” The need for close examination of taken-for-granted terms arose in several of the students’ reflections. In an effort to make deeper sense of what these normative ideas might mean, students voluntarily turned to supplemental sources that had either been provided in class or that they located independently. An example of this concerned Peru’s constitution, which the student noted had included high standards, but that the country’s PISA scores suggested that concern about “equality/equity is not longstanding.”

Discussion

The findings suggest that the grafting strategy--of deliberately and purposefully infusing a Social Foundations’ course with ICE--provided an outlet for students to follow through with emergent comparative interests and opened opportunities for them to engage regularly with the comparative and international. Through individual and group analysis and discussion of equity and equality, we can see the emergence of students’ ability to see “globally.” Students, for example, without reading literature within the field of comparative education, independently made a shift in their scholarly attention to think about the importance of examining quality over availability of

primary and secondary schooling; this conclusion resulted from their comparative constitutional analysis. In addition, the findings suggest that students will independently make connections with course materials to engage in comparative thinking. Certain sources that were introduced via the formal curriculum or in-class activities proved to be particularly meaningful including the *Time for School* documentary and the recent PISA scores.

This grafted ICE course, when considered as part of a larger effort to advance the internationalization of teacher education, did raise concerns about their resulting “global competence” (Zeichner, 2010). Though, as discussed above, students showed evidence of an inclination to look beyond the U.S. for understanding of educational dynamics and began to draw encouraging conclusions, we recognized that our students had yet to fully develop their “perspective or sociocultural consciousness, where one learns that their ways of thinking, behaving and being are deeply influenced by their social and cultural location, race, ethnicity, gender, social class, language, nationality, and so on” (Zeichner, 2010, p. 6). We saw emergent evidence of this, though, in the students’ response to the *Preschool in Three Cultures*’ excerpt regarding giftedness and subsequent conversations about unexamined U.S. assumptions about giftedness. To address this shortcoming in the course, perhaps we need to define and set particular goals around the cultivation of global competence as part of the course purposes and work deliberately to cultivate their global perspectives. In addition, we are attentive to the general recognition in the class, as expressed in their responses to the constitution assignment that comparative work is challenging. We will consider potentially effective ways to explicate the comparative process, which was found to be difficult by students, within the framework and parameters of this grafted class for the future.

Finally, data from the end-of-class survey and the written reflections point strongly to the ways students will voluntarily “take up” the comparative and international if curricular and assessment space is provided. We were encouraged that a majority of students expressed an interest in a stand-alone ICE class and that they opted to engage in international comparison when the opportunity presented itself (e.g., through the course’s first assignment). We structured these opportunities as part of our deliberate attempt to be more democratic in the class and to “draw out” ICE interests in the students, but consider now that we need to make additional efforts to assist the students in their “drawing together” of the national and international. That is, in cultivating globally competent teachers, we hope that they gain new dispositions and habits that equip them “to work in solidarity with others to transform the current system” (Zeichner, 2010, p. 7).

Significance and Conclusions

In applying the grafting strategy to a required undergraduate teacher education course, we recognize that it is highly unlikely that stand-alone comparative education courses will find a place in large teacher education programs. However, we take seriously the assertion that “it is both sound methodologically and practically to employ the comparative method and results of comparative investigations within teacher education programs” (McDowell, 1977, p. 38). While we will continue to advocate for the inclusion of comparative education and other globally-oriented courses in teacher preparation programs, we believe that grafting ICE onto a foundations course is a necessary component of preparing future U.S. teachers to deeply interrogate the fundamental purposes of education in society. As U.S. society continues to diversify, and the interconnectedness between the U.S. and global forces intensifies, it is imperative that our future teachers are able to understand the deep interconnectedness between schools, culture and society at a global level. We believe that grafting the comparative perspective might provide an effective and efficient way to do so.

Further, insights from our study reveal that while this grafting strategy was clearly an effort driven by two comparativists, it shows tremendous promise in terms of fulfilling student interest. The larger questions that our study reveal include the extent to which instructors who do not have comparative backgrounds are or are not able/willing to engage in the grafting strategy. Grafting ICE onto Social Foundations, as we designed and implemented it in this study, remains highly instructor dependent since materials that merge the two do not yet exist (although we recognize that important texts for stand-alone ICE-teacher focused classes--like Kubow Fossum's 2007 text and Mundy, Bickmore, Hayhoe, Madden, and Madjidi's 2008 text are important contributions to be drawn from in a grafted ICE course). We see the value of sharing grafting strategies and example materials as a way of enabling more instructors to engage in the comparative method. Finally, as we reflect on our application of the grafting strategy and student insights on their engagement with the comparative, we are left wondering about potential weaknesses with the grafting approach: What is sacrificed in terms of breadth and depth of learning when instructors graft instead of implement entire comparative education units? Is the grafting strategy one that depends on professors with a background in ICE or can non-ICE specialists also successfully adopt it? And, finally, is grafting sufficiently democratic in creating space for generative curricular input and influence from students? More research is needed to answer these important questions in relation to the grafting of international comparative education in social foundations courses in preservice teacher education.

References

- Adamson, B. (2012). International comparative studies in teaching and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, 641-648.
- Apple, J. A. (1951). Providing for teacher growth in international understanding. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 2(3),193-198.
- Cuban, L. (1992). The corporate myth of reforming public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 74, 157-159.
- Dickson, G. E. (1967). International teacher education research: The new frame of reference for teacher education reform. *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 18(3), 277-284.
- Giroux, H.A. & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Education Review*, 56, 213-238.
- Heymann, J., Raub, A., & Cassola, A. (2014). Constitutional rights to education and their relationship to national policy and school enrolment. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 29, 131-141.
- Hogan, P. (Producer). (2009). *Time for school* [Documentary]. United States: Thirteen for WNET.org.
- Ferillo, B. (Producer & Director). (2005). *Corridor of shame: The neglect of South Carolina's rural schools* [Documentary]. United States: Ferillo & Associates, Inc.
- Fusarelli, L.D. & Johnson, B. (2004). Educational governance and the new public management. *Public Administration and Management*, 9, 118-127.
- Kubow, P. K., & Fossum, P.R. (2007). *Comparative education: Exploring issues in international Context* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Lareau, A. (2005). Social class differences in family-school relationships. In A. Sadovnik, P. Cookson & S. Semel, (Eds.), *Exploring education: An introduction to the foundations of education* (3rd ed.) (pp. 477-494). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

- McDowell, D. W. (1977). The comparative imperative for the social foundations education of prospective teachers. *Educational Studies*, 8, 231-239.
- McGaha, J.M., & Linder, S. M. (2014). Determining teacher candidates' attitudes toward global mindedness. *Action in Teacher Education*, 36, 305-321.
- Mundy, K, Bickmore, K., Hayhoe, R., Madden, M. & Madjidi, K. (Eds.)(2008). *Comparative and international education: issues for teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- O'Connor, K., & Zeichner, K. (2011). Preparing US teachers for critical global education. *Globalisation, Societies, and Education*, 9, 521-536.
- OECD Policy Brief (2008). Ten Steps to Equity in Education. Retrieved Oct 2007 from <http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/39989494.pdf>.
- Olmedo, I., & Harbon, L. (2010). Broadening our sights: Internationalizing teacher education for a global arena. *Teaching Education*, 21, 75-88.
- O'Sullivan, M.C., Wolhuter, C.C., & Maarman, R. F. (2010). Comparative education in primary teacher education in Ireland and South Africa. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 775-785.
- Partanen, A. (2012). What Americans Keep Ignoring about Finland's School Success. Retrieved December 2011 from: <http://www.theatlantic.com/national/print/2011/12/what-americans-keep-ignoring-about-finlands-school-success/250564/>
- Patrick, K. F., Macqueen, S., & Reynolds, R. (2014). Pre-service teacher perspectives on the importance of global education: World and classroom views. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 20, 470-482.
- Provenzo, E.F. (2008). Toward a renewed definition of the social foundations of education. In E. F. Provenzo (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of the social and cultural foundations of education* (pp. 967-1002). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Ross, H. (2007). Generally educated teachers: Engaging the friction between local and global knowledge. In C. Bjork, D. K. Johnston, & H. Ross (Eds.), *Taking teachers seriously: What we can learn from educators at liberal arts institutions* (pp. 132-148). Boulder, CO: Paradigm Press.
- Ross, H. (2002). The space between us: The relevance of relational theory to re-imagining comparative education (Presidential Address). *Comparative Education Review*, 46, 407-432.
- Schultz, B. (2008). *Spectacular things happen along the way*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Tobin, J.J., Wu, D.Y.H., & Davidson, D. H. (1989). *Preschool in three cultures*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Watson, K., & Williams, P. (1984). Comparative studies and international awareness in teacher education: The need for reappraisal. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 10(3), 249-255.
- Widegren, P. & Doherty, C. (2010). Is the world their oyster? The global imagination of pre-service teachers. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 38, 5-22.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Preparing globally competent teachers: A U.S. perspective. Speech at 2010 NAFSA Colloquium on the Internationalization of Teacher Education. Retrieved October 2011 from https://www.nafsa.org/_/File/_/zeichner_colloquium_paper.pdf

About the Authors

Payal P. Shah is an assistant professor of foundations of education and qualitative inquiry in the College of Education at the University of South Carolina. Her research focuses on critical methodologies in comparative education and gender, education, and development in India.

Kara D. Brown is an associate professor of foundations of education and comparative education in the College of Education at the University of South Carolina. Her research focuses on language policy in Estonia and teacher migration globally.

Appendix A – Example Abridged Course Syllabus

SCHOOLS IN COMMUNITIES Spring 2015

Course Purpose:

This course aims to help you understand the broad context of teaching in the United States and, in particular, South Carolina. This class is about why we teach, why schools exist, and the importance of socio-historical and cultural context. The goal of this course is to enable you to become more aware of and sensitive to the complex dynamics underlying education in the United States.

As a diligent reader and participant in class, you should, by the end of the course;

- have a better understanding of schooling from historical, sociological, philosophical and anthropological perspectives. In effect, this means you will understand the key foundational *concepts* and *approaches* to understanding public education;
- gain an awareness of the historical and contemporary context of schooling in the United States and South Carolina;
- be able to explain, critique, and suggest strategies for reforming the public educational system;
- refine skills using and questioning primary and secondary sources. You will become more attentive to the author’s voice in presenting arguments and perspectives; and
- be left with many important “big” questions about education and society in South Carolina, the U.S., and the world.

Course emphasis: EDFN300 values a multiplicity of voices. An emphasis on appreciating experiences, wisdom, and expertise of the people behind these voices runs through this course’s pedagogy, design, materials, expectations, and assignments. As you advance through the semester, I hope that you become attentive to, and likewise value, the opportunity to learn from others and develop your own voice.

In preparation for the semester -- Required Texts, Resources & Readings:

- Class reader available at XXX & all handouts from class (e.g., articles, etc.)

<u>Assignments & Evaluation:</u>	
1. Reading quiz (5 total @ 10 points each):	50 points
2. Analysis assignments (2 @ 30 & 1 @ 40 points each):	90 points
3. Blog entries (5 total at 10 points each):	50 points
4. Midterm exam:	100 points
5. Final exam:	100 points
Total Points:	400 points

Breakdown of Assignments

1. **Reading Quiz:** At five points during the semester (not including the first, mid-term exam and final weeks), I will ask you, at the start of class, to respond to one question related to the day’s readings. No surprises, just the questions you will have already thought about for the day (i.e.,

prompts from the posted reading questions or a “big” take-away from the reading). These will be short responses that take less than 5 minutes.

2. **Analysis assignments** (Due 1/30, 2/22 & 4/12): These brief written assignments ask you to craft a two-page written response to achievement gap data and NCLB. The third, a multi-media assignment will be an educational biography. More details provided in class.
3. **Blog Entries** (5 entries at 10 points each, see details below for posting times). Over the semester, you will be expected to contribute to and extend our class dialogue on the class blog (housed on our Blackboard site). You need to contribute at least five thoughtful reflections over the course of the semester on the readings or class dialogue. Three of these postings must be original entries and two must be responses to your class colleague’s entries.
4. **Midterm Assessment (3/5)**: The midterm assessment (with in-class and take-home components) covers all materials from the first half of class.
5. **Final Assessment (5/2)**: The final assessment (with in-class and take-home components) will be a comprehensive (i.e., material from the whole semester is covered) assessment of class material. Details to follow.

Date	Topic	Assignment	Due Today
UNIT I. Creating Greater Opportunities for Equality, Equity & Opportunity? The state of U.S. public schools			
Week 1			
M 1/12	Introduction: Exploring ideas of equity, equality & excellence in schooling		
W, 1/14	The state of U.S. public schools: Thinking globally and comparatively	*Watch <i>Time for School</i> (PBS Documentary, 53 mins.) online at http://video.pbs.org/video/1239934544/ *Partanen, “What Americans Keep Ignoring about Finland’s School Success” *OECD Policy Brief	*Bring signed syllabus statement (found on last page of syllabus) to class
Week 2			
M, 1/19	Martin Luther King Jr. Service Day – No class meeting		
W, 1/21	The state of U.S. public schools: Thinking nationally	*Duncan & Murnane, “Introduction: The American Dream Then and Now” * Kohn, “What Does it Mean to be Well Educated?”	*Bring in signed paper

	and about South Carolina		contract on plagiarism
Week 3			
M, 1/26	Purposes & principles of education in the U.S.	*McMannon, "The Changing Purposes of Education and Schooling" *Cuban & Tyack, "Learning from the Past"	
W, 1/28	Equity & education in South Carolina: <i>Abbeville v. The State</i>	CLASS MEETS ONLINE TODAY * View <i>Corridor of Shame</i> online and participate in online forum http://web3.sctv.org/etvforums/shame.wmv *Moore, "Shamed" *Trainor, "Abbeville Aftermath" & "State Asks SC Supreme Court to rehear"	Two required online responses to the documentary (not part of the blog total)
Week 4			
M, 2/2	Looking at the connections between <i>inside and outside</i> school: Class & family	*Lareau, "Social Class Differences in Family-School Relationships"	*Analysis Assignment #1 (Due 1/30 by 11:59pm)
W, 2/4	Looking <i>inside</i> schools for the ways we structure equality: Organizing students' learning	*Hallinan, "Tracking: From Theory to Practice" & Oakes, "More than Misplaced Technology" *Rist, "Labeling"	
Week 5			
M, 2/9	Looking <i>inside</i> schools for the ways we structure equality: Pedagogy	*Freire, "The Banking Concept of Education" *Giroux, "Teachers as Transformative Intellectuals"	
W, 2/11	Looking <i>inside</i> schools for the ways we structure equality: Pedagogy & curriculum	*Schultz, selection from <i>Spectacular Things Happen Along the Way</i>	
Week 6			
M, 2/16	Looking <i>inside</i> schools for the ways we structure equality: Curriculum	*Collins, "How Texas Inflicts..."	
W, 2/18	Looking <i>outside</i> schools for the ways we structure equity: Finance	*Baker, Sciarra & Farrie, "Is School Funding Fair?"	

Week 7			
M, 2/23	Looking <i>outside</i> schools for the ways we structure equity: Poverty	*Harrington, selection from <i>The Other America</i> *Krugman, "Poverty is Poison" *SEF, "Low-income Students in the South's Public Schools"	Analysis Assignment #2: (Due 2/22 by 11:59)
W, 2/25	Looking <i>inside and across</i> communities: Learning together & learning apart	Wells et al. "Against the Tide" Frankenberg & Orfield, selection from the <i>Resegregation of Suburban Schools</i>	
Week 8			
M, 3/2	Looking <i>back</i> to structured inequality & the legacies of those structures	*Clark, excerpt from <i>Ready from Within</i> *Wellington, "Ambiguous Legacy: Summerton, South Carolina, and <i>Briggs v. Elliott</i> "	
W, 3/5	IN-CLASS MIDTERM ASSESSMENT		
UNIT II. Creating Greater Opportunities for Equality & Equity Strategies for Change & Reform			
Week 9	SPRING BREAK – No Class Meetings M, 3/9 & W, 3/11		
Week 10			
M, 3/16	Reform: Approaches & frameworks	*Reese, "Why Americans Love to Reform the Public Schools"	
W, 3/18	Federal reform: No Child Left Behind & Race to the Top	*Darling-Hammond, "From 'Separate but Equal' to 'No Child Left Behind'" *Onosko, "Race to the Top Leaves Children and Future Citizens Behind"	
Week 11			
M, 3/23	Reform to address the curriculum: Common core & standards	*Listen to Common Core NPR audio file: http://www.npr.org/2014/09/19/347145921/debate-should-schools-embrace-the-common-core	
W, 3/25	Reforming teacher education & teachers	*Goldstein, selection from <i>The Teacher Wars</i> *Freakonomics' program on teachers & teacher ed	

Week 12			
M, 3/30	Reform at the state & district level: Expand public school choice	*Lauren, "False Promises: The School Choice Provisions in No Child Left Behind" *Kahlenberg & Potter, "Ensuring Equity in Charter Schools"	
W, 4/1	Reform at the school level: Responses to changing populations--a look at the U.S.	*Thompson, "Where Education and Assimilation Collide" *Valenzuela, "Subtractive Schooling, Caring Relations, and Social Capital in the Schooling of U.S.-Mexican Youth" *Listen and read all 8 student profiles, http://www.edweek.org/ew/qc/2009/17profiles.h28.html	
Week 13			
M, 4/6	Changing populations & School adaptations: A look at South Carolina	CLASS MEETS ONLINE TODAY *View "Nuestro Futuro" online & participate in online forum http://www.knowitall.org/nuestrofuturo/watch.html# (class meets online)	Two required online responses to the documentary (not part of the blog total)
W, 4/8	State reform: Kindergarten & universal pre-K	*Heckman, chapter from <i>Giving Kids a Fair Chance</i> *Recommended, SEF, "Pre-Kindergarten in the South: The Region's Comparative Advantage in Education"	
Week 14			
M, 4/13	School reform: Building community	*Noguera, "A Broader, Bolder Approach to School Reform" *Moll et al., "Funds of Knowledge for Teaching"	Analysis Assignment #3: TBD Due 4/12 by 11:59)
W, 4/15	Excellence & opportunity in curricular reform	*Noddings, "Democracy and Schooling" *Ceschini, J. "STEM + Art: A Brilliant Combination" *Colvin, "Rigor: It's All the Rage, but What Does it Mean?"	
Week 15			
M, 4/20	School reform: Changing practice with linguistically diverse students	*Christensen, "Putting Out the Linguistic Welcome Mat" *Wheeler & Swords, "Codeswitching"	
W, 4/22	School reform: Radical reorganizations?	*Weil, "Teaching Boys and Girls Separately" *McNeil, "Single-Sex Schooling Gets a New Showcase"	
Week 16			
M, 4/27	Teacher reform & the future	*Kohl, selection from <i>The Discipline of Hope</i> *Noddings, selection from <i>The Challenge to Care in Schools</i>	

Sat, 5/2	FINAL ASSESSMENT
-------------	-------------------------

10 January 2015

Name:

Appendix B – Example Handout

**COMPARATIVE 6th GRADE PUBLIC SCHOOL LESSON PLANS:
SPRING 2015 IN ESTONIA AND SOUTH CAROLINA**

6th Grade Lesson Plan—Miina Härma Gymnasium, Tartu Estonia

Period	Time	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI
1	8-8:45	Handicrafts	Phys Ed	Math	History	Russian
2	8:55-9:40	Handicrafts	German/French	Math	Phys Ed	Science
3	9:50-10:35	English	Math	Russian	English	German/French
LUNCH						
4	10:55-11:40	Math	English	English	Civics	English
5	11:50-12:35	Estonian	Science	Estonian	Estonian	Math
6	12:50-13:35	Russian	Estonian	History	Science	Art
7	13:45-14:30	*Choir	Estonian	*Choir	Class meeting	Art

*Denotes optional

Source: <http://mhg.tartu.ee> (Translated by K. Brown)

6th Grade Lesson Plan—Osula Basic School, Osula, Estonia

Period	Time	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI
1	8:10-8:55	Võru (Local language)	Math	Math	Math	English
2	9:05-9:50	Math	Science	Russian	Art	Math
3	10-10:45	Science	Russian	Estonian	Russian	History
LUNCH						
4	11:05-11:50	Russian	English	Handicrafts	Civics	Civics
5	12:10-12:55	Music	Literature	Handicrafts	Estonian	Literature
6	13:05-13:50	History	Phys Ed	Science	English	Phys Ed
7	14-14:55	Phys Ed		Computing	Phys Ed	

Source: <http://www.osula.edu.ee> (Translated by K. Brown)

**6th Grade Lesson Plan—Dent Middle School (The Learning Collaborative),
Columbia, South Carolina, USA**

Period	Time	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI
	7:30-7:40	Homeroom				
1	7:40-8:49	Math				
2	8:53-10:01-	English/Language Arts				
3	10:05-11:13	Science				
4	11:17-12:27	Social Studies				
	12:27-12:51	LUNCH				
5	12:55-1:38	Foreign Language				
6	1:42-2:25*	Co-curricular (e.g., Art, Dance, Music, etc.)				
	2:25-2:30	Homeroom				

*Students riding the bus are released at 2:20pm

Source: <http://tlc6.weebly.com>

Appendix C – Constitutional Analysis Assignment

Analysis Assignment #1: Constitutions & Schooling

For this first assignment of the semester, I ask you to engage in a modest comparative research project. We will talk in these initial weeks of the semester about differing governmental commitments to and provisions of public education. A useful starting point in this exploration is to examine the constitutional guarantee for education/schooling. This assignment helps to draw our attention to and appreciate the ways geography, historical periods, and political philosophies, among other factors, help to shape guarantees for public education.

Instructions: Please select two comparative units: two U.S. states, a U.S. state and another country, or two countries. The U.S. Constitution may not be included in this comparison. Your single document should have two parts. In Part I, select and copy the relevant passages of these two unit's constitutions. In Part II, review the two units to interrogate the constitutional guarantees in *each* of these units regarding education. In this second part, include thorough responses to all the below questions.

In no more than a total of 500 words (but no less than 300) for Part II, share the following for **each** state/country: (1) What is the year of each of the constitutions you examined? (2) What *kind* of schooling/education is guaranteed to citizens? What are the key descriptive terms used? Include specific reference to the original constitutions (i.e., original language). Reference terms directly from the constitutions; (3) What strikes you as you read both of these constitutions—are they similar, different, in which ways? And, what about the realization of these guarantees? Do these constitutional commitments seem feasible to realize given what you know about the conditions in each country/state? Include specific examples to support your conclusion(s); (4) include in this reflection at least a couple of sentences about the ways that you conducted this research. Why did you select these countries/states? How did you search for the constitutions? And, what questions did this prompt reflection raise for you?; and (5) a word count for Part II must be included at the end of this section.

Resource of potential use: Constitute-- <https://www.constituteproject.org/>

Due: Friday, January 30th by 11:59pm, 30 points

Submit via Blackboard on SafeAssignment by the above date and time; Bring paper copy to class on Monday, February 2nd

Assessment: I will assess your work based on the complete and engaged response to each question above and creative, error-free writing. Use APA style.