Education 135:
Gender and Education Spring, 2005
Tuesday Thursday
Stevenson Acad 175 12:00-1:45 PM
Professor Doris Ash
251 Social Sciences I
dash5@ucsc.edu
831 459-5549
Office hours TBA

Course Description

Education 135 addresses the changing but continuing patterns of unequal expectations, opportunities, and treatment throughout the educational system for all students, female and male. In this course we will explore a number of ways (but not a complete exposition) of how gender is played out, structured, reproduced and transformed in contemporary classrooms (from preschool to university) and non-classrooms (playground, museums, clubs).

We will focus our attention primarily on the teaching and learning aspects of gender and education, the experiences of the learner in the classroom and how this has changed (or not) over the past decades, secondarily we will examine the experiences of the teachers and those who support learners. We will take a theoretically grounded yet practical approach as we systematically examine the role gender plays in elementary school, adolescence, university and beyond. We will examine programs designed to mitigate gender inequalities. We will use access to science learning as a case study. Other disciplines will also be addressed. Students will be expected to be part of a small group that studies topics related to gender equity and education and to present their work to the class.

Required Texts— Available at Slug Books

Jossey-Bass Reader (2002). <u>Gender in Education</u> Ash, D. Course Reader

Course Requirements

Attendance is required. If you cannot attend leave a message with me— Email or phone. Three unexcused absences could result in a no-pass.

- •You are expected to have completed the readings prior to the day for which they are listed. Students will take turns being discussion leaders
- •Free writes and quizzes will occur throughout the quarter to assess your understanding of the material and to make linkages between your personal experience and the readings.

Course **evaluation** will be based on reflective work that includes interviews, classroom/informal observations, and original research.

Major assignments include:

There will be four (4) two to three page written assignments; these are described briefly in the reader and will be explained in more detail as the course progresses. These will have practical applications.

- Observation of teaching/ learning in a classroom settings
 Use one of your own or other classrooms as the basis for your work.
 A template will be provided. We will discuss this.
- 2. Observation in an informal teaching/learning setting playground or museum, aquarium, after school club etc. A template will be provided. We will discuss this.
- 3. Interview with an educator and/or change agent who is a role model in your field or who has informed your thinking? A template will be provided. We will discuss this.
- 4. Expanded view of an education issue and Review of an article related to your final project

Final project

The Final Project can take one of two forms

1. A curriculum design piece

For the design piece see the guidelines at the end of this document Or

2. a critical review of a text--yes an entire text

For this there ere many books on reserve at McHenry library and I have list of many others. You can also suggest your own.

Reflective notebooks are mandatory

Course Requirements and Evaluation

Class-work will include discussions of readings, analysis and discussion of interviews, and presentations. Homework is central to the course and includes summaries of readings, interviews with a student, essays, and a research paper.

Attendance is required. No more than 3 absences.

Students will be expected to revise any unsatisfactory written assignments and to turn revisions in by the last class meeting.

Expected work includes

- •4 multi-page written documents (approximately one due every two weeks) 40%,
- •Class participation in discussion including acting as discussion leader (20%)
- A reflective course notebook 10% and
- An end of quarter project (written guidelines will be given) (30%).

Points

Excellent/outstanding work	90-100
Very Good work	80-90
Good	70-80
Satisfactory but could use more work	60-70
Needs revision	below 60

Overall Grading Rubric:

Excellent A

Extraordinary, with coherent analysis that integrated ideas and evidence in well-developed and eloquent reflections. Extremely thoughtful engagement with the ideas.

Very Good

Very well developed, with clear connections between ideas and evidence to support the arguments

Good

Of good sound quality, reflecting active engagement with the topic, though in places the work would have benefited from being pushed further

Satisfactory I

Somewhat uneven times sketchy and not sufficiently grounded in the course materials or not addressing the topic fully

Not satisfactory

Not satisfactory, either showing a lack of adequate engagement with the topic or not turned in at all.

Students will be expected to have turned in a portfolio with the following written products (these can be revised versions)

- 1. All of the above assignments
- 2. Class reflective notebooks
- 3. End of quarter assignment

Narrative Evaluation Format

Overall, this student's participation and written assignments indicated

- impressive
- well-developed
- A good working
- Satisfactory
- uneven
- minimal
- Understanding of the ideas in the course.

Class participation:

- Made strong contributions to class meetings
- Was clearly engaged during class meetings
- Contributed insightful ideas and supported other students' learning
- Listened actively and contributed to the classroom dynamics
- Attended class regularly
- was usually present
- •!Attended irregularly
- Was often absent.

Written assignments

The required essays were usually:

- extraordinary, with coherent analysis that integrated ideas and evidence in well-developed and eloquent reflections
- very well developed, with clear connections between ideas and evidence to support the arguments
- of good sound quality, reflecting active engagement with the topic, though in places the work would have benefited from being pushed further
- satisfactory though somewhat uneven, at times sketchy and not sufficiently grounded in the course materials or not addressing the topic fully
- not satisfactory, either showing a lack of adequate engagement with the topic or not turned in at all.

The required written reports on an interview showed:

- extremely thoughtful engagement with the ideas
- thoughtful engagement with the ideas
- uneven engagement with the ideas

The required notebook showed:

- extremely thoughtful engagement with the ideas
- thoughtful engagement with the ideas
- uneven engagement with the ideas

The required presentations showed:

- extremely thoughtful engagement with the ideas
- thoughtful engagement with the ideas
- uneven engagement with the ideas

The required final project showed

- extremely thoughtful engagement with the ideas
- thoughtful engagement with the ideas
- uneven engagement with the ideas

Items below apply to only some students: I observed impressive progress in ______ understanding of the course material, as evidenced by improvements in understanding of the readings and class material, or depth of analysis of ideas and evidence, or coherence and organization of ideas expressed. _____ went beyond the assigned work in class by ______(extra presentation, optional rewrite, optional reading annotation). This was clearly honors quality work. Of the writing assignments _____ were late or missing.

On reserve at Mc Henry Library

Education 135

AAUW (1999). Gender Gaps: Where schools still fail our children. Marlowe &Co: NY

Brown, Lyn M. & Gilligan, Carol (1992). *Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Psychology and Girls Development*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Caplan, J. C. & Caplan, Jeremy B. (1999). *Thinking Critically about research on sex and gender, second edition*. New York: Longman.

Eisenhart, Margaret A., and Finkel, Elizabeth .(1998). *Women's Science*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Grumet, Madeleine R. (1988). *Bitter Milk: Women and Teaching*. University of Mass Press: Amherst.

Holland, Dorothy C. & Eisenhart, Margaret A. (1990). *Educated in Romance*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press,.

Hubbard, Ruth. (1990). *The Politics of Women's Biology*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Jacobus, Mary., Keller, Evelyn Fox. & Shuttleworth, Sally (1990). *Body / Politics*. New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall Inc..

Keller, Evelyn Fox. & Longino, Helen E. (1996). *Feminism and Science*. New York: Oxford University Press,.

Keller, Evelyn Fox. (1983) A Feeling for the Organism. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Luttrell, Wendy (1997). School smart and mother wise: working class women's identity and schooling. NY: Routledge.

LeVay, Simon. (1993) The Sexual Brain. Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Martin, Jane Roland (2000). Coming of age in academe: rekindling women's hopes and reforming the academy. NY: Routeledge.

Miedzian, Myriam. (1991). *Boys Will Be Boys*. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday Publishing.

Orenstein, Peggy. (1994). Schools Girls. New York: Anchor Books.

Rosser, Sue V. (1990). Female-Friendly Science. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sadker, Myra and David. (1995). Failing at Fairness. New York: Touchstone Publishing.

Sayre, Anne (1975). Rosalind Franklin and DNA. New York: Norton Books.

Schiebinger, Linda (1999) *Has feminism changed science*? Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Shaffer, Susan Morris & Gordon, Linda Perlman. (2000). Why Boy's Don't Talk and Why We Care. Md.: Mid-Atlantic Equity Consortium, Inc.

Streitmatter, Sharon (999). For Girls only: Making a case for single-sex schooling. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Thorne, Barrie (1997) Gender Play: Girls and boys in school. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ Press.

Education 135:
Gender and Education Spring, 2005
Tuesday Thursday
Stevenson Acad 175 12:00-1:45 PM
Professor Doris Ash
251 Social Sciences I
dash5@ucsc.edu
831 459-5549
Office hours TBA

Introduction

Kudritzki, P. (undated). Girls in Science. Triad Project (UCSF), Draft Document.

Crowley, K. & Callanan, M. (1999). Parents Explain More Often to Boys Than to Girls During Shared Scientific Thinking.

The Classroom

Sadker, Myra and David. (1995). *Failing at Fairness*. New York: Touchstone Publishing. Chapter 1

Gallas, Karen, (1995). The Gender Circus, Chapter 2

Thorne, Barrie. (1997). *Gender Play: Girls and boys in school*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
Chapter 1 & 2

Background On Learning

Committee on Programs for Advanced Study of Mathematics and Science in American High Schools, National Research Council (2002). Learning and understanding: 7 principles of Learning. Learning and Understanding: Improving Advanced Study of Mathematics and Science in U.S. High Schools. Washington, FC:National Academy of Science Press

Donovon, M., Bransford, J., & Pellegrino, J. (1999). How People Learn: Bridging research and practice. Washington, FC:National Academy of Science Press

What About the Boys

Weaver-Hightower, M. (2003). The "Boy Turn", *Review of Educational Research* Winter 2003, Vol.73, No. 4 pp. 471-498

Shaffer, Susan Morris & Gordon, Linda Perlman. (2000). *Why Boy's Don't Talk and Why We Care*. Md: Mid-Atlantic Equity Consortium, Inc. Chapter 13 & 43

Miedzian, Myriam. (1991). *Boys Will Be Boys*. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday Publishing.

Chapter 2 &3

Sommers, Christina. (2000). The War against Boys. *The Atlantic Monthly*.

Kimmel, Michael. (2000). What About the Boys? New York: State University at Stony Brook.

Boys and Girls

Sadker, Myra and David. (1995). *Failing at Fairness. Missing in Interaction*. New York: Touchstone Publishing.

Chapter 3

Francis, Becky. (2000). *Boys, Girls and Achievement*. New York: Routledge Falmer Publishing.

Chapter 1

Adler, Patricia and Peter, &Kless, S. (1992) Socialization to Gender Roles: Popularity among Elementary School Boys and Girls. *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 65, Issue 3 pp. 169-187.

Lopez, Nancy. (2002). Rewriting race and gender high school lessons: Second generation Dominicans in New York City. *Teachers College Record*, 104(6), 1187-1203.

Sexual Harassment

American Association of University Women. (2001). Hostile Hallways

Hearing Adolescents

Brown, Lyn M. & Gilligan, Carol (1992). *Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Psychology and Girls Development*. New York: Ballantine Books. Chapter 1

Orenstein, Peggy. (1994). *Schools Girls*. New York: Anchor Books. Chapter 12

Blackburn, Mollie. (2002). Disrupting the (Hetero)normative: Exploring literary performances and identity work with queer youth. *Journal of Adult and Adolescent Literacy* 46(4), 312-324.

Rodriguez, A.J. (2002). Using sociotransformative (sTc) constructivism to Unearth Gender Identity Discourses in Upper Elementary Schools. *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education, Vol. 3, Issue 2.*

Gender Identity

Savin-Williams, R. Lesbian, Gay Male, and Bisexual Adolescents

Francis, Becky. (2000). *Boys, Girls and Achievement*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer Publishing. Chapter 2

Kuper, R. (2000). *Retracing My Journey Toward Self Acceptance and Effectiveness as a Lesbian Teacher*. Teacher Narrative as Critical Inquiry. New York: Teachers College Press. Chapter 8

Villenas, Sofia, & Moreno, Melissa. (2001). To *valerse por si misma* Between race, capitalism, and patriarchy: Latina mother-daughter pedagogies in North Carolina. *Qualitative Studies in Education 14*(5), 671-687.

Assessment and Gender

Murphy, Patricia. (1991). Assessment and Gender. Ma: Cambridge Journal of Education, Vol. 21, No. 2.

Herr, Kathryn, & Arms, Emily. (2004). Accountability and single-sex schooling: A collision of reform agendas. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 527-555.

Women in College

Holland, Dorothy C. & Eisenhart, Margaret A. (1990). *Educated in Romance*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Chapter 5 6 & 7

Chapman, Valerie-Lee, & Sork, Thomas J. (2001). Confessing regulation, or telling secrets? Opening up the conversation on graduate supervision. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 51(2), 94-107.

Single Sex Schooling

Rennie, Leonie J. et. al. (1998). *Constructing Achievement in English and Science*. Perth, Australia: University of Technology.

Baker, Dale. Good Intentions: An Experiment in Single-Sex Science and Mathematics Classrooms. Arizona: Arizona State University College of Education.

Haag, Pamela. (1998). Single-Sex Education in Grades K-12: What Does the Research Tell Us? *Separated by Sex*. Washington DC: American Association of University Women Educational Foundation.

Teaching Practice

Rennie, Leonie J. (2001). *Gender Equity and Science Teacher Preparation*. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Rennie, Leonie J. (1998). Gender Equity: Toward Clarification and a Research Direction for Science Teacher Education. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*. Vol. 35. No.8.

Gondek, Rebecca. (2001). *Promoting Gender Equity in the Science Classroom*. MA: WEEA Equity Resource Center EDC.

Grossman, H. (1994). Accommodating to Gender Differences, *Gender Issues in Education, Boston*: Allyn and Bacon. Chapter 4

Jensen, Jennifer, de Castell, Suzanne, & Bryson, Mary. (2003). "Girl talk": Gender, equity, and identity discourses in school-based computer culture. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 26(6), 561-573.

Sample Gender Equity Programs

U.S. Department of Education's Gender Equity Expert Panel (2000).

National Women's History Project (2002).

Life Lab Science Program Events (2004).

Kekelis, Linda, and Heber, Etta. (200). Snapshots of FIRST science clubs. Ca. Chabot Space and Science Center.

Web Resource on Women and Education

Research on Women and Education (RWE)

Women's Education, Research and Resource Center University College Dublin (WERRC)

Women, Girls, and Education (WSSLINKS)

Women and Education

Women and Math

Koblitz, Ann Hibner. (1997). *Women in Mathematics: The Addition of Difference*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Kenschaft, Patrica Clark. (2001). Winning Women into Mathematics. Eisenhower National Clearinghouse.

Gender and Mathematics Education Research. (2001). Eisenhower National Clearinghouse.