

Course Title: EDPL 756, Curriculum in Higher Education
Semester: Spring 2004
Instructor: Steven Selden
Phone: 301 405-3566 (o)
Email: ss22@umail.umd.edu
Phone: 301 405 3566
Day/Time: Mondays, 7:00-9:45
Room: 3233 Benjamin

I. Course Description

EDPL 756, Curriculum in Higher Education, is informed by an appreciation for the university as a community of multiple discourses. The course is also informed by critical theorists' insights that capital, culture, and curriculum can be linked in creating a more thorough understanding of the contingent nature of particular cultural forms. These two perspectives, multivocalism and critical theory, will be used this semester as EDPL 756 undertakes an analysis of the contested terrain of the undergraduate curriculum. To that end, we will consider conditions affecting curriculum change in higher education including an analysis of the various bases for the college curriculum in the context of college and university life.

A Note to Students

An important caveat must always be recognized throughout our course discussions and analyses this semester. Difficult as it may be to grasp at times, knowledge in the academy is always understood as tentative. As a human construction, such knowledge is necessarily incomplete. Nevertheless, we are morally compelled by our role as citizens in a democracy to make judgements. The caution then, is to eschew making the knowledge informing these judgements an absolute based on political, theoretical or theological fiat. While decisions based on such putative absolutes are being taken by many in the world today, it should be clear that this posture is antithetical to the academic enterprise of which EDPL 756 is an integral part.

II. Course Focus

Organized in a seminar format, EDPL 756 will have three foci:

1) *The Conservative Restoration and Curricular Reform.* EDPL 756's first focus considers pressures for curriculum reform sponsored by organizations external to the university. Here we will consider the connections between principled conservative philanthropies, sponsored think tanks, and initiatives and programs designed to influence undergraduate course offerings and content.

2) Canonical Knowledge. EDPL 756's second focus deals with "canonical knowledge," knowledge that for many is a requirement for membership in the community of the learned and which must have primacy in the curriculum. It is an *a priori* assumption of our course that principled individuals may take a strong position in support of such content. It is also assumed, that absent strong evidence to the contrary, such support should not be confused with positions regarding race and gender and their presence and importance in the undergraduate curriculum. In a similar fashion, the expressed concern of academic traditionalists that the American undergraduate curriculum has been watered down and has become hostage to the forces of "political correctness" will also be carefully considered. The readings will place this charge in historical and empirical grounds as well as in terms of national policy reports.

3) National Policy Reports on the State of Undergraduate Education in America. The third focus will be upon a series of national reports on higher education during the past two decades. Whenever possible, speakers from advocacy groups as well as campus experts will be invited to address the class.

III. Course Requirements

A. Attendance

Students are expected to attend all classes and to read all assigned materials. Class participation is required. Students are encouraged to read web editions of the *New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, or *Education Week* during the semester paying particular attention to articles focusing upon higher education curriculum issues. Each class will begin with a brief, "for the good of the order," discussion of these and other course relevant items.

Students unable to attend class must contact classmates or the instructor directly after the missed class to secure assignments and obtain copies of any distributed materials.

B. Assignments and Student Evaluation

Final grades for EDPL 756 will be based on the following three assignments:

- 1. Class participation (10%):** Students are expected to participate in class discussions.
- 2. Brief Research Paper Assignment (40%):** Linking Conservative Foundations, Activist Organizations, and the Undergraduate Curriculum. The assignment will allow students to succinctly integrate (with full and correct citations and direct footnotes) the links between one conservative foundation, one conservative activist organization, and one of their curriculum policy products. The assignment does not ask for a complete research paper. Rather it requires a very brief, but fully referenced, response. The assignment requires the "mining" of readings and web-sites for data. It asks that these "nuggets" of data be organized into a small but fully supported "Faberge Egg" of a response. To repeat, you are to integrate of three levels of data, linking *a* conservative foundation, *an* activist organization,

and *one* product, produced by that organization designed to impact the undergraduate curriculum.

The response should link the goals, history, and founders, of one conservative foundation (e.g., John M. Olin Foundation, Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, Sarah Sciafe Foundation) to the goals, organization, and membership of one activist organization (e.g., American Council of Trustees and Alumni, Intercollegiate Studies Association), and to a single product of that organization.

The response should be no longer than 6-8 pages (double-spaced, 12 pt type). In order to avoid superficiality, and to allow for references and citations, you should devote six (6) pages to either foundation, organization, or product. Written responses are expected to follow an accepted writing style (e.g., APA, MLA, etc.). After choosing your focus, please organize in terms of the following headings:

1. Heading
2. Title
3. Introduction (approximately 1/4 page)
4. The Conservative Foundation (approximately 6 pages or 1/2 page)
5. The Activist Organization (approximately 6 pages or 1/2 page)
6. The Curriculum Policy Product (approximately 6 pages or 1/2 page)
7. Conclusion (approximately 1/4 page)
8. Works Cited

The only sources that are to be considered for use for this assignment are listed below:

American Council of Trustees and Alumni www.goacta.org

Covington, S. (1997). *Moving a public policy agenda: The strategic philanthropy of conservative foundations, a report from the national committee for responsive philanthropy*. NCRP, Washington, DC.

Egen, R., (1996). *Buying a movement: Right-wing Foundations and American Politics*. Washington DC: People for the American Way.

The Foundation Center offers a 990-PF search capability on its website at <http://fdncenter.org/funders/>.

Guidestar: The national database for nonprofit organizations <http://www.guidestar.org>

Learning Lab - Demystifying the 990-PF. General Info Disclosure Requirements
Accessibility via the Web Anatomy of Form 990-PF
<http://fdncenter.org/learn/demystify/>

Martin, J. L. Neal, A. D. & Nagel, M. S. (1996). *The Shakespeare file: What English majors are really studying*. Washington D.C.: American Council of Trustees and Alumni. www.goacta.org

Mediatransparency www.mediatransparency.org

Intercollegiate Studies Institute www.isi.org

Intercollegiate Studies Institute (2003). *Choosing the right college 2004: The whole truth about America's top schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Please place your name, EDPL 756 College Curriculum, Spring 2004, and instructor's name at the top left of the first page of your response. Students will be required to make a formal presentation of their analyses to the class on March 29, 2004. Written copies of the analyses are to be submitted to the instructor and all class members.

3. Reading Contracts (40%): Students are to complete a Reading Contract assignment for each reading assigned. A copy of a blank form can be found at the end of this syllabus and will be emailed to all students after the first class meeting. Hard copies of these contracts will be submitted to the instructor with the final exam on May 17, 2004.

4. Analyzing the *Choosing* (10%): Students will select, review, and analyze 10 colleges from, *Choosing the right college 2004: The whole truth about America's top schools*. Analyses to be organized in terms of *Choosing's* "theme," academic life, political atmosphere, and campus atmosphere, if provided. Students may wish to create a chart or grid to the volume's reports. Include an overall response to *Choosing's* analyses. Due April 12, 2004.

C. Assignment Schedule/Grade Record Keeper

Assignment	Due Date	Length	% of Final Grade
1. Class Participation	Every Class	As Appropriate	10% _____
2. Research Paper Assignment	March 15, 2004	4-6 pages	40% _____
3. Reading Guides	May 17, 2004	one page per reading	40% _____
4. Analyzing the <i>Choosing</i>	April 17, 2004	<5 pages	10% _____
Grade Total			100% _____

IV. Course (Instructor) Evaluation

The College of Education is in the process of selecting a course evaluation instrument to be administered in all COE classes. This nationally-normed instrument will be completed by the class participants as part of the students' evaluation of EDPL 756. If the new instrument allows, students will have the opportunity to select 10-12 additional course-specific items from a pre-existing item pool during the first class meeting; these items will be included in the final course evaluation. When the summaries of the evaluations become available during the fall semester, they will be mailed to each class participant.

V. Accommodations for Students with Documented Disabilities

Students who have documented disabilities and wishing to discuss academic accommodations should contact the course instructor during the first week of classes. Students requesting an accommodation may also contact the Office of Disability Support Services (301-314-7682). DSS will assist in determination and implementation of appropriate academic accommodations.

VI. Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is the foundation of learning. The university has approved a Code of Academic Integrity available on the web www.inform.umd.edu/CampusInfo/Departments/jpo/code/acinteg.html. The code prohibits students from cheating on the exams, plagiarizing papers, submitting the same paper for credit in two courses without authorization, buying papers, submitting fraudulent documents, and forging signatures. As part of the course requirements for EDPL 756 students should familiarize themselves with the code and its obligations.

VII. Religious Observances

The University System of Maryland provides that students should not be penalized because of the observance of their religious beliefs; students shall be given an opportunity, whenever feasible, to make up within a reasonable time, any academic assignment that is missed due to individual participation in religious observances.

VIII. Class Schedule

EDPL 756, The College Curriculum Spring 2003

<i>Date</i>	<i>Concept and Assignment</i>
February 2, 2004	<u>Introduction and Overview</u> Brief History of the Undergraduate Curriculum Culture wars and the Canon Conservative Philanthropy and the Curriculum - 990 PF's Intellectual Frameworks Assignments Using in-class portable laptops, students will search the following websites: Mediatransparency www.mediatransparency.org American Council of Trustees and Alumni www.goacta.org Intercollegiate Studies Institute www.isi.org Learning Lab - Demystifying the 990-PF. General Info Disclosure Requirements Accessibility via the Web Anatomy of Form 990-PF http://fdncenter.org/learn/demystify/ Apple, M. W., (2001). "Strange allies: Multicultural conservatism in America," (xerox copy). Distributed to class.
February 9, 2004	<u>The Campus Culture Wars: Real or Imagined?</u>

Miller, J., (Summer 2002). *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*. Special issue devoted to the education.

Optional Reading: Selden, S. (1996). "General Education in American Universities: A Historical Overview and Discussion of Contemporary Initiatives at the University of Maryland at College Park." Paper presented at the International Conference on the Role of General Education in Higher Education, Taipei, Taiwan. (Bel-Jean materials)

February 16, 2004

Neo-conservative Activists and the Undergraduate Curriculum: Conservative Foundations and Curriculum Policy

Covington, S. (1997). *Moving a public policy agenda: The strategic philanthropy of conservative foundations, a report from the national committee for responsive philanthropy*. NCRP, Washington, DC.

Egen, R., (1996). *Buying a movement: Right-wing Foundations and American Politics*. Washington DC: People for the American Way.

Optional reading: Apple, M. W., (2001). "Strange allies: Multicultural conservatism in America," (xerox copy).

February 23, 2004

Canonical Knowledge: Is it Possible to Have English Majors Without Studying Shakespeare, Milton, or Chaucer?

Yardley, J. (December 30, 1996). "For English Departments, A Major Change," *The Washington Post*, D 2.

Martin, J. L. Neal, A. D. & Nagel, M. S. (1996). *The Shakespeare file: What English majors are really studying*. Washington D.C.: American Council of Trustees and Alumni. www.goacta.org

March 1, 2004

Canonical Knowledge: Do We Have English Majors Who Have Not Studied Shakespeare Milton, or Chaucer?

Wilson, J. K. (2000). "The canon and the curriculum: Revolution and the traditionalist revolt." In, Altbach, P.G. Berdahl, R.O. & Gumpert, J. *American higher education: Social, political, and economic challenges*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

March 8, 2004

National Reports - Interrogating Canons and Multiculturalism: Policy Recommendations From The National Endowment for the Humanities and ISI

Bennett, W. J. (1984). *To Reclaim A Legacy: A Report on the Humanities in Higher Education*, Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities.

Intercollegiate Studies Institute (2003). *Choosing the right college 2004: The whole truth about America's top schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Optional Reading: Cheney, L. (1992). *Telling The Truth: A Report on the State of the Humanities in Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities.

Optional Reading: Conrad, C. & Duren, K. M. (Fall 1997). "On Culture, Canons, and College Curriculum," *The Review of Higher Education*, Volume 21, No. 1, pp. 103-110.

Optional Reading: Nemeck, M. R. (Winter 1997). "The Role of Curricular Debate in the University," *The Review of Higher Education*, Volume 20, No. 2, pp. 215-227.

March 15, 2004

Revisiting the History of the Canon: Mutable or Immutable?

Levine, L. (1996). *The Opening of the American Mind: Canons, Culture, and History*. Boston: Beacon Press.

March 22, 2004

Spring Break - Sorry, No Class

March 29, 2004

Research Assignment: Linking Conservative Foundations, Activist Organizations, and the Undergraduate Curriculum

Students will discuss and describe the findings from brief research assignments to the class. Copies of the assignment are to be provided to both the class and the instructor.

April 5, 2004

Choosing the Right College (off-campus Assignment)

Students select, review, and analyze 10 colleges from, *Choosing the right college 2004: The whole truth about America's top schools*. Analyses to be organized in terms of *Choosing's* "theme," academic life, political atmosphere, and campus atmosphere, if provided. Students may wish to create a chart or

grid to the volume's reports. Include an overall response to *Choosing's* analyses.

April 12, 2004

Choosing the Right College: The Findings

Students will report on their analyses of *Choosing the right college 2004: The whole truth about America's top schools*. Copies of the analyses should be provided to students and instructor.

April 19, 2004

National reports - Nine Essential Qualities for an Undergraduate Curriculum: Policy Recommendations from the Liberal Arts College Community

Curtis, M. H. (1988). *Integrity in the Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community, The Findings and Recommendations of the Project on Redefining the Meaning and Purpose of Baccalaureate Degrees*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

April 26, 2004

National Reports - Involvement, Expectations, Assessment, and the Undergraduate Curriculum: Policy Recommendations from the National Institute of Education

Astin, A. W. (1984). *Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

May 3, 2004

If *What is Known is Ideological, How things are Known is Epistemological: The Undergraduate Curriculum as Realms of Meaning*

Phenix, P. (1966). *Realms of Meaning: A Philosophy of the Curriculum for General Education*. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp. 1-52.

May 10, 2004

Looking to the Future: The Undergraduate Curriculum In A Postmodern World

Schrag, C. O. (1988). "Liberal Learning in the Postmodern World," Phi Beta Kappa Address, Purdue University.

Jones, E.A., (2002) Transforming the curriculum: Preparing students for a changing world. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Volume 29, Number 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

May 17, 2004

Research Papers/Reading Guides Due

Students present overview of research papers to class. A one-page summary of the papers' purposes, methods, and findings, as well as a copy of the paper's complete references should also be prepared for class distribution.

IX. Course Bibliography

EDPL 756

The College Curriculum

A. Books to be Purchased

- Curtis, M. H. (1990). *Integrity in the Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community, The Findings and Recommendations of the Project on Redefining the Meaning and Purpose of Baccalaureate Degrees*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.
- Intercollegiate Studies Institute (2003). *Choosing the right college 2004: The whole truth about America's top schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Please purchase at discount price from ISI directly via their website www.isi.org)
- Jones, E.A., (2002) *Transforming the curriculum: Preparing students for a changing world*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Volume 29, Number 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levine, L., (1996). *The Opening of the American Mind: Canons, Culture, and History*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Miller, J., (Summer 2002). *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*.

B. BelJean Course Packet (Maryland Book Exchange)

- Astin, A. W. (1984). *Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of American higher education*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.
- Bennett, W. J. (1984). *To reclaim a legacy: A report on the humanities in higher education*, Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities.
- Conrad, C. & Duren, K. M. (Fall 1997). "On culture, canons, and college curriculum," *The Review of Higher Education*, Volume 21, No. 1, pp. 103-110.
- Covington, S. (1997). *Moving a public policy agenda: The strategic philanthropy of conservative foundations, a report from the national committee for responsive philanthropy*. NCRP: Washington, DC.
- Martin, J. L. Neal, A. D. & Nagel, M. S. (1996). *The Shakespeare file: What English majors are really studying*. Washington D.C.: American Council of Trustees and Alumni. www.goacta.org
- Nemec, M. R. (Winter 1997). "The role of curricular debate in the university," *The Review of Higher Education*, Volume 20, No. 2, pp. 215-227.

- Phenix, P. (1966). *Realms of meaning: A philosophy of the curriculum for general education*. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Schrag, C. O. (March 31, 1988). “ Liberal learning in the postmodern world,” Phi Beta Kappa Address, Purdue University.
- Selden, S. (1996). “ General education in American universities: A historical overview and discussion of contemporary initiatives at the University of Maryland at College Park.” Paper presented at the International Conference on the Role of General Education in Higher Education, Taipei, Taiwan.
- Wilson, J. K. (1999). “ The canon and the curriculum: Revolution and the traditionalist revolt.” In, Altbach, P.G. Berdahl, R.O. & Gumport, J. *American higher education: Social, political, and economic challenges*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Yardley, J. (December 30, 1996). “ For English departments, a major change,” *The Washington Post*, D 2.

C. Materials Distributed in Class

- Apple, M. W., (2001). “ Strange allies: Multicultural conservatism in America,” (xerox copy).
- Cheney, L. (1992). *Telling the truth: A report on the state of the humanities in higher education*. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities.
- Egen, R., (1996). *Buying a movement: Right-wing foundations and American politics*. Washington DC: People for the American Way.
- Martin, J., and Neale, A., (2001). *How our universities are failing America and what can be done about it*. Washington D.C.: American Council of Trustees and Alumni.
www.goacta.org

D. Optional Texts/Readings

- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What Matters in college? Four critical years revisited*, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Gaff, J. G. & Ratcliff J. L.(1996). *Handbook of the undergraduate curriculum: A comprehensive guide to purposes, structures, practices, and change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Levine, A. (1978). *Handbook on undergraduate curriculum*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Rudolph, F. (1993). *Curriculum: A history of the American undergraduate course of study since 1636*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

READING CONTRACT EXAMPLE

Student: _____
Course: EDPL 837, Race, Class, and Social Justice: A Policy
Seminar in Curriculum Theory and Development
Instructor: Dr. Steven Selden
Assignment: Reading Contract Assignment # ____

I. Full Citation: Dworkin, R., (1994). "Will Clinton's plan be fair?" *New York review of books*, Volume XLI, Numbers 1 & 2, January, 13, pp. 20- 27.

II. Brief Summary of Article (one-paragraph, prose style):

Professor Dworkin distinguishes between two principles that might be considered useful in achieving social justice in regards to American health-care. He distinguishes between the "Rescue Principle" and the "Prudent Insurance Principle." In the first

III. Main Points, Key Terms and Concepts (3-5 examples):

1. Rescue Principle
2. Prudent Insurance Principle
3.

IV. Exemplary Quotes in Support of II-III above (5-8):

1. The key issue for us in reading the Dworkin article is not necessarily that of health care. It is rather that of deconstructing the notion of "fairness." Dworkin may also recognize this as he notes:

Little attention has been given to the most profound issue that [the Clinton Health Plan] raises. How do we decide whether the Health Security Act, or any other structure for medical care in the United States, is *fair*? (Dworkin, 1994, p. 20, italics added)

2. Dworkin does ask whether the Act or the Board ration would allocate health-care fairly? "We cannot avoid the question of justice," Dworkin notes,

What is appropriate medical care depends on what it would be unfair to withhold on the grounds that it costs too much. That question has been missing from the public debate, perhaps because the most emotionally laden discussions have been assigned to a Board that would not be created until after the act is passed. (Dworkin, 1994, p. 20)

3.

V. Relation to Other Readings/Class Discussions:

Dworkin's analysis of the now unsuccessful Clinton Health Act links closely to the Fordham Institute's *2003 index of social health* in that we see that after nine years the issue of health-care in America

VI. Critical/Analytic Comments (3-4):

1. One interesting insight one might glean from Dworkin's NYRB article is that
2.

February 1, 2004