

## Collection

Users can Collect posts into a printable, sortable format. Collections are a good way to organize posts for quick reading. A Collection must be created to tag posts. [More Help](#)

Print Preview

Filter

Sort by Date of Last Post Order ▼ Descending

Select: [All](#) [None](#)

Mark

---

**Thread:** [Week 3 Readings](#)

**Post:** [RE: Week 3 Readings](#)

**Author:** **Shaun O'malley**

**Posted Date:** September 9, 2021 2:20 AM

**Status:** Published

I feel like Dewey's concepts factor a lot into current student development theory in college. Students come to college with a certain set of knowledge/data on specific topics. They interact with something different or unknown to them and have that cognitive dissonance moment where they realize that maybe all of their preconceived notions about the topic might be wrong. So they make new meaning about the topic from their newfound experience with it. <-- The actual definition of growth.

I think in student development theory, many theorists suggest this form of growth necessary to become a self authored (Baxter-Magolda), life-long learner (Herro, Sanford, Chickering, Bloom, Maslow, Kohlberg, Knowles, Kolb, Freire, etc.) that can actually become self-actualized and free of the "bonds" of societal oppression.

Reply
Quote
Mark as Unread

---

**Thread:** [Addams' Legacy](#)

**Post:** [RE: Addams' Legacy](#)

**Author:** **Shaun O'malley**

**Posted Date:** September 9, 2021 2:04 AM

**Status:** Published

I knew her name was connected to the Women's Suffrage movement but I did not now much about her as a person. Some cool fun facts:

- 1) First American Woman to receive the Nobel Peace Prize
- 2) Created the field of Social Work in the Untied States...and though people may not directly connect that to her, social work is alive and well in the US
- 3) She created the first settlement house in the USA, Hull House, and it offered nightly classes for people, which largely became the "night-class" program at most institutions across the country.

Her philosophy, is interesting, as it emerged as a counterbalance to industrialistic education. (Montessori, Dewey, and Addams all believed that they needed to create a form of education that focused on the student and their learning to better society and balk at Bobbitt's notion of industrial education).

Reply
Quote
Mark as Unread

---

**Thread:** [Vild- 3](#)

**Posted Date:** September 8, 2021 6:12 PM

**Forum Statistics**

O'malley Shaun (11)

**GRADE**  
9/8/21 1:49 AM **15.00** /15

ade by rubric


Comments

**Post:** [RE: Vild- 3](#) **Status:** Published  
**Author:**  **Shaun O'malley**

I always felt that the term "hidden curriculum" was purely negative in that it referred to an intentional or unintentional bias that students picked up from the political messaging that existed in the curriculum/program, etc.


But I guess on its very basis, the "hidden curriculum" is all of those messages that students get or learn outside of the formal curriculum which means all of that learning that happens from their time of birth to the time they have formal education on a topic.

[Reply](#) [Quote](#) [Mark as Unread](#)

**Thread:** [Week 3 Questions](#) **Posted Date:** September 8, 2021 5:59 PM  
**Post:** [RE: Week 3 Questions](#) **Status:** Published  
**Author:**  **Shaun O'malley**

I wonder if specialization would change the student-teacher dynamic? I wonder if teachers would become more "robotic" or more "focused on their subject" than the actual process of teaching the students. Though Dewey suggested this specialization, that sounds more like a scholar-academic approach vs. a learning-centered approach to teaching?


[Reply](#) [Quote](#) [Mark as Unread](#)

**Thread:** [Culturally Sensitive Classrooms and Flexible Seating](#) **Posted Date:** September 8, 2021 5:48 PM  
**Post:** [RE: Culturally Sensitive Classrooms and Flexible Seating](#) **Status:** Published  
**Author:**  **Shaun O'malley**

Just playing a bit of devil's advocate here and seeing what other people's thoughts are on this. On question #1 you talked about these 4 steps. Do you think step 3, "having students use their native language to teach other students vocabulary" is taboo today? I think a trend right is that students in the classroom shouldn't have to be the "expert" or teach others the vocabulary just because they are the "resident expert" on the matter.

I think it is extremely important to include other cultures, etc into the classroom and into the learning but is this step 3 outdated? Does anyone use their current students to teach their class about vocabulary in their native tongue?

[Reply](#) [Quote](#) [Mark as Unread](#)

**Thread:** [Discussion #3](#) **Posted Date:** September 8, 2021 2:34 AM  
**Post:** [RE: Discussion #3](#) **Status:** Published  
**Author:**  **Shaun O'malley**


I find it fascinating all of the stuff that Montessori did in her lifetime. A true advocate for women's rights and the education of children. In her curriculum she added "peace-education" to the curriculum as a result of experiencing WWI and WWII. Could you imagine being able to establish peace-education and social justice into a curriculum into today's modern schooling? People got upset when trying to teach CRT!

During one of the conferences, Montessori built a Montessori display classroom that had 3 glass walls so spectators could watch the children in the classroom working vigorously to solve puzzles and complete the learning strategies that Montessori developed.

I mentioned in my last post that I have a neuro-divergent nephew. This year he is starting 2nd grade after being held back for two years. The students in the classroom started making comments to the teacher, "Why can't so and so do what we can do." It was definitely a challenging moment because the students weren't asking to be hateful or mean but because we all know the curious nature of 2nd graders...eventually if left unchecked though this attitude could eventually turn into bullying.

I could only imagine what a Montessori classroom could do for a neuro-divergent individual and what an impact that could have on a student.



**Thread:** Z.Jones      **Posted Date:** September 8, 2021 2:20 AM  
**Post:** [RE: Z.Jones](#)      **Status:** Published  
**Author:**  Shaun O'malley

I agree that there is not a clear cut answer to what is a curriculum specifically. But for this discussion I had a similar question because I was feeling kind of lost with all of the "voices" weighing in on this terminology. Because of that, I am going to post my answer here so you can see it as well:

Question #2: I am a bit lost. With the 4 different curriculum ideologies and all of the different theorists out there it becomes super complex to figure out which curriculum ideology/path/direction to follow? My only experience teaching comes from a college classroom and I don't fully grasp how middle or high school curriculums fully work or the teacher's ability to make the curriculum/teaching theirs. But I imagine most of this theorizing does not come on a lay person's level (i.e. teacher, professor, etc).

The answer to this question hit me pretty quickly in Schiro when reviewing all of the ideologies. Every ideologies definition of education all focuses on the same thing. They all have the same mission, but with different avenues of attainment; the betterment of society is the core focus:

Scholar Academic Ideology	Purpose of education is to help children become better citizens.
Social Efficiency Ideology	Education's aims are two-fold 1) Perpetuation functioning of society and 2) to train children to become functioning adults in society.
Learner-Centered Ideology	Purpose of education is to focus on children so that they can grow and learn naturally and at their own pace so they can better enjoy society (thus be active and engaged in it).
Social Reconstruction Ideology	Purpose of education is to form a more just society, that allows for maximum satisfaction of all its members.

With that, the goal of education is the same...the argument and fighting comes over the best means to the ends. And I don't know if any one curriculum ideology is better or not, but what is truly important is the "impetus" for achieving a successful educational program. Allan Ornstein quoted Thomas Hopkins in his article "Philosophy as a basis for curriculum decisions,"

"Philosophy has entered into every important decision that has ever been made about curriculum and teaching in the past and will continue to be the basis of every important decision in the future...there is rarely a moment in a school day when a teacher is not confronted with occasions where philosophy is a vital part of action" (102).

Ornstein further establishes the notion of philosophy as the root of curriculum by quoting John Goodland and saying that "philosophy becomes the criterion for determining the aims, means and ends of curriculum. The aims are states of value, based on philosophical beliefs; the means represent processes and methods, which reflect philosophical choices; and the ends connote the facts, concepts and principles of the knowledge or behavior learned – what is felt to be important to learning" (103).

The key here then is it does not fully matter if you use a scholar-academic focus or a hands-on-learning focus, what is important is that you have a strong philosophical foundation that is guiding

the values and aims of the educational program that is based on the goal of bettering society and its citizens for the betterment of society.

- Ornstein, A. (1990). Philosophy as a Basis for Curriculum Decisions. *The High School Journal*, 74(2), 102-109. Retrieved September 8, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40364829>





**Thread:** Buckman\_Discussion post 3 **Posted Date:** September 8, 2021 2:07 AM  
**Post:** [RE: Buckman\\_Discussion post 3](#) **Status:** Published

[RE: Buckman\\_Discussion post 3](#)

**Author:**  **Shaun O'malley**

This is going to be cheesy, I don't know if you have ever watched the show "Good Trouble?" It is a spinoff of the show "The Foster's."

It touches on this subject a lot in the show and shows how a teacher is supporting her students to be activists while dodging a system that seeks to hold them back, make them out to be criminals, and implement racially-charged sanctions against them.

It is pretty powerful to watch how the teachers and student act in the show and how they are working to implement restorative justice practices into the classroom to counter sanctions that specifically target POC and minority groups.

As to public schools not understanding the culture...for the longest time these institutions were run by white men? Is it so shocking that they don't understand the complexity of multiculturalism? All major agencies today are still struggling with how to overcome the gender/race/orientation/ethnicity barriers that still exist.

Until we start to see humans as humans and equal, equitability in schools will always be a challenge...so its a "roll up the sleeves," and let's all go to work to making the educational arena a little more just and a little more fair every day.

I wonder how many professional development programs really find success in teaching/developing this competency in its educators?





**Thread:** McClain - Discussion 3 **Posted Date:** September 8, 2021 1:56 AM  
**Post:** [RE: McClain - Discussion 3](#) **Status:** Published

**Author:**  **Shaun O'malley**

Reading Jane Addam's chapter was definitely an eye opening moment for me. Not that I didn't think that we were taking away from immigrants by trying to create a "standardized educational program" that everyone can go through and learn from. Eliminating their culture and forcing them into the American-shaped hole...but what was truly heart-wrenching is to think that students and parents are being divided because we are not only whitewashing culture but we are creating a cultural divide of hostility between parent and child.

That hits rough.






**Thread:** Byars' Got Desks? **Posted Date:** September 8, 2021 1:54 AM  
**Post:** [RE: Byars' Got Desks?](#) **Status:** Published

**Author:**  **Shaun O'malley**

I think that overall the environment plays a huge role in student learning. I have always applauded the work that teachers put into setting up, developing and creating an environment that is welcoming, open and conducive to active learning.

Having worked in Residence Life for years, this is a similar trend to the type of furniture and environments that are being built into residence halls on college campuses. Lots of splashes of colors, large and small study rooms, musical practice rooms, seating, collaborative learning opportunities such as "hub computing" and networking are all a part of creating an environment conducive to learning...i'd imagine it is much the same in a kindergarten classroom but with more "hightech" options.

[Reply](#) [Quote](#) [Mark as Unread](#)

**Thread:** [Discusion #3 - O'Malley](#) **Posted Date:** September 8, 2021 1:49 AM  
**Post:** [Discusion #3 - O'Malley](#) **Status:** Published  
**Author:**  [Shaun O'malley](#)

Question #1: I work with students a lot. As a person who works with student conduct, we have to meet with students when they violate the code of conduct on campus. We always try to make the conduct process an educational opportunity for the student and a partnership where the student takes responsibility for their actions and accepts the consequences of those actions. In the readings this week, Bobbitt says, "Education is established upon the presumption that human activities exist upon different levels of quality or efficiency; that performance of low character isn't good; that it can be eliminated through training; and that only the best or at least the best attainable is good enough (p. 16)."

Sometimes in our meetings students learn their lesson and do not make the same mistake. However, sometimes students continue to make the same mistakes, or they in turn make even bigger ones. So I wonder can "performance of low character" be "truly eliminated" by training?

Answer: I would like to add onto Bobbitt's work and make a distinction between training and development. Though training is extremely important because it levels the playing field by giving people an opportunity to understand what is expected of them and how to do the task, I believe that the true eliminator of a performance of low character involves development. "'Training' refers to a systematic approach to learning and development to improve individual, team and organization effectiveness" (as quoted by Goldstien and Ford, 2002, in Aguinis, 2009). I have trained many people in my lifetime, and the goal of training is to always ensure that everyone understands the expectations and how to do the job. But just because you train someone and re-train them and continue to train them does not mean that they have the passion, drive, or care to do the job successfully. As a restaurant manager, I was able to train many cooks how to cook or many servers how to serve, but that did not mean that they did not keep making the same mistakes or that they did not care about the work that they were doing enough to do it without error.

Aguinis and Kraiger state that, "...development refers to activities leading to the acquisition of new knowledge or skills for purposes of personal growth." I think that there is a lot to say about how training is a tool that can lead to development, but at the same time people have to want to develop and grow and just because you use "Training" as a tool, does not meant that people will ever grow or develop into what we want.

Question #2: I am a bit lost. With the 4 different curriculum ideologies and all of the different theorists out there it becomes super complex to figure out which curriculum ideology/path/direction to follow? My only experience teaching comes from a college classroom and I don't fully grasp how middle or high school curriculums fully work or the teacher's ability to make the curriculum/teaching theirs. But Id imagine most of this theorizing does not come on a lay person's level (i.e. teacher, professor, etc).

The answer to this question hit me pretty quickly in Schiro when reviewing all of the ideologies. Every ideologies definition of education all focuses on the same thing. They all have the same mission, but with different avenues of attainment; the betterment of society is the core focus:

Scholar Academic Ideology	Purpose of education is to help children become better citizens.
Social Efficiency Ideology	Education's aims are two-fold 1) Perpetuation functioning of society and 2) to train children to become functioning adults in society.

Learner-Centered Ideology	Purpose of education is to focus on children so that they can grow and learn naturally and at their own pace so they can better enjoy society (thus be active and engaged in it).
Social Reconstruction Ideology	Purpose of education is to form a more just society, that allows for maximum satisfaction of all its members.

With that, the goal of education is the same...the argument and fighting comes over the best means to the ends. And I don't know if any one curriculum ideology is better or not, but what is truly important is the "impetus" for achieving a successful educational program. Allan Ornstein quoted Thomas Hopkins in his article "Philosophy as a basis for curriculum decisions,"

"Philosophy has entered into every important decision that has ever been made about curriculum and teaching in the past and will continue to be the basis of every important decision in the future...there is rarely a moment in a school day when a teacher is not confronted with occasions where philosophy is a vital part of action" (102).

Ornstein further establishes the notion of philosophy as the root of curriculum by quoting John Goodland and saying that "philosophy becomes the criterion for determining the aims, means and ends of curriculum. The aims are states of value, based on philosophical beliefs; the means represent processes and methods, which reflect philosophical choices; and the ends connote the facts, concepts and principles of the knowledge or behavior learned – what is felt to be important to learning" (103).

The key here then is it does not fully matter if you use a scholar-academic focus or a hands-on-learning focus, what is important is that you have a strong philosophical foundation that is guiding the values and aims of the educational program that is based on the goal of bettering society and its citizens for the betterment of society.

- Aguinis, Herman. (2009). Benefits of Training and Development for Individuals and Teams, Organizations and Society. *Annual Review of Psychology*; 60:1.
- Ornstein, A. (1990). Philosophy as a Basis for Curriculum Decisions. *The High School Journal*, 74(2), 102-109. Retrieved September 8, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40364829>




Select: [All](#) [None](#)

Mark 

← OK