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Greene’s work is provocative and progressive, focusing on what has come before and how we move forward in education. She asks, “How do we as teachers, cautioned against thinking in terms of predictions and predeterminations, provoke all our students to learn how to learn in a world we and they already know is neither equitable nor fair?”
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Beverly Gerber and Doris Guay wrote this book as a resource for the practical application of theory into practice for art educators. According to them, “teaching students with disabilities in art classrooms begins, not so much with full knowledge and understanding of disabilities, management techniques, and strategies, but with caring and belief in the values of art education” (p.8). This introduction provides strategies and examples of ways to use art as a tool for teaching students, bridging the gap between art education and special education. Gerber, her professional roots anchored in personal experiences, has devoted her career to developing educational approaches to teaching art and integrating theory with praxis, in a way that addresses the physical adaptations of art instruction. The outlining of task analysis, and identifying behaviour in a way that supports enhanced learning for these students is a tool that has extreme value in the inclusive classroom. This is a true balance of experiential storytelling and pedagogical theory that clearly breaks down the research in a manageable way.
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Olivia Gude, creator of the Postmodern Principles and an arts educator writes clearly about challenging traditional art practices and how art is taught in schools today. Her opinion that the importance of student expression and the art making process far outweighs the common view that student art should look a certain way. Gude confronts the problem of hearing “teachers despair that students only evaluate work by the criteria of realism.” (p.12)

She puts forth optional criteria that can run alongside the standards, to allow art educators to think more openly about how students should view art making. These are broad terms that can be applied with many interpretations, but are equally applicable to the inclusive classroom. Gude focuses on the process, questioning perceptions of art and what it means, as well as encouragement of ‘cultural conversations’, which are vital to all types of learners, and can be adapted for different levels.
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A prominent player in pedagogy, Paulo Freire’s revolutionary writing is foundational to educational philosophy today. Ever relevant, Freire’s idea that students are not vessels to be filled, and knowledge is power, is constantly in question in education. His work reads like a political agenda, yet functions as an ever-significant manifesto about change and education.

Revolutionary action and oppressive actions described as opposites, Freire questions perceptions of higher order thinking in the working classes, and critical thinking in action as a way of having freedom of knowledge. He suggests that by looking at the teacher-student relationship, the dynamic of that that interaction and exchange of knowledge, which should be multi-directional, can change the outcomes of learning. This book is a powerful tool when writing and researching education that will provide a deeper understanding into past theory of pedagogy.
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Dana Goldstein, constantly immersed in education through personal connections and career paths, writes boldly about the history of the American school system. She challenges the turns it has taken, questioning how and why things are the way they are as a result of it. Though not purely academic writing, this provides another facet to my research on the historical context of urban education in America and New York. Goldstein, a researcher through her previous work as a journalist, and in the field of education going back to W.E. B. Du Bois and the shift in teaching as it became a feminine profession.

Jessica,

Really great start. I think you’ve got some good bases covered – special ed instruction with art. Some good historical/theoretical references specific to critical pedagogy. I think after you’ve had time to review the family-school partnership literature – this will be a key addition to the lit review.

It is still unclear how you intend to thread a larger critique of American or Western education (by looking at power systems/inequity from Kincheloe and Friere) within the context of the special education world. I think this is key and will probably develop more over time as you read and get used to the literature more. Nice work.