

TeachingWorks Journal club
November 11, 2016
Debi Khasnabis and Kim Ransom

Practices central to community mapping project in the CBP:

1. Identify a “place” in the geographical community of the school.
2. Identify (and photograph) the assets/local resources in community.
3. Associate local resources (use a photograph as a marker) with content area standards. (Consult the CCSS or the NGSS for example.)
4. Draw connections between the local resources in the community, the standard, and the realities of the people.
5. Envision and sketch plans for a unit!

From Sharkey, J., Clavijo Olarte, A. and L.M. Ramírez (2016). Developing a deeper understanding of community-based pedagogies with teachers: Learning with and from teachers in Colombia. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(4): 306-319.

Maribel developed a 9-week unit on graffiti for her eighth-grade Spanish language arts class (42 students, ages 13-15), which met twice a week for 150-min blocks. The project had three phases: mapping and analyzing the graffiti in the school neighborhood, understanding the aesthetics and semiotics of graffiti, and producing student-authored graffiti for the neighborhood. The two main standards addressed were as follows: “Understand and interpret texts taking into account how language functions in communicative situations, the use of reading strategies, and the role of the speaker and context” and “produce written texts demonstrating knowledge of language in communicative situations and textual production strategies” (MEN, 2006, p. 38).

For the first phase, students walked around the ALP neighborhood, took pictures of the different types of graffiti that drew their attention, and emailed the photos to Maribel who converted them to PowerPoint slides to use for class discussion and initial analysis. **During the second phase**, Maribel invited graffiti experts and artists into the class to share the history of the medium, and to provide an overview of key techniques and symbols in the images. **Bridging the second and third phases**, students conducted local investigations on refranes, popular sayings, a typical part of the language/literature curricula. Maribel presented examples from the course readings (novels, short stories, etc.) and then asked the students to collect local examples from family members and ones they saw or heard in the neighborhood. After the students had created a long list of refranes, pairs of students picked one to interpret and represent in graffiti form. This became **their final project**: graffiti for the neighborhood.

During the classroom observation in September, the students were working on their projects. They spent about 60 min in the school courtyard working on their images—painted on banners to be hung around the school and explaining the style and techniques they had chosen. Students were able to explain the type of graffiti they had chosen (“throw up; wild style,” etc.) and how the visuals of their design reflected their interpretation of the refrán. One example was “love is blind” (see Figure 2). The student-artists used several techniques reviewed in the project, and their oral presentation included the following:

The clothing indicates the couple was just married. Their kissing and hugging represents an element of “love.” However, their faces are skulls representing death that might be

caused by each other along their relationship as they do not recognize how harmful that relationship may be. (Maribel, September 2013, teaching notes)

Small Group Directions:

1. **Community Mapping:** Nominate one person in your group who can substantively recall a community based locale in a setting that he/she has lived, worked or visited. While the person from this setting (“same-place group member”) narrates, others in the group (“non same-place group members”) should listen and ask questions, seeking to understand the resources associated with the locale.
 - a. Describe the location.
 - b. Emulate the practices Maribel used to analyze the resources extant in this locale.
 - c. Consider a CCSS or NGSS standard and its link to your ideas.
2. **Reflexive activity:** Consider Maribel’s portrait as a “same-place” teacher¹. Discuss the following two perspectives based on your own experience of community mapping.
 - a. What can the same-place person “see anew?”
 - b. What challenges might the *non-same-place person* experience as they engage in CBP across the vast and deep beauty of difference (TVDBD)?

Community-Based Pedagogy process by month (Sharkey, et. al., 2016)

*Our work for today is situated within the dotted lines. These areas represent the “asset mapping,” “exploring making concrete connections,” and “sharing/discussing the mapping exercise across [teachers]”.

<p>Feb (2013) 1st introduction N=11</p>	<p>→ 1-hr session</p> <p>→ open to all teachers; teacher self-select</p> <p>→ presented the Project</p>	<p>→ explaining the program to teachers</p>
<p>March (2013) 1st workshop N=11</p>	<p>→ asset-based approaches to learning</p> <p>→ asset-mapping</p>	<p>→ teachers ask teachers to identify the strengths and talents brought to collaboration</p> <p>→ used (Kretzmann & McKnight to “pie chart schematic” (p. 310) i.e. physical locations, institutions, associations,</p>
<p>May (2013) 2nd workshop N= 7/7</p>	<p>→ explored making concrete connections between community resources and the curriculum</p>	<p>→ swapped the four approaches to curriculum areas which included language arts; social sciences, natural sciences, and mathematics</p>
<p>June (2013) 3rd workshop N= 4/7</p>	<p>→ workshop includes teachers from other schools</p>	<p>→ sharing/discuss the mapping exercises across sites/grade-levels etc.</p> <p>→ teacher begin planning their curriculum to implement in July/August</p> <p>→ teachers input information in a “planning matrix ”</p>

¹ Note, we only exclude same-race because Sharkey, et. al. do not specify if the teachers are same-race. We do however note that being a same-race (or non-same race) teacher is also a factor that should be considered in thinking about the potential in using CBP methods.