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**Course Process Review**

1. Entry #2 on pg. 2 – What will it be? freewriting: This was a very early point in my thinking about an action research project. I spent all of cct 692 thinking and researching on Biology teaching. I imagined this class to be an extension of that work. The freewriting on pg. 2 represents my early ideas on what I could do with action research around Biology curricula. This was an important thought process because it moved me away from this topic and on to thinking about supporting students in SWS. The work with Biology still remains an important area in my development but looking back I am pleased with spending time focusing in on students and ultimate the work in cct 693 supports the cct 692 work as I think about teaching my students as whole individuals.
2. Freewriting on pg. 5: In this writing I get down another idea that has been bouncing around in my head as I reflected on my early ideas of action research and my project. This was during the time in class that we focused on some case studies to help us understand the process of action research. The freewriting sketch’s out my early thinking on what would eventually become my action research project, SWS tutorial or some other version of a student support structure. This was an important turning point. I remember starting this writing not very committed to the idea of SWS support and still thinking my work should be in the area of Biology curriculum. I ended the writing with a feeling that working on this project could have a more immediate impact on students and it provided me an avenue to work on student relationships.
3. Freewriting pg 11 in response to February 27th meeting with Jeremy and Buddy meeting on March 1st: These meetings and the reflection on the meetings guided me towards a pilot version of the big idea of my action research. This was a moment that I realized that I could re-conceptualize my project into two action concurrent research cycles. The looking forward epicycle started to come into view for me in a different way. The pilot was my intervention and the lessons learned from evaluating the pilot would directly feed into the next cycle that focused on the yearlong support. The cycle timelines overlap as some of the planning for next year is happening now even though the pilot has just gotten underway.
4. “Idea Flash” on pg. 12: This section shows some early thinking on how this support would be different than the existing tutorial program in the BHS mainstream school. This is the first point in the process that I started consider what the support structure would be and what is would need to be to serve the varying population that needed support. The early thinking here took me back to the SWS 4 circle framework that we use as a staff to think about the program and the people within the program.
5. Reelections on March 30th Readings pg. 21: These reflections along with the Evaluation Clock work shifted my thinking about action research. My early thinking about action research seemed very familiar. It appeared to be a process that I would carryout in some format on a regular basis in my teaching. Changes in classroom policy, implementation of new curriculum or a new way of engaging with parents all have been shifts that I have made year to year. It appeared that these interventions mirrored the steps of action research. I could even stretch myself to retroactively fill in the epicycles in my mind around some of these past changes. The shift represented here connected to the deliberate planning of the evaluation of the intervention. This step is key to action research and not an aspect of my previous process. While evaluation existed in a very informal form it is often insufficient and not formulaic.

**Annotated Clipping**

[Muir](http://www.faculty.umb.edu/pjt/muir08.pdf%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank), Hazel. 2008. Science rules OK: Running societies the rational way. New Scientist (24 May):40-43.

The purpose of action research is to make a thoughtful change and to determine the effects of that change. The insights refine the next shift in policy. The systems we endeavor to change are complex and full of variables that cannot be completely controlled. They are human constructs and thus can be as complex as the human condition. The effort to reduce this complexity down or contrastingly the belief that the system is so complex that learning from one unique situation cannot be transferred to a different environment appears to relate to Muir’s points. Good science does not drive good policy. Assumption is in control, as least for the time being. I want to believe that enough failed policy will eventually lead to some rational thought.

 This article reminded me about this ted talk by Daniel Pink. He is addressing a different topic within a different arena but the same human condition seems to be at play.

<https://www.ted.com/talks/dan_pink_on_motivation>