Course Information

Date Submitted: 1/28/2014

Current Prefix and Number: EDC - Curriculum and Instruction , EDC 642 RESRCH &THRY IN TCHNG LANGUAGE ARTS

Other Course:

Proposed Prefix and Number:

What type of change is being proposed?

Major Change

Major – Add Distance Learning

Should this course be a UK Core Course?   No

1. General Information

a. Submitted by the College of: EDUCATION

b. Department/Division: Education Curriculum &Instr

c. Is there a change in 'ownership' of the course?   No

If YES, what college/department will offer the course instead: Select...

e. Contact Person

Name: Janice F. Almasi

Email: janice.almasi@uky.edu

Phone: 257-1981

Responsible Faculty ID (if different from Contact)

Name:

Email:

Phone:

f. Requested Effective Date

Semester Following Approval: Yes OR Effective Semester:

2. Designation and Description of Proposed Course

a. Current Distance Learning (DL) Status: Please Add

b. Full Title: RESEARCH AND THEORY IN TEACHING LANGUAGE ARTS

Proposed Title: Research and Theory in Literacy Education

c. Current Transcript Title: RESRCH &THRY IN TCHNG LANGUAGE ARTS

Proposed Transcript Title: RESRCH &THRY IN LITERACY EDUCATION

d. Current Cross-listing: none

Proposed – ADD Cross-listing :

Proposed – REMOVE Cross-listing:

e. Current Meeting Patterns

   LECTURE: 3

Proposed Meeting Patterns

   LECTURE: 1

   SEMINAR: 2

f. Current Grading System: Graduate School Grade Scale

   Proposed Grading System: Graduate School Grade Scale

g. Current number of credit hours: 3

   Proposed number of credit hours: 3

h. Currently, is this course repeatable for additional credit?   No

   Proposed to be repeatable for additional credit?   No

   If Yes: Maximum number of credit hours:

   If Yes: Will this course allow multiple registrations during the same semester?   No

2i. Current Course Description for Bulletin: A systematic study of research and theory in oral and written language acquisition and the implications of this knowledge for facilitating the development of listening, speaking and writing in classroom settings. The interrelationships among all of the language arts (reading, writing, listening and speaking) will be stressed.

   Proposed Course Description for Bulletin: The purpose of this course is to critically examine, analyze, and reflect upon research and theory pertaining to the production and understanding of oral and written language (reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and visually representing).

2j. Current Prerequisites, if any: Prereq: EDC 330 or 533 or 534 or consent of instructor.

   Proposed Prerequisites, if any: EDC 641 or equivalent course in research foundations

2k. Current Supplementary Teaching Component:

   Proposed Supplementary Teaching Component:

3. Currently, is this course taught off campus?   No

   Proposed to be taught off campus?   No

   If YES, enter the off campus address:

4. Are significant changes in content/student learning outcomes of the course being proposed?   No

If YES, explain and offer brief rational:

5a. Are there other depts. and/or pgms that could be affected by the proposed change?   No

   If YES, identify the depts. and/or pgms:

5b. Will modifying this course result in a new requirement of ANY program?   No

   If YES, list the program(s) here:

6. Check box if changed to 400G or 500: No·

Distance Learning Form

Instructor Name: Janice F. Almasi

Instructor Email: janice.almasi@uky.edu

Internet/Web-based: Yes

Interactive Video: No

Hybrid: No

1.How does this course provide for timely and appropriate interaction between students and faculty and among students? Does the course syllabus conform to University Senate Syllabus Guidelines, specifically the Distance Learning Considerations?   The course will be offered synchronously online through Adobe Connect or a similar online platform. The instructor also has office hours and is available via email, by phone, and through online video chat as needed. The syllabus conforms to university guidelines with respect to distance learning.

2.How do you ensure that the experience for a DL student is comparable to that of a classroom-based student's experience? Aspects to explore: textbooks, course goals, assessment of student learning outcomes, etc.   All course readings, course goals, and assignments/assessments are identical to the classroom-based course. The only difference is the online meeting format.

3.How is the integrity of student work ensured? Please speak to aspects such as password-protected course portals, proctors for exams at interactive video sites; academic offense policy; etc.   Course content (i.e., readings and modules) will be located in the course's Blackboard shell, which is accessed using students' UK IDs and passwords. No exams are given in this course; all assignments will be submitted directly to the instructor for grading. The academic offense policy is listed in the syllabus.

4.Will offering this course via DL result in at least 25% or at least 50% (based on total credit hours required for completion) of a degree program being offered via any form of DL, as defined above?   Yes

If yes, which percentage, and which program(s)?   Over 50% of the literacy masters program in the department of Curriculum &Instruction will be offered via distance learning.

5.How are students taking the course via DL assured of equivalent access to student services, similar to that of a student taking the class in a traditional classroom setting?   Information about technological assistance, library services, and information for students with special needs is all contained in the syllabus.

6.How do course requirements ensure that students make appropriate use of learning resources? All readings and course modules are contained in the course Blackboard shell. Additionally, the syllabus provides information on p. 7 regarding appropriate use of the modules and other materials.

7.Please explain specifically how access is provided to laboratories, facilities, and equipment appropriate to the course or program. There is no use of laboratories or other equipment in this course. Information on accessing library services is provided in the syllabus.

8.How are students informed of procedures for resolving technical complaints? Does the syllabus list the entities available to offer technical help with the delivery and/or receipt of the course, such as the Information Technology Customer Service Center (http://www.uky.edu/UKIT/)? Information on technological assistance and distance library services is listed on the first page of the syllabus

9.Will the course be delivered via services available through the Distance Learning Program (DLP) and the Academic Technology Group (ATL)? YES

If no, explain how student enrolled in DL courses are able to use the technology employed, as well as how students will be provided with assistance in using said technology. This will be an online course that uses a program such as Adobe Connect.

10.Does the syllabus contain all the required components? YES

11.I, the instructor of record, have read and understood all of the university-level statements regarding DL.

    Instructor Name: Janice F. Almasi

    SIGNATURE|LAHENR3|Laurie A Henry|EDC 642 CHANGE Dept Review|20140114

    SIGNATURE|MYRT|Martha L Geoghegan|EDC 642 CHANGE College Review|20140122

    SIGNATURE|LAHENR3|Laurie A Henry|EDC 642 CHANGE Dept Review|20140114

    SIGNATURE|MYRT|Martha L Geoghegan|EDC 642 CHANGE College Review|20140306

    SIGNATURE|ZNNIKO0|Roshan N Nikou|EDC 642 CHANGE Graduate Council Review|20140312

    SIGNATURE|LAHENR3|Laurie A Henry|EDC 642 CHANGE Dept Review|20140228

    SIGNATURE|MYRT|Martha L Geoghegan|EDC 642 CHANGE College Review|20140307

Courses | Request Tracking

Course Change Form

https://myuk.uky.edu/sap/bc/soap/rfc?services=

Generate R

Open in full window to print or save

Attachments:

Browse...   **Upload File**

	ID	Attachment
Delete	2558	EDC 642 Syllabus Spring 2014_KHP edits.docx
Delete	2632	EDC 642 Fall 2012 nonDL.docx

First | 1 | Last

Select saved project to retrieve... | Get   New

NOTE: Start form entry by choosing the Current Prefix and Number
(*denotes required fields)

	Current Prefix and Number:	EDC - Curriculum and Instruction ▼ EDC 642 RESRCH & THRY IN TCHNG LANGUAGE ARTS ▼	*Proposed Prefix & Number:*

*	What type of change is being proposed?	☑ Major Change ☑ Major – Add Distance Learning ☐ Minor - change in number within the same hundred series, exception the same "hundred series" ☐ Minor - editorial change in course title or description which does not in content or emphasis ☐ Minor - a change in prerequisite(s) which does not imply a change in content or emphasis, or which is made necessary by the elimination or s alteration of the prerequisite(s) ☐ Minor - a cross listing of a course as described above

Should this course be a UK Core Course? ○ Yes ◉ No

If YES, check the areas that apply:

☐ Inquiry – Arts & Creativity   ☐ Composition & Communications - II

☐ Inquiry – Humanities   ☐ Quantitative Foundations

☐ Inquiry - Nat/Math/Phys Sci   ☐ Statistical Inferential Reasoning

☐ Inquiry – Social Sciences   ☐ U.S. Citizenship, Community, Diversity

☐ Composition & Communications – I   ☐ Global Dynamics

1.	General Information			
a.	Submitted by the College of: EDUCATION		Submission Date: 1/28/2014	
b.	Department/Division:	Education Curriculum & Instr		
c.*	Is there a change in "ownership" of the course?			
	○ Yes ◉ No If YES, what college/department will offer the course instead? Select... ▼			
e.*	* Contact Person Name: Janice F. Almasi Email: janice.almasi@uky.edu Phone: 257-1981			
	* Responsible Faculty ID (if different from Contact) Email: Phone:			
f.*	Requested Effective Date:	☑ Semester Following Approval	OR	Specific Term: *
2.	Designation and Description of Proposed Course.			

a.	Current Distance Learning(DL) Status:	○ N/A ○ Already approved for DL* ◉ Please Add ○ Please Drop
	*If already approved for DL, the Distance Learning Form must also be submitted <u>unless</u> the department affirms (by checking this box) tha proposed changes do not affect DL delivery.	

b.	Full Title:	RESEARCH AND THEORY IN TEACHING LANGUAGE ARTS	*Proposed Title: *	Research and Theory in Li Education
c.	Current Transcript Title (if full title is more than 40 characters):		RESRCH & THRY IN TCHNG LANGUAGE ARTS	

c.	Proposed Transcript Title (if full title is more than 40 characters):			RESRCH & THRY IN LITERACY EDUCATION			
d.	**Current Cross-listing:**	☑ N/A		OR	Currently² Cross-listed with (Prefix & Number):		none
	Proposed – ADD² Cross-listing (Prefix & Number):						
	Proposed – REMOVE ³⁴ Cross-listing (Prefix & Number):						

e.	Courses must be described by **at least one** of the meeting patterns below. Include number of actual contact hours ⁵ for each meeting pattern type.						
Current:	Lecture 3	Laboratory²		Recitation		Discussion	Indep. Stud
	Clinical	Colloquium		Practicum		Research	Residency
	Seminar	Studio		Other	Please explain:		
Proposed: *	Lecture 1	Laboratory²		Recitation		Discussion	Indep. Stud
	Clinical	Colloquium		Practicum		Research	Residency
	Seminar 2	Studio		Other	Please explain:		

f.	**Current Grading System:**		Graduate School Grade Scale	
	Proposed Grading System:*	◯ Letter (A, B, C, etc.) ◯ Pass/Fail ◯ Medicine Numeric Grade (Non-medical students will receive a letter grade) ◉ Graduate School Grade Scale		

g.	**Current number of credit hours:**		3	Proposed number of credit hours:*	3

h.*	**Currently, is this course repeatable for additional credit?**	◯ Yes ◉ N
*	Proposed to be repeatable for additional credit?	◯ Yes ◉ N
	If YES:	Maximum number of credit hours:	
	If YES:	Will this course allow multiple registrations during the same semester?	◯ Yes ◯ N

i.	**Current Course Description for Bulletin:**
	A systematic study of research and theory in oral and written language acquisition and the implications of this knowledge for facilitating the development of listening, speaking and writing in classroom settings. The interrelationships among all of the language arts (reading, writing, listening and speaking) will be stressed.
*	Proposed Course Description for Bulletin:
	The purpose of this course is to critically examine, analyze, and reflect upon research and theory pertaining to the production and understanding of oral and written language (reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and visually representing).

j.	**Current Prerequisites, if any:**
	Prereq: EDC 330 or 533 or 534 or consent of instructor.
*	Proposed Prerequisites, if any:
*	EDC 641 or equivalent course in research foundations

k.	Current Supplementary Teaching Component, if any:	○ Community-Based Experience
		○ Service Learning
		○ Both

	Proposed Supplementary Teaching Component:	○ Community-Based Experience
		○ Service Learning
		○ Both
		○ No Change

3.	Currently, is this course taught off campus?	○ Yes ◉ N
*	*Proposed to be taught off campus?*	○ Yes ◉ N
	If YES, enter the off campus address:	

4.*	Are significant changes in content/student learning outcomes of the course being proposed?	○ Yes ◉ N
	If YES, explain and offer brief rationale:	

5.	Course Relationship to Program(s).	
a.*	Are there other depts and/or pgms that could be affected by the proposed change?	○ Yes ◉ N
	If YES, identify the depts. and/or pgms:	

b.*	Will modifying this course result in a new requirement^Z for ANY program?	○ Yes ◉ N
	If YES^Z, list the program(s) here:	

6.	Information to be Placed on Syllabus.	
a.	☐ Check box if changed to 400G or 500.	If changed to 400G- or 500-level course you must send in a syllabus and *you must include the differentiation* undergraduate and graduate students by: (i) requiring additional assignments by the graduate students; and establishing different grading criteria in the course for graduate students. (See *SR 3.1.4.*)

Distance Learning Form

This form must accompany every submission of a new/change course form that requests distance learning delivery. This form may be required when changing a course already approved for fields are required!

Introduction/Definition: For the purposes of the Commission on Colleges Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accreditation review, *distance learning* is defined as educational process in which the majority of the instruction (interaction between students and instructors and among students) in a course occurs when students and instruct the same place. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. A distance learning (DL) course may employ correspondence study, or audio, video, or computer technolo

A number of specific requirements are listed for DL courses. The *department* proposing the change in delivery method is responsible for ensuring that the require are satisfied at the individual course level. It is the responsibility of the instructor to have read and understood the university-level assurances regarding an equivalent e students utilizing DL (available at http://www.uky.edu/USC/New/forms.htm).

Course Number and Prefix:	EDC 642	Date:	10/10/2013
Instructor Name:	Janice F. Almasi	Instructor Email:	janice.almasi@uky.edu

Check the method below that best reflects how the majority of the course content will be delivered.

Internet/Web-based ☑   Interactive Video ☐   Hybrid ☐

Curriculum and Instruction

1. How does this course provide for timely and appropriate interaction between students and faculty and among students? Does the course syllabus conform to Univers Syllabus Guidelines, specifically the Distance Learning Considerations?

   The course will be offered synchronously online through Adobe Connect or a similar online platform. The instructor also has office hours and is available via email, by phone, and through online video chat as needed.

2. How do you ensure that the experience for a DL student is comparable to that of a classroom-based student's experience? Aspects to explore: textbooks, course goa assessment of student learning outcomes, etc.

All course readings, course goals, and assignments/assessments are identical to the classroom-based course. The only difference is the online meeting format.

3. How is the integrity of student work ensured? Please speak to aspects such as password-protected course portals, proctors for exams at interactive video sites; acad policy; etc.

Course content (i.e., readings and modules) will be located in the course's Blackboard shell, which is accessed using students' UK IDs and passwords. No exams are given in this course; all assignments will be submitted

4. Will offering this course via DL result in at least 25% or at least 50%* (based on total credit hours required for completion) of a degree program being offered via a DL, as defined above?

Yes

Which percentage, and which program(s)?

Over 50% of the literacy masters program in the department of Curriculum & Instruction will be offered via distance learning.

*As a general rule, if approval of a course for DL delivery results in 50% or more of a program being delivered through DL, the effective date of the course's DL deli six months from the date of approval.

5. How are students taking the course via DL assured of equivalent access to student services, similar to that of a student taking the class in a traditional classroom se

Information about technological assistance, library services, and information for students with special needs is all contained in the syllabus.

Library and Learning Resources

6. How do course requirements ensure that students make appropriate use of learning resources?

All readings and course modules are contained in the course Blackboard shell. Additionally, the syllabus provides information on p. 7 regarding appropriate use of the modules and other materials.

7. Please explain specifically how access is provided to laboratories, facilities, and equipment appropriate to the course or program.

There is no use of laboratories or other equipment in this course. Information on accessing library services is provided in the syllabus.

Student Services

8. How are students informed of procedures for resolving technical complaints? Does the syllabus list the entities available to offer technical help with the delivery and/ the course, such as the Information Technology Customer Service Center (http://www.uky.edu/UKIT/)?

Information on technological assistance and distance library services is listed on the first page of the syllabus

9. Will the course be delivered via services available through the Distance Learning Program (DLP) and the Academic Technology Group (ATL)?

◉ Yes
○ No

If no, explain how students enrolled in DL courses are able to use the technology employed, as well as how students will be provided with assistance in using said te

This will be an online course that uses a program such as Adobe Connect.

10. Does the syllabus contain all the required components, below? ☑ Yes

- Instructor's *virtual* office hours, if any.
- The technological requirements for the course.
- Contact information for Distance Learning programs (http://www.uky.edu/DistanceLearning) and Information Technology Customer Service Center (http://www.uky.edu/UKIT/Help/; 859-218-HELP).
- Procedure for resolving technical complaints.
- Preferred method for reaching instructor, e.g. email, phone, text message.
- Maximum timeframe for responding to student communications.
- Language pertaining academic accommodations:
  - "If you have a documented disability that requires academic accommodations in this course, please make your request to the University Disability Res Center. The Center will require current disability documentation. When accommodations are approved, the Center will provide me with a Letter of Acc which details the recommended accommodations. Contact the Disability Resource Center, Jake Karnes, Director at 859-257-2754 or jkarnes@email.u
- Specific dates of face-to-face or synchronous class meetings, if any.
- Information on Distance Learning Library Services (http://www.uky.edu/Libraries/DLLS)
  - Carla Cantagallo, DL Librarian
  - Local phone number: 859 257-0500, ext. 2171; long-distance phone number: (800) 828-0439 (option #6)
  - Email: dllservice@email.uky.edu
  - DL Interlibrary Loan Service: http://www.uky.edu/Libraries/libpage.php?lweb_id=253&llib_id=16

11. I, the instructor of record, have read and understood all of the university-level statements regarding DL.

Instructor Name:
Janice F. Almasi

Revised 8/09

[i] See comment description regarding minor course change. *Minor changes are sent directly from dean's office to Senate Council Chair.* If Chair deems the change as "n form will be sent to appropriate academic Council for normal processing and contact person is informed.

[ii] Courses are typically made effective for the semester following approval. No course will be made effective until all approvals are received.

[iii] Signature of the chair of the cross-listing department is required on the Signature Routing Log.

[iv] Removing a cross-listing does not drop the other course – it merely unlinks the two courses.

[v] Generally, undergrad courses are developed such that one semester hr of credit represents 1 hr of classroom meeting per wk for a semester, exclusive of any lab me meeting generally represents at least two hrs per wk for a semester for 1 credit hour. (See *SR 5.2.1.*)

[vi] You must *also* submit the Distance Learning Form in order for the course to be considered for DL delivery.

[vii] In order to change a program, a program change form must also be submitted.

Submit as New Proposal   Save Current Changes

EDC 642 – Research and Theory in Literacy Education
Spring, 2014 – Tuesday 5:00-7:30 pm

Instructor:	Dr. Janice F. Almasi
Office Location	101 Taylor Education Building
Phone Number	859-257-1981
Email	Janice.almasi@uky.edu
Office Hours	Mondays 11:00 – 12:30 pm or by appointment
Virtual Office Hours	Made by arrangement via email
Technological Requirements	Computer with internet access or access to UK computer facilities.
Technological Assistance	Contact Information Technology Customer Service Center http://www.uky.edu/UKIT or 859-257-1300
Course website	Available via something like Blackboard: https://elearning.uky.edu/
Preferred method for contacting instructor	Email
Anticipated Response Time	Within 48 hours
Distance Learning Library Services	DL Librarian: Cantagallo, Carla **Phone:** (859) 218-1240 **Email:** dllservice@email.uky.edu DL Interlibrary Loan Service: http://libraries.uky.edu/page.php?lweb_id=253

Course Description
The purpose of this course is to critically examine, analyze, and reflect upon research and theory pertaining to the production and understanding of oral and written language (reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and visually representing). Toward this end, students will learn how to integrate and apply these ideas in the classroom to analyze and reflect upon their own practice and compare and contrast their findings with findings from published research and theory.

Prerequisite: EDC 641 or equivalent course in research foundations

Course Learning Targets, Outcomes, and Assessments
This course is designed to partially fulfill requirements of the International Reading Association standards for Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach candidates and of the Kentucky Teacher Standards. By the end of this course, students will be able to:

1. Develop an understanding of the field's current views regarding the complex processes of reading, writing, listening, speaking, viewing, and visually representing and discuss the implications of these ideas for instruction in diverse classrooms in written responses and in small and large group discussions in class.

2. Develop an understanding of how to critically evaluate research literature and demonstrate the ability to effectively apply this understanding while reading research and during small and large group discussions in class.

3. Critically analyze literacy research and theory by communicating ideas clearly, listening effectively, resolving differences reasonably, and demonstrating skilled participation as a group member.
4. Initiate and complete a research project that addresses a literacy-related area in which they wish to develop as a professional.

5. Share research projects with colleagues in the class who are interested in the same or similar topics.

6. Design instructional practices for use in research that reflect current research and theory in literacy education and write about the ways in which these practices and/or the practices they have been using are consistent with research and theory.

Table 1. How EDC 642 Course Objectives Align with International Reading Association Standards for Reading Professionals (IRA, 2010)

http://www.reading.org/General/CurrentResearch/Standards/ProfessionalStandards2010.aspx, University of Kentucky College of Education Framework, Kentucky Teacher Standards (EPSB, 2008) http://www.kyepsb.net/teacherprep/standards.asp, and Common Core State Standards (CCSO, 2010) http://www.corestandards.org/the-standards/english-language-arts-standards.

EDC 642 Course Objectives	Associated Course Assessments	International Reading Association Standards (IRA, 2010)	COE Framework	Kentucky Teacher Standards (EPSB, 2008)	Common Core State Standards
1. Develop an understanding of the field's current views regarding the complex processes of writing, speaking, and listening and discuss the implications of these ideas for instruction in diverse classrooms in written responses and in small and large group discussions in class.	• Weekly written responses to course readings (Responses to Theory/Summaries of Research) • Participation in weekly class discussion	**Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge –** Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. 1.1: Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections. 1.1a. Interpret major theories of reading and writing processes and development to understand the needs of all readers in diverse contexts. 1.1c. Read and understand the literature and research about factors that contribute to reading success (e.g., social, cognitive, and physical). 1.2: Understand the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time in the perceptions of reading and writing development, processes, and components. 1.2a. Interpret and summarize historically shared knowledge (e.g., instructional strategies and theories) that addresses the needs of all readers. **Standard 4: Diversity –** Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society 4.1: Recognize, understand, and value the forms	1. Research 3. Learning	1	Rdg. 1 Lang 2

Objective	Assessment	Standard		KTS	Standards
		of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write. [Reading specialists may have responsibilities for teaching students who struggle with learning to read and must also be able to support teachers in their efforts to provide effective instruction for all students.] 4.1a. Demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing.			
2. Develop an understanding of how to critically evaluate research literature and demonstrate the ability to effectively apply this understanding while reading research and during small and large group discussions in class	• Weekly Written Responses to Course Reading • Participation in Weekly Class Discussion	**Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge –** Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. 1.1: Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections. 1.1b. Demonstrate a critical stance toward the scholarship of the profession.	1. Research 3. Learning	1,7,10	Rdg 1, 2, 3, 4 Wrtg 1, 2, 3, 4 S & L 1, 2
3. Critically analyze literacy research and theory by communicating ideas clearly, listening effectively, resolving differences reasonably, and demonstrating skilled participation as a group member.	• Weekly Written Responses to Course Reading • Participation in Weekly Class Discussion	**Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge –** Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. 1.1: Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections. 1.1b. Demonstrate a critical stance toward the scholarship of the profession. 1.1c. Read and understand the literature and research about factors that contribute to reading success (e.g., social, cognitive, and physical).	1. Research 3. Learning	KTS 1	Wrtg 1 S&L 1, 2
4. Initiate and complete a research	• Mini-Research Project	**Standard 6: Professional Learning and**	1. Research	KST 1,7,10	Rdg

Learning Outcome	Assessment	Standard/Element	CF	KTS	Standards
project that addresses a literacy-related area in which they wish to develop as a professional.		**Leadership** – Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility. 6.2: Display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors. [This element deals with positive attitudes not only with colleagues but also with community members, parents and guardians, and so forth.] 6.2b. Promote the value of reading and writing in and out of school by modeling a positive attitude toward reading and writing with students, colleagues, administrators, and parents and guardians.	3. Learning		1, 3, 4 Wrtg 1,2,3,4
5. Share research projects with colleagues in the class.	• Mini-Research Project and Presentation	**Standard 6: Professional Learning and Leadership** – Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility. 6.2: Display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors. [This element deals with positive attitudes not only with colleagues but also with community members, parents and guardians, and so forth.] 6.2d. Demonstrate effective interpersonal, communication, and leadership skills.	1. Research 3. Learning	KTS 1,7,10	S & L 1, 2
6. Design instructional practices for use in research that reflect current research and theory in literacy education and write about the ways in which these practices and/or the practices they have been using are consistent with research and theory.	• Weekly written responses to course readings (Responses to Theory/Summaries of Research) • Mini-Research Project • Participation in weekly class discussion	**Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge** – Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. 1.1 Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language	3. Learning	KTS 1,2,3,4	Rdg 1, 3, 4 Wrtg 1, 2, 3, 4

comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections.
1.1a. Interpret major theories of reading and writing processes and development to understand the needs of all readers in diverse contexts.
1.1c. Read and understand the literature and research about factors that contribute to reading success (e.g., social, cognitive, and physical).

Standards Legend:

International Reading Association (IRA, 2010)

1. Foundational Knowledge
2. Curriculum and Instruction
3. Assessment and Evaluation
4. Diversity
5. Literate Environment
6. Professional Learning and Leadership

University of Kentucky College of Education Framework

1. Research
2. Reflection
3. Learning
4. Leading

Kentucky Teacher Standards (EPSB, 2008)

1. Teacher demonstrates applied content knowledge
2. Teacher designs and plans instruction
3. Teacher creates and maintains the learning climate
4. Teacher implements and manages instruction
5. Teacher assesses and communicates learning results
6. Teacher demonstrates the implementation of technology
7. Reflects on and evaluates teaching and learning
8. Collaborates with colleagues/ parents/others
9. Evaluates teaching and implements professional development
10. Provides leadership within school/community/profession

Common Core State Standards: English Language Arts (CCSSO, 2010)

Reading:
1. Key ideas and details
2. Craft and structure
3. Integration of knowledge and ideas
4. Range of reading and level of text complexity

Writing:
1. Text types and purposes
2. Production and distribution of writing
3. Research to build and present knowledge
4. Range of Writing

Speaking and Listening:
1. Comprehension and collaboration
2. Presentation of knowledge and ideas

Language:
1. Conventions of standard English
2. Knowledge of language
3. Vocabulary acquisition and use

Course Delivery

This proposed course is designed as an online course. Course participants will attend weekly class meetings online throughout the term in an environment such as Blackboard and Adobe Connect. During this time students will work in on independent research projects and participate in online discussions and online chats.

Suggestions for Proceeding through this Online Course:

Organization of Blackboard course shell

1. The general course information is in the **Course Information** tab.
2. Most of the course materials are in the **Course Content** tab.
3. The electronic readings are in the **Readings** tab
4. The information for required assignments is in the **Assignments** tab.
5. The online discussion posts should be entered in the **Discussion Board** tab.
6. To submit a "drop box question" (a question you have about content or issues that weren't addressed through the presentation, materials, or discussion), click on the **Submit a Drop Box Question** tab and send an email to the primary instructor
7. A general calendar can be accessed with the **Calendar** tab.
8. Important announcements and updates can be accessed through the **Announcements** tab.

Suggestion for modules

1. If you need to post for the online discussion early in the day (e.g., 11:00 a.m.), you'll need to start the module (i.e., watch the presentation, do the readings) with enough time to submit your post on time. This means YOU MAY NEED TO START THE NIGHT BEFORE the listed date.
2. In general, WATCH THE PRESENTATION FIRST for each module. By following the link you will access the PowerPoint presentation with voice-over, which is streamed in from the University's server. Each presentation ranges from approximately 15-30 minutes. At the end of most presentations, I have a preview of the readings. In one or two cases there may be a discrepancy with the readings listed in the presentation and readings listed in the syllabus. ALWAYS FOLLOW THE SYLLABUS READINGS, regardless of what is in the presentation.
3. Soon after you do watch the presentation DO THE READINGS.
4. Soon after you've done the readings EXPERIENCE THE OTHER MATERIALS in the module.
5. After you've explored the entire module, if a discussion post is due that day, fulfill your responsibility for the online discussion being sure to meet your deadlines of either the 11 a.m. or 5 p.m. deadlines.
6. With some videos, you do not need to watch the whole video. I often indicate excerpts that I want you to watch, and there are often FOCUS QUESTIONS TO GUIDE YOUR WATCHING. I encourage you to keep these questions "beside you" while watching.

Required Texts:
There are two required textbooks:

1. American Psychological Association (2009). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
2. Tracey, D. H. & Morrow, L. M. (2012). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford.

Outside Readings* Additional required readings (provided through the Blackboard page for our course): [*Readings will come from current and seminal research literature and will be updated each time the course is offered. A sample is offered below.]

Date: Week 1
Topic: Overview of Course
1. Theoretical Reading (Required):
Tracey, D. H. & Morrow, L. M. (2012). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford. (Chapter 1)

Date: Week 2
Topic: Historical Trends in Literacy Research
1. Theoretical Reading (Required):
Tracey, D. H. & Morrow, L. M. (2012). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford. (Chapter 2)

2. Research Studies (Required):
Alexander, P. A., & Fox, E. (2004). A historical perspective on reading research and practice. In R. B. Ruddell & N. J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (5th ed., pp. 33-68). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
Gaffney, J. S., & Anderson, R. C. (2000). Trends in reading research in the United States: Changing intellectual currents over three decades. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (vol. 3, pp. 53-74). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Date: Week 3
Topic: Response to Literature
1. Theoretical Reading #1 (Required):
Tracey, D. H. & Morrow, L. M. (2012). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford. (Chapter 4, pp.57-68)

2. Theoretical Reading #2 (Required--Select ONE of the following):
Rosenblatt, L. M. (1991). Literature--S. O. S.! *Language Arts, 68,* 444-448. (seminal)
Rosenblatt, L. M. (2004). The transactional theory of reading and writing. In R. B. Ruddell & N. J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (5th ed., pp. 1363-1398). Newark, DE: International Reading Association. (seminal)

3. Research Studies (Required--Select ONE of the following):
Akrofi, A., Janisch, C., Button, K., & Liu, X. (2010). Catch a star book! Responses of fifth-grade students to celebrity-authored children's literature. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 49,* 142-161.
McEneaney, J. E., Li, L.,Allen, K., & Guzniczak, L. (2009). Stance, navigation, and reader response in expository hypertext. *Journal of Literacy Research, 41*(1), 1-45. (experimental)

Sipe, L. (2000). The construction of literary understanding by first and second graders in oral response to picture storybook read-alouds. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35*(2), 252-275.

Sipe, L. R., & Brightman, A. E. (2009). Young children's interpretations of page breaks in contemporary picture storybooks. *Journal of Literacy Research, 41*(1), 68-103. (qualitative: descriptive/naturalistic)

Date: Week 4
Topic: Sociocultural Theories, Oral Language, and Classroom Discourse
1. Theoretical Reading #1 (Required):
Tracey, D. H. & Morrow, L. M. (2012). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford. (Chapter 6, pp. 116-132)

2. Theoretical Reading #2: (Required—Select ONE of the following)
Gee, J. (2001). Reading as situated language: A sociocognitive perspective. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 44*(8), 714-725.

3. Research Study (Required: Select ONE of the following):
Chinn, C. A., Anderson, R. C., & Waggoner, M. A. (2001). Patterns of discourse in two kinds of literature discussion. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(4), 378-411. (comparative study)

Dong, T., Anderson, R. C., Kim, I., & Li, Y. (2008). Collaborative reasoning in China and Korea. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*(4), 400-424. (quasi-experimental)

Lewis, C. (1997). The social drama of literature discussions in a fifth/sixth grade classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English, 31*(2), 163-204.

Mercer, N., Wergerif, R., & Dawes, L. (1999). Children's talk and the development of reasoning in the classroom. *British Educational Research Journal, 25*(1), 95-111. (quantitative/qualitative analysis)

Nystrand, M., Wu, L. L., Gamoran, A., Zeiser, S., & Long, D. A. (2003). Questions in time: Investigating the structure and dynamics of unfolding classroom discourse. *Discourse Processes, 35*(2), 135-198. (event-history analysis)

Reznitskaya, A., Anderson, R. C., McNurlen, B., Nguyen-Jahiel, K., Archodidou, A., & Kim, S. (2001). Influence of oral discussion on written argument. *Discourse Processes, 32*(2&3), 155-175. (comparative)

Date: Week 5
Topic: Oral Language, Classroom Discourse, Power and Authority
1. Theoretical Reading: (Required)
Buzzelli, & Johnston, B. (2001). Authority, power, and morality in classroom discourse. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 873-884.

2. Research Studies: (Required) (Select TWO of the following to read)
Almasi, J. F., O'Flahavan, J. F., & Arya, P. (2001). A comparative analysis of student and teacher development in more and less proficient discussions of literature. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(2), 96-120. (descriptive/comparative case study)

Clarke, L. W. (2006). Power through voicing others: Girls' positioning of boys in literature circle discussions. *Journal of Literacy Research, 38*(1), 53-79. (qualitative: critical discourse analysis)

Evans, K. S. (2002). Fifth-grade students' perceptions of how they experience literature discussion groups. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37*(1), 46-69. (qualitative)

Maloch, B. (2002). Scaffolding student talk: One teacher's role in literature discussion groups. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37*(1), 94-112. (qualitative)

Many, J. E. (2002). An exhibition and analysis of verbal tapestries: Understanding how scaffolding is woven into the fabric of instructional conversations. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37*(4), 376-407. (qualitative)

Matthews, M. W., & Kesner, J. (2003). Children learning with peers: The confluence of peer status and literacy competence within small-group literacy events. *Reading Research Quarterly, 38*(2), 208-234.

Van Sluys, K., Lewis, M., & Seely Flynt, A. (2006). Researching critical literacy: A critical study of analysis of classroom discourse. *Journal of Literacy Research, 38*(2), 197-233. (qualitative: critical literacy in action)

Date: Week 6
Topic: Literacy Practices and Identity Development
1. Theoretical Reading (Required):
Ferdman, B. M. (1990). Literacy and cultural identity. *Harvard Educational Review, 60*(2), 180-204. (seminal piece)

Moje, E. B., & Luke, A. (2009). Literacy and identity: Examining the metaphors in history and contemporary research. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(4), 415-437.

2. Research Study (Required: Select ONE of the Following):
Dagenais, D., Day, E., & Toohey, K. (2006). A multilingual child's literacy practices and contrasting identities in the figured worlds of French immersion classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*(2), 205-218. (qualitative: ethnography)

Falk, I. (2004). Literacy by Design, not by default: Social capital's role in literacy learning. *Journal of Research in Reading, 24*(3), 313-323. (qualitative: case study)

Finders, M. J. (1996). "Just girls: Literacy and allegiance in junior high school. *Written Communication, 13,* 93-129. (seminal study/qualitative: ethnography)

Hicks, D. (2004). Growing up girl in working-poor America: Textures of Language, poverty, and place. *Ethos, 32*(2). 214-232. (qualitative: feminist ethnography)

Jiménez, R. T. (2000). Literacy and the identity development of Latina/o students. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(4), 971-1000. (formative experiment)

Leander, K. M. (2004). "They took out the wrong context": Uses of time-space in the practice of positioning. *Ethos, 32*(2), 188-213. (discourse-focused ethnography)

Luttrell, W., & Parker, C. (2001). High school students' literacy practices and identities, and the figured world of school. *Journal of Research in Reading, 24*(3), 235-247. (qualitative: ethnography)

McCarthey, S. J. (2001). Identity construction in elementary readers and writers. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(2), 122-151. (qualitative: life-story/case study)

Wortham, S. (2004). From good student to outcast: The emergence of a classroom identity. *Ethos, 32*(2), 164-187. (qualitative: ethnography)

Date: Week 7
Topic: Comprehension Strategies Instruction and Narrative Text
1. Theoretical Reading #1 (Required):
Tracey, D. H. & Morrow, L. M. (2012). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford. (Chapter)

Afflerbach, P., Pearson, P. D., & Paris, S. G. (2008). Clarifying differences between reading skills and reading strategies. *The Reading Teacher, 61*(5), 364-373.

Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). *Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide* (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from whatworks.ed.gov/publications/practiceguides.

2. Research Study (Required—select ONE of the following):

Brown, R. Pressley, M., Van Meter, P., & Schuder, T. (1996). A quasi-experimental validation of transactional strategies instruction with low-achieving second-grade readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88*(1), 18-37.

Dewitz, P., Jones, J., & Leahy, S. (2009). Comprehension strategy instruction in core reading programs. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(2), 102-126. dx.doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.41.2.1

Van Keer, H. (2004). Fostering reading comprehension in fifth grade by explicit instruction in reading strategies and peer tutoring. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 74*, 37-70.

Date: Week 8
Topic: Vocabulary
1. Theoretical Reading (Required):

Nagy, W. E., & Hiebert, E. H. (2011). Toward a theory of word selection. In M. L. Kamil, P. D. Pearson, E. B. Moje, & P. P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. IV, pp. 388-404). New York: Routledge.

2. Review of Research (Required):

National Center for Education Statistics (2012).*The Nations Report Card: Vocabulary Results from the 2009 and 2011 NAEP Reading Assessments* (NCES 2013 452). Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

3. Research Study (Required--select ONE of the following)

Erkaya, O. R., & Dower, I. S. (2012). Perceptions of an EL learner on vocabulary development. *International Journal of Special Education, 27*(1), 81-92.

Gámez, P. B., & Lesaux, N. K. (2012). The relation between exposure to sophisticated and complex language and early-adolescent Englsh-only and language-minority learners' vocabulary. *Child Development, 83*(4), 1316-1331.

Lesaux, N. K., Kieffer, M. J., Faller, S. E., & Kelley, J. G. (2010). The effectiveness and ease of implementation of an academic vocabulary intervention for linguistically diverse students in urban middle schools. *Reading Research Quarterly, 45*(2), 196-228.

Suanda, S. H., & Namy, L. L. (2013). Young word learners' interpretations of words and symbolic gestures within the context of ambiguous reference. *Child Development, 84*(1), 143-153.

Vadasy, P. F., Nelson, R., & Sanders, E. A. (2011). Longer term effects of a tier 2 Kindergarten vocabulary intervention for English learners. *Remedial and Special Education, 34*(2), 91-101.

Date: Week 9
Topic: Engagement and Motivation in Reading and Writing
1. Theoretical Reading #1 (Required):

Tracey, D. H. & Morrow, L. M. (2012). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford. (Chapter 6, pp. 116-132)

1. Review of Research/Theory (Required):

Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schunk, D. H. (2003). *Self-efficacy for reading and writing: Influence of modeling, goal setting, and self-evaluation. Reading & Writing Quarterly, 19,* 159-172. (research overview)

2. Research Studies (Required--Select ONE of the following):

Abbott, J. A. (2000). "Blinking out" and "Having the touch": Two fifth-grade boys talk about flow experiences in writing. *Written Communication, 17*(1), 53-92. (case study)

Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., Barbosa, P., Perencevich, K. C., Taboada, A., Davis, M. H., Scafiddi, N. T., & Tonks, S. (2004). Increasing reading comprehension and engagement through concept-oriented reading instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*(3), 403-423.

Kaplan, A., Licthinger, E., Gorodetsky, M. (2009). Achievement goal orientations and self-regulation in writing: An integrative perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*(1), 51-69.

Mata, L. (2011). Motivation for reading and writing in kindergarten children. *Reading Psychology, 32,* 272-299. (measure development)

Nolen, S. B. (2007). Young children's motivation to read and write: Development in social contexts. *Cognition and Instruction, 25*(2), 219–270. (longitudinal, mixed methods)

Warren, S. J., Dondlinger, M. & Barab, S. A. (2008). A MUVE towards PBL writing: Effects of a digital learning environment designed to improve elementary student writing. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 41*(1), 113–140. (quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design)

Date: Week 10
Topic: 21st Century Literacies and Multiliteracies
1. Review of Research/Theory #1 (Required):

Leu, D. J., et al. (in press). New literacies, reading research, and the challenges of change: A deictic perspective of our research worlds. In J. V. Hoffman, D. L. Schallert, C. M. Fairbanks, J. Worthy, & B. Maloch (Eds.), *55th Annual yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 1-20). Oak Creek, WI: National Reading Conference.

<div align="center">OR VIEW</div>

Leu, D. J. (2005, November 30). *New literacies, reading research, and the challenges of change: A deictic perspective of our research worlds.* Keynote address presented at the 55th Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL. Archived at: http://www.newliteracies.uconn.edu/nrc/don_leu_2005.html

2. Review of Research/Theory #2 (Required):

Street, B. (2005, December 1). New literacies, new times: How do we describe and teach the forms of literacy knowledge, skills, and values people need for new times? In J. V. Hoffman, D. L. Schallert, C. M. Fairbanks, J. Worthy, & B. Maloch (Eds.), *55th Annual yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 21-42). Oak Creek, WI: National Reading Conference.

<div align="center">OR VIEW</div>

Street, B. (2005, December 1). *Literacies across cultural contexts: Implications for pedagogy and curriculum.* Keynote address presented at the 55th Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL. Archived at: http:// www.newliteracies.uconn.edu/nrc/brian_street_2005.html

3. Research Studies (Required--Select ONE of the following):

Coiro, J., & Dobler, E. (2007). Exploring the online reading comprehension strategies used by sixth-grade skilled readers to search for and locate information on the Internet. *Reading Research Quarterly, 42*(2), 214-257.

Lewis, C., & Fabbo, B. (2005). Instant messaging, literacies, and social identities. *Reading Research Quarterly, 40,* 470-501.

Rowsell, J., & Pahl, K. (2007). Sedimented identities in texts: Instances of practice. *Reading Research Quarterly, 42*(3), 388-404.

Date: Week 11
Topic: Fluency
1. Theoretical Reading (Required
Kuhn, M.R., & Stahl, S.A. (2003). Fluency: A review of developmental and remedial practices. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95(1)*, 3-21.
Rasinski, T., & Hoffman, J. (2003). Oral reading in the school literacy curriculum. *Reading Research Quarterly, 38*(4), 510-522.

2. Research Studies (Required—Select ONE of the following):
Clark, R., Morrison, T.G., & Wilcox, B. (2009). Readers' theater: A process of developing fourth-graders' reading fluency. *Reading Psychology, 30(1)*, 359-385.
Kuhn, M. R., Schwanenflugel, E. B., Levy, B. A., & Rasinski, T. V. (2010). Aligning theory and assessment of reading fluency: automaticity, prosody, and definitions of fluency. *Reading Research Quarterly, 45*(2), 230-251.
Miller, J. & Schwanenflugel, P. J. (2008). A longitudinal study of the development of reading prosody as a dimension of oral reading fluency in early elementary school children. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*(4), 336-354.
Stahl, S.A., & Heubach, K.M. (2005). Fluency-oriented reading instruction. *Journal of Literacy Research, 37(1)*, 25-60.
Tyler, B.J., & Chard, D. (2000). Using readers theater to foster fluency in struggling readers: A twist on the repeated reading strategy. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 16(2)*, 163-168.

Date: Week 12
Topic: Word Identification, Analogizing, Phonics, and Phonemic Awareness
1. Theoretical Reading #1 (Required):
Tracey, D. H. & Morrow, L. M. (2012). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford. (Chapter 6, pp. 116-132)

2. Research Studies (Required—Select ONE of the following):
Ehri, L. C., Satlow, E., & Gaskins, I. (2009). Grapho-phonemic enrichment strengthens keyword analogy strategy instruction for struggling young readers. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 25*, 162-191.
Fischel, J. E., Bracken, S. S., Fuchs-Eisenberg, A., Spira, E. G., Katz, S., & Shaller, G. (2007). Evaluation of curricular approaches to enhance preschool early literacy skills. *Journal of Literacy Research, 39*(4), 471-501.
Gelzheiser, L. M., Scanlon, D., Vellutino, F., Hallgren-Flynn, L., Schatschneider, C. (2011). Effects of the interactive strategies approach—extended. *Elementary School Journal, 112*(2), 280-306.
Juel, C., & Minden-Cupp, C. (2000). Learning to read words: Linguistic units and instructional strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35*(4), 458-492.
Morris, D., Bloodgood, J. W., Lomax, R. G., & Perney, J. (2003). Developmental steps in learning to read: A longitudinal study in kindergarten and first grade. *Reading Research Quarterly, 38*(3), 302-328.
White, T. G. (2005). Effects of systematic and strategic analogy-based phonics on grade 2 students' word reading and reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 40*(2), 234-255.

Date: Week 13
Topic: Writing: Writing Development
1. Theoretical Reading: (Required)

Harste, J. C., Burke, C. L., & Woodward, V. A. (1994). Children's language and world: Initial encounters with print. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed., pp. 48-69). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

2. *Research Studies: (Required) (Select ONE of the following to read)*

Bradley, D. H. (2001). How beginning writers articulate and demonstrate their understanding of the act of writing. *Reading Research and Instruction, 40*(4), 273-296. (case study)

Eitelgeorge, J. S., & Barrett, R. (2004). Multiple continua of writing development in a first grade classroom. *Reading Research and Instruction, 43*(2), 17-64. (case study)

Jasmine, J., & Weiner, W. (2007). The effects of writing workshop on abilities of first grade students to become confident and independent writers. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 35*(2), 131-139. (mixed methods)

Wollman-Bonilla, J. E. (2001). Can First-Grade Writers Demonstrate Audience Awareness? *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(2), 184-201. (case study)

Yaden, D. B., & Tardibuono, J. M. (2004). The emergent writing development of urban Latino preschoolers: Developmental perspectives and instructional environments for second-language learners. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 20*, 29-61.

Date: Week 14
Topic: Writing: Process Writing and Writing Strategies
1. Theory/Background (Required) (Select ONE of the following):

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(3), 445-576.

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools – A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Santangelo, T., Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (2008). Using self-regulated strategy development to support students who have "trubol giting thangs into werds." *Remedial and Special Education, 29*(2), 78-89.

2. Research Studies: (select TWO of the following to read)

Andrzejczak, N., Trainin, G., & Poldberg, M. (2005, October 19). From image to text: Using images in the writing process. *International Journal of Education & the Arts, 6*(12), 1-16. Retrieved [August 26, 2011] from http://ijea.asu.edu/v6n12/ (qualitative: grounded theory)

Harris, K. R., Graham, S., & Mason, L. H. (2006). Improving the writing, knowledge, and motivation of struggling young writers: Effects of self-regulated strategy development with and without peer support. *American Educational Research Journal, 43*(2), 295-340. (experiment)

Jacobsen, L. T, & Reid, R. (2010). Improving the persuasive essay writing of high school students with ADHD. *Exceptional Children, 76*(2), 157-174. (multiple-baseline design)

Jarvey, M., McKeough, A., & Pyryt, M. C. (2008). Teaching trickster tales: A comparison of instructional approaches. *Research in the Teaching of English, 43*(1), 42-73. (quasi-experiment)

Matthewman, S., & Triggs, P. (2004). Obsessive compulsive font disorder: The challenge of supporting pupils writing with the computer. *Computers and Education, 43*, 125-135. (case study)

Myhill, D. (2009). Children's patterns of composition and their reflections on their composing processes. *British Educational Research Journal, 35*(1), 47–64. (case study)

Patel, P., & Laud, L. (2009). Helping students to add detail and flair to their stories. *Preventing School Failure, 54*(1), 2-9. (action research case study)

Tracy, B., Graham, S., & Reid, R. (2009). Teaching Young Students Strategies for planning and drafting stories: The impact of self-regulated strategy development. *Journal of Educational Research, 102*(5), 323-331. (experiment)

Date: Week 15

Topic: Culture and Diversity in Literacy Instruction

1. Theoretical Reading (Required):

August, D., Shanahan, T., & Escamilla, K. (2009). English Language Learners: Developing literacy in second-language learners—Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth. *Journal of Literacy Research, 41,* 432-452.

Purcell-Gates, V. (2005). What does culture have to do with it? In J. V. Hoffman, D. L. Schallert, C. M. Fairbanks, J. Worthy, & B. Maloch (Eds.), *55th Annual yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 43-59). Oak Creek, WI: National Reading Conference.

<center>OR VIEW</center>

Purcell-Gates, V. (2005, December 1). *What does culture have to do with it?* Keynote address presented at the 55th Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL. Archived at: http://www.newliteracies.uconn.edu/nrc/victoria_purcell-gates_2005.html

2. Research Studies (Required—Select TWO of the following):

Carbone, P. M., & Orellana, M. F. (2010). Developing academic identities: Persuasive writing as a tool to strengthen emergent academic identities. *Research in the Teaching of English, 44*(3), 292-316.

Cuero, K. K. (2009). Authoring multiple *formas de ser:* Three bilingual Latino/a fifth graders navigating school. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 8*(2), 141–160

Dyson, A. H. (2003). School literacy: The view from inside a child culture. In A. H. Dyson, *The brothers and sisters learn to write: Popular literacy in childhood and school cultures* (pp. 4-27). New York: Teachers College Press.

Heath, S. B. (1982). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. *Language in Society, 11*(1), 49-76. (seminal study/ethnography)

Ranker, J. (2009). Student Appropriation of writing lessons through hybrid composing practices: Direct, diffuse, and indirect use of teacher-offered writing tools in an ESL classroom. *Journal of Literacy Research, 41,* 393–431.

Ruan, J. (2004). Bilingual Chinese/English first-graders developing metacognition about writing. *Literacy, 38*(2), 106-112.

Serrano, R., & Howard, E. (2007). Second language writing development in English and in Spanish in a two-way immersion programme. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 10*(2), 152-170. (case study)

Tharp, R. G. (1982). The effective instruction of comprehension: Results and description of the Kamehameha Early Education Program. *Reading Research Quarterly, 17,* 503-527.

Course Schedule and Outline

Date	Topic	Readings	Written Assignments
Week 1	**Introduction:** • Overview of Course • What does it mean to be literate? **Distinctions between Theory, Research and Models:** • Research and Theory Activity • What is research? • Who does research? • What is theory? • What is a model? **Overview of syllabus**	**Theory:** • *Lenses on Reading* Ch. 1 • The syllabus	
Week 2	**Theory:** • Early Roots: Early Theories and Models **Literacy Topic: Historical Precedents in Literacy** • Historical Eras and Trends in Literacy Research	**Theory:** • *Lenses on Reading* Ch. 2 **Historical Precedents:** • Alexander & Fox (2004) Gaffney & Anderson (2000)	• <u>Reading Preparation #1 Due</u> • Brainstorm list of possible research topics
Week 3	**Theory: Reader Response and Transactional Theory** • Constructivism and Reader Response Theory • What is transactional theory? • How is it relevant to literacy? **Literacy Topic: Reader Response and Transactional Theory** • What does research on response to literature tell us? • What is the role of reader response in the classroom?	**Theory #1:** • *Lenses on Reading* Ch. 4 (pp.57-68) **Theory #2 (Select 1):** • Rosenblatt (1991) • Rosenblatt (2004) **Research: (Select 1)** • Akrofi et al. (2010) • McEneaney et al. (2009) • Sipe & Brightman (2009) • Sipe (2000)	• <u>Reading Preparation #2 Due</u> • Continue to refine brainstorming regarding possible research topic/questions

Date	Topic	Readings	Written Assignments
Week 4	**Theory: Sociocultural Theory** • What is internalization? • What is the ZPD? • What is the role of oral language? • If you scaffold peer discussion is transactional theory apparent? **Literacy Topic: Oral Language/Classroom Discourse** • What is peer discussion? • How is it linked to sociocultural theory?	**Theory:** • *Lenses on Reading* Ch. 6 (pp. 116-132) • Gee (2001) **Research: (Select 1)** • Chinn et al. (2001) • Dong et al. (2008) • Lewis (1997) • Mercer et al. (1999) • Nystrand et al. (2003) • Reznitskaya et al. (2001)	• Reading Preparation #3 Due • Begin process of narrowing
Week 5	**Theory: Sociocultural Theories and Authority & Power** • How is scaffolding linked to sociocultural theory? • How is authority and power present in classroom discourse? **Literacy Topic: Oral Language, Classroom Discourse and Authority and Power** • Analysis and critique of studies • How is authority and power linked to scaffolding? • How is oral language impacted?	**Theory:** • Buzzelli & Johnston (2001) **Research (Read 2):** • Almasi et al. (2001) • Clarke (2006) • Evans (2002) • Maloch (2002) • Many (2002) • Matthews & Kesner (2003) • Van Sluys & Flynt (2006)	• Proposal Due: Includes Introduction, Rationale, Research Question, and Methods • Begin search for related literature
Week 6	**Theory: Identity** • What Discourses are Needed to be Literate in School? • What identities do we construct as readers and writers? **Research: Literacy Practices and Identity Development** • How do literacy practices influence identity development?	**Theory:** • Ferdman (1990) or Moje & Luke (2009) **Research: (Select 1)** • Dagenais et al. (2006) • Falk (2004) • Finders (1996) • Hicks (2004) • Jiménez (2000) • Leander (2004) • Luttrell & Parker (2001) • McCarthey (2001) • Wortham (2004)	• Reading Preparation #4 Due • Continue search for related literature

Date	Topic	Readings	Written Assignments
Week 7	**Theory:** • Information Processing Theories • Metacognition **Literacy Topic: Comprehension Strategies and Narrative Text** • Strategy Instruction • How do skills and strategies differ? • How is strategy instruction different? • Principles of strategy instruction	**Theory:** • *Lenses on Reading* Ch. 4 (pp. 72-75) and Ch. 7 (pp. 150-153, 160-163) **Research (All read):** • Afflerbach, Pearson & Paris (2008) **Research (Select 1):** • Brown, Pressley Van Meter & Schuder (1996) • Dewitz, Jones & Leahy (2009) van Keer (2004) **Practical:** • Shanahan et al. (2010)	• Reading Preparation #5 Due • Develop preliminary research design and begin drafting instruments, interview protocols, etc. for use in study
Week 8	**Review of Research:** • NAEP Vocabulary Findings **Literacy Topic: Vocabulary** • How is vocabulary learning important to literacy? • What does it mean to "know" a word? • How do we select words for instruction? • How does vocabulary acquisition develop?	**Theory:** • Nagy & Hiebert (2011) **Review of Research:** • NCES (2012) **Research (Select 1):** • Erkaya & Dower (2012) • Gámez & Lesaux (2012) • Lesaux et al. (2010) • Suanda & Namy (2013) • Vadasy et al. (2011)	• Reading Preparation #6 Due
Week 9	**Theory:** • Engagement, Motivation and Self-Efficacy • What is the nature of motivation and its impact on reading? • How might these ideas transfer to writing? **Literacy Topic: Engagement and Motivation in Reading and Writing** • How can we motivate and engage literacy learners? • What factors influence students' motivation for literacy? • What can we do in the classroom to support motivated literacy practices?	**Theory:** • Guthrie & Wigfield (2000) • Schunk (2003) **Research (Read One):** • Abbott (2000) • Guthrie et al. (2004) • Kaplan et al. (2009) • Mata, L. (2011) • Nolen, (2007) • Warren et al. (2008) • Schunk (2003)	• Reading Preparation #7 Due • Draft instruments, interview protocols, etc. for use in study due

Date	Topic	Readings	Written Assignments
Week 10	*Theory:* • 21st Century Literacies/Multiliteracies ***Literacy Topic: 21st Century Literacies and Multiliteracies*** • What does it mean to be literate in a global society in the 21st century? • What distinguishes 21st Century Literacies from Multiliteracies?	***Theory 1:*** • Leu et al. (2013) ***Theory 2:*** • Street (2005) OR view Street (2005) NRC talk skip ***Research 1:*** • Coiro & Dobler (2007) ***Research 2 (Read One):*** • Lewis & Fabbo (2005) • Rowsell & Pahl (2007)	• Turn in draft proposal that includes topic, questions, design, methods • Begin data gathering
Week 11	*Theory:* • Automaticity theory ***Literacy Topic #6: Fluency*** • What do reviews of research tell us about fluency instruction? • What does research tell us about best fluency practices? • What is the role of speed, accuracy, and prosody in fluent reading? • How should we assess fluency?	***Review of Research:*** • *Lenses on Reading* Ch. 5 (pp. 97-98), Ch. 7 (pp. 154-159) • Kuhn & Stahl (2003) • Rasinski & Hoffman, (2003) ***Research (Select 1):*** • Clark, Morrison & Wilcox (2009) • Kuhn, Schwanenflugel, Levy & Rasinski (2010) • Miller & Schwanenflugel (2008) • Stahl & Heubach (2005) • Tyler & Chard (2000)	• Reading Preparation #8 Due • Continue data gathering • Turn in draft of methodology
Week 12	***Theory: Theories of Literacy Development*** • Emergent Literacy • Stage Models ***Literacy Topic: Word Identification: Analogizing, Phonics and Phonemic Awareness*** • How do children learn to read words? • What does research about instruction related to analogizing, phonics, and phonemic awareness instruction?	*Theory:* • *Lenses on Reading* Ch. 5 (all) and Ch. 7 (pp. 157-191) ***Research (Select 1):*** • Ehri, Satlow, & Gaskins (2009) • Fischel et. al (2007) • Gelzheiser et al. (2011) • Juel & Minden-Cupp (2000) • Morris et. al (2003) • White (2005)	• Reading Preparation #9 Due • Continue data collection • Begin data analysis

Date	Topic	Readings	Written Assignments
Week 13	***Theory: Writing Development*** • *Emergent writing* • *Strategies underlying writing development* ***Topic: Writing Development Research*** • What theories are operating in writing research? • Do the findings support the theories?	**Theory:** • Harste, Burke, & Woodward (1994) **Research (Select 1):** • Bradley (2001) • Eitelgeorge & Barrett (2004) • Jasmine & Weiner (2007) • Wollman-Bonilla (2001) • Yaden & Tardibuono (2004)	• Continue data analysis • Review of Literature Due
Week 13	***Theory: Process Writing and Writing Strategies*** • How do writers learn to become strategic? ***Research: Writing Process and Writing Strategies Research*** • What does the research say about process writing and teaching students writing strategies? • How can we help struggling writers in the classroom? • What strategies can we teach to help struggling writers?	**Theory (Select 1):** • Graham & Perin (2007a) • Graham & Perin (2007b) • Santangelo et al. (2008) **Research: (Select 2)** • Anrzejczak et al. (2005) • Jarvey et al. (2008) • Jacobsen (2010) • Matthewman & Triggs (2004) • Myhill (2009Harris et al. (2006) • Patel & Laud (2009) • Tracy et al. (2009)	• Reading Preparation #10 Due
Week 15	***Theory:*** • Cultural Practice of Literacy • Do typical models of writing pertain to ELLs? • How does the writing of ELLs differ from native speakers ***Literacy Topic: Culture and Diversity in Literacy instruction*** • How does cultural and linguistic diversity impact literacy instruction? • How does cultural and linguistic diversity impact literacy achievement?	***Theory:*** • August, Shanahan, & Escamilla (2009) • Purcell-Gates (2005) OR view Purcell-Gates (2005) NRC Talk **Research (Select 2):** • Carbone & Orellana (2010) • Cuero (2009) • Dyson (2003) • Heath (1987) • Ranker (2009) • Ruan (2004) • Serrano & Howard (2007) • Tharp (1982)	• Work on final paper • Work on presentation
Week 16	*Sharing Our Accomplishments* • Oral presentations of research small groups	• None	• Final paper and presentation due

THE INSTRUCTOR RESERVES THE RIGHT TO CHANGE ANY PART OF THIS SYLLABUS DURING THE SEMESTER. STUDENTS WILL BE ADEQUATELY NOTIFIED WHENEVER CHANGES OCCUR.

Grades

Final grades for this course will be based on 200 points. The grading scale is as follows:

Reading Preparations/Written Responses	60 pts.	30%
Mini-Research Project Paper	120 pts.	60%
Introduction and Statement of Problem/Rationale	10 pts.	
Theoretical Framework/Review of Research	15 pts.	
Methodology	30 pts.	
Presentation of Findings/Interpretations	30 pts.	
Plan of Action/Discussion/Conclusions	15 pts.	
Mechanics/Reference List/APA Style	10 pts.	
Presentation	10 pts.	
Class Participation	20 pts.	10%
TOTAL	200 pts.	100%

Points	Percentage	Grade
180-200	90-100%	A
160-179	80-89%	B
140-159	70-79%	C
< 140	< 69.9%	E

Late Assignments

Late assignments may be penalized 20% of their total point value if turned in 24 hours following the due date. Further penalties may be assessed if turned in beyond that point. The instructor may return assignments for revision if they do not meet minimum requirements. The final grade in such instances will represent an average of the original and the revised grade. Exceptions may be made for students with extenuating circumstances. Students who have problems with absences or completing assignments should contact the instructor as soon as the problem arises.

Attendance

Your attendance and thoughtful participation are essential in this class! Unexcused absences will result in the loss of 2 points (1%) from the final grade. For an absence to be excused, you must:
1) Email or call me before the start of class (or as soon as is reasonably possible) to let me know of your absence
2) Contact me to learn about what you missed and to arrange to make up any missed work

You also may be required provide documentation, depending on the nature of your absence (e.g., doctor's note). The instructor may also excuse other absences at her discretion for unusual circumstances. S.R. 5.2.4.2 defines the following as acceptable reasons for excused absences:
a) serious illness;
b) illness or death of family member;
c) University-related trips;
d) major religious holidays;
e) other circumstances determined by the instructor to be "reasonable cause for absence".

According to the Rules of the University Senate, those students who miss more than 20% of the class FOR ANY REASON may be dropped by the instructor from the class. This is true even if you are sick and

have medical excuses. The rationale for this rule is that people who miss more than 20% are not really receiving the content of the course.

Students anticipating an absence for a major religious holiday are responsible for notifying the instructor in writing of anticipated absences due to their observance of such holidays no later than the last day for adding a class. Information regarding dates of major religious holidays may be obtained through the religious liaison, Mr. Jake Karnes (257-2754).

Students with Special Needs

The American with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal anti-discrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protections for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides a reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you believe you have a disability requiring an accommodation, please notify your instructor and contact the Disability Resource Center (Mr. Jake Karnes, jkarnes@uky.edu) 257-2754, room 2 Alumni Gym.

The course will be conducted with openness and respect to all individuals' points of view and experience. The activities and discussions will not tolerate discrimination or prejudice toward any person or group's religion, ethnicity, disability, gender, or sexual orientation.

Statement on Plagiarism

As commonly defined, plagiarism consists of passing off as one's own the ideas, words, writing, etc., which belong to another. In accordance with this definition, you are committing plagiarism if you copy the work of another person and turn it in as your own, even if you should have permission of that person. Plagiarism is one of the worst academic violations, for the plagiarist destroys trust among others. Plagiarism, cheating and other forms of academic dishonesty are serious offenses that lead to significant consequences. Anyone found to be cheating or plagiarizing will receive an automatic E in this course. Furthermore, serious consequences from the university could follow.

Course Assignments

1. Reading Preparations/Written Responses
(10 assignments @ 6 pts. each = 60 pts, 30% of total grade)

I expect that you will come to each class having read all required readings and prepared to participate thoughtfully each evening. Prior to each week's class meeting you will be required to complete a response in preparation for, or related to, the week's readings. We will use your preparations/responses in class each week to fuel our discussions about various literacy topics.

These preparations will be designed by the professor and handed out the week prior to the due date. Some will be written products others may be graphic organizers, or some other multimodal form of response. Each response will be collected and graded. It is hoped that these preparations will not only help you understand and prepare for the readings each week, but also engage you in the types of pre-reading activities you should be designing for your own students. These responses should show evidence of critical thinking, reflectivity, and an ability to integrate information. They should also use APA style and refer to course readings If you are unprepared to participate

responsibly in class, points will be deducted from your grade.

Format for Written Responses
As a preparation for each class meeting, you will be required to prepare a written response/summary of each reading required for that class. These responses/summaries will help you learn how to summarize and think about research. We will use your responses/summaries in class each week to fuel our discussions about various literacy topics.

Your responses do not need to be lengthy. In fact, they will work best if they are limited 2 typed (double-spaced, with 1-inch margins) pages.

2-page responses to assigned readings each week should address *key points, conflicts, synthesis,* and *personal commentary*:

a. **Key Points:** Highlight the *key* points the author is making. Each reading describes a theory, a perspective, or explains a model. Write also about the aspects critical to the theory and those points distinguishing the author's perspective from other perspectives. In addition, think about how the author would elaborate on statements such as, "A significant feature we need to recognize is . . . because . . . ."

b. **Conflicts/Critique:** There are several positions an author might take regarding the issues involved in describing theories and processes in reading. Think about what conflicts emerge for you as well as within the field of reading (i.e., among researchers, among practitioners, and between researchers and practitioners). As you read, do you see any points of contention arising in conversation among researchers, teachers, theorists, and students? Also, think critically about the ideas by considering political, social, historical, and cultural aspects. That is, what elements might be influencing (or biasing) the author's perspective?

c. **Synthesis:** Here you should endeavor to synthesize the readings and make connections between the assigned readings for the week. Such connections are known as "intertextual" connections. Well-written responses will also endeavor to make intertextual connections to previous course-related readings.

d. **Personal Commentary:** Describe your own personal insights regarding the ideas/issues in the text. You might make connections to your own experiences as a reader, learner, teacher, or researcher.

I will grade each of your weekly responses using the following five-point rubric:

Grade	Scoring Rubric for Responses to Non-research Readings
4	• Response is provided for the entire reading assignment. • Response exhibits critical thinking and evaluation. • Response synthesizes information across all reading assignments for the week. • Response makes relevant and insightful intertextual connections between the current readings and to past course readings.

	• APA style is used accurately throughout the response.
3	• Response is provided for the entire reading assignment. • Response exhibits critical thinking and evaluation. • Response synthesizes information across all reading assignments for the week. • Response makes relevant and insightful intertextual connections between the current readings and to past course readings. • APA style is *not* used accurately throughout the response.
2	• Response is provided for the entire reading assignment. • Response exhibits some critical thinking and evaluation but portions may reflect mere summaries of the information in the readings. • Response attempts to synthesize information across all reading assignments for the week. • Response attempts to make intertextual connections between the current readings and to past course readings. • APA style is used accurately throughout the response.
1	• Response is *not* provided for the entire reading assignment. • Response does *not* exhibit critical thinking and evaluation. Instead, the response is a summary of the information in the readings. • Response does *not* synthesize information across all reading assignments for the week. • Response does *not* make intertextual connections between the current readings and past course readings. • APA style is either not used or is used inaccurately.
0	• Response is turned in late. • Response is not turned in at all.

Format for Summaries of Research:
Your initial summaries can be in chart form and/or use phrases to summarize. Regardless, you should summarize the information below for *each* research report read each week. Numbers 1 - 12 can be in brief, note-like phrases. However, #13 should be in paragraph form.

At the point in the semester in which I am convinced you can adequately identify all elements of a research study, you will be expected to synthesize a study briefly in a paragraph—I will let you know when that point in the semester occurs.

Introduction
1. Citation: Complete reference citation in APA style

2. Purpose/Goal of the study and General Rationale
   (a) What was the purpose or goal of the study?
   (b) How did the authors make the case for its general importance?
   (c) What were the research questions?
3. Fit and Specific Rationale
   (a) How does the topic of the study fit into the existing research literature?
   (b) How was that research literature used to establish the need for this study?

Methods Used
   4a. Research Design (I want you to *try* to determine the design using the Mertler (2012) text)
      (a) What type of research design did the author use? (e.g., experimental, quasi-experimental, causal comparative, correlational, case study, ethnography, etc.)
4b. Participants
      (a) Who was studied? (number, gender, age, SES, other characteristics)
      (b) How were participants selected?
5. Context
   (a) Where does the study take place? (describe important characteristics)
6. Steps in Sequence (Procedures)
   (a) In the order performed, describe the procedural steps in the study?
   (b) Include a description of treatment conditions if applicable
7. Data Sources/Measures
   (a) What constituted the data? (e.g., test scores, questionnaire responses,etc)
   (b) How was the data collected?
   (c) What was the role of the researcher in the process?
8. Data Analysis Procedures
   (a) What form of data analysis was used?
   (b) How did the data analysis answer the research questions?
   (c) What (if any) statistical procedures were used to analyze the data?
9. Results
   (a) What were the results produced by the data analysis?
10. Conclusions
      (a) What did the authors conclude about how the results in #9 responded to the purpose of the study in #2?
    (b) What practical implications does the study have for instruction?
11. Cautions: Limitations/Critique of Study
      (a) What cautions or limitations does the author raise about the study itself or about interpreting the results?
    (b) What are your own reservations and criticisms of the study?
12. Discussion
      (a) What interesting facts or ideas did you learn from the research? (Include anything of value such as the results, the research design, the methods used, references, history, useful arguments, or personal inspiration)

Must be written in paragraph form:
    13. Response and Critique of Research*

* Your responses can include your emotional reaction to the research or theory, but *should more importantly*, include any concerns, questions, or issues occurring to you while you were reading and reflecting on the research. State the concern, question, or issue and explain *why* it is a problem. As well, you should provide critical commentary regarding the investigation itself. Your critique might focus on strengths and/or weaknesses of the theoretical framework, literature review, methodology, results, or discussion/conclusions. This portion, of course, will be difficult without a background in research methodology, but this type of thinking and the issues to consider will be modeled throughout the course. Hopefully, this will be an area in which you learn how to read research with a critical lens. We will use these responses to fuel and foster critical discourse about each reading in class. So, the responses should be written in paragraph form, rather than in phrases.

I will grade each of your weekly responses using the following five-point rubric. Thus, each research report read each week will be "worth" a maximum of 4 points (e.g., If you were assigned to read 2 research reports you would complete 2 research summaries. Each summary would be worth 4 points, for a total possible score that week of 8).

Grade	Scoring Rubric for Summaries of Research
4	- Summary is provided of the *entire* research study. - Summarized information is accurate for the *entire* research study. - Your personal discussion of the study (#12 above) exhibits sincere thought. - Your critique of the research (#13 above) exhibits *extensive* critical thinking and evaluation, shows evidence of what we have learned in class, and uses citations to support critical points made. - APA style is used accurately throughout the summary.
3	- Summary is provided of the *entire* research study. - Summarized information is accurate for the *entire* research study. - Your personal discussion of the study (#12 above) exhibits sincere thought. - Your critique of the research (#13 above) exhibits *extensive* critical thinking and evaluation, shows evidence of what we have learned in class, and uses citations to support critical points made. - APA style is *not* used accurately throughout the summary.
2	- Summary is provided of the *entire* research study. - Summarized information is accurate for *most* of the research study. - Your personal discussion of the study (#12 above) exhibits sincere thought. - Your critique of the research (#13 above) exhibits *some* critical thinking and evaluation, shows evidence of what we have learned in class, and/or uses citations to support critical points made. - APA style is used accurately throughout the summary.

1	• Summary is *not* provided of the entire research study. • Summarized information contains inaccuracies on several parts of the research study. • Your personal discussion of the study (#12 above) does *not* exhibit extensive thought. • Your critique of the research (#13 above) does *not* exhibit critical thinking and evaluation related to what we have learned in class and/or does *not* use citations to support critical points made. • APA style is *not* used accurately throughout the summary.
0	• Response is turned in late. • Response is not turned in at all.

2. Mini-Research Project Paper (120 pts., 60% of total grade)

This is the integrative project for the course and is designed to help you learn how to design a qualitative investigation and how to gather, analyze, interpret, and communicate the results of your inquiry. It should be viewed as an *opportunity* rather than as a requirement (although you must complete it in order to pass the class). Begin by thinking about a "foreshadowed question" (Malinowski, 1922, pp. 8-9). Such questions may arise from the theoretical literature, your own experience, or your own values. Your job is to begin by asking yourself, "What really interests me, puzzles me, and/or arouses my curiosity about literacy education?" Then you must select a site for your research in which you can examine this issue or problem. You will spend the remainder of the semester examining this context as you try to understand or make sense of your issue or problem. At various points throughout the semester you will be asked to turn in aspects of this mini-study. At the end of the semester you will turn in a completed report of this investigation. You may choose to organize the final product as a conventional paper (as outlined below) or in a more unconventional manner that is negotiated with the professor. Your goal is to provide the most coherent presentation of your mini-study as possible. However you present your inquiry, I will look for the following key elements (unless you negotiate an alternative framework):

Throughout the semester the course will be designed to assist you with this paper. At three points in the semester I will collect portions of the paper grade them, and provide you with feedback. Based on the feedback you receive, you may elect to *revise* that portion of the paper and turn the revision in with the entire paper on the final night of class.

In **Week 5** you will be required to submit the Introduction, Statement of problem/Rationale, and your Research Questions. In **Week 10** you will be required to submit the methodology section of the paper. In **Week 12** you will be required to submit the Review of Literature portion of the paper.

At the end of the semester you will turn in a completed copy of your entire research mini-study. If you have revised a portion of your paper, you should turn in the original draft along with the revision. This will enable me to provide you with consistent feedback.

You may choose to organize the final product as a conventional paper (as outlined below) or in a more unconventional manner that is negotiated with the professor. Of course, research paper can often be written in very different manners. Your goal is to provide the most coherent presentation of your research study as possible. **Regardless, this paper must be presented in** APA style. However you present your research, I will look for the following key elements (unless you negotiate an alternative framework):

A. Theoretical/Conceptual Framework: (25 pts.)

1. *Introduction and Statement of Problem/Rationale/Research Questions (10 pts.):* During this portion you will introduce the reader to your topic of study and your research question/issue/problem (i.e., What do I need to know?). It is also your goal to convince your reader that the topic has educational significance and that there is a need for exploring the topic in detail (e.g., Why is this subject important? Why do I need to know this?). Thus, the writing here is persuasive. My evaluation will look for a well-defined and clearly articulated problem or issue that motivates your investigation. Generally, better written arguments will cite relevant literature that supports the need for investigation and will *not* rely on personal opinions or personal experiences.

   By the end of this section readers should know what your research question/problem is and be convinced that it is important to study it in more depth. You should end this section with a list of clear research questions.

2. *Theoretical Framework and Review of Research Literature (15 pts.):* Here you will explain and describe, in detail, those theories that frame and are pertinent to your topic or issue. Your goal here is to provide the reader with the background that situates and links your topic to relevant theoretical perspectives. My evaluation will look for a thorough and well-articulated explanation of the theories that frame the problem that you are exploring.

   You will also review relevant research studies that have examined and explored your topic (and that most likely have attempted to elucidate some part of a theory explained in your theoretical framework). Your goal here is to find relevant historical and current research, review it, and synthesize it in a manner that sheds new light on the topic (e.g., What is the content of previous work on this subject? How will your work build on what has already been done?). It is important here to try to make connections and linkages between each of the studies (or group of studies) in order to synthesize. You should refer to at least 3 pieces of research within this review of research.

   You should rely more heavily on literacy/research journals that publish high quality literacy research. Some of these journals include:

American Educational Research Journal	*Learning Disability Quarterly*
British Educational Research Journal	*Literacy Research and Instruction*
Discourse Processes	*Reading Research Quarterly*
Educational Psychologist	*Reading and Writing Quarterly*
Ethos	*Research in the Teaching of English*

Journal of Educational Psychology　　　*Review of Educational Research*
Journal of Educational Research　　　　*Teaching and Teacher Education*
Journal of Literacy Research　　　　　　*Written Communication*

You may also find articles in other literacy journals. The following journals have wonderful articles in them; however, they are primarily written for practitioners:

- *The Reading Teacher*
- *Language Arts*
- *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*

B. Methodology: (<u>30 pts.</u>)

1. *<u>Research Design (4 points)</u>*. It is essential in any report of research to describe the design of your investigation. By design, I mean the style of research (or the research tradition) into which your study falls. Examples of designs might include: experimental, quasi-experimental, correlational, causal-comparative, ethnography, descriptive case study, interpretive case study, cross-case analysis, etc. By describing the design of your study you help your audience establish an anticipatory set for reading your work.

2. *<u>Participants (4 points)</u>*. It is important to provide a thorough description of those who participated in your investigation. Here you are seeking to provide an explicit description of those people from whom you are observing and interviewing. Such descriptions should include aspects such as age, gender, race, and ethnicity and other features relevant to your question of interest (e.g., socioeconomic status, social position, ability level, self-perception, etc.). Because your interpretations are inextricably tied to your participants, and generalizations cannot go beyond these participants, the more thorough your description the better.

3. *<u>Site (4 points)</u>*. Again it is essential that you describe your research site as completely as possible (e.g., Where will I find and gather the data?). Such descriptions help readers understand the context in which your participants dwell as it pertains to your question of interest. Interpretations of data vary substantially depending upon the context in which the data were collected. Thus, descriptions of these contexts are critical to interpretation and evaluation.

4. **Description of Researcher Role or Treatment Conditions**

   For Qualitative Studies:
   <u>Researcher Role (4 points)</u>. In any investigation it is essential to fully describe the role that you assumed as the researcher within your context. We will read and discuss multiple roles (e.g., participant observer, nonparticipant observer). This is also where you may feel that it is necessary to include your autobiographical roots (if it may help your readers understand the nature of your inquiry). The point for such information is to minimize distortion by identifying and describing the source of your interest in the subject.

   For Experimental Studies:
   <u>Treatment Conditions (4 points)</u>. Provide a detailed and explicit description of what occurred in each treatment condition. That is, carefully explain what occurred in the experimental condition

and what occurred in the control (or comparison) condition. If different instructional treatments were provided be sure to carefully explain how the instruction differed in each condition.

5. _Data Sources and/or Measures (4 points)_. Include a thorough description of each data source or measure.

    For Qualitative Studies:
    Here you are identifying and describing the kinds of data that will provide insight into your research questions. Therefore, your job is to describe your primary and secondary sources of data. You must have a sufficient number observations and/or interviews for saturation to occur. Include not only descriptions of the types of data, but the amount of data collected within each format. For example, primary sources of data might include 2 videotaped discussions and 2 focal group interviews. Secondary sources might include field notes from 5 observations, audiotaped class discussions, theoretical memos, descriptions of the site, photographs of the site, and student work samples.

    For Experimental Studies:
    Here you describe the dependent variables, or measures, you are using. These measures should be described in detail. As well, you should include information related to the reliability and validity of the measures. If you do not know this information, you can find such information in _Mental Measurements Yearbook_ in the Education Library.

6. _Data Gathering Procedures (6 points)_. Provide a detailed description of how your data was gathered. Some researchers find it helpful to provide a timeline of all data gathering activity to accompany their prose descriptions.

7. _Analysis Procedures (4 points)_. This is a critical feature that is often oversimplified and written superficially by researchers. In this section you should describe the manner in which you plan to analyze all of your data. That is, you must go beyond merely mentioning that you "used grounded theory" or "analytic induction" or "ANOVA" (or whatever the name of the method) to analyze your data. You must explain, in detail, the _process_ you plan to engage in as you try make sense of your data.

C. Presentation of Results/Interpretation: **(30 pts.)**
This is often the most difficult and formidable task in writing your research report. The difficult part comes in deciding how best to communicate your results. It is important to first think about your audience (i.e., to whom do you want your message to speak?). One answer to this question is "the professor." This is an incorrect answer. You must assume that I am unfamiliar with your data and your study (although I will be reading your work with great care and attention and may be quite familiar with your data and your study). You should write as if for a refereed professional journal. My evaluation will look for a coherent presentation of your results (10 points) that is well-linked to and supported by your analysis (6 points). I will also look here to determine the quality of your analysis (6 points).

For qualitative research, supportive evidence from a variety of sources is essential for credibility. Therefore, I will look for supportive evidence in the form of quotes from transcripts, photographs, field note excerpts, etc. to affirm your results (8 points). Remember that triangulation of evidence and methodology creates the most credible presentation in qualitative studies.

For experimental research, your data should be presented clearly in tables, charts, and/or graphs in APA style. You should also provide a description and interpretation of the data in prose form. Throughout the prose description you should refer to the tables, charts, and graphs as you explain and interpret the data. Raw, unsynthesized data should not be presented in this section (8 points).

Coherence = 10 points
Connection between results and analysis = 6 points
Analysis = 6 points
Presentation of evidence/data = 8 points

D. Plan of Action/Discussion/Conclusions: (15 pts.)
  1. *Summary and Conclusions (4 pts.).* Here you will summarize your work by discussing the conclusions from your data and how it might be explained by theory.

  2. *Plan of Action/Implications for Literacy Instruction (7 pts.).* Provide either a plan of action for how you/your school might solve the issue you examined or provide an explanation of the practical implications of your research findings. This is where practitioners in the field would go to understand the research findings in terms of what it means for the classroom. A question that should guide your writing throughout this section is: What should practitioners know or do in their classrooms as a result of the research you conducted?

  3. *Limitations (4 pts.).* This is an essential aspect of your report (particularly the thinking that goes into its preparation). Here you will explain those aspects of design, methodology, or interpretation that have limited your study. Inevitably there are flaws or missed opportunities (sometimes even outright mistakes) that occur during the course of the investigation or as a result of the type of investigation undertaken. This is where I will expect those limitations to be described. Often if you have taken care to write theoretical memos throughout your investigation you will have already made note of items that limit your study. These notes will prove useful as you write this section.

E. Mechanics, Reference List and APA Style: (10 pts.)
You will present a list of all sources cited within your paper. This list, and the paper itself, must be in APA style (6th Edition). If you are unfamiliar with APA style, you should purchase the 6th Edition of the handbook of the American Psychological Association (APA) and use it as a guide or go online for a basic APA tutorial http://www.apastyle.org/learn/tutorials/basics-tutorial.aspx.

F. Class Presentation (10 pts.)
On the last night of class you will share your study and its findings with the class. Your presentation should be about 15 minutes long. Your presentation should be professional and should include some sort of handout or powerpoint presentation to help communicate the following: (a) purpose/goal of study, (b) research questions, (c) theoretical framework, (d) methodology, (e) findings/results, (f) conclusions, (g) plan of action, (h) limitations. You should also be prepared to respond to questions about your study from your peers.

Timeline:
  1. Start to think about the problem, issue, or topic that is of interest to you as soon as possible-- today. Think about issues that have bothered you while teaching in your own class, methods you would like to try out in your classroom, issues that you do not understand, issues that you would like to know more about, or issues that perplex you in education.
  2. Use the initial class readings to gain some ideas if you are having difficulty or discuss it with me.

Write a proposal to turn in during WEEK 5. I will read and react to them as quickly as possible. I expect these proposals to provide an introduction, a rationale for studying the issue (with reference citations), at least one research question, and a brief overview of the methodology. Consider this proposal a draft of your Institutional Review Board permission.

3. Once you have approval from me, submit your draft to the Institutional Review Board and begin to make arrangements to visit your site and gain access.

4. Periodically throughout the semester you will turn in pieces of your study as indicated on the syllabus. Consider these submissions "best drafts." That is, these should be polished products that are your *best* effort. I will read and react to them. Based upon my feedback you may revise your drafts and turn them in with the completed mini-study at the end of the semester.

3. Class Participation (20 pts., 10% of total grade)

You are expected to come to each class prepared to participate fully in class discussions and in class activities. Your contributions and insights are necessary for making the class successful. I hope you will view the format of this course as one in which constructive and collaborative exchanges of ideas can occur. Thus, you may at times disagree with the professor, your classmates, and the authors of our readings. Please feel free to politely and respectfully share any and all agreements and disagreements. Through critical discourse we come to understand others and ourselves better. This is the heart of critical inquiry. Such responsible participation will positively affect this portion of your grade.

Absence and/or tardiness will adversely affect your grade. Of course, it is understood that unfortunate events or incidents may occur within your family. As well, at times a professional obligation may necessitate missing a portion of class. Please inform me of such circumstances prior to class and we will jointly decide the degree to which your participation grade will be affected.

Passive participation in class and/or lack of preparedness for class will also adversely affect your grade.

Scoring Rubric: Final Project

	Exemplary (108 -120 pts.)	Acceptable (107-84 pts.)	Poor (below 83 pts.)
Theoretical/Conceptual Framework (25 pts. total)			
Introduction **(10 pts.)**	• Introduction offers thorough and convincing statement of problem • Importance of the problem is thoroughly rationalized • Rationale connects the project with practical needs	• Introduction offers a reasonable statement of problem • Importance of the problem is adequately explained • Rationale may connect the project with practical needs	• Introduction is missing OR does not offer a coherent statement of problem • Importance of problem is not explained • Rationale does not connect with practical needs
Theoretical Framework and Review of Literature **(15 pts.)**	• Theoretical framework is thoroughly described • Theories clearly connect with the project • Prior research is effectively reviewed • At least 3 research studies are included	• Theoretical framework is somewhat described • Theories connect with the project • Some prior research is reviewed • 2 or 1 research studies are included	• Theoretical framework is missing or poorly described • Theories are not appropriate for project • No prior research is reviewed, or if included, is poorly reviewed • 0 research studies are included
Methodology (30 pts. total)			
Methodology	• Methodology section clearly and thoroughly explains what was done • All decisions are rationalized	• Methodology section clearly explains what was done; explanations are adequate but not detailed • Most decisions are rationalized	• Methodology section missing or incomplete • Few, or no, decisions are explained
Research Design **(4 pts.)**	• Research design clearly identified and thoroughly justified	• Research design identified and partially justified	Research design not identified, inappropriate, or poorly explained
Participants **(4 pts.)**	• Participants, and their selection, thoroughly described • Justification provided for types of participants	• Participants, and their selection, described • Some justification provided for types of participants	• Participants and their selection poorly (or not) described • No justification provided for types of participants

Site (4 pts.)	• Research site thoroughly described, • Site selection is clearly rationalized	• Research site described • Site selection is partly rationalized	• Research site is not described • Site selection is not rationalized
Researcher Role **or** Treatment Conditions (4 pts.)	• Research site thoroughly described, • Site selection is clearly rationalized • For qualitative study, researcher clearly describes her/his role in project AND explains how role may have impacted study • For quantitative study, researcher fully explains the treatment conditions •	• Research site described • Site selection is partly rationalized • For qualitative study, researcher mentions her/his role in project; brief discussion of how role may have impacted study • For quantitative study, researcher explains the treatment conditions •	• Research site is not described • Site selection is not rationalized • For qualitative study, researcher does not describes her/his role in project • For quantitative study, researcher provides little or no explanation of treatment conditions
Data Sources **and Measures** (4 pts.)	• Data sources and/or measures are clearly described and thoroughly justified	• Data sources and/or measures are described with some justification	• Data sources and/or measures not described or inadequately described
Data Collection/Gathering Procedures **(6 pts)**	• Data collection sources are clearly described and thoroughly justified	• Data collection sources are described with some justification	• Data collection sources not described or inadequately described
Data Analysis Procedures (4 pts.)	• Data analysis procedures are clearly described and thoroughly justified	• Data analysis procedures are described with some justification	• Data analysis procedures not described or inadequately described
Presentation of Results (30 pts. of total)			
Presentation of Results **Coherence (10 pts.)** **Connection between results and analysis (6 pts.)** **Analysis (6 pts.)** **Presentation of evidence/data (8 pts.)**	• Results/findings thoroughly described • Clear, strong connections between raw data, analysis and results/findings • Results/findings organized in logical manner • Strong evidence of critical thinking	• Results/findings adequately described • Connections between raw data, analysis and results/findings are adequate but not strong • Results/findings organized in logical manner • Some evidence of	• Results/findings are missing or poorly described • No connections between raw data, analysis and results/findings, or connections are unclear • Results/findings disorganized

		critical thinking	• No evidence of critical thinking
Plan of Action/Discussion/Conclusion (15 pts. of total)			
Plan of Action/Discussion/Conclusions Summary **(4 pts.)**	• Overall, section offers important insights & implications • Strong evidence of critical thinking • Summary and conclusions are effectively concise	• Overall, section offers reasonable insights & implications • Some evidence of critical thinking • Summary and conclusions are discussed	• Overall, section offers few insights or implications • Little or no evidence of critical thinking • Summary and conclusions are omitted or poorly discussed
Plan of Action/Implications **(7 pts.)** Limitations **(4 pts.)**	• Implications section offers important insights • Implications relate back to problem • Clear, strong implications for literacy instruction • Appropriate recommendations for future research • If appropriate, researcher insightfully discusses how study may address theory • Thorough discussion of study's limitations • Limitations provide evidence of critical reflection on study	• Implications section offers reasonable insights • Implications relate back to problem • Implications for literacy instruction discussed • Some recommendations for future research • If appropriate, researcher addresses how study may address theory • Some discussion of study's limitations • Limitations provide evidence of some reflection on study	• Implications section offers no new insights • Implications do not connect to problem • No implications for literacy instruction discussed • No recommendations for future research • Researcher does not address how study may address theory when clearly appropriate • No, or inadequate, discussion of study's limitations • Limitations provide no evidence of some reflection on study
Mechanics (10 pts.)			
Mechanics/References / APA Style (10 pts.)	• A complete list of all sources cited within your paper is provided. • APA style used correctly throughout paper • Paper is error-free, or 0-1 mistakes are made per page (including spelling, grammar, and other mechanics)	• Reference list is complete or missing no more than 1 reference • APA style used throughout paper, with no more than 3 errors • No more than 2-3 mistakes are made per page (including spelling, grammar, and other mechanics)	• Reference list is missing or incomplete • APA style not used, or used with more than 3 errors overall • 4 or more mistakes are made per page (including spelling, grammar, and other mechanics)

Class Presentation (10 pts. total)			
Class Presentation (10 points)	• Researcher's participation in class presentation is highly professional • Strong written product (e.g., poster, handout, PPT) that concisely yet effectively explains what was done, what was found, and how it applies to literacy instruction • Researcher provides strong, effective answers to questions	• Researcher's participation in class presentation is effective • Written product (e.g., poster, handout, PPT) adequately explains what was done, what was found, and how it applies to literacy instruction • Researcher provides adequate answers to questions	• Researcher does not participate in class presentation, or presentation is unprofessional • Written product (e.g., poster, handout, PPT) missing or does not adequately explain what was done, what was found, and/or how it applies to literacy instruction • Researcher provides poor answers to questions

Total = _____

Janice F. Almasi, Ph.D.
Carol Lee Robertson Endowed Professor of Literacy Education
101 Taylor Education Building
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40511
(O) (859) 321-6952
email: janice.almasi@uky.edu ·

Office Hours:
Tuesdays 3:30-4:30 PM
(or by appointment)

Class Meetings:
Tuesdays 5:00-7:30 PM
323 Dickey Hall

Overview

Purpose: The purpose of this course is to critically examine, analyze, and reflect upon research and theory pertaining to the production and understanding of oral and written language (speaking, listening, reading, writing, viewing, and visually representing). Toward this end, students will learn how to integrate and apply these ideas in the classroom to analyze and reflect upon their own practice and compare and contrast their findings with findings from published research. More specifically, students enrolled in this course will:

1. Discuss their critical analyses of course readings by communicating their ideas clearly, listening effectively, resolving differences reasonably, and demonstrating skilled participation as a group member.

2. Initiate and complete a research project that addresses a literacy-related area in which they wish to develop as a professional.

3. Share research projects with their colleagues in the class who are interested in the same or similar topics.

4. Design instructional practices for use in research that reflect current research and theory in literacy education and write about the ways in which these practices and/or the practices they have been using are consistent with research and theory.

5. Develop an understanding of how to critically evaluate research literature and demonstrate the ability to effectively apply this understanding while reading research and during small and large group discussions in class.

6. Develop an understanding of the field's current views regarding the complex processes of writing, speaking, and listening and discuss the implications of these ideas for instruction in diverse elementary classrooms in written responses and in small and large group discussions in class.

Table 1. How EDC 642 Course Objectives Align with International Reading Association Standards for Reading Professionals (IRA, 2010)

http://www.reading.org/General/CurrentResearch/Standards/ProfessionalStandards2010.aspx, University of Kentucky College of Education Framework, Kentucky Teacher Standards (EPSB, 2008) http://www.kyepsb.net/teacherprep/standards.asp, and Common Core State Standards (CCSSO, 2010) http://www.corestandards.org/the-standards/english-language-arts-standards.

EDC 642 Course Objectives	Associated Course Assessments	International Reading Association Standards (IRA, 2010)	COE Framework	Kentucky Teacher Standards (EPSB, 2008)	Common Core State Standards
1. Discuss critical analyses of course readings by communicating ideas clearly, listening effectively, resolving differences reasonably, and demonstrating skilled participation as a group member.	• Weekly Written Responses to Course Reading Participation in Weekly Class Discussion	**Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge** – Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. 1.1: Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections. 1.1b. Demonstrate a critical stance toward the scholarship of the profession. 1.1c. Read and understand the literature and research about factors that contribute to reading success (e.g., social, cognitive, and physical).	1. Research 3. Learning	KST 1	Wrtg 1 S&L 1, 2
2. Initiate and complete a research project that addresses a literacy-related area in which they wish to develop as a professional.	• Mini-Research Project	**Standard 6: Professional Learning and Leadership** – Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility. 6.2: Display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors. [This element deals with positive attitudes not only with colleagues but also with community members, parents and guardians, and so forth.]	1. Research 3. Learning	KST 1,7,10	Rdg 1, 3, 4 Wrtg 1,2,3,4

EDC 642 Syllabus, p. 3

Objective	Standard	Assessment			
	6.2b. Promote the value of reading and writing in and out of school by modeling a positive attitude toward reading and writing with students, colleagues, administrators, and parents and guardians.				
3. Share research projects with their colleagues in the class who are interested in the same or similar topics.	**Standard 6: Professional Learning and Leadership** – Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility. 6.2: Display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors. [This element deals with positive attitudes not only with colleagues but also with community members, parents and guardians, and so forth.] 6.2d. Demonstrate effective interpersonal, communication, and leadership skills.	• Mini-Research Project	1. Research 3. Learning	KST 1,7,10	S & L 1, 2
4. Design instructional practices for use in research that reflect current research and theory in literacy education and write about the ways in which these practices and/or the practices they have been using are consistent with research and theory.	**Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge** – Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. 1.1: Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections. 1.1a. Interpret major theories of reading and writing processes and development to understand the needs of all readers in diverse contexts. 1.1c. Read and understand the literature and research about factors that contribute to reading success (e.g., social, cognitive, and physical).	• Weekly written responses to course readings (Responses to Theory/Summaries of Research) • Mini-Research Project • Participation in weekly class discussion	3. Learning	KST1,2,3,4	Rdg 1, 3, 4 Wrtg 1, 2, 3, 4
5. Develop an understanding of how to	**Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge** –	• Weekly Written	1. Research	1,7,10	Rdg

Objective	Assessment	Standard	Category		Codes
critically evaluate research literature and demonstrate the ability to effectively apply this understanding while reading research and during small and large group discussions in class	Responses to Course Reading • Participation in Weekly Class Discussion	Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. 1.1: Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections. 1.1b. Demonstrate a critical stance toward the scholarship of the profession.	3. Learning		1, 2, 3, 4 Wrtg 1, 2, 3, 4 S & L 1, 2
6. Develop an understanding of the field's current views regarding the complex processes of writing, speaking, and listening and discuss the implications of these ideas for instruction in diverse elementary classrooms in written responses and in small and large group discussions in class.	Weekly written responses to course readings (Responses to Theory/Summaries of Research) • Participation in weekly class discussion	**Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge** – Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. 1.1: Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections. 1.1a. Interpret major theories of reading and writing processes and development to understand the needs of all readers in diverse contexts. 1.1c. Read and understand the literature and research about factors that contribute to reading success (e.g., social, cognitive, and physical). 1.2: Understand the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time in the perceptions of reading and writing development, processes, and components. 1.2a. Interpret and summarize historically shared knowledge (e.g., instructional strategies and theories) that addresses the needs of all readers. **Standard 4: Diversity** – Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that	1. Research 3. Learning	1	Rdg. 1 Lang 2

develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society

4.1: Recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write. [Reading specialists may have responsibilities for teaching students who struggle with learning to read and must also be able to support teachers in their efforts to provide effective instruction for all students.]

4.1a. Demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing.

Standards Legend:

International Reading Association (IRA, 2010)
1. Foundational Knowledge
2. Curriculum and Instruction
3. Assessment and Evaluation
4. Diversity
5. Literate Environment
6. Professional Learning and Leadership

University of Kentucky College of Education Framework
1. Research
2. Reflection
3. Learning
4. Leading

Kentucky Teacher Standards (EPSB, 2008)
1. Teacher demonstrates applied content knowledge
2. Teacher designs and plans instruction
3. Teacher creates and maintains the learning climate
4. Teacher implements and manages instruction
5. Teacher assesses and communicates learning results
6. Teacher demonstrates the implementation of technology
7. Reflects on and evaluates teaching and learning
8. Collaborates with colleagues/ parents/others
9. Evaluates teaching and implements professional development
10. Provides leadership within school/community/profession

Common Core State Standards: English Language Arts (CCSSO, 2010)

Reading:
1. Key ideas and details
2. Craft and structure
3. Integration of knowledge and ideas
4. Range of reading and level of text complexity

Writing:
1. Text types and purposes
2. Production and distribution of writing
3. Research to build and present knowledge
4. Range of Writing

Speaking and Listening:
1. Comprehension and collaboration
2. Presentation of knowledge and ideas

Language:
1. Conventions of standard English
2. Knowledge of language
3. Vocabulary acquisition and use

Required Texts:
1. Mertler, C. (2012). *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. **ISBN:** 978-1-4129-8889-6 **(MERT)**

   2. APA (2009). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: APA. **ISBN:** 1-43-380561-8
   http://www.apastyle.org/learn/tutorials/basics-tutorial.aspx.

Optional Text:
3. Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson. **ISBN-10:** 0-13-259693-8 **(CRES)**

Outside Readings:
The following readings will either be available online via the Google Docs website:
https://www.google.com/accounts/ServiceLogin?service=writely&passive=1209600&continue=
https://docs.google.com/&followup=https://docs.google.com/&ltmpl=homepageor

Or they will be handed out in class:

Date: September 4, 2012
Topic: Language Acquisition, Discourses, and Identity

1. Theoretical Reading: (Required) (Select ONE of the following):
Gee, J. (2001). Reading as situated language: A sociocognitive perspective. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 44*(8), 714-725.

Gee, J. (1992). Socio-cultural approaches to literacy (Literacies). *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 12*, 31-48.

2. Research Study (Required):
Heath, S. B. (1982). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. *Language in Society, 11*(1), 49-76. (seminal study/ethnography)

3. Research Methods Reading (Required):
Mertler, C. (2012). Chapter 1: Introduction to action research (pp. 3-34). In *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Research Methods Reading (Optional):

Creswell, J. W. (2012). Chapter 1: The process of conducting research using quantitative and qualitative approaches (pp. 1-28) In *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Date: September 11, 2012
Topic: Language Acquisition, Discourses, and Identity

1. Theoretical Reading (Required):
Ferdman, B. M. (1990). Literacy and cultural identity. *Harvard Educational Review, 60*(2), 180-204. (seminal piece)

Moje, E. B., & Luke, A. (2009). Literacy and identity: Examining the metaphors in history and contemporary research. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(4), 415-437.

2. Research Study (Required: Select ONE of the Following):

Dagenais, D., Day, E., & Toohey, K. (2006). A multilingual child's literacy practices and contrasting identities in the figured worlds of French immersion classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*(2), 205-218. (qualitative: ethnography)

Falk, I. (2004). Literacy by Design, not by default: Social capital's role in literacy learning. *Journal of Research in Reading, 24*(3), 313-323. (qualitative: case study)

Finders, M. J. (1996). "Just girls: Literacy and allegiance in junior high school. *Written Communication, 13,* 93-129. (seminal study/qualitative: ethnography)

Hicks, D. (2004). Growing up girl in working-poor America: Textures of Language, poverty, and place. *Ethos, 32*(2). 214-232. (qualitative: feminist ethnography)

Jiménez, R. T. (2000). Literacy and the identity development of Latina/o students. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(4), 971-1000. (formative experiment)

Leander, K. M. (2004). "They took out the wrong context": Uses of time-space in the practice of positioning. *Ethos, 32*(2), 188-213. (discourse-focused ethnography)

Luttrell, W., & Parker, C. (2001). High school students' literacy practices and identities, and the figured world of school. *Journal of Research in Reading, 24*(3), 235-247. (qualitative: ethnography)

McCarthey, S. J. (2001). Identity construction in elementary readers and writers. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(2), 122-151. (qualitative: life-story/case study)

Wortham, S. (2004). From good student to outcast: The emergence of a classroom identity.

Ethos, 32(2), 164-187. (qualitative: ethnography)

3. Research Methods Reading (Required):
Mertler, C. (2012). Chapter 2: Overview of the action research process (pp. 35-50). In *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Research Methods Reading (Optional):
Creswell, J. W. (2012). Chapter 17: Action research designs (pp. 576-595). In *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Date: September 18, 2012
Topic: Oral Language Development and Peer Discussion of Text

1. Theoretical Reading: (Required)
Forman, E. A., & Cazden, C. B. (2004). Exploring Vygotskian perspectives in education: The cognitive value of peer interaction (pp. 163-186). In R. B. Ruddell & N. J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (5th ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

2. Research Study (Required: Select ONE of the Following):
Chinn, C. A., Anderson, R. C., & Waggoner, M. A. (2001). Patterns of discourse in two kinds of literature discussion. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(4), 378-411. (comparative study)

Dong, T., Anderson, R. C., Kim, I., & Li, Y. (2008). Collaborative reasoning in China and Korea. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*(4), 400-424. (quasi-experimental)

Mercer, N., Wergerif, R., & Dawes, L. (1999). Children's talk and the development of reasoning in the classroom. *British Educational Research Journal, 25*(1), 95-111. (quantitative/qualitative analysis)

Nystrand, M., Wu, L. L., Gamoran, A., Zeiser, S., & Long, D. A. (2003). Questions in time: Investigating the structure and dynamics of unfolding classroom discourse. *Discourse Processes, 35*(2), 135-198. (event-history analysis)

Reznitskaya, A., Anderson, R. C., McNurlen, B., Nguyen-Jahiel, K., Archodidou, A., & Kim, S. (2001). Influence of oral discussion on written argument. *Discourse Processes, 32*(2&3), 155-175. (comparative)

3. Research Methods Reading (Required):
Mertler, C. (2012). Chapter 3: Planning for action research (Identifying a topic/Gathering preliminary information, pp. 53-60). In *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Research Methods Reading (Optional):
Creswell, J. W. (2012). Chapter 2: Identifying a research problem (pp. 58-78). In *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Date: September 25, 2012
Topic: Oral Language Development and Peer Discussion of Text

1. Theoretical Readings (Required):
Rosenblatt, L. M. (1991). Literature--S. O. S.! *Language Arts, 68,* 444-448. (seminal)

Rosenblatt, L. M. (2004). The transactional theory of reading and writing. In R. B. Ruddell & N. J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (5th ed., pp. 1363-1398). Newark, DE: International Reading Association. (seminal)

2. Research Studies (Required) (Select ONE of the Following):
Akrofi, A., Janisch, C., Button, K., & Liu, X. (2010). Catch a star book! Responses of fifth-grade students to celebrity-authored children's literature. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 49,* 142-161.

McEneaney, J. E., Li, L.,Allen, K., & Guzniczak, L. (2009). Stance, navigation, and reader response in expository hypertext. *Journal of Literacy Research, 41*(1), 1-45. (experimental)

Sipe, L. R., & Brightman, A. E. (2009). Young children's interpretations of page breaks in contemporary picture storybooks. *Journal of Literacy Research, 41*(1), 68-103. (qualitative: descriptive/naturalistic)

3. Research Methods Reading (Required):
Mertler, C. (2012). Chapter 3: Planning for action research (Reviewing related literature, pp. 60-81). In *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Research Methods Reading (Optional):
Creswell, J. W. (2012). Chapter 3: Reviewing the literature (pp. 79-107). In *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Date: October 2, 2012
Topic: Oral Language Development and Peer Discussion of Text

1. Theoretical Reading: (Required)
Buzzelli, & Johnston, B. (2001). Authority, power, and morality in classroom discourse. *Teaching and teacher education, 17*, 873-884.

2. Research Studies: (Required) (Select TWO of the following to read)
Almasi, J. F., O'Flahavan, J. F., & Arya, P. (2001). A comparative analysis of student and teacher development in more and less proficient discussions of literature. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(2), 96-120. (descriptive/comparative case study)

Clarke, L. W. (2006). Power through voicing others: Girls' positioning of boys in literature circle discussions. *Journal of Literacy Research, 38*(1), 53-79. (qualitative: critical discourse analysis)

Evans, K. S. (2002). Fifth-grade students' perceptions of how they experience literature discussion groups. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37*(1), 46-69. (qualitative)

Maloch, B. (2002). Scaffolding student talk: One teacher's role in literature discussion groups. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37*(1), 94-112. (qualitative)

Many, J. E. (2002). An exhibition and analysis of verbal tapestries: Understanding how scaffolding is woven into the fabric of instructional conversations. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37*(4), 376-407. (qualitative)

Matthews, M. W., & Kesner, J. (2003). Children learning with peers: The confluence of peer status and literacy competence within small-group literacy events. *Reading Research Quarterly, 38*(2), 208-234.

Van Sluys, K., Lewis, M., & Seely Flynt, A. (2006). Researching critical literacy: A critical study of analysis of classroom discourse. *Journal of Literacy Research, 38*(2), 197-233. (qualitative: critical literacy in action)

3. Research Methods Reading (Required):
Mertler, C. (2012). Chapter 4: Developing a research plan (pp. 83-116). In *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Research Methods Reading (Optional):
Creswell, J. W. (2012). Chapter 4: Specifying a purpose and research questions or hypotheses (pp. 109-139). In *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Date: October 9, 2012
Topic: Writing: Writing Development

1. Theoretical Reading: (Required)
Harste, J. C., Burke, C. L., & Woodward, V. A. (1994). Children's language and world: Initial encounters with print. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed., pp. 48-69). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

2. Research Studies: (Required) (Select ONE of the following to read)

Bradley, D. H. (2001). How beginning writers articulate and demonstrate their understanding of the act of writing. *Reading Research and Instruction, 40*(4), 273-296. (case study)

Eitelgeorge, J. S., & Barrett, R. (2004). Multiple continua of writing development in a first grade classroom. *Reading Research and Instruction, 43*(2), 17-64. (case study)

Jasmine, J., & Weiner, W. (2007). The effects of writing workshop on abilities of first grade students to become confident and independent writers. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 35*(2), 131-139. (mixed methods)

Wollman-Bonilla, J. E. (2001). Can First-Grade Writers Demonstrate Audience Awareness? *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(2), 184-201. (case study)

Yaden, D. B., & Tardibuono, J. M. (2004). The emergent writing development of urban Latino preschoolers: Developmental perspectives and instructional environments for second-language learners. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 20*, 29-61.

3. Research Methods Reading (Required):
Mertler, C. (2012). Chapter 5: Collecting data (Qualitative data collection techniques, pp. 119-132). In *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Research Methods Reading (Optional):
Creswell, J. W. (2012). Chapter 7: Collecting qualitative data (pp. 204-235). In *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Date: October 16, 2012
Topic: Writing: Process Writing

1. Theoretical Reading: (Required)
Hayes, J. R. (2004). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In R. B. Ruddell & N. J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (5th ed., pp. 1399-1430). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

2. Research Studies: (select ONE of the following to read)
Andrzejczak, N., Trainin, G., & Poldberg, M. (2005, October 19). From image to text: Using images in the writing process. *International Journal of Education & the Arts, 6*(12), 1-16. Retrieved [August 26, 2011] from http://ijea.asu.edu/v6n12/ (qualitative: grounded theory)

Jarvey, M., McKeough, A., & Pyryt, M. C. (2008). Teaching trickster tales: A comparison of instructional approaches. *Research in the Teaching of English, 43*(1), 42-73. (quasi-experiment)

Matthewman, S., & Triggs, P. (2004). Obsessive compulsive font disorder: The challenge of supporting pupils writing with the computer. *Computers and Education, 43,* 125-135. (case study)

Myhill, D. (2009). Children's patterns of composition and their reflections on their composing processes. *British Educational Research Journal, 35*(1), 47–64. (case study)

3. Research Methods Reading (Required):
Mertler, C. (2012). Chapter 5: Collecting data (Quantitative data collection techniques, pp. 132-154). In *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Research Methods Reading (Optional):
Creswell, J. W. (2012). Chapter 5: Collecting quantitative data (pp. 140-173). In *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Date: October 23, 2012
Topic: Writing and Writing Development: Genre

1. Theoretical Readings (Required) (Select ONE of the following):
Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1993). Rethinking genre from a sociocognitive perspective. *Written Communication, 10*(4), 475-509.

Russell, D. (1997). Rethinking genre in school and society: An activity theory analysis. *Written Communication, 14*(4), 504-554.

Tower, C. (2003). Genre development and elementary students' informational writing: A Review of the literature. *Reading Research and Instruction, 42*(4), 14-39.

2. Research Studies: (Required) (Select ONE of the following to read)
Chapman, M. (1994). The emergence of genres: Some findings from an examination of first-grade writing. *Written Communication, 11*(3), 348-380. (case study)

Donovan, C. A., & Smolkin, L. B. (2002). Children's genre knowledge: An examination of K-5 students' performance on multiple tasks providing differing levels of scaffolding. *Reading Research Quarterly, 57*(4), 428-465. (causal comparative/qualitative?)

Honig, S. (2010). What do children write in science? A study of the genre set in a primary science classroom. *Written Communication, 27*(1), 87-119. (descriptive)

Kamberelis, G. (1999). Genre development and learning: "Children writing stories, science reports, and poems." *Research and the Teaching of English, 33*(4), 403-460. (descriptive)

Kamberelis, G., & Bovino, T. D. (1999). Cultural artifacts as scaffolds for genre development. *Reading Research Quarterly, 34*(2), 138-170. (quasi-experiment)

Schaenen, I. (2010). ''Genre means'': A critical discourse analysis of fourth grade talk about genre. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 7*(1), 28–53. (action research)

Schneider, J. J. (2003). Contexts, genres, and imagination: An examination of the idiosyncratic writing performances of three elementary children within multiple contexts of writing instruction. *Research in the Teaching of English, 37*, 329-379. (case study)

3. Research Methods Reading (Required):
Mertler, C. (2012). Chapter 6: Analyzing data (Qualitative data analysis techniques, pp. 155-163). In *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Research Methods Reading (Optional):
Creswell, J. W. (2012). Chapter 8: Analyzing and interpreting qualitative data (pp. 236-264). In *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Date: November 6, 2012
Topic: Writing and Writing Development: Strategies

1. Theory/Background (Required) (Select ONE of the following):
Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(3), 445-576.

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools – A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York.* Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Santangelo, T., Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (2008). Using self-regulated strategy development to support students who have "trubol giting thangs into werds." *Remedial and Special Education, 29*(2), 78-89.

2. Research Studies (Required) (Select ONE of the Following):
Harris, K. R., Graham, S., & Mason, L. H. (2006). Improving the writing, knowledge, and motivation of struggling young writers: Effects of self-regulated strategy development with and without peer support. *American Educational Research Journal, 43*(2), 295-340. (experiment)

Jacobsen, L. T, & Reid, R. (2010). Improving the persuasive essay writing of high school students with ADHD. *Exceptional Children, 76*(2), 157-174. (multiple-baseline design)

Patel, P., & Laud, L. (2009). Helping students to add detail and flair to their stories. *Preventing School Failure, 54*(1), 2-9. (action research case study)

Tracy, B., Graham, S., & Reid, R. (2009). Teaching Young Students Strategies for planning and drafting stories: The impact of self-regulated strategy development. *Journal of Educational Research, 102*(5), 323-331. (experiment)

3. Research Methods Reading (Required):
Mertler, C. (2012). Chapter 6: Analyzing data (Quantitative data analysis techniques, pp. 163-199). In *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Research Methods Reading (Optional):
Creswell, J. W. (2012). Chapter 6: Analyzing and interpreting quantitative data (pp. 174-203). In *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Date: November 13, 2012
Topic: Writing and Writing Development: Persuasive Text

1. Research Studies: (Required) (Select ONE of the following to read)
Dickey, M. D. (2011). Murder on Grimm Isle: The impact of game narrative design in an
    educational game-based learning environment. *British Journal of Educational
    Technology, 42*(3), 456–469. (case study/grounded theory)

Midgette, E., Haria, E. P., MacArthur, C. (2008). The effects of content and audience
    awareness goals for revision on the persuasive essays of fifth and eighth-grade
    students. *Reading and Writing, 21,* 131-151. (experiment)

Nippold, M. A., Ward-Lonergan, J. M., & Fanning, J. L. (2005). Persuasive writing in children,
    adolescents, and adults: A study of syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic development.
    Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 36, 125–138.
    (causal/comparative/descriptive)

2. Research Methods Reading (Required):
Mertler, C. (2012). Chapter 7: Developing an action plan (pp. 201-215). *Action research:
    Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Date: November 20, 2012
Topic: English Language Learners and Bilingual Students as Writers

1. Theoretical Reading (Required):
August, D., Shanahan, T., & Escamilla, K. (2009). English Language Learners: Developing
    literacy in second-language learners—Report of the National Literacy Panel on
    Language-Minority Children and Youth. *Journal of Literacy Research, 41,* 432-452.

2. Research Studies: (Required) (Select ONE of the following to read)
Carbone, P. M., & Orellana, M. F. (2010). Developing academic identities: Persuasive writing as
    a tool to strengthen emergent academic identities. *Research in the Teaching of English,
    44*(3), 292-316.

Cuero, K. K. (2009). Authoring multiple *formas de ser*: Three bilingual Latino/a fifth graders
    navigating school. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 8*(2), 141–160

Ranker, J. (2009). Student Appropriation of writing lessons through hybrid composing practices:
    Direct, diffuse, and indirect use of teacher-offered writing tools in an ESL classroom.
    Journal of Literacy Research, 41, 393–431.

Ruan, J. (2004). Bilingual Chinese/English first-graders developing metacognition about writing.
    Literacy, 38(2), 106-112.

Serrano, R., & Howard, E. (2007). Second language writing development in English and in

Spanish in a two-way immersion programme. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 10*(2), 152-170. (case study)

3. Research Methods Reading (Required):
Mertler, C. (2012). Chapter 9: Writing up action research (pp. 241-258). In *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Research Methods Reading (Optional):
Creswell, J. W. (2012). Chapter 9: Reporting and evaluating research (pp. 272-291). In *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Date: November 27, 2012
No Class: Work on Mini-Research Project Papers

Date: December 4, 2012
Topic: Engagement and Motivation

1. Review of Research/Theory (Required) (Select ONE of the following):
Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schunk, D. H. (2003). *Self-efficacy for reading and writing: Influence of modeling, goal setting, and self-evaluation. Reading & Writing Quarterly, 19*, 159-172. (research overview)

2. Research Studies (Required) (Select ONE of the following):
Abbott, J. A. (2000). "Blinking out" and "Having the touch": Two fifth-grade boys talk about flow experiences in writing. *Written Communication, 17*(1), 53-92. (case study)

Kaplan, A., Licthinger, E., Gorodetsky, M. (2009). Achievement goal orientations and self-regulation in writing: An integrative perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*(1), 51-69.

Mata, L. (2011). Motivation for reading and writing in kindergarten children. *Reading Psychology, 32*, 272-299. (measure development)

Nolen, S. B. (2007). Young children's motivation to read and write: Development in social contexts. *Cognition and Instruction, 25*(2), 219–270. (longitudinal, mixed methods)

Warren, S. J., Dondlinger, M. & Barab, S. A. (2008). A MUVE towards PBL writing: Effects of a digital learning environment designed to improve elementary student writing. *Journal*

of Research on Technology in Education, 41(1), 113–140. (quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design)

3. Research Methods Reading (Required):
Mertler, C. (2012). Chapter 8: Sharing and reflecting (pp. 217-239). In *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Syllabus

Date	Topic	Readings	Written Assignments Due
8/28	*Introduction:* • Overview of Course • What is Theory? • What is Research? • What Does it Mean to be Literate? • What Discourses are Needed to be Literate in School? • Overview of Syllabus		
9/4	*Discourses and Identity:* • What Discourses are Needed to be Literate in School? • What identities do we construct as readers and writers? *Theory: Language Acquisition* • How can we design classroom instruction to optimize language acquisition? *Research Design: Action Research* • Introduction to Action Research	**All Read:** • The syllabus **Theory:** • Gee (2001) or Gee (1992) **Research:** • Heath (1982) **Research Methods:** • Mertler Ch. 1	• Reading Preparation #1 Due • Brainstorm list of possible research topics
9/11	*Discourses and Identity:* • What Discourses are Needed to be Literate in School? • What identities do we construct as readers and writers? *Theory: Language Acquisition* • How can we design classroom instruction to optimize language acquisition? *Research Design: Action Research* • Overview of Action Research Process	**Theory:** • Ferdman (1990) or Moje & Luke (2009) **Research: (Select 1)** • Dagenais et al. (2006) • Falk (2004) • Finders (1996) • Hicks (2004) • Jiménez (2000) • Leander (2004) • Luttrell & Parker (2001) • McCarthey (2001) • Wortham (2004) **Research Methods:** • Mertler Ch. 2	• Reading Preparation #2 Due • Continue to refine brainstorming regarding possible topic

Date	Topic	Readings	Written Assignments Due
9/18	*Theory: Sociocultural Theory* • What is internalization? • What is the ZPD? • What is the role of oral language? *Topic #1: Oral Language/Peer Discussion* • What is peer discussion? • How is it linked to sociocultural theory? *Research Design: Action Research* • Identifying a topic • Gathering preliminary information	**Theory:** • Forman & Cazden (1994) **Research: (Select 1)** • Chinn et al. (2001) • Dong et al. (2008) • Mercer et al. (1999) • Nystrand et al. (2003) • Reznitskaya et al. (2001) **Research Methods:** • Mertler Ch. 3	• Reading Preparation #3 Due • Begin process of narrowing topic
9/25	*Theory: Transactional Theory* • What is transactional theory? • How is it relevant to literacy? *Topic #1: Oral Language/Peer Discussion* • How was sociocultural theory present in research studies? • What do studies say in relation to transactional theory? • Examination of research designs *Research Methods:* • Reviewing related literature	**Theory:** • Rosenblatt (1991) • Rosenblatt (2004) **Research: (Select 1)** • Akrofi et al. (2010) • McEneaney et al. (2009) • Sipe & Brightman (2009) **Research Methods:** • Mertler Ch. 3	• Reading Preparation #4 Due • Proposal Due: Includes Introduction, Rationale, Research Question, and Methods • Begin search for related literature

Date	Topic	Readings	Written Assignments Due
10/2	*Theory: Transactional/Sociocultural Theories and Authority & Power* • If you scaffold peer discussion is transactional theory apparent? • How is scaffolding linked to sociocultural theory? • How is authority and power present in classroom discourse? *Topic #1: Oral Language/Peer Discussion* • Analysis and critique of studies • How is authority and power linked to scaffolding? • How is oral language impacted? *Research Design:* • Developing a research plan or a proposal	**Theory:** • Buzzelli & Johnston (2001) **Research (Read 2):** • Almasi et al. (2001) • Clarke (2006) • Evans (2002) • Maloch (2002) • Many (2002) • Matthews & Kesner (2003) • Van Sluys & Flynt (2006) **Research Methods:** • Mertler Ch. 4 (pp. 83-116)	• Reading Preparation #5 Due • Continue search for related literature
10/9	*Theory: Writing Development* • Emergent writing • Strategies underlying writing development *Topic #2: Writing Development Research* • What theories are operating in writing research? • Do the findings support the theories? *Research Design: Qualitative Research* • Characteristics of Qualitative Research • Data Sources • Researcher Role • Designs • Observation • Fieldnotes • Qualitative Lab	**Theory:** • Harste, Burke, & Woodward (1994) **Research (Select 1):** • Bradley (2001) • Eitelgeorge & Barrett (2004) • Jasmine & Weiner (2007) • Wollman-Bonilla (2001) • Yaden & Tardibuono (2004) **Research:** • Mertler Ch. 5 (pp. 119-132)	• Reading Preparation #6 Due • Develop preliminary research design and begin drafting instruments, interview protocols, etc. for use in study

Date	Topic	Readings	Written Assignments Due
10/16	*Theory: Cognitive Process Theory* • Stage vs. Process Models of Writing • Overview of the model • Implications of the model *Topic #2: Writing Process Research* • Does research support Cognitive Process Theory? • Do various research designs yield different findings? *Research Design: Quantitative* • Characteristics of experimental designs • Data Sources • Experimental design lab	**Theory:** • Hayes (2004) **Research (Select 1):** • Anrzejczak et al. (2005) • Jarvey et al. (2008) • Matthewman & Triggs (2004) • Myhill (2009) **Research Methods:** • Mertler Ch. 5 (pp. 132-154)	• Reading Preparation #7 Due • Draft instruments, interview protocols, etc. for use in study due
10/23	*Theory: Genre* • Conceptualizations of genre • Uses of genre theory is classrooms? • How does text structure and genre relate to sociocultural theory? *Research: Genre* • Critique and analysis of research in light of theory *Research Design: Qualitative Data Analysis* • Coding Data • Interpreting Data • Qualitative analysis of sample data	**Theory: (Select 1)** • Berkenkotter & Huckin (1993) • Russell (1997) • Tower (2003) **Research: (Select 1)** • Chapman (1994) • Donovan & Smolkin (2002) • Honig (2010) • Kamberelis (1999) • Kamberelis (1999) • Schaenen (2010) • Schneider (2003) **Research Methods:** • Mertler Ch. 6 (pp. 155-163)	• Reading Preparation #8 Due •Turn in draft proposal that includes topic, questions, design, methods • Begin data gathering

Date	Topic	Readings	Written Assignments Due
10/30	*Catch Up Day*	• Will be assigned the class before depending on what readings we need to catch up	• Reading Preparation #9 Due • Continue data gathering • Turn in draft of methodology
11/6	*Theory: Writing Strategies* • What does the research say about teaching students writing strategies? *Research: Writing Strategies Research* • How can we help struggling writers in the classroom? • What strategies can we teach to help struggling writers? *Research Design: Quantitative Data Analysis* • Descriptive Statistics • Inferential Statistics • Quantitative analysis of sample data	**Theory:** • Graham & Perin (2007a) • Graham & Perin (2007b) • Santangelo et al. (2008) **Research: (Select 1)** • Harris et al. (2006) • Jacobsen (2010) • Patel & Laud (2009) • Tracy et al. (2009) **Research Methods:** • Mertler Ch. 6 (pp. 163-199)	• Reading Preparation #10 Due • Continue data collection • Begin data analysis

Date	Topic	Readings	Written Assignments Due
11/13	*Research: Persuasive Writing* • How does a child's ability to write persuasively vary by age? • What characteristics of persuasive writing are children capable of producing? *Research Design: Action Plans* • How can we use the findings from our studies to take action in our schools and classrooms?	**Research: (Select 1)** • Dickey (2011) • Midgette et al. (2008) • Nippold et al. (2005) **Research Methods:** • Mertler Ch. 7 (p. 201-215)	• Continue data analysis • Review of Literature Due
11/20	*Theory: Writing and English Language Learners* • Do typical models of writing pertain to ELLs? • How does the writing of ELLs differ from native speakers? *Research: Studying the Writing of English Language Learners* • How can we evaluate ELLs' writing fairly? • What is the role of students' beliefs and expectations on their writing? *Research Design: Writing It Up* • Now that you have the data and have it analyzed how do you write it up?	**Theory/Review of Research:** • August, Shanahan & Escamilla (2010) **Research: (Select 1)** • Carbone & Orellana (2010) • Cuero (2009) • Ranker (2009) • Ruan (2004) • Serrano & Howard (2007) **Research Methods:** • Mertler Ch. 9 (pp. 241-258)	• Begin writing final paper

Date	Topic	Readings	Written Assignments Due
11/27	**NO CLASS: Literacy Research Association Conference, San Diego, CA**		
12/4	*Theory: Motivation and Engagement* • What is the nature of motivation and its impact on reading? • Engagement model of reading • How might these ideas transfer to writing? *Research: Motivation during Writing Research* • What factors influence students' motivation for writing? • What can we do in the classroom to support motivated writing? *Research Design: Sharing Your Research* • How to present and share your research	**All Read:** • Guthrie & Wigfield (2000) • Schunk (2003) **Read One:** • Abbott (2000) • Kaplan et al. (2009) • Mata, L. (2011) • Nolen, (2007) • Warren et al. (2008) • Schunk (2003) **Research Methods:** • Mertler Ch. 8 (pp. 217-239)	• Work on final paper • Work on presentation
12/11	*Sharing Our Accomplishments:* • Present findings of your study in roundtable format to a small group of classmates		• Mini-Research Paper Due

Some Assumptions/Expectations

1. You are expected to attend every class meeting. It is highly improbable that one would be able to simulate the experiences you will have in each class meeting (i.e., whole class discussion, interactions with peers, interactions with professor, class activities) without physically (and mentally) being present in the class.

2. You are expected to come to class having read the required class readings. This is a graduate-level course. It is assumed you are "in" this for the learning experience and will complete all reading assignments so each class may proceed based upon the assumption that the material in the readings for each class has at least an initial envisionment.

Participation involves having thought critically about the readings prior to arriving at class. Critical thinking requires not only that one has read and responded to the readings, but also that one has generated questions, issues, concerns, or puzzlements about the readings.

3.   You are expected to come to class prepared to actively participate in course activities and discussions.

If you have a diagnosed disability (physical, learning, or psychological) which will make it difficult for you to carry out the course work as outlined, or, requires accommodations such as recruiting notetakers, readers, or extended time on exams and/or assignments, please advise me during the first two weeks of the course so we may review possible arrangements for reasonable accommodations.

Course Requirements and Evaluation

Reading Preparations/Written Responses	60 pts.	30%
Mini-Research Project Paper	120 pts.	60%
Introduction and Statement of Problem/Rationale	10 pts.	
Theoretical Framework/Review of Research	15 pts.	
Methodology	30 pts.	
Presentation of Findings/Interpretations	30 pts.	
Plan of Action/Discussion/Conclusions	15 pts.	
Mechanics/Reference List/APA Style	10 pts.	
Presentation	10 pts.	
Class Participation	20 pts.	10%
TOTAL	200 pts.	100%

Grading

A =   **Superior** work that meets all criteria and shows exceptional merit and creativity (90-100%)

B =   **Excellent** work that meets all criteria and shows effort (80-89%)

C =   **Adequate** work which meets all criteria (70-79%)

E =   **Poor** work (69% and below)

Description of Course Requirements

NOTE:	All assignments must be typed or word-processed and handed in on time. Handwritten or late assignments will not be accepted.

1. Reading Preparations/Written Responses
(10 assignments @ 6 pts. each = 60 pts, 30% of total grade)

I expect that you will come to each class having read all required readings and prepared to participate thoughtfully each evening. Prior to each week's class meeting you will be required to complete a response in preparation for, or related to, the week's readings. We will use your preparations/responses in class each week to fuel our discussions about various literacy topics.

These preparations will be designed by the professor and handed out the week prior to the due date. Some will be written products others may be graphic organizers, or some other multimodal form of response. Each response will be collected and graded. It is hoped that these preparations will not only help you understand and prepare for the readings each week, but also engage you in the types of pre-reading activities you should be designing for your own students. These responses should show evidence of critical thinking, reflectivity, and an ability to integrate information. They should also use APA style and refer to course readings If you are unprepared to participate responsibly in class, points will be deducted from your grade.

Format for Written Responses
As a preparation for each class meeting, you will be required to prepare a written response/summary of each reading required for that class. These responses/summaries will help you learn how to summarize and think about research. We will use your responses/summaries in class each week to fuel our discussions about various literacy topics.

Your responses do not need to be lengthy. In fact, they will work best if they are limited 2 typed (double-spaced, with 1-inch margins) pages.

2-page responses to assigned readings each week should address *key points, conflicts, synthesis,* and *personal commentary*:

a. **Key Points:** Highlight the *key* points the author is making. Each reading describes a theory, a perspective, or explains a model. Write also about the aspects critical to the theory and those points distinguishing the author's perspective from other perspectives. In addition, think about how the author would elaborate on statements such as, "A significant feature we need to recognize is . . . because . . . ."

b. **Conflicts/Critique**: There are several positions an author might take regarding the issues involved in describing theories and processes in reading. Think about what conflicts emerge for you as well as within the field of reading (i.e., among researchers, among practitioners, and between researchers and practitioners). As you read, do you see any points of contention arising in conversation among researchers, teachers, theorists, and students? Also, think critically about the ideas by considering political, social, historical, and cultural aspects. That is, what elements might be influencing (or biasing) the author's perspective?

c. **Synthesis**: Here you should endeavor to synthesize the readings and make connections between the assigned readings for the week. Such connections are known as "intertextual" connections. Well-written responses will also endeavor to make intertextual connections to previous course-related readings.

d. **Personal Commentary**: Describe your own personal insights regarding the ideas/issues in the text. You might make connections to your own experiences as a reader, learner, teacher, or researcher.

I will grade each of your weekly responses using the following five-point rubric:

Grade	Scoring Rubric for Responses to Non-research Readings
4	• Response is provided for the entire reading assignment. • Response exhibits critical thinking and evaluation. • Response synthesizes information across all reading assignments for the week. • Response makes relevant and insightful intertextual connections between the current readings and to past course readings. • APA style is used accurately throughout the response.
3	• Response is provided for the entire reading assignment. • Response exhibits critical thinking and evaluation. • Response synthesizes information across all reading assignments for the week. • Response makes relevant and insightful intertextual connections between the current readings and to past course readings. • APA style is *not* used accurately throughout the response.
2	• Response is provided for the entire reading assignment. • Response exhibits some critical thinking and evaluation but portions may reflect mere summaries of the information in the readings. • Response attempts to synthesize information across all reading assignments for the week. • Response attempts to make intertextual connections between the current readings and to past course readings. • APA style is used accurately throughout the response.

1	• Response is *not* provided for the entire reading assignment. • Response does *not* exhibit critical thinking and evaluation. Instead, the response is a summary of the information in the readings. • Response does *not* synthesize information across all reading assignments for the week. • Response does *not* make intertextual connections between the current readings and past course readings. • APA style is either not used or is used inaccurately.
0	• Response is turned in late. • Response is not turned in at all.

Format for Summaries of Research:
Your initial summaries can be in chart form and/or use phrases to summarize. Regardless, you should summarize the information below for *each* research report read each week. Numbers 1 - 12 can be in brief, note-like phrases. However, #13 should be in paragraph form.

At the point in the semester in which I am convinced you can adequately identify all elements of a research study, you will be expected to synthesize a study briefly in a paragraph—I will let you know when that point in the semester occurs.

Introduction
1. Citation: Complete reference citation in APA style
2. Purpose/Goal of the study and General Rationale
    (a) What was the purpose or goal of the study?
    (b) How did the authors make the case for its general importance?
    (c) What were the research questions?
3. Fit and Specific Rationale
    (a) How does the topic of the study fit into the existing research literature?
    (b) How was that research literature used to establish the need for this study?

Methods Used
    4a. Research Design (I want you to *try* to determine the design using the Mertler (2012) text)
    (a) What type of research design did the author use? (e.g., experimental, quasi-experimental, causal comparative, correlational, case study, ethnography, etc.)
4b. Participants
    (a) Who was studied? (number, gender, age, SES, other characteristics)
    (b) How were participants selected?
5. Context
    (a) Where does the study take place? (describe important characteristics)
6. Steps in Sequence (Procedures)

(a) In the order performed, describe the procedural steps in the study?

(b) Include a description of treatment conditions if applicable

7. Data Sources/Measures

(a) What constituted the data? (e.g., test scores, questionnaire responses,etc)

(b) How was the data collected?

(c) What was the role of the researcher in the process?

8. Data Analysis Procedures

(a) What form of data analysis was used?

(b) How did the data analysis answer the research questions?

(c) What (if any) statistical procedures were used to analyze the data?

9. Results

(a) What were the results produced by the data analysis?

10. Conclusions

(a) What did the authors conclude about how the results in #9 responded to the purpose of the study in #2?

(b) What practical implications does the study have for instruction?

11. Cautions: Limitations/Critique of Study

(a) What cautions or limitations does the author raise about the study itself or about interpreting the results?

(b) What are your own reservations and criticisms of the study?

12. Discussion

(a) What interesting facts or ideas did you learn from the research? (Include anything of value such as the results, the research design, the methods used, references, history, useful arguments, or personal inspiration)

Must be written in paragraph form:

13. Response and Critique of Research*

* Your responses can include your emotional reaction to the research or theory, but *should more importantly*, include any concerns, questions, or issues occurring to you while you were reading and reflecting on the research. State the concern, question, or issue and explain *why* it is a problem. As well, you should provide critical commentary regarding the investigation itself. Your critique might focus on strengths and/or weaknesses of the theoretical framework, literature review, methodology, results, or discussion/conclusions. This portion, of course, will be difficult without a background in research methodology, but this type of thinking and the issues to consider will be modeled throughout the course. Hopefully, this will be an area in which you learn how to read research with a critical lens. We will use these responses to fuel and foster critical discourse about each reading in class. So, the responses should be written in paragraph form, rather than in phrases.

I will grade each of your weekly responses using the following five-point rubric. Thus, each research report read each week will be "worth" a maximum of 4 points (e.g., If you were assigned to read 2 research reports you would complete 2 research summaries. Each summary would be worth 4 points, for a total possible score that week of 8).

Grade	Scoring Rubric for Summaries of Research
4	• Summary is provided of the *entire* research study. • Summarized information is accurate for the *entire* research study. • Your personal discussion of the study (#12 above) exhibits sincere thought. • Your critique of the research (#13 above) exhibits *extensive* critical thinking and evaluation, shows evidence of what we have learned in class, and uses citations to support critical points made. • APA style is used accurately throughout the summary.
3	• Summary is provided of the *entire* research study. • Summarized information is accurate for the *entire* research study. • Your personal discussion of the study (#12 above) exhibits sincere thought. • Your critique of the research (#13 above) exhibits *extensive* critical thinking and evaluation, shows evidence of what we have learned in class, and uses citations to support critical points made. • APA style is *not* used accurately throughout the summary.
2	• Summary is provided of the *entire* research study. • Summarized information is accurate for *most* of the research study. • Your personal discussion of the study (#12 above) exhibits sincere thought. • Your critique of the research (#13 above) exhibits *some* critical thinking and evaluation, shows evidence of what we have learned in class, and/or uses citations to support critical points made. • APA style is used accurately throughout the summary.
1	• Summary is *not* provided of the entire research study. • Summarized information contains inaccuracies on several parts of the research study. • Your personal discussion of the study (#12 above) does *not* exhibit extensive thought. • Your critique of the research (#13 above) does *not* exhibit critical thinking and evaluation related to what we have learned in class and/or does *not* use citations to support critical points made. • APA style is *not* used accurately throughout the summary.
0	• Response is turned in late. • Response is not turned in at all.

2. **Mini-Research Project Paper (120 pts., 60% of total grade)**
   This is the integrative project for the course and is designed to help you learn how to design a qualitative investigation and how to gather, analyze, interpret, and communicate the results of your inquiry. It should be viewed as an *opportunity* rather than as a requirement (although you must complete it in order to pass the class). Begin by thinking about a "foreshadowed question" (Malinowski, 1922, pp. 8-9). Such questions may arise from the theoretical literature, your own experience, or your own values. Your job is to begin by asking yourself, "What really interests me, puzzles me, and/or arouses my curiosity about literacy education?" Then you must select a site for your research in which you can examine this issue or problem. You will spend the remainder of the semester examining this context as you try to understand or make sense of your issue or problem. At various points throughout the semester you will be asked to turn in aspects of this mini-study. At the end of the semester you will turn in a completed report of this investigation. You may choose to organize the final product as a conventional paper (as outlined below) or in a more unconventional manner that is negotiated with the professor. Your goal is to provide the most coherent presentation of your mini-study as possible. However you present your inquiry, I will look for the following key elements (unless you negotiate an alternative framework):

   Throughout the semester the course will be designed to assist you with this paper. At three points in the semester I will collect portions of the paper grade them, and provide you with feedback. Based on the feedback you receive, you may elect to *revise* that portion of the paper and turn the revision in with the entire paper on the final night of class.

   On September 25, 2012 you will be required to submit the Introduction, Statement of problem/Rationale, and your Research Questions. On October 30, 2012 you will be required to submit the methodology section of the paper. On November 13, 2012 you will be required to submit the Review of Literature portion of the paper.

   At the end of the semester (December 11, 2012) you will turn in a completed copy of your entire research mini-study. If you have revised a portion of your paper, you should turn in the original draft along with the revision. This will enable me to provide you with consistent feedback.

   You may choose to organize the final product as a conventional paper (as outlined below) or in a more unconventional manner that is negotiated with the professor. Of course, research paper can often be written in very different manners. Your goal is to provide the most coherent presentation of your research study as possible. **Regardless, this paper must be presented in APA style.** However you present your research, I will look for the following key elements (unless you negotiate an alternative framework):

   A. **Theoretical/Conceptual Framework: (25 pts.)**
      1. *Introduction and Statement of Problem/Rationale/Research Questions (10 pts.):*
         During this portion you will introduce the reader to your topic of study and your research question/issue/problem (i.e., What do I need to know?). It is also your goal to convince your reader that the topic has educational significance and that there is a

need for exploring the topic in detail (e.g., Why is this subject important? Why do I need to know this?). Thus, the writing here is persuasive. My evaluation will look for a well-defined and clearly articulated problem or issue that motivates your investigation. Generally, better written arguments will cite relevant literature that supports the need for investigation and will *not* rely on personal opinions or personal experiences.

By the end of this section readers should know what your research question/problem is and be convinced that it is important to study it in more depth. You should end this section with a list of clear research questions.

2. *Theoretical Framework and Review of Research Literature (15 pts.):* Here you will explain and describe, in detail, those theories that frame and are pertinent to your topic or issue. Your goal here is to provide the reader with the background that situates and links your topic to relevant theoretical perspectives. My evaluation will look for a thorough and well-articulated explanation of the theories that frame the problem that you are exploring.

You will also review relevant research studies that have examined and explored your topic (and that most likely have attempted to elucidate some part of a theory explained in your theoretical framework). Your goal here is to find relevant historical and current research, review it, and synthesize it in a manner that sheds new light on the topic (e.g., What is the content of previous work on this subject? How will your work build on what has already been done?). It is important here to try to make connections and linkages between each of the studies (or group of studies) in order to synthesize. You should refer to at least 3 pieces of research within this review of research.

You should rely more heavily on literacy/research journals that publish high quality literacy research. Some of these journals include:

American Educational Research Journal	*Learning Disability Quarterly*
British Educational Research Journal	*Literacy Research and Instruction*
Discourse Processes	*Reading Research Quarterly*
Educational Psychologist	*Reading and Writing Quarterly*
Ethos	*Research in the Teaching of English*
Journal of Educational Psychology	*Review of Educational Research*
Journal of Educational Research	*Teaching and Teacher Education*
Journal of Literacy Research	*Written Communication*

You may also find articles in other literacy journals. The following journals have wonderful articles in them; however, they are primarily written for practitioners:

• *The Reading Teacher*

• *Language Arts*
• *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*

B. Methodology: (30 pts.)

1. *Research Design (4 points)*. It is essential in any report of research to describe the design of your investigation. By design, I mean the style of research (or the research tradition) into which your study falls. Examples of designs might include: experimental, quasi-experimental, correlational, causal-comparative, ethnography, descriptive case study, interpretive case study, cross-case analysis, etc. By describing the design of your study you help your audience establish an anticipatory set for reading your work.

2. *Participants (4 points)*. It is important to provide a thorough description of those who participated in your investigation. Here you are seeking to provide an explicit description of those people from whom you are observing and interviewing. Such descriptions should include aspects such as age, gender, race, and ethnicity and other features relevant to your question of interest (e.g., socioeconomic status, social position, ability level, self-perception, etc.). Because your interpretations are inextricably tied to your participants, and generalizations cannot go beyond these participants, the more thorough your description the better.

3. *Site (4 points)*. Again it is essential that you describe your research site as completely as possible (e.g., Where will I find and gather the data?). Such descriptions help readers understand the context in which your participants dwell as it pertains to your question of interest. Interpretations of data vary substantially depending upon the context in which the data were collected. Thus, descriptions of these contexts are critical to interpretation and evaluation.

4. **Description of Researcher Role or Treatment Conditions**

    For Qualitative Studies:
    Researcher Role (4 points). In any investigation it is essential to fully describe the role that you assumed as the researcher within your context. We will read and discuss multiple roles (e.g., participant observer, nonparticipant observer). This is also where you may feel that it is necessary to include your autobiographical roots (if it may help your readers understand the nature of your inquiry). The point for such information is to minimize distortion by identifying and describing the source of your interest in the subject.

    For Experimental Studies:
    Treatment Conditions (4 points). Provide a detailed and explicit description of what occurred in each treatment condition. That is, carefully explain what occurred in the experimental condition and what occurred in the control (or comparison) condition. If different instructional treatments were provided be sure to carefully explain how the instruction differed in each condition.

5. _Data Sources and/or Measures (4 points)_. Include a thorough description of each data source or measure.

   For Qualitative Studies:
   Here you are identifying and describing the kinds of data that will provide insight into your research questions. Therefore, your job is to describe your primary and secondary sources of data. You must have a sufficient number observations and/or interviews for saturation to occur. Include not only descriptions of the types of data, but the amount of data collected within each format. For example, primary sources of data might include 2 videotaped discussions and 2 focal group interviews. Secondary sources might include field notes from 5 observations, audiotaped class discussions, theoretical memos, descriptions of the site, photographs of the site, and student work samples.

   For Experimental Studies:
   Here you describe the dependent variables, or measures, you are using. These measures should be described in detail. As well, you should include information related to the reliability and validity of the measures. If you do not know this information, you can find such information in _Mental Measurements Yearbook_ in the Education Library.

6. _Data Gathering Procedures (6 points)_. Provide a detailed description of how your data was gathered. Some researchers find it helpful to provide a timeline of all data gathering activity to accompany their prose descriptions.

7. _Analysis Procedures (4 points)_. This is a critical feature that is often oversimplified and written superficially by researchers. In this section you should describe the manner in which you plan to analyze all of your data. That is, you must go beyond merely mentioning that you "used grounded theory" or "analytic induction" or "ANOVA" (or whatever the name of the method) to analyze your data. You must explain, in detail, the _process_ you plan to engage in as you try make sense of your data.

C. **Presentation of Results/Interpretation: (30 pts.)**
   This is often the most difficult and formidable task in writing your research report. The difficult part comes in deciding how best to communicate your results. It is important to first think about your audience (i.e., to whom do you want your message to speak?). One answer to this question is "the professor." This is an incorrect answer. You must assume that I am unfamiliar with your data and your study (although I will be reading your work with great care and attention and may be quite familiar with your data and your study). You should write as if for a refereed professional journal. My evaluation will look for a coherent presentation of your results (10 points) that is well-linked to and supported by your analysis (6 points). I will also look here to determine the quality of your analysis (6 points).

For qualitative research, supportive evidence from a variety of sources is essential for credibility. Therefore, I will look for supportive evidence in the form of quotes from transcripts, photographs, field note excerpts, etc. to affirm your results (8 points). Remember that triangulation of evidence and methodology creates the most credible presentation in qualitative studies.

For experimental research, your data should be presented clearly in tables, charts, and/or graphs in APA style. You should also provide a description and interpretation of the data in prose form. Throughout the prose description you should refer to the tables, charts, and graphs as you explain and interpret the data. Raw, unsynthesized data should not be presented in this section (8 points).

Coherence = 10 points
Connection between results and analysis = 6 points
Analysis = 6 points
Presentation of evidence/data = 8 points

D. Plan of Action/Discussion/Conclusions: (15 pts.)
  1. *Summary and Conclusions (4 pts.).* Here you will summarize your work by discussing the conclusions from your data and how it might be explained by theory.

  2. *Plan of Action/Implications for Literacy Instruction (7 pts.).* Provide either a plan of action for how you/your school might solve the issue you examined or provide an explanation of the practical implications of your research findings. This is where practitioners in the field would go to understand the research findings in terms of what it means for the classroom. A question that should guide your writing throughout this section is: What should practitioners know or do in their classrooms as a result of the research you conducted?

  3. *Limitations (4 pts.).* This is an essential aspect of your report (particularly the thinking that goes into its preparation). Here you will explain those aspects of design, methodology, or interpretation that have limited your study. Inevitably there are flaws or missed opportunities (sometimes even outright mistakes) that occur during the course of the investigation or as a result of the type of investigation undertaken. This is where I will expect those limitations to be described. Often if you have taken care to write theoretical memos throughout your investigation you will have already made note of items that limit your study. These notes will prove useful as you write this section.

E. Mechanics, Reference List and APA Style: (10 pts.)
You will present a list of all sources cited within your paper. This list, and the paper itself, must be in APA style (6th Edition). If you are unfamiliar with APA style, you should purchase the 6th Edition of the handbook of the American Psychological Association (APA) and use it as a guide or go online for a basic APA tutorial

http://www.apastyle.org/learn/tutorials/basics-tutorial.aspx.

F. **Class Presentation (10 pts.)**
On the last night of class you will share your study and its findings with the class. Your presentation should be about 15 minutes long. Your presentation should be professional and should include some sort of handout or powerpoint presentation to help communicate the following: (a) purpose/goal of study, (b) research questions, (c) theoretical framework, (d) methodology, (e) findings/results, (f) conclusions, (g) plan of action, (h) limitations. You should also be prepared to respond to questions about your study from your peers.

Timeline:

1. Start to think about the problem, issue, or topic that is of interest to you as soon as possible--today. Think about issues that have bothered you while teaching in your own class, methods you would like to try out in your classroom, issues that you do not understand, issues that you would like to know more about, or issues that perplex you in education.

2. Use the initial class readings to gain some ideas if you are having difficulty or discuss it with me. Write a proposal to turn in on <u>September 25, 2012</u>. I will read and react to them as quickly as possible. I expect these proposals to provide an introduction, a rationale for studying the issue (with reference citations), at least one research question, and a brief overview of the methodology. Consider this proposal a draft of your Institutional Review Board permission.

3. Once you have approval from me, submit your draft to the Institutional Review Board and begin to make arrangements to visit your site and gain access.

4. Periodically throughout the semester you will turn in pieces of your study as indicated on the syllabus. Consider these submissions "best drafts." That is, these should be polished products that are your *best* effort. I will read and react to them. Based upon my feedback you may revise your drafts and turn them in with the completed mini-study at the end of the semester.

4. **Class Participation (20 pts., 10% of total grade)**
You are expected to come to each class prepared to participate fully in class discussions and in class activities. Your contributions and insights are necessary for making the class successful. I hope you will view the format of this course as one in which constructive and collaborative exchanges of ideas can occur. Thus, you may at times disagree with the professor, your classmates, and the authors of our readings. Please feel free to politely and respectfully share any and all agreements and disagreements. Through critical discourse we come to understand others and ourselves better. This is the heart of critical inquiry. Such responsible participation will positively affect this portion of your grade.

Absence and/or tardiness will adversely affect your grade. Of course, it is understood that unfortunate events or incidents may occur within your family. As well, at times a professional obligation may necessitate missing a portion of class. Please inform me of such circumstances prior to class and we will jointly decide the degree to which your participation grade will be affected.

Passive participation in class and/or lack of preparedness for class will also adversely affect your grade.

Academic Dishonesty

Plagiarism is a serious academic offense. It is particularly dangerous while writing reviews of literature. You should be mindful that plagiarism is the use of others' words without using quotations and without citing the original source of the idea. You may summarize or synthesize the ideas using *your own* words, but if you use the *author's words*, you must quote and cite the original author and the page number from where the quotation was taken (see APA for style).

As well, academic dishonesty in writing and reviewing research consists of citing sources without having read them. If you cite a source you should have read it. If you are reading a source that cites another source (i.e., a secondary citation), then you must cite the secondary source in APA style.

Cheating, plagiarizing, or engaging in any other form of academic dishonesty can lead to serious consequences at the University-level. At a minimum, anyone found to engage in academic dishonest of any form in this course will automatically receive a final grade of "E."

Scoring Rubric: Final Project

	Exemplary (108 -120 pts.)	Acceptable (107-84 pts.)	Poor (below 83 pts.)
Theoretical/Conceptual Framework (25 pts. total)			
Introduction (10 pts.)	• Introduction offers thorough and convincing statement of problem • Importance of the problem is thoroughly rationalized • Rationale connects the project with practical needs	• Introduction offers a reasonable statement of problem • Importance of the problem is adequately explained • Rationale may connect the project with practical needs	• Introduction is missing OR does not offer a coherent statement of problem • Importance of problem is not explained • Rationale does not connect with practical needs
Theoretical Framework and Review of Literature (15 pts.)	• Theoretical framework is thoroughly described • Theories clearly connect with the project • Prior research is effectively reviewed • At least 3 research studies are included	• Theoretical framework is somewhat described • Theories connect with the project • Some prior research is reviewed • 2 or 1 research studies are included	• Theoretical framework is missing or poorly described • Theories are not appropriate for project • No prior research is reviewed, or if included, is poorly reviewed • 0 research studies are included
Methodology (30 pts. total)			
Methodology	• Methodology section clearly and thoroughly explains what was done • All decisions are rationalized	• Methodology section clearly explains what was done; explanations are adequate but not detailed • Most decisions are rationalized	• Methodology section missing or incomplete • Few, or no, decisions are explained
Research Design (4 pts.)	• Research design clearly identified and thoroughly justified	• Research design identified and partially justified	Research design not identified, inappropriate, or poorly explained
Participants (4 pts.)	• Participants, and their selection, thoroughly described • Justification provided for types of participants	• Participants, and their selection, described • Some justification provided for types of participants	• Participants and their selection poorly (or not) described • No justification provided for types of participants
Site (4 pts.)	• Research site thoroughly described, • Site selection is clearly rationalized	• Research site described • Site selection is partly rationalized	• Research site is not described • Site selection is not rationalized

Researcher Role or Treatment Conditions (4 pts.)	• Research site thoroughly described, • Site selection is clearly rationalized • For qualitative study, researcher clearly describes her/his role in project AND explains how role may have impacted study • For quantitative study, researcher fully explains the treatment conditions •	• Research site described • Site selection is partly rationalized • For qualitative study, researcher mentions her/his role in project; brief discussion of how role may have impacted study • For quantitative study, researcher explains the treatment conditions •	• Research site is not described • Site selection is not rationalized • For qualitative study, researcher does not describes her/his role in project • For quantitative study, researcher provides little or no explanation of treatment conditions
Data Sources and Measures (4 pts.)	• Data sources and/or measures are clearly described and thoroughly justified	• Data sources and/or measures are described with some justification	• Data sources and/or measures not described or inadequately described
Data Collection/Gathering Procedures (6 pts)	• Data collection sources are clearly described and thoroughly justified	• Data collection sources are described with some justification	• Data collection sources not described or inadequately described
Data Analysis Procedures (4 pts.)	• Data analysis procedures are clearly described and thoroughly justified	• Data analysis procedures are described with some justification	• Data analysis procedures not described or inadequately described
Presentation of Results (30 pts. of total)			
Presentation of Results **Coherence (10 pts.)** **Connection between results and analysis (6 pts.)** **Analysis (6 pts.)** **Presentation of evidence/data (8 pts.)**	• Results/findings thoroughly described • Clear, strong connections between raw data, analysis and results/findings • Results/findings organized in logical manner • Strong evidence of critical thinking	• Results/findings adequately described • Connections between raw data, analysis and results/findings are adequate but not strong • Results/findings organized in logical manner • Some evidence of critical thinking	• Results/findings are missing or poorly described • No connections between raw data, analysis and results/findings, or connections are unclear • Results/findings disorganized • No evidence of critical thinking
Plan of Action/Discussion/Conclusion (15 pts. of total)			
Plan of Action/Discussion/ Conclusions Summary (4 pts.)	• Overall, section offers important insights & implications • Strong evidence of critical thinking • Summary and conclusions are effectively concise	• Overall, section offers reasonable insights & implications • Some evidence of critical thinking • Summary and conclusions are discussed	• Overall, section offers few insights or implications • Little or no evidence of critical thinking • Summary and conclusions are omitted or poorly discussed • Implications section

Plan of Action/ Implications **(7 pts.)**	• Implications section offers important insights • Implications relate back to problem • Clear, strong implications for literacy instruction • Appropriate recommendations for future research • If appropriate, researcher insightfully discusses how study may address theory	• Implications section offers reasonable insights • Implications relate back to problem • Implications for literacy instruction discussed • Some recommendations for future research • If appropriate, researcher addresses how study may address theory	offers no new insights • Implications do not connect to problem • No implications for literacy instruction discussed • No recommendations for future research • Researcher does not address how study may address theory when clearly appropriate
Limitations **(4 pts.)**	• Thorough discussion of study's limitations • Limitations provide evidence of critical reflection on study	• Some discussion of study's limitations • Limitations provide evidence of some reflection on study	• No, or inadequate, discussion of study's limitations • Limitations provide no evidence of some reflection on study
Mechanics (10 pts.)			
Mechanics/References/ APA Style (10 pts.)	• A complete list of all sources cited within your paper is provided. • APA style used correctly throughout paper • Paper is error-free, or 0-1 mistakes are made per page (including spelling, grammar, and other mechanics)	• Reference list is complete or missing no more than 1 reference • APA style used throughout paper, with no more than 3 errors • No more than 2-3 mistakes are made per page (including spelling, grammar, and other mechanics)	• Reference list is missing or incomplete • APA style not used, or used with more than 3 errors overall • 4 or more mistakes are made per page (including spelling, grammar, and other mechanics)
Class Presentation (10 pts. total)			
Class Presentation (10 points)	• Researcher's participation in class presentation is highly professional • Strong written product (e.g., poster, handout, PPT) that concisely yet effectively explains what was done, what was found, and how it applies to literacy instruction • Researcher provides strong, effective answers to questions	• Researcher's participation in class presentation is effective • Written product (e.g., poster, handout, PPT) adequately explains what was done, what was found, and how it applies to literacy instruction • Researcher provides adequate answers to questions	• Researcher does not participate in class presentation, or presentation is unprofessional • Written product (e.g., poster, handout, PPT) missing or does not adequately explain what was done, what was found, and/or how it applies to literacy instruction • Researcher provides poor answers to questions

Total = _____