

**GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY**  
**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION & HUMAN DEVELOPMENT**  
**EDLE 818 Instructional Leadership: Supervision Policy and Practice**  
**Section 001, CRN 17173, Spring 2015**

**Instructor:** Robert G. Smith  
**Phone:** Office: 703-993-5079; Mobile: 703-859-6944  
**Fax:** 703-993-3643  
**Website:** <http://www.taskstream.com>  
**E-mail:** rsmithx@gmu.edu  
**Mailing address:** George Mason University  
Education Leadership Program  
Thompson Hall Suite 1300, Office 1306  
4400 University Dr., MSN 4C2  
Fairfax, VA 22030-4444  
**Office hours:** Thursdays, 11:00 am – 4:00 pm and by appointment

**Schedule information**

**Location:** Thompson, L013

**Meeting times:** Thursdays, 4:30-7:10 p.m., 1/22/15-4/30/15

**Course Description: EDLE 818 Instructional Leadership—Supervision Policy and Practice  
(3:3:0)**

Introduces current topics and research in supervision and instruction, including theory and empirical work focused on instruction, teacher learning, teacher evaluation, and instructional leadership.

**Course Objectives**

This course aims to support students' participation in the inquiry into instructional leadership by exploring what we know about supervision and instruction and how this knowledge has been constructed. More specifically, the course will investigate critical components of current instructional leadership, including instruction and its supervision, teacher learning, and instructional reform. Students will simultaneously engage in the investigation of these concepts and the methodology common to the study of instructional leadership. Ultimately, students will work to use this exploration to build their own research agendas, specific to their research questions.

Within the course, students should explore the following questions:

1. Inquiry into Instruction:
  - a. How do we know what is happening in classrooms?
  - b. How do we know what should be happening in classrooms?

- c. How do we know whether teachers are effective?
- 2. Inquiry into Teacher Learning:
  - a. What is learning?
  - b. How do we know *what* teachers should learn?
  - c. How do we know *how* teachers learn?
- 3. Inquiry into Instructional Leadership:
  - a. What is leadership?
  - b. How will we know instructional leadership when we see it?
  - c. How and where does it occur?

### **Student Outcomes**

Students who successfully complete this course will be able to:

- 1. demonstrate clear understanding of current issues in instruction and its supervision, teacher learning, and instructional reform;
- 2. produce a mini-study based on the observation of instruction;
- 3. engage in conversation to explore topics in their field of interest that represent opportunities for future investigation;
- 4. use theory to frame researchable questions and use extant literature to inform research problems relating to instructional leadership; and
- 5. develop further their ability to write doctoral-level papers.

### **National Standards**

The following Education Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards are addressed in this course:

**Standard Element 1.3:** Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement

**ELCC Standard Element 2.1:** Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.

**Standard Element 2.2:** Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.

**ELCC Standard Element 2.3:** Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.

**ELCC Standard Element 3.4:** Candidates understand and can develop school capacity for distributed leadership.

**ELCC Standard Element 5.5:** Candidates understand and can promote social justice within a school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

**ELCC Standard Element 6.2:** Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment

**ELCC Standard Element 6.3:** Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

### **Nature of Course Delivery**

Through readings, discussions, cooperative learning activities, case studies, and presentations, students will learn the theory, practice and impact of instruction and its leadership and supervision, along with teacher learning and instructional reform.

**Content.** The three primary purposes of the course are to help students inquire into instruction and its supervision, teacher learning, and instructional leadership.

**Teaching and Learning.** Each class will include a variety of activities and exercises. Specific process goals for the class are as follows:

1. Classes will reflect a balance of activities that enable students to participate actively in their development as scholars. To promote an atmosphere that allows us to accomplish this, we will:
  - a. start and end on time;
  - b. maintain (flexibly) a written agenda reflecting objectives for each class;
  - c. support our points of view with evidence;
  - d. strive to be open to new ideas and perspectives; and
  - e. listen actively to one another.
2. Student work will reflect what is expected from scholars. Students are expected to:
  - a. write papers that are well researched, proofread, submitted in a timely fashion, and consistent with APA guidelines;
  - b. participate actively in class discussions in a manner that challenges the best thinking of the class; and
  - c. provide constructive feedback to others both on their ideas and on their written work, striving to learn from each other and to test each other's ideas.
3. We will endeavor to create a classroom climate that approximates what we know about learning organizations. Therefore, it is important that we create a space that allows participants to try out new ideas and voice opinions without fear of ridicule or embarrassment. The hallmark of a learning organization is a balance between openness and constructive feedback; hence, everyone is expected to:
  - a. come fully prepared to each class;
  - b. demonstrate appropriate respect for one another;
  - c. voice concerns and opinions about class process openly;
  - d. recognize and celebrate each other's ideas and accomplishments; and
  - e. show an awareness of each other's needs.

## Course Materials

**Required Text.** Choose one of the following:

Bryk, A.S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J.Q. (2010). *Organizing Schools for Improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

- Fullan, M.F. & Boyle, A. (2014). *Big-city school reforms: Lessons from New York, Toronto, and London*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hubbard, L., Mehan, H., & Stein, M.K. (2006). *Reform as learning: School reform, organizational culture, and community politics in San Diego*. New York: Routledge.
- Supovitz, J.A. (2006). *The case for district-based reform: leading building and sustaining school improvement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

### **Selected required and optional articles available through Taskstream.**

To complete required assignments successfully, students will need to have access to a personal computer with internet access, and the ability to use basic word processing and e-mail. Correspondence by e-mail will use your Mason e-mail account. We will also use TaskStream to facilitate communication, to post assignments and class handouts, and to submit written work for assessment.

### **Course Requirements, Performance-based Assessment, and Evaluation Criteria**

#### **Attendance**

Students are expected to attend every class for its entirety. Maximum class participation points will be earned by students who attend all classes, are on time and do not leave early.

#### **General Expectations**

Consistent with expectations of doctoral courses in the Education Leadership program, grading is based heavily on student performance on written assignments. The assignments constructed for this course reflect a mix of skills associated with the application of research to education leadership contexts. Overall, written work will be assessed using the following broad criteria:

1. Application of concepts reflected in class discussion and readings
2. Creativity and imagination
3. Clarity, concision and organization

Additionally, a portion of the class grade will be based on participation and the contribution made to class discussions. The overall weights of the various performances are as follows:

#### **Grading Weights**

**Class participation (20 points).** Students are expected to participate actively in class discussions, in group activities, and in serving as critical friends to other students. Attendance is expected for all classes. **If you must be absent, please notify me by e-mail or phone.** More than one absence may result in a reduction in participation points. Arriving at class more than 30 minutes late or leaving more than 30 minutes before the end of class may result in loss of points.

**Written assignments (80 points).** Several different types of performance-based assignments will be completed during the semester. The directions for each assignment and a rubric for grading each assignment are described at the end of this syllabus. The assignments and the points assigned are:

1. Identifying Questions and Frames for Inquiry into Instruction (10 pts)
2. Method Section & Data Collection (10 points).
3. Analysis of Instruction Paper (25 points).
4. Statement of a Research Problem and Paper Presentation Proposal (35 pts)

**Submission of assignments**

All assignments must be submitted electronically, through TaskStream. TaskStream is an online assessment system used by the college to collect student work, provide feedback to students, and maintain an ongoing record of student assessment data. You will be provided with a TaskStream account and use TaskStream to submit work for courses, as well as to prepare and submit your internship portfolio.

**Late work.** I expect all students to submit their work on time, meaning no later than by midnight of the due date. Assignments will not be accepted later than **48 hours** after a due date. Papers due on a day when you are absent must be submitted via TaskStream by the due date.

**Rewrites.** Students may rewrite a paper (other than the final paper) and re-submit the paper for re-grading within one week of receiving the paper back. I recommend that students not consider re-writing papers with scores of 3.6 or higher. If you wish to discuss your work, I am willing to do so at a time of mutual convenience. Papers that are initially submitted more than 48 hours late will not be graded.

**Grading Scale**

A+	100
A	95-99
A-	90-94
B+	87-89
B	83-86
B-	80-82
C	75-79
F	0-74

**GMU Taskstream Requirements**

Every student registered for any Education Leadership course with a required performance-based assessment is required to submit this assessment (the School Improvement Project Proposal) to TaskStream (regardless of whether a course is an elective, a onetime course or part of an undergraduate minor). Evaluation of the performance-based assessment by the course instructor will also be completed in TaskStream. Failure to submit the assessment to TaskStream will result in the course instructor reporting the course grade as Incomplete (IN). Unless the IN grade is changed upon completion of the required TaskStream submission, the IN will convert to an F nine weeks into the following semester.

**GMU Policies and Resources for Students**

- a. Students must adhere to the guidelines of the George Mason University Honor Code [See <http://oai.gmu.edu/the-mason-honor-code/>].
- b. Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing [See <http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/policies/responsible-use-of-computing/>].
- c. Students are responsible for the content of university communications sent to their George Mason University email account and are required to activate their account and check it regularly. All communication from the university, college, school, and program will be sent to students solely through their Mason email account.
- d. The George Mason University Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) staff consists of professional counseling and clinical psychologists, social workers, and counselors who offer a wide range of services (e.g., individual and group counseling, workshops and outreach programs) to enhance students' personal experience and academic performance [See <http://caps.gmu.edu/>].
- e. Students with disabilities who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with the George Mason University Office of Disability Services (ODS) and inform their instructor, in writing, at the beginning of the semester [See <http://ods.gmu.edu/>].
- f. Students must follow the university policy stating that all sound emitting devices shall be turned off during class unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.
- g. The George Mason University Writing Center staff provides a variety of resources and services (e.g., tutoring, workshops, writing guides, handbooks) intended to support students as they work to construct and share knowledge through writing [See <http://writingcenter.gmu.edu/>].

### **Professional Dispositions**

Students are expected to exhibit professional behaviors and dispositions at all times.

### **Core Values Commitment**

The College of Education & Human Development is committed to collaboration, ethical leadership, innovation, research-based practice, and social justice. Students are expected to adhere to these principles. <http://cehd.gmu.edu/values/>

**EDLE 818.001 (Smith) Spring2015 Tentative Class Schedule.**

To accommodate the learning needs of class members, the topic and reading schedule will be amended during the semester. When the tentative weekly schedule is revised, revisions will be posted on Taskstream.

Session #	Date 2014	Topics	Reading/Writing Assignment
1	1/22	Introductions Generation of research questions Leadership type, supervision and effective schools Requirements for Paper #1	Robinson, V.M., Lloyd, C.A. & Rowe K. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. <i>Educational Administration Quarterly</i> , 44, 634-675. doi: 10.1177/0013161X08321509
<b>Section One: Inquiry into Instruction</b>			
2	1/29	Looking at instruction Creating frames	Kazemi, E., & Stipek, D. (2001). Promoting conceptual thinking in four upper-elementary mathematics classrooms. <i>The Elementary School Journal</i> , 102, 59-80.  Young, E. (2010). Challenges to conceptualizing and actualizing culturally relevant pedagogy: How viable is the theory in classroom practice? <i>Journal of Teacher Education</i> , 619, 248-260. doi: 10.1177/0022487109359775
3	2/5	Critiquing Frameworks Methods for collecting data and analyzing instruction Data collection and analysis Excerpts Peer Review of Paper #1 Requirements for discussion of teacher evaluation studies and of local district evaluation systems Selection of articles for Class 4 Selection of book to read	Bring draft of Paper #1 to class Choose one: Bryk et al (2010) Fullan & Boyle (2014) Supovitz (2006) Hubbard et al (2006)
-----	2/8	<b>Paper #1: Identifying Questions and Frames for Inquiry into Instruction due</b>	
4	2/12	Strengths and challenges of Paper #1 Requirements for Assignment #2 How do we know whether teachers are effective? Group \investigation of research on current teacher evaluation models	Choose one: Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2013). <i>Ensuring fair and reliable measures of effective teaching: Culminating findings from the MET project's three-year study</i> . Retrieved from www.metproject.org/ Corcoran, S. (2010). Can teachers be evaluated by their students' test scores? Should they be? Providence, R.I: Annenberg Institute for School Reform. Retrieved from www.annenberginstitute.org

Session #	Date 2014	Topics	Reading/Writing Assignment
			<p>Firestone, W.A. (2014). Teacher evaluation policy and conflicting theories of motivation. <i>Educational Researcher</i>, 43, 100-107. doi: 10.3102/0013189X14521864</p> <p>Harris, D.N., Ingle, W.K. &amp; Rutledge, S.A. (2014). How teacher evaluation methods matter for accountability: A comparative analysis of teacher effectiveness ratings by principals and teacher value-added measures. <i>American Educational Research Journal</i>, 51, 73-112. doi: 10.3102/0002831213517130</p> <p>Hill, H.C., Kapitula, L. &amp; Umland, K. (2011). A validity argument approach to evaluating teacher value-added scores. <i>American Educational Research Journal</i>, 48, 794–831. doi: 10.3102/0002831210387916</p> <p>Papay, J.P. (2010). Different tests, different answers: The stability of teacher value-added estimates across outcome measures. <i>American Educational Research Journal</i>, 48, 163–193 doi: 10.3102/0002831210362589</p> <p>Whitehurst, G.J., Chingos, M.M. &amp; Lindquist, K.M. (2014). <i>Evaluating teachers with classroom observations: Lessons learned in four districts</i>. Washington, D.C.: Brown Center on Education Policy: Brookings Institution.</p>
5	2/19	Group investigation of current teacher evaluation practices Select articles for Class 7	<p>Present and critique one school district plan for teacher evaluation.</p> <p>Resource: Virginia Department of Education. (2011). <i>Guidelines for uniform performance standards and evaluation criteria for teachers</i>. Retrieved from <a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/</a></p>
6	2/26	Sharing processes and data collection Linking methods to frameworks Peer review of Paper #2	Bring draft to class
	3/1	<b>Paper #2: Method Section for Inquiry into Instruction due</b>	
<b>Section Two: Teacher Learning</b>			
7	3/5	Strengths and challenges of Paper #2 Requirements for Paper #3 Formative evaluation of class Teacher learning: cognitive	<p>Cognitive Frame: Choose one: Ball, D., Thames, M. &amp; Phelps, G. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What makes it special? <i>Journal of Teacher Education</i>, 59, 389-407. doi: 10.3102/0002831210362589</p>



Session #	Date 2014	Topics	Reading/Writing Assignment
		and sociocultural frames	<p>Hill, H.C., Blunk, M.L., Charalambous, C.Y., Lewis, J.M., Phelps, G.C., Sleep, L., &amp; Ball, D. (2008). Mathematical knowledge for teaching and the mathematical quality of instruction: An exploratory study. <i>Cognition and Instruction</i>, 24, 430-511. doi:10.1080/07370000802177235</p> <p>Sociocultural Frame: Choose one:</p> <p>Cochran-Smith, M. &amp; Lytle, S.L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. In C. Faltis &amp; J. Abedi (Eds.) <i>Review of Research in Education</i> (pp. 249-305). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association. doi:10.3102/0091732X024001249</p> <p>Kelly, P. (2006). What is teacher learning? A socio-cultural perspective. <i>Oxford Review of Education</i>, 32, 505-519. doi:10.1080/03054980600884227</p> <p>Stillman, J. (2011). Teacher learning in an era of high-stakes accountability: Productive tension and critical professional practice. <i>Teachers College Record</i>, 113, 133-180.</p>
8	3/12	Results of formative evaluation of class Structures and purposes of professional development	<p>Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. <i>Educational Researcher</i>, 33, 3-15. doi:10.3102/0013189X033008003</p> <p>Knapp, M. S. (2003). Professional development as a policy pathway. In R. Floden (Ed.) <i>Review of Research in Education</i> (pp.109 – 157). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association. doi:10.3102/0091732X027001109</p>
9	3/19	Presenting findings Connecting findings to Implications Items to address in teacher leadership articles Peer review of paper #3	Bring draft to class
-----	3/22	<b>Paper #3: Analysis of Instruction due</b>	
<b>Section Three: Inquiry into Instructional Leadership</b>			

Session #	Date 2014	Topics	Reading/Writing Assignment
10	3/26	Strengths and challenges of Paper #3 Requirements for Paper #4 What is teacher leadership? What makes it leadership? What do we know about how it happens? Choose collaborative inquiry article	York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. <i>Review of Educational Research</i> , 74, 255-316. doi: 10.3102/00346543074003255 Choose One: Heck, R.H. & Hallinger, P. (2009). Assessing the contribution of distributed leadership to school improvement and growth in math achievement. <i>American Educational Research Journal</i> , 46, 659-689. doi:10.3102/0002831209340042 Gallucci, C., Van Lare, M., Yoon, I.H., & Boatright, B. (2010). Instructional coaching: Building theory about the role and organizational support for professional learning. <i>American Educational Research Journal</i> , 47, 919-963. doi: 10.3102/0002831210371497 Gersten, R., Diminio, J., Madhavi, J., Kim, J.S., & Santoro, L.E. (2010). Teacher study group: Impact of the professional development model on reading instruction and student outcomes in first grade classrooms. <i>American Educational Research Journal</i> , 47, 694-739. doi: 10.3102/0002831209361208 Leithwood, K. & Mascall, B. (2008). Collective leadership effects on student achievement. <i>Educational Administration Quarterly</i> , 44, 529-561. doi: 10.1177/0013161X08321221 Vescio, V., Ross, D. & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. <i>Teaching and Teacher Education</i> 24, 80-91. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2007.01.004
-----	4/2	<b><i>No class--school districts' spring break</i></b>	
11	4/9	Action research Collaborative inquiry Select article on principal leadership Items to address on principal leadership	Choose one: Cochran-Smith, M., Barnatt, J., Friedman, A., & Pine, G. (2009). Inquiry on inquiry: Practitioner research and student learning. <i>Action in Teacher Education</i> , 311 (2), 17- 32. Lewis, C., Perry, R. & Murata, A. (2006). How should research contribute to instructional improvement? The case of lesson study. <i>Educational Researcher</i> , 35, 3-14. doi: 10.3102/0013189X035003003 Wiseman, A. & Fox, R. K. (2010). Supporting teachers' development of cultural competence through teacher research. <i>Action in Teacher Education</i> , 32(4), 26-37.

Session #	Date 2014	Topics	Reading/Writing Assignment
12	4/16	Principal Leadership: Socratic dialogue Items to address in large-scale reform literature	Choose one: Blasé, J. & Blasé, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. <i>Educational Administration Quarterly</i> , 35, 349-378. doi: 10.1177/0013161X99353003 Grissom, J.A., Loeb, S. & Master, B. (2013). Effective instructional time use for school leaders: Longitudinal evidence from observations of principals. <i>Educational Researcher</i> , 42, 433-444. doi: 10.3102/0013189X13510020 Marks, H.M., & Printy, S.M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. <i>Educational Administration Quarterly</i> , 39, 370-397. doi: 10.1177/0013161X03253412 May, H. & Supovitz, J.A. (2011). The scope of principal efforts to improve instruction. <i>Educational Administration Quarterly</i> , 47, 332-352. doi: 10.1177/0013161x10383411 Supovitz, J., Sirinides, P. & May H. (2010). How principals and peers influence teaching and learning. <i>Educational Administration Quarterly</i> , 46, 31-56. doi:10.1177/1094670509353043
13	4/23	Instructional Leadership as Large-scale reform. Reporting and comparing reforms in San Diego, Duval County, Chicago, New York, Toronto & London	Bring book presentation materials
14	4/30	Peer review and discussion of papers Course evaluation Wrap Up	Bring draft of Paper #4
-----	5/3	<b>Paper #4: Statement of a Research Problem and Paper Presentation Proposal due</b>	

## References and Other Related Sources

- Ball, D., Thames, M. & Phelps, G. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What makes it special? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(5), 389-407. doi: 10.3102/0002831210362589
- Bauer, S., Brazer, S., Van Lare, M, & Smith, R.G. (2013). Organizational design in support of professional learning communities in one district. In S. Conley and B. Cooper (Eds.) *Teacher collaboration: Advancing professionalism & school Quality* (pp. 49-80). New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2013). *Ensuring fair and reliable measures of effective teaching: Culminating findings from the MET project's three-year study*. Retrieved from [www.metproject.org/](http://www.metproject.org/)
- Blasé, J. & Blasé, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35, 349-378.  
doi: 10.1177/0013161X99353003
- Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher*, 33(8), 3-15.
- Bryk, A.S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J.Q. (2010). *Organizing Schools for Improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Barnatt, J., Friedman A., & Pine, G. (2009). Inquiry on inquiry: Practitioner research and student learning. *Action in Teacher Education*, 311 (2), 17- 32.
- Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. In C. Faltis & J. Abedi (Eds.) *Review of Research in Education* (pp. 249-305). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

doi: 10.3102/0091732X024001249

Corcoran, S. (2010). *Can teachers be evaluated by their students' test scores? Should they be?*

Providence, R.I: Annenberg Institute for School Reform. Retrieved from

[www.annenberginstitute.org](http://www.annenberginstitute.org).

Cuban, L. (1993). *How teachers taught*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cuban, L. (2007). Hugging the middle: Teaching in an era of testing

and accountability. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 15(1), 1-

27. Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v15n1/>

Cuban, L. (2009). *Hugging the middle: How teachers teach in an era of testing and*

*accountability*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2013). *Getting teacher evaluation right: What really matters for*

*effectiveness and improvement*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E. & Rothstein, J. (2012).

Evaluating teacher evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan* 9(6): 8-15.

Firestone, W.A. (2014). Teacher evaluation policy and conflicting theories of motivation.

*Educational Researcher*, 43, 100-107. doi:10.3102/0013189X14521864

Fullan, M.F. & Boyle, A. (2014). *Big-city school reforms: Lessons from New York, Toronto, and*

*London*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gallucci, C., Van Lare, M., Yoon, I.H., & Boatright, B. (2010). Instructional coaching: Building

theory about the role and organizational support for professional learning. *American*

*Educational Research Journal*, 47(4), 919-963. doi: 10.3102/0002831210371497

Gersten, R., Diminio, J., Madhavi, J., Kim, J.S., & Santoro, L.E. (2010). Teacher study group:

- Impact of the professional development model on reading instruction and student outcomes in first grade classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47, 694-739. doi: 10.3102/0002831209361208
- Glass, G.V.(2008). *Fertilizers, pills and magnetic strips*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Glickman, C.D., Gordon, S.P. & Ross-Gordon, J.M. (2014). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (9th edition). Upper Saddle River, N.J: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Grissom, J.A., Loeb, S. & Master, B. (2013). Effective instructional time use for school leaders: Longitudinal evidence from observations of principals. *Educational Researcher*, 42, 433–444. doi:10.3102/0013189X13510020
- Hargreaves, A. & Fullan, M. Professional capital: (2012). *Transforming teaching in every school*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Harris, D.N. (2011), *Value-added measures in education: What every educator needs to know*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Harris, D.N., Ingle, W.K. & Rutledge, S.A. (2014). How teacher evaluation methods matter for accountability: A comparative analysis of teacher effectiveness ratings by principals and teacher value-added measures. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51, 73-112. doi: 10.3102/0002831213517130
- Heck, R.H. & Hallinger, P. (2009). Assessing the contribution of distributed leadership to school improvement and growth in math achievement. *American Educational Research Journal* 46, 659–689. doi: 10.3102/0002831209340042

- Hill, H.C., Blunk, M.L., Charalambous, C.Y., Lewis, J.M., Phelps, G.C., Sleep, L., & Ball, D. (2008). Mathematical knowledge for teaching and the mathematical quality of instruction: An exploratory study. *Cognition and Instruction*, 24(4), 430-511.  
doi: 10.1080/07370000802177235
- Hill, H.C., Kapitula, L. & Umland, K. (2011). A validity argument approach to evaluating teacher value-added scores. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48, 794–831.  
doi: 10.3102/0002831210387916
- Hord, S.M. & Hall, G.E. (1987). Three images: What principals do in curriculum implementation. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 17, 55-89.
- Hubbard, L., Mehan, H., & Stein, M.K. (2006). *Reform as learning: School reform, organizational culture, and community politics in San Diego*. New York: Routledge.
- Hulpia, H., Devos, G. (2010). How distributed leadership can make a difference in teachers' organizational commitment: A qualitative study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 565- 575. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.08.006
- Kazemi, E., & Stipek, D. (2001). Promoting conceptual thinking in four upper-elementary mathematics classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal*, 102, 59-80.
- Kelly, P. (2006). What is teacher learning? A socio-cultural perspective. *Oxford Review of Education*. 32(4), 505-519. doi. 10.1080/03054980600884227
- Knapp, M. (2003). Professional development as a policy pathway. In R. Floden (Ed.) *Review of Research in Education* (pp.109 – 157). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association. doi: 10.3102/0091732X027001109
- Knight, S. & Smith, R. (2004). Development and use of a classroom observation instrument to

- investigate teaching for meaning in diverse classrooms. In H. Waxman, R. Tharp and R.S. Hilberg (Eds.), *Observational research in U.S. classrooms: New approaches for understanding cultural and linguistic diversity* (pp. 97-121). Cambridge University Press.
- Lieberman, A. & Mace, D.P. (2010). Making practice public: Teacher learning in the 21st century. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61, 77–88. doi: 10.1177/0022487109347319.
- Leithwood, K. (2005). Understanding successful principal leadership: Progress on a broken front. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43, 619- 629. doi 10.1108/09578230510625719
- Leithwood, K. & Mascal, B. Collective leadership effects on student achievement (2008). *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44, 529-561.  
doi:10.1177/0013161X08321221
- Lewis, C., Perry, R. & Murata, A. (2006). How should research contribute to instructional improvement? The case of lesson study. *Educational Researcher*, 35, 3–14.  
doi: 10.3102/0013189X035003003
- Marks, H.M., & Printy, S.M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39, 370-397. doi: 10.1177/0013161X03253412
- May, H. & Supovitz, J.A. (2011). The scope of principal efforts to improve instruction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47, 332–352. doi: 10.1177/0013161x10383411
- Munby, H., Russell, T., & Martin, A.K. (2001). Teachers' knowledge and how it develops. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research of teaching* (4th ed., pp.877-904). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
- Newmann, F.M., Smith, B, Allensworth, E. & Bryk, A.S. (2001). Instructional program coherence: What it is and why it should guide school improvement. *Educational*



*Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23, 297–321. doi: 10.3102/01623737023004297

Papay, J.P. (2010). Different tests, different answers: The stability of teacher value-added estimates across outcome measures. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48,163–193. doi: 10.3102/0002831210362589

Popham, W.J. (2013). *Evaluating America's teachers: Mission impossible?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin

Ravitch, D. (2010). *The death and life of the great American school system*. How testing and choice are undermining education. New York: Basic Books.

Robinson, V.M., Lloyd, C.A. & Rowe K. (2008).The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44, 634-675. doi:10.1177/0013161X08321509

Rowan, B., Correnti, R., Miller, R.J. & Camburn, E.M. (2009). *School improvement by design: Lessons from a study of comprehensive school reform programs*. CPRE. Retrieved from:[http://www.cpre.org/images/stories/cpre\\_pdfs/sii%20final%20report\\_web%20file.pdf](http://www.cpre.org/images/stories/cpre_pdfs/sii%20final%20report_web%20file.pdf)

Sarason, S. B. (1971). *The culture of the school and the problem of change*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Saunders, W.M., Goldenberg, C.N., & Gallimore, R. (2009). Increasing achievement by focusing grade-level teams on improving classroom learning: a prospective, quasi-experimental study of Title I schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46, 1006–1033. doi:10.3102/0002831209333185

Smith, R. G. & Knight, S. (1997). Collaborative inquiry: Teacher leadership in the practice of creative intelligence. In R. Sinclair & W. Ghory, W. (Eds.), *Reaching and teaching all students: Grassroots efforts that work* (pp. 39-60). Thousand Oaks, CA. Corwin Press.

- Stillman, J. (2011). Teacher learning in an era of high-stakes accountability: Productive tension and critical professional practice. *Teachers College Record*, 113, 133-180.
- Supovitz, J.A. (2006). *The case for district-based reform: leading building and sustaining school improvement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Supovitz, J., Sirinides, P. & May, H. (2010). How principals and peers influence teaching and learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(1), 31–56.  
doi: 10.1177/1094670509353043
- Talbert, J.E., McLaughlin, M.W. (1994). Teacher professionalism in local school contexts. *American Journal of Education*, Vol.102, 123-153. doi: 0 1 95- 6744/94/0202-000 1.
- Tyack, D. & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Van Lare, M., Brazer, S., Bauer, S. & Smith, R.G. (2013). Professional learning communities using evidence: Examining teacher learning and organizational learning. . In S. Conley and B. Cooper (Eds.) *Teacher collaboration: Advancing professionalism & school quality* (pp. 157-182). New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Vescio, V. Ross, D. & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 24, 80–91. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2007.01.004
- Virginia Department of Education. (2011). *Guidelines for uniform performance standards and evaluation criteria for teachers*. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/>
- Whitehurst, G.J., Chingos, M.M. & Lindquist, K.M. (2014). *Evaluating teachers with classroom observations: Lessons learned in four districts*. Washington, D.C.: Brown Center on Education Policy: Brookings Institution.

- Wiseman, A. & Fox, R. K. (2010). Supporting teachers' development of cultural competence through teacher research. *Action in Teacher Education*, 32(4), 26-37.
- Wood, D. (2007). Teachers' learning communities: Catalyst for change or a new infrastructure for the status quo? *Teachers College Record*, 109 (3), 699–739.
- York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(3), 255-316. doi: 10.3102/00346543074003255
- Young, E. (2010). Challenges to conceptualizing and actualizing culturally relevant pedagogy: How viable is the theory in classroom practice? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 619(3), 248-260. doi: 10.1177/0022487109359775
- Zeiser, K.L., Taylor, J., Rickles, J. & Garet, M.S. (2014). *Evidence of deeper learning outcomes: Report #3a Findings from the study of deeper learning: Opportunities and outcomes*. Washington, D.C.: American Institutes for Research

## **Paper #1: Identifying Questions and Frames for Inquiry into Instruction**

### **10 Points**

### **Rationale**

This course demands you investigate and design systematic methods to observe instruction in classrooms. *You are not being asked to design a research project that can be generalized to a population or to theory.* Instead, the goal is for you to sharpen qualitative skills, investigate an area of interest, and analyze a specific component of classroom instruction. As a point of entry, this task introduces or supports you in the process of developing researchable questions and a focused framework for data collection. Working from literature you have read about instruction, classroom readings, and classroom discussion, decide what question you want to ask concerning how instruction is happening in a classroom. Your data collection will be fine-grained, so you will have to construct a question(s) appropriate for small-scale, qualitative design.

### **Tasks**

1. Start by forming a researchable question(s) about some aspect of instruction. Because this is such a limited inquiry, your question should be exploratory (as opposed to inquiring about correlations or cause and effects). One suggestion is to envision the type of instruction you want to observe and ask a question about one particular component of instruction that might be there. Here are some examples:
  - a. How are 3<sup>rd</sup> grade teachers implementing a particular element of balanced literacy?
  - b. What conversation patterns exist around mathematics in a 6<sup>th</sup> grade class for English Language Learners?
  - c. How do 2<sup>nd</sup> grade teachers design collaborative structures in Language Arts instruction?
  - d. To what extent do High School Chemistry teachers make teacher thinking explicit to students?
2. Develop a simple framework that will guide you in collecting data on your question. This should be very general and does not have to link to theory. Instead, decide the boundaries of what data you collect, and what you omit. For example, if my question is (a), I will name that particular element (i.e. read alouds) and get clear on what counts as a read aloud and what constitutes “implementing”.
3. Write a paper of approximately 4 pages that contains the following:
  - An introductory paragraph that orients the reader to the general topic of your paper and introduces a one-sentence thesis that states your research interest.
  - A clear presentation of your question including a justification for why your question is relevant to the study of instruction.
  - A section that explains and justifies your frame. What are the central concepts of your question and how are you defining them?
  - A conclusion that hypothesizes possibilities of what you might see through this frame.
  - Proper citations and a reference list that includes the sources you use.

**Assessment Rubric for Identifying Questions and Frames for Inquiry into Instruction  
10 Points**

	<b>Exceeds Expectations 4 points</b>	<b>Meets Expectations 3 points</b>	<b>Approaching Expectations 2 points</b>	<b>Falls Below Expectations 1 point</b>
<u>Introduction (15%)</u> The introduction orients the reader to the purpose of the paper and presents the paper's thesis.	The introduction provides a road map regarding the author's research interest, and clearly foreshadows the paper's main points through the thesis.	The introduction provides an adequate orientation to the paper and a thesis is presented. The thesis may not be analytical or clearly stated.	The introduction is vague and does not adequately orient the reader to the paper.	The introduction neither orients the reader nor introduces a thesis.
<u>Question (250%)</u> The question(s) should be clear and researchable through a small-scale qualitative project and is justified by its importance to instruction.	The question is both specific and clearly researchable through the method of observation. The justification is artfully argued and skillfully clarifies the question, illustrating a clear connection to instruction.	The question is researchable through the method of observation. The justification describes how the question is connected to instruction.	The question may be researchable but may not be appropriate for observation. It is not clear how the question is connected to instruction, or the justification does not help clarify the connection.	The question has no justification, is inappropriate for an observational study and/or is missing.
<u>Frame (35%)</u> The frame guides the researcher in only collecting data that is positioned to answer the question. Explanation of the frame should offer an argument for what concepts are being observed and how they will be measured.	The frame clearly articulates and defines the constructs and the ways in which the constructs can be measured. The frame is clearly connected to the questions, and is presented so that its relevance is convincing.	The frame is presented with definitions and ideas about how constructs will be measured. There appears to be a connection between the framework and question.	The frame has definitions and measurements for constructs, but may not be clear. The connection between the frame and question is unclear.	The frame is unclear and/or missing.
<u>Conclusion (15%)</u> The conclusion finishes the paper by summarizing the thesis, question(s) and frame and offering a hypothesis of what will be observed.	The conclusion follows logically from the body of the paper and provides a vivid description of what might be observed.	The conclusion follows logically from the body, but it offers a weak or unclear hypothesis of what might be observed.	The conclusion attempts to summarize the paper but does not offer a hypothesis.	The conclusion is missing or does not follow logically from the body of the paper.
<u>Mechanics and APA (10%)</u> Your written work should always represent you as accurate and precise.	The paper is nearly error-free, which reflects clear understanding of APA format and thorough proofreading.	The paper contains occasional grammatical errors, questionable word choice, and/or minor APA errors.	Errors in grammar and punctuation are present, but spelling has been proofread. There are several violations of APA format.	The paper contains frequent errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, and/or APA format.

## **Paper #2: Method Section for Inquiry into Instruction**

### **10 Points**

#### **Rationale**

This paper is considered the second step to prepare for instructional observations. Building on your research question and frame, developed in Paper #1, you will develop tools to guide you in your data collection. This paper is a presentation and justification for the context you are observing, how you are collecting data, and how you will analyze that data.

#### **Tasks**

To complete this writing assignment, follow the steps below:

1. Start with an introduction that orients your reader to what you are studying and offers a thesis statement.
2. Your paper will include a revised explanation of your question and framework.
3. Include a methods section that includes the following components:
  - a. Context: Where will you be collecting data?
  - b. Participants: Who are you observing (use pseudonyms)? Give significant background information – years of experience, years in this grade level, etc.) Justify your choice of participant.
  - c. Data collection methods: How are you gathering data? You will be primarily using observation methods, although you are welcome to include very limited interview and documentation data. You will include an **observation guide** as an appendix to your paper and refer to it within this section.
  - d. Data analysis methods: How are you going to systematically analyze what you collect? Be sure to name what you will be looking for in the data.
4. Include a conclusion that revisits the content of the paper and ends the paper persuasively, offering an overall justification for what you are studying.

Your paper is likely to be approximately eight pages.

**Assessment Rubric: Method Section for Inquiry into Instruction  
10 Points**

	<b>Exceeds Expectations (4 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (3 points)</b>	<b>Approaching Expectations (2 points)</b>	<b>Falls Below Expectations (1 point)</b>
<u>Introduction (10%)</u> The introduction orients the reader to the purpose of the paper and presents the paper's thesis.	The introduction provides a road map of the discussion and includes a thesis that clearly argues a sharp focus.	The introduction provides a road map of the discussion and includes a thesis.	The introduction provides an unclear road map and/or an unclear thesis.	There is no clear introduction and/or thesis.
<u>Research question(s) (10%)</u> The research question(s) creates the basis for the method that follows.	The research question(s) is clearly stated, related to instruction, researchable and may be answered by the methods proposed.	The research question(s) is stated clearly but its relationship to instruction and/or the likelihood of its answer being provided by research is unclear.	The research question(s), although stated, is unclear.	The research question(s) is largely or entirely absent.
<u>Frame (10%)</u> The frame guides the researcher in only collecting data that are positioned to answer the question. Explanation of the frame should offer an argument for what concepts are being observed and how they will be measured.	The frame clearly articulates and defines the constructs and the ways in which the constructs can be measured. The frame is clearly connected to the questions, and is presented so that its relevance is convincing.	The frame is presented with definitions and ideas about how constructs will be measured. There appears to be a connection between the framework and question.	The frame has definitions and measurements for constructs, but may not be clear. The connection between the frame and question is unclear.	The frame is unclear or missing.
<u>Method: Context (10%)</u> The context includes the location for data collection.	The location for data collection will be clear and justified by reference to relationship to the frame and question(s).	The location for data collection will be stated.	The location for data collection is inappropriate for answering the research question.	The location is not referenced.
<u>Method: Data collection (15%)</u> The observation and any other procedure are described and justified.	Data collection methods are clearly specified and linked to the research question(s) and frame.	Data collection methods are clearly specified but their relationship to the research question and/or frame is less clear.	Data collections methods are specified but unjustified.	Data collection methods are largely ignored or missing.
<u>Method: Data analysis (15%)</u> The procedure for data analysis is systematic and holds promise for answering the research question(s).	The data analysis procedure is clearly explicated and justified by its likelihood of answering the research question(s).	The data analysis procedure is described and its relationship to the research question is referenced.	The data analysis procedure is described but its relationship to the research question is either unclear or questionable.	The data collection procedure is largely ignored or missing.
<u>Conclusion (10%)</u>	The conclusion	The conclusion	The conclusion	The conclusion is

The conclusion finishes the paper by offering a clear summary and justification of the method and study.	summarizes research question, the frame, the context and methods of observation, collection and analysis of data.	summarizes the research question(s) and frame, but ignores and/or treats unclearly one or more aspects of the method.	summarizes a portion of the paper.	largely ignored or missing.
<u>Mechanics and APA (10%)</u> Your written work should always represent you as accurate and precise.	The paper is nearly error-free and reflects clear understanding of APA format and thorough proofreading.	The paper contains occasional grammatical errors, questionable word choice, and/or minor APA errors.	The paper contains errors in grammar and punctuation, and/or several violations of APA format.	The paper contains frequent errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, and/or APA format.
<u>Appendix: Observation Guide (10%)</u> The observation guide provides clear directions for how the observation will be conducted.	The observation guide describes clearly the procedures (including instrumentation if appropriate) to be used to collect data.	The observation guide describes the procedures for data collection.	The observation guide is incomplete.	The observation guide is missing.



**Paper #3: Analysis of Instruction**  
**25 points**

**Rationale**

In your prior papers, you identified the framework and methods you would use to inquire into instruction. With this assignment, you will employ your plan to observe a classroom, collect data, and offer an analysis of instruction. This paper is meant to be a focused, condensed exploration of a particular aspect of instruction, as determined by the student. Therefore, consider your data collection and analysis as just a slice of a normal research project. Instead, the intent is to walk through the process of observing instruction in a systematic way.

**Tasks**

1. Using your observation guide, observe a classroom. (Amount of observation is dependent upon your plan in Paper #2.
2. Collect data following our design.
3. Employ one analytical tool discussed in class to analyze data. You will attach this tool (i.e. coding charts) to your paper as an appendix.
4. Prepare a 15 page paper that includes the following components:
  - a. Using previous papers include an introduction that orients your reader and presents a thesis.
  - b. Include a section on your question and your framework.
  - c. Include a methods section - based on Paper #2 with revisions.
  - d. Present your findings in a cohesive way, displaying relevant data.
  - e. Include a discussion offering some the “take aways” of your observation.
  - f. Finally, include a conclusion that reflects upon your process through this project.

Confidentiality: You will not reveal identities throughout this project and are should create pseudonyms to protect participants. Also, this observation is purely for research purposes and should not hold any connection to formal evaluation procedures within schools.

**Assessment Rubric for Analysis of Instruction  
25 Points**

	<b>Exceeds Expectations (4 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (3 points)</b>	<b>Approaching Expectations (2 points)</b>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations (1 point)</b>
<u>Introduction (10%)</u> The introduction orients the reader to the purpose of the paper and presents the paper's thesis.	The introduction draws the reader into the paper effectively. The thesis is clear and focused, offering a concise argument.	The introduction orients the reader to the paper. The thesis is apparent.	The introduction explains what is in the paper, but lacks a clear and analytical thesis.	The introduction is largely missing and lacks a clear thesis.
<u>Framework (30%)</u> The framework offers a useful definition of instructional leadership and is rooted in literature.	The framework is clear and useful to guide inquiry. The concepts are substantially justified through a skillful use of research and theory.	The framework is potentially useful to guide inquiry. The concepts are justified through use of research and theory.	The framework attempts to define instructional leadership. Some literature is used.	The framework is unclear or is not connected to body of literature.
<u>Case (10%)</u> The case should be clearly explained with relevant details.	The case is explained clearly with appropriate specification. The context gives all needed details to make sense of the analysis.	The case is explained clearly but provides too little context to make sense of the analysis.	The case offers irrelevant details or lacks specification.	The case is incomplete, irrelevant or missing.
<u>Analysis (40%)</u> The paper should offer a thoughtful analysis of leadership, offering illustrative excerpts from the case.	This section offers a substantially coherent analysis of the case that builds an insightful argument. The use of data is consistently appropriate and the data are skillfully dissected.	This section is consistent in presenting coherent, insightful and appropriate analysis.	The analysis is inconsistent by reference to coherence, appropriateness and /or insight.	The analysis lacks logic, does not rely on illustrative excerpts from the data, and/or is largely missing.
<u>Mechanics and APA (10%)</u> Your written work should always represent you as accurate and precise.	The paper is nearly error-free and reflects clear understanding of APA format and thorough proofreading.	The paper contains occasional grammatical errors, questionable word choice, and/or minor APA errors.	The paper contains errors in grammar and punctuation, and/or several violations of APA format.	The paper contains frequent errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, and/or APA format.

**Paper #4: Statement of a Research Problem and Paper Presentation Proposal**  
**(Required Performance)**  
**35 points**

**Rationale**

This assignment requires students to establish a research focus by writing a statement of their research problem that would be appropriate for a dissertation proposal or dissertation. In addition to practicing writing a statement of their research problem, students are required to write a proposal for a paper presentation at the annual convention of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA). Thus, students practice two very important skills: 1) providing a persuasive argument for investigating a particular research problem, and 2) persuading peer reviewers that their research is worthy of presentation. Students are expected to be novices, not experts, in both processes.

This is the culminating assignment for the course in which you will put the literature you have found to work for you. The skill of using research in this way is vital to scholarship.

**Tasks**

1. Write a statement of your research problem that has the following components:
  - A brief introduction that orients the reader to the topic
  - A statement of purpose—What do you intend to learn from your research?
  - A statement of significance—Why is it important to conduct this research?
  - Two – four research questions
2. Write a UCEA paper presentation proposal that does not exceed 2,000 words and contains the following components (and in this order required by UCEA):
  - Purpose
  - Rationale and Significance
  - Theoretical framework (We will not have talked a great deal about this, so you will just need to do the best you can based on the articles you have read.)
  - Data sources and methods (This will be hypothetical for you.)
  - Findings and conclusions (Write this prospectively: “I anticipate that my research will reveal that . . .”)
  - Relationship to program theme (Although this is a component of the UCEA paper proposal format, **you are not expected to write this portion** because it will be too much of a stretch.)

## Assessment Rubric for Statement of a Research Problem and Paper Presentation Proposal

	<b>Exceeds Expectations (4 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (3 points)</b>	<b>Approaching Expectations (2 points)</b>	<b>Falls Below Expectations (1 point)</b>
<p><u>Introduction (10%)</u> The introduction orients the reader to the purpose of the paper—a discussion of your intended research focus.</p>	<p>The introduction draws the reader into the paper effectively. The thesis is clear and analytical, dealing directly with purpose and significance, and employs coherent arguments and support from published literature.</p>	<p>The introduction orients the reader to the paper. The thesis is apparent, though not entirely clear. It may be more descriptive than analytical.</p>	<p>The introduction explains what is in the paper, but lacks a clear and analytical thesis.</p>	<p>The introduction is weak. The paper lacks a clear thesis.</p>
<p><u>Purpose (10%)</u> It is important to explain to the reader what you wish to study.</p>	<p>The purpose is clear and compelling and well supported by published literature, if possible. The purpose is explained from multiple perspectives (e.g., practical and academic) in a logical and persuasive manner.</p>	<p>The purpose of the research is clear from at least one perspective.</p>	<p>The purpose is apparent, but confusing.</p>	<p>The purpose is missing or unclear.</p>
<p><u>Significance (25%)</u> It is important to explain to the reader why it is meaningful to pursue your chosen topic.</p>	<p>The significance is clear and compelling and well supported by published literature. Significance is explained from multiple perspectives (e.g., practical and academic) in a logical and persuasive manner, and significance is clearly linked to purpose.</p>	<p>The author weaves together arguments regarding the significance of the topic that follow logically from the stated purpose.</p>	<p>Significance is apparent, but not well supported by literature and/or seems unrelated to purpose.</p>	<p>Significance is unclear or missing.</p>
<p><u>Research Questions (15%)</u> Readers need to know the research questions to help them understand the research designed to answer them.</p>	<p>The research questions are inclusive and stimulating. The questions are clearly and persuasively linked to purpose and significance.</p>	<p>A reasonable set of questions is presented. The questions clearly follow from purpose and significance.</p>	<p>The questions are neither very informative nor researchable. Links to purpose and significance may be unclear.</p>	<p>The questions are inadequate.</p>

<p><u>UCEA Proposal (30%)</u> Writing a proposal such as this is an important component of scholarly work.</p>	<p>The proposal is well written and persuasive. It responds to each criterion and does not exceed the 2,000 word limit.</p>	<p>The proposal is clearly written and responds to each criterion listed.</p>	<p>The proposal is inconsistent or may have left out one or more of the criteria.</p>	<p>The proposal is difficult to understand or may be incomplete.</p>
<p><u>Mechanics and APA (10%)</u> Your written work should always represent you as accurate and precise.</p>	<p>The paper is nearly error-free and reflects clear understanding of APA format and thorough proofreading.</p>	<p>The paper contains occasional grammatical errors, questionable word choice, and/or minor APA errors.</p>	<p>The paper contains errors in grammar and punctuation, and/or several violations of APA format.</p>	<p>The paper contains frequent errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, and/or APA format.</p>

**Class Participation  
20 Points**

	<b>Exceeds expectations (4)</b>	<b>Meets expectations (3)</b>	<b>Approaches expectations (2)</b>	<b>Falls below expectations (1)</b>
<b>Attendance (30%)</b>	Exemplary attendance and tardies	Near perfect attendance, few tardies	Occasional (2-3) absences and/or tardies	Frequent absences and/or tardies
<b>Quality of Questions and Interaction (20%)</b>	Most queries are specific and on point. Deeply involved in class dialogue. Challenges ideas and seeks meaning.	Often has specific queries, stays involved in class dialogue, though sometimes tentative or off-base.	Asks questions about deadlines, procedures, directions or for help with little specificity. Infrequently discusses ideas.	Rarely asks questions of substance.
<b>Effort (20%)</b>	Volunteers as appropriate and often leads in group settings. Engages and brings out the best in others.	Willingly participates with instructor and classmates. Engages others.	Reluctantly participates when asked. Seeks easiest duties in groups. Tolerates others.	Actively avoids involvement when possible. Complains about others. Uses large set of excuses.
<b>Demonstration of preparation for class (30%)</b>	Demonstrates preparation regularly by referring to previous learning, text and other sources to contribute to class discussion and is prepared for each and every class.	Demonstrates preparation regularly by referring to previous learning, text and other sources to contribute to class discussion.	Periodically demonstrates preparation and readiness for class.	Rarely demonstrates readiness for class