

George Mason University
College of Education and Human Development
Literacy Program

EDRD 635.001: School Based Inquiry in Literacy
3 Credits, Summer 2018
Monday, Wednesday, Friday 5:00-7:40 pm
May 21-July 6
209 Krug Hall, Fairfax Campus

Faculty

Name: Allison Ward Parsons
Office hours: By Appointment
Office location: 1603 Thompson Hall, Fairfax campus
Office Phone: 703-993-5257
Email address: award12@gmu.edu

Prerequisites/Corequisites

[EDRD 630 Advanced Literacy Foundations and Instruction, Birth to Middle Childhood, admission to the literacy emphasis, or permission from the program coordinator.

EDRD 631 Advanced study of literacy theory, research, and practice as it relates to adolescents and adults. Addresses sociocultural, cognitive, linguistic, psychological, and developmental influences on literacy. Includes reading, writing, and oral communication.

EDRD 632 Literacy Assessments and Interventions for Groups. Provides literacy assessments and interventions for groups of learners. Includes exploration of assessment tools for classrooms and large populations. Class members conduct related practice in their own classrooms or specified field settings.

EDRD 633 Literacy Assessments and Interventions for Individuals. Provides literacy assessments and interventions for individuals. Includes diagnosis and remediation for learners who find reading and writing difficult. Requires assigned practicum experience.

EDRD 634 School Based Leadership Prepares reading specialist as a school leader. Expands knowledge of literacy gained in prerequisite courses, and applies it to professional development work with teachers at their own site.

EDRD 637 Supervised Literacy Practicum. Supervised literacy practicum that requires students to conduct assessments of and provide instruction to struggling readers.

University Catalog Course Description

Capstone course in literacy emphasis focusing on research-based inquiry related to literacy in school settings. Includes review of literature and teacher inquiry project.

Course Overview

Not Applicable

Course Delivery Method

This course will be delivered using a hybrid (2-75% online) format.

Learner Outcomes or Objectives

This course is designed to enable students to do the following:

1. Identify specific areas of literacy interest; plan research steps for gaining information about their interest; and begin to carry out those plans and articulate the answers derived. (Literature Review; Article Review)
2. Read and analyze literacy studies related to their research interest and write an intelligent and coherent literature review. (Literature review)
3. Write an opinion article advocating for an approach or issue based on their research interest in literacy. (OpEd)
4. Write a grant proposal to fund a project or materials to enhance her/his role as a literacy leader. (Grant Proposal)
5. Make a formal presentation to their peers on a research plan and preliminary findings. (Presentation)

Professional Standards (International Reading Association):

IRA Standards (2010 Standards for Reading Professionals)

Upon completion of this course, students will have met the following professional standards:

1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 6.2, 6.4

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.

1.2 Interpret and summarize historically shared knowledge (e.g., instructional strategies and theories) that addresses the needs of all readers. Inform educators and others about the historically shared knowledge base in reading and writing and its role in reading education.

1.3 Model fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior when teaching students and working with other professionals.

2.1 Demonstrate an understanding of the research and literature that undergirds the reading and writing curriculum and instruction for all pre-K–12 students.

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.

6.4 Demonstrate an understanding of local, state, and national policies that affect reading and writing instruction.

Virginia State Standards addressed in this course: 6i, 6j

6i. Demonstrate effective communication skills in working with a variety of groups, including parents, teachers, administrators, community leaders, etc.

6j. Demonstrate knowledge of current research and exemplary practices in English/reading.

Required Texts

There are no required texts for this course.

RECOMMENDED TEXTS:

APA Manual, 6th edition.

Zinsser, W. (2006). *On writing well, 30th anniversary edition: The classic guide to writing nonfiction*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Course Performance Evaluation

Students are expected to submit all assignments on time in the manner outlined by the instructor (e.g., Blackboard, Tk20, hard copy).

1. Assignment Descriptions:

A. Class Participation: (15%) Class attendance is expected. Class participation is a required component of your grade. It is expected that you fully participate in both online and face-to-face settings. Participation involves several aspects: being fully prepared for class, completing work in a timely manner, offering critical insights to discussions, asking in-depth, thoughtful questions, and providing thoughtful, responsive feedback to your peers. ***It is critical to keep up with the readings.*** It is your responsibility to come to class with insights, questions, comments, and concerns from the readings. In general, we will engage in three types of activities:

1. Mini-lectures, activities, and discussions.
2. Discussion of the week's readings via discussion boards and in-class small groups.
3. Critical friend meetings and/or pair and small group meetings in which you will provide feedback and support for each other's work.

The following rubric will be used for assessment:

	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Approaching expectations	Does not meet expectations
Attendance 50%	The candidate attended all face-to-face and synchronous classes and was always on time for class.	The candidate missed one face-to-face class and synchronous. The candidate was occasionally late for class/left early.	The candidate missed two face-to-face class and synchronous classes. The candidate was often late to class/left early.	The candidate missed three or more face-to-face class and synchronous classes. The candidate was consistently late to class/left early.
Participation 50 %	1. The candidate actively participates in small and/or whole group class meetings by meaningfully contributing to each class session. The candidate critically considers class content and poses questions to push	1. The candidate makes active contributions to the learning group and class. The candidate may usually, but not always, critically consider content and/or pose questions. 2. The candidate demonstrates	1. The candidate participates at least peripherally in group and class discussions. The candidate is somewhat engaged in all classes and sometimes or rarely pushes their own and their peers' thinking. 2. The	1. Candidate does not actively participate in discussions. 2. The candidate's communication with professor and peers is usually unprofessional.

	their thinking and address misunderstandings. 2. The candidate always demonstrates professionalism in all communications with professor and peers and follows procedures I the syllabus.	professionalism in all communications with professor and peers .	candidate may occasionally demonstrate unprofessionalism in communications with professor and peers.	
--	--	--	--	--

B. Performance Based Assessment (PBA): (85%) A detailed description is included at the end of syllabus. This PBA blends a literature review (40%), op ed piece (10%), and grant proposal (35%). This performance-based assessment (PBA) **MUST** be uploaded *and* submitted to TK20 in Blackboard for evaluation when the assignment is due. **ONLY PBAs posted to TK20 will be graded.** This means NO final grades will be posted until all materials are on Blackboard. You must post a PBA in order to receive class credit.

2. Assignment and examination weighting:

Assignment	Value	Due Dates
Class Attendance & Participation	15%	ongoing
Critical Friends meetings & feedback	5%	
Online and F2F attendance and participation	10%	
Literature Review	40%	Wednesday, June 20
Annotated Bibliography	10%	June 4
Final Paper	30%	
Op Ed	10%	Friday, June 22
Grant Proposal	35%	Friday, July 6

3. Grading Policies:

Please note that Literacy students must re-take any course in which they receive a grade of C or lower, in order to be eligible for licensure (Please note that the grade of B- is not given).

Grading Scale

A = 94%-100%

A- = 90%-93%

B+ = 87%-89%

B = 80%-86%

C = 75%-79%

4. Other expectations/information:

Class attendance

Class attendance is both important and required. If, due to an emergency, you will not be in class, **you must contact the instructor via phone or email.** You are expected to email assignments regardless of class attendance on the day that the assignment is due. Students are responsible for obtaining information given during class discussions despite attendance. **Attendance will influence your grade.**

Assignments

All assignments should be turned in on the due date in the schedule below via paper copy OR email attachment (by 4:30pm, whether or not you are in class that evening). Save all electronic files with your last name and assignment titles (ex: **SMITH_ProfDevProposal.docx**). All assignments must be typed in 12-point Times New Roman font, and double-spaced with one-inch margins. **Writing quality (including mechanics, organization, and content) is figured into the overall points for each writing assignment**, so please proofread carefully. Late papers and projects will not be accepted without penalty, excepting extraordinary circumstances.

General

Email response:

I will respond to all emails within 24 hours during the week and 48 hours on weekends/holidays. If you do not get a reply within 24/48 hours PLEASE resend email.

Students are expected to respond to emails within 24 hours during the week.

Please **consult the syllabus FIRST** for all questions. Then consult me with questions and concerns about assignments, expectations, or class activities. I am happy to clarify and lend assistance on projects and assignments, but please come to me within a reasonable time frame. I will be available for the 15 minutes before class, by appointment, and by-email. I look forward to collaborating with each of you as you work towards your goals.

Professional Dispositions

See <https://cehd.gmu.edu/students/polices-procedures/>

Class Schedule

Note: Faculty reserves the right to alter the schedule as necessary, with notification to students.

Class/Date	Class Format	Topics	Assignments DUE	Readings
#1 Monday May 21	F2F	Literacy Leaders: roles in policy and advocacy: Course Overview Lit Review Analysis Literature Review Process: Formulating a research question Database searches		Flanigan 2007 (focus on lit review & skim rest to understand logic chain)
#2 Wednesday May 23	Synchronous	Evaluating Literature for relevance and validity/reliability. Annotated Bibliography intro Critical Friends	Identify a research topic & email to Allison.	Hall 2005 (focus on lit review & skim rest to understand logic chain)
#3 Friday	Asynchronous	Literature Review: evaluating research.	Research, read, and annotate AT LEAST 3	

May 25			articles on your topic & begin to construct logic chain/outline for lit review. This is the start of your Annotated Bibliography assignment.	
#4 Monday May 28 MEMORIAL DAY	NO CLASS HAPPY MEMORIAL DAY!	Continue researching, reading, annotating articles. Sort them according to emerging themes.	Continue to work on Annotated Bibliography assignment, adding another 5-6 articles this week. What does the research say about your topic? Be objective!!	
#5 Wednesday May 30	F2F	Literature Review: Drafting and Writing Literature reviews In class: Rationale & Synthesis statement Critical Friend(s) conferences	Outline of literature review Bring all articles to class (elec. or hard copies). Identify literacy grant for proposal	
#6 Friday June 1	Asynchronous		Continue AB project Confer with critical friend(s)	
#7 Monday June 4	Asynchronous		Submit minimum 15 entries for Annotated Bibliography, grouped according to theme/major findings Once you receive instructor feedback on AB, begin drafting lit review	
#8 Wednesday June 6	Synchronous		Continue drafting	
#9 Friday June 8	Asynchronous		Continue drafting, confer with CF as needed	

Monday June 11	F2F	Academic Writing workshop: outlines, academic writing: organization streamlining, revising, editing for clarity *Bring everything to class!	Continue drafting	
#10 Wednesday June 13	Asynchronous		Continue drafting, confer with CF as needed	
#11 Friday June 15	Asynchronous		COMPLETE Literature Review Draft due to critical friends.	Nutt, 2003 Stinson, 2007
#12 Monday June 18	F2F	Lit Review in-class peer coaching Op Ed: Craft Writing Choosing an outlet Choosing a position Drafting an Op-Ed (in class)	Read 2-4 education-based editorials and op-ed pieces in newspapers and magazines; analyze the craft Share at least 2 op-eds & brief reactions via Twitter hashtag: #EDRD635	Pence, 2000
#13 Wednesday June 20	Synchronous	Grant Writing: Researching and analyzing grant announcements (RFP) Craft analysis: Grant sample How to follow an RFP Grant writing: Needs assessment & Project narrative **Bring 632 Part A, 634 Yearlong/Part 1 to aid drafting in class	Literature Review Due to TK20 by midnight.	Maxwell, 2005 Bring possible grant announcements to class for discussion.
#14 Friday June 22	Asynchronous		Op-Ed paper due on TK20 by midnight.	

			Grant craft wiki (in CF groups, identify and discuss needs assessment, logic chain, and writing craft elements). Begin drafting grant proposal	
#15 Monday June 25	F2F	Grant writing: Budget sourcing and development Streamlining the logic chain & revising for clarity	Continue drafting grant proposal Any lit review revisions due on TK20	
#16 Wednesday June 27	Asynchronous		Continue drafting grant proposal	Nutt. 2003 Stinson, 2007
#17 Friday June 29	Asynchronous		<i>Full grant proposal draft due to critical friends.</i>	
Monday July 2	F2F	In-class grant peer coaching Final presentations Literacy leadership-summarizing discussion Course Evaluations		
#24 Wednesday July 4	NO CLASS	HAPPY INDEPENDENCE DAY		
#25 Friday July 6	Asynchronous		Final grant proposal due to TK20 by midnight. All PBA assignments must be posted to TK-20 by midnight.	

Core Values Commitment

The College of Education and 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/>.

GMU Policies and Resources for Students

Policies

- Students must adhere to the guidelines of the Mason Honor Code (see <https://catalog.gmu.edu/policies/honor-code-system/>).
- Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing (see <http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/policies/responsible-use-of-computing/>).
- Students are responsible for the content of university communications sent to their Mason 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.
- Students with disabilities who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with George Mason University Disability Services. Approved accommodations will begin at the time the written letter from Disability Services is received by the instructor (see <http://ods.gmu.edu/>).
- Students must silence all sound emitting devices during class unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.

Campus Resources

- Support for submission of assignments to Tk20 should be directed to tk20help@gmu.edu or <https://cehd.gmu.edu/aero/tk20>. Questions or concerns regarding use of Blackboard should be directed to <http://coursessupport.gmu.edu/>.
- For information on student support resources on campus, see <https://ctfe.gmu.edu/teaching/student-support-resources-on-campus>

For additional information on the College of Education and Human Development, please visit our website <https://cehd.gmu.edu/students/> .

Selected Performance Based Assessment (PBA detailed description):

This Performance Based Assessment (PBA) is intended to instill a culture of outreach in coaching to support teachers in schools. Competent and effective reading specialists and literacy coaches should be prepared to investigate and understand the needs of the teachers they serve, as well as to advocate and secure resources and services for teachers and students in their schools. Therefore, the PBA for this course is comprised of three integrated parts:

- (1) Literature review
- (2) Op-ed piece, and
- (3) Grant proposal.

A detailed description of each of these three assignments is provided below with a rubric for evaluating each part. **Please follow all APA guidelines to complete this assignment.** The PBA is not considered to be complete unless all three parts are submitted.

Part I: Literature Review

Literacy specialists need to be knowledgeable of the current research in literacy. Choose a topic in the field of literacy that you think that needs to be developed in your school. Review the current (past 10 – 15 years), relevant (focused on your topic), peer-reviewed research on the topic. Also, review any seminal work and theoretical bases that would ground your topic in the research literature. Write a well-organized synthesis and critique of the research on the topic that captures what has been done and what needs to be done. Your review should conclude with a clear and insightful analysis of how your topic contributes to literacy success as well as how this knowledge can be used to address the needs of all learners.

You must use peer-reviewed (scholarly) research articles. Do not use articles in state/local journals or practitioner-focused journals. Best to search the GMU databases

- Early Childhood Research Quarterly
- Journal of Early Childhood Literacy
- Journal of Literacy Research (formerly Journal of Reading Behavior)
- Language Arts
- Literacy Research & Instruction
- Reading Research Quarterly
- Reading and Writing Quarterly
- Yearbooks of the Literacy Research Association/National Reading Conference
- Yearbooks of the Association of Literacy Educators & Researchers/College Reading Association

Literature Review Rubric & Scoring Guide

IRA Standard/ Element	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Approaching Expectations (2)	Below Expectations (1)
1.1c Demonstrate a critical stance toward the scholarship of the profession.	<i>Provides exemplary evidence of a critical stance toward the scholarship of the profession.</i> The review offers an effective synthesis and critique of the body of literature on the topic.	<i>Provides satisfactory evidence of a critical stance toward the scholarship of the profession.</i> The review provides only a synthesis of research on the topic.	<i>Provides partial evidence of a critical stance toward the scholarship of the profession.</i> The review provides a summary of the research on the topic.	<i>Provides little or no evidence of a critical stance toward the scholarship of the profession.</i> Research is not clearly summarized.
1.1d Read and understand the literature and research about factors that contribute to reading success (e.g., social,	<i>Provides exemplary evidence of reading and understanding the literature and research about factors that</i>	<i>Provides satisfactory evidence of reading and understanding the literature and research about factors that</i>	<i>Provides partial evidence of reading and understanding the literature and research about factors that</i>	<i>Provides little or no evidence of reading and understanding the literature and research about factors that</i>

cognitive, and physical).	<i>contribute to reading success.</i> The review draws original and insightful conclusions about the factors that contribute to literacy success.	<i>contribute to reading success.</i> The review concludes with a synthesis of factors that contribute to literacy success.	<i>contribute to reading success.</i> The review includes a summary of factors that contribute to literacy success.	<i>contribute to reading success.</i> The review does not address how factors contribute to literacy success.
1.2a Interpret and summarize historically shared knowledge (e.g., instructional strategies and theories) that addresses the needs of all readers.	<i>Provides exemplary evidence of interpreting and summarizing historically shared knowledge that addresses the needs of all readers.</i> The review draws original and insightful conclusions about knowledge from the field that can be used to address the needs of all learners.	<i>Provides satisfactory evidence of interpreting and summarizing historically shared knowledge that addresses the needs of all readers.</i> The review provides a synthesis of knowledge from the field that can be used to address the needs of all learners.	<i>Provides partial evidence of interpreting and summarizing historically shared knowledge that addresses the needs of all readers.</i> The review provides a summary of knowledge from the field that can be used to address the needs of all learners.	<i>Provides little or no evidence of interpreting and summarizing historically shared knowledge that addresses the needs of all readers.</i> The review does not provide a view that addresses the needs of all learners.

Part II: Op-Ed Piece

Literacy specialists are well-educated professionals. Accordingly, they are in a position to advocate for the education profession. For this assignment, you are to write an opinion piece or a letter to policy makers based on the information that was developed in the literature review (Part I). The piece should include ideas for organizational change, professional development, or other recommendations to those who are in a position to effect change.

The opinion piece should be about 500 – 750 words and should include the following characteristics: (a) is tightly focused on one issue; (b) the topic is presented clearly in the first paragraph; (c) the information is credible and well researched – based on the literature reviewed; (d) the issue is timely, can be controversial, but is not offensive; (e) the piece has a clear point of view; (f) the piece makes reference to other points of view, where applicable; (g) the piece concludes with a ‘next steps’ or a ‘call to action’ that suggest what can be done.

The letter should be sent to the District Office, the School Board, or a local newspaper or journal. Evidence that the piece has been submitted is required for successful completion of Part II.

Op-Ed Rubric & Scoring Guide

IRA Standard/ Element	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Approaching Expectations (2)	Below Expectations (1)
1.2b Inform educators and	<i>Provides exemplary</i>	<i>Provides satisfactory</i>	<i>Provides partial evidence of</i>	<i>Provides little or no evidence of</i>

<p>others about the historically shared knowledge base in reading and writing and its role in reading education.</p>	<p><i>evidence of informing educators and others about the historically shared knowledge base in reading and writing and its role in reading education.</i></p> <p>Provides accurate and credible (indicates source of facts) information based on research and professional knowledge.</p>	<p><i>evidence of informing educators and others about the historically shared knowledge base in reading and writing and its role in reading education.</i></p> <p>Provides accurate information on the topic based on research and professional knowledge but does not indicate source of facts.</p>	<p><i>informing educators and others about the historically shared knowledge base in reading and writing and its role in reading education.</i></p> <p>Provides information on the topic based on professional knowledge and opinion.</p>	<p><i>informing educators and others about the historically shared knowledge base in reading and writing and its role in reading education.</i></p> <p>Does not provide information on the topic or bases information on opinion only.</p>
<p>1.3b Communicate the importance of fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior in literacy instruction and professional behavior.</p>	<p><i>Provides exemplary evidence of communicating the importance of fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior in literacy instruction and professional behavior.</i></p> <p>The piece provides a strong yet positive message and strongly models fair mindedness and ethical principles.</p>	<p><i>Provides satisfactory evidence of communicating the importance of fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior in literacy instruction and professional behavior.</i></p> <p>The piece provides positive message and models fair mindedness and ethical principles.</p>	<p><i>Provides partial evidence of communicating the importance of fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior in literacy instruction and professional behavior.</i></p> <p>The piece provides a generally positive message but does not model fair mindedness and ethical principles.</p>	<p><i>Provides little or no evidence of communicating the importance of fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior in literacy instruction and professional behavior.</i></p> <p>The piece does not provide a positive message nor does it model ethical principles.</p>
<p>6.4a Demonstrate an understanding of local, state, and national policies that affect reading and writing instruction.</p>	<p><i>Provides exemplary evidence of understanding local, state, and national policies that affect reading and writing instruction.</i></p> <p>Provides an accurate and well-</p>	<p><i>Provides satisfactory evidence of understanding local, state, and national policies that affect reading and writing instruction.</i></p> <p>Provides accurate information about</p>	<p><i>Provides partial evidence of understanding local, state, and national policies that affect reading and writing instruction.</i></p> <p>Provides information about</p>	<p><i>Provides little or no evidence of understanding local, state, and national policies that affect reading and writing instruction.</i></p> <p>Does not address policy issues.</p>

	connected tie between the topic relevant policies that affect literacy instruction.	relevant policies that affect literacy instruction.	relevant policies, but the information is not completely accurate.	
6.4c Promote effective communication and collaboration among stakeholders, including parents and guardians, teachers, administrators, policymakers, and community members.	<i>Provides exemplary evidence of promoting effective communication and collaboration among stakeholders, including parents and guardians, teachers, administrators, policymakers, and community members.</i> The piece provides well-reasoned next steps or call to action that is within the purview of readers to do.	<i>Provides satisfactory evidence of promoting effective communication and collaboration among stakeholders, including parents and guardians, teachers, administrators, policymakers, and community members.</i> The piece provides next steps or call to action that is well-reasoned but not within the purview of most readers.	<i>Provides partial evidence of promoting effective communication and collaboration among stakeholders, including parents and guardians, teachers, administrators, policymakers, and community members.</i> The piece provides next steps or call to action that is not well reasoned.	<i>Provides little or no evidence of promoting effective communication and collaboration among stakeholders, including parents and guardians, teachers, administrators, policymakers, and community members.</i> The piece does not provide next steps or call to action.
6.4d Advocate with various groups (e.g., administrators, school boards, and local, state, and federal policymaking bodies) for needed organizational and instructional changes to promote effective literacy instruction.	<i>Provides exemplary evidence of advocating with various groups for needed organizational and instructional changes to promote effective literacy instruction.</i> The piece provides clear and purposeful direction for members of various groups regarding changes that would promote effective literacy instruction.	<i>Provides satisfactory evidence of advocating with various groups for needed organizational and instructional changes to promote effective literacy instruction.</i> The piece provides clear direction for members of various groups regarding changes that would promote effective literacy instruction.	<i>Provides partial evidence of advocating with various groups for needed organizational and instructional changes to promote effective literacy instruction.</i> The piece indicates that various groups should promote effective literacy instruction but does not provide direction.	<i>Provides little or no evidence of advocating with various groups for needed organizational and instructional changes to promote effective literacy instruction.</i> The piece does not address changes that could be implemented by various groups to promote effective literacy instruction.

Evidence that letter was submitted? Yes/No

Part III. Grant Proposal

Literacy specialists are in a position to procure funding to create, support, or develop literacy programs or instruction within the school. Based on the topic of the literature review conducted in Part I and the opinion piece in Part II, locate a small grant opportunity that addresses your school’s needs and interests. You will write the proposal based upon the instructions for that particular grant and submit the grant within the grantor’s deadline for submission. Your proposal should follow all of the guidelines suggested by the funding agency and include all of the necessary permissions and attachments required to submit the grant application. Therefore, you must submit the grant proposal guidelines with your proposal. Evidence that the piece has been submitted is required for successful completion of Part III.

Grant Proposal Rubric & Scoring Guide

IRA Standard/ Element	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Approaching Expectations (2)	Below Expectations (1)
1.1a Interpret major theories of reading and writing processes and development to understand the needs of all readers in diverse contexts.	<i>Provides exemplary evidence of interpreting major theories of reading and writing processes and development to understand the needs of all readers in diverse contexts.</i> The proposal presents a well-researched and well-defined and well-connected theoretical base to support the work to be funded.	<i>Provides satisfactory evidence of interpreting major theories of reading and writing processes and development to understand the needs of all readers in diverse contexts.</i> The proposal presents a well-defined theoretical base but it is not well connected to the work to be funded.	<i>Provides partial evidence of interpreting major theories of reading and writing processes and development to understand the needs of all readers in diverse contexts.</i> The proposal presents a theoretical base, but it is not well defined.	<i>Provides little or no evidence of interpreting major theories of reading and writing processes and development to understand the needs of all readers in diverse contexts.</i> The proposal does not present a theoretical base for the work to be funded.
2.1a Demonstrate an understanding of the research and literature that undergirds the reading and writing curriculum for all students.	<i>Provides exemplary evidence of understanding the research and literature that undergirds the reading and writing curriculum for all students.</i> The proposal demonstrates complete understanding of	<i>Provides satisfactory evidence of understanding the research and literature that undergirds the reading and writing curriculum for all students.</i> The proposal demonstrates understanding of the research and	<i>Provides partial evidence of understanding the research and literature that undergirds the reading and writing curriculum for all students.</i> The proposal demonstrates some understanding of	<i>Provides little or no evidence of understanding the research and literature that undergirds the reading and writing curriculum for all students.</i> The proposal demonstrates a limited understanding of

	the research and literature that undergirds the reading and writing curriculum for all students.	literature that undergirds the reading and writing curriculum for all students.	the research and literature that undergirds the reading and writing curriculum for all students.	the research and literature that undergirds the reading and writing curriculum for all students.
6.2d Demonstrate effective interpersonal, communication, and leadership skills.	<i>Provides exemplary evidence of effective interpersonal, communication, and leadership skills.</i> The proposal demonstrates a complete understanding of audience and professionalism in communication.	<i>Provides satisfactory evidence of effective interpersonal, communication, and leadership skills.</i> The proposal demonstrates understanding of audience and professionalism in communication.	<i>Provides partial evidence of effective interpersonal, communication, and leadership skills.</i> The proposal demonstrates some understanding of audience and professionalism in communication.	<i>Provides little or no evidence of effective interpersonal, communication, and leadership skills.</i> The proposal demonstrates a weak understanding of audience and professionalism in communication.
6.4b Write or assist in writing proposals that enable schools to obtain additional funding to support literacy efforts.	<i>Provides exemplary evidence of ability to write or assist in writing proposals that enable schools to obtain additional funding to support literacy efforts.</i> The plan for using the funds is well organized and presents a clear picture of how the funds will support literacy efforts in the school as well as who will be involved in executing the plan and how the plan will be evaluated.	<i>Provides satisfactory evidence of ability to write or assist in writing proposals that enable schools to obtain additional funding to support literacy efforts.</i> The plan for using the funds is well organized and presents a clear picture of how the funds will support literacy efforts in the school. EITHER involved personnel OR evaluation of the plan are discussed in detail, but not both.	<i>Provides partial evidence of ability to write or assist in writing proposals that enable schools to obtain additional funding to support literacy efforts.</i> The plan for using the funds is well organized and presents a clear picture of how the funds will support literacy efforts in the school. NEITHER involved personnel NOR evaluation of the plan are discussed in detail, although they each may be briefly mentioned.	<i>Provides little or no evidence of ability to write or assist in writing proposals that enable schools to obtain additional funding to support literacy efforts.</i> The plan for using the funds is not clearly organized.

Writing Rubric (to be used across all papers)

	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Not met (1)
--	---------------	----------------	----------------	-------------

Writer uses a variety of resources to support ideas.	Writer uses multiple, relevant resources that very strongly support ideas and insights; inclusion of references evenly blends into writing.	Writer uses many resources, mostly relevant; supports ideas and insights; inclusion of references blends into writing.	Writer uses some resources; somewhat relevant; loosely supports ideas and insights may be choppy	Writer uses few resources, may not be relevant; weakly supports ideas and insights; may be disjointed from text
Readability	Error free: accurate spelling, grammar, language usage; variety of sentence structures; broad, rich vocabulary. APA consistently followed	Minor errors (1-3) in spelling, grammar, language usage; some variety of sentence structures; appropriate vocabulary. APA mostly followed, may have minor errors.	Several errors in spelling, grammar, language usage; minimal variety of sentence structures; limited vocabulary. APA contains several errors.	Contains numerous errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, or sentence structure. APA not followed.

