George Mason University
College of Education and Human Development
Literacy and Reading

EDRD 829-001 Advanced Foundations of Literacy Education

3 credits
Spring 2020
Mondays, 4:30 – 7:10
Thompson Hall 1010, Fairfax Campus

PROFESSOR: Dr. Bill Brozo
Office: 1406 Thompson
Hours: by appointment
Phone: 703-993-3894
Email: wbrozo@gmu.edu
Mailing Address: MSN 4B3, Graduate School of Education, George Mason University
                 Fairfax, VA 22030

PREREQUISITE(S)

EDUC 800, EDRS 810, or permission of instructor.

UNIVERSITY CATALOG COURSE DESCRIPTION

Advanced Foundations of Literacy Education explores advanced foundational theory, research, and methodology across the broad field of literacy both nationally and internationally. Includes analysis of historical and current trends, research, practice, and policy in literacy. Individual projects will connect literacy to students' areas of interest. Appropriate for PhD in Education students in any specialization. Offered by Graduate School of Education. May not be repeated for credit.

COURSE OVERVIEW

Not Applicable

COURSE DELIVERY METHOD

This course will be taught from an inquiry-oriented perspective. Lecture, class discussion, and role plays will be employed to understand and critique literacy theory, research, policy, and practice. Students will also have the opportunity to develop and explore their own questions about literacy that are meaningful to them, given their work to this point in the doctoral program.

LEARNER OUTCOMES AND OBJECTIVES

This course is designed to enable students to do the following:
1. Read, critique, and synthesize theoretical and research literature
2. Engage in critical class discussion on required course readings
3. Craft a proposal to present at an international or national conference
4. Write a term paper based on course options and student's own interests and give a short presentation on what was learned.

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS
Not Applicable

REQUIRED TEXTS

The syllabus lists required readings, most of which may be accessed through GMU Library electronic databases. All other required readings will be supplied by the professor.

Kamil, M., Pearson, P.D., Moje, E.B., & Afflerbach, P. (2011) *Handbook of reading research, Volume IV*. New York: Routledge.
Available online:
https://epdf.pub/handbook-of-reading-research-volume-iv.html

COURSE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Students are expected to submit all assignments on time in the manner outlined by the instructor.

Important Note: Regardless of the assignment you choose, your paper must be original for this course. If relevant, you may draw on ideas from previous work, but only 10% of a paper completed for another course may comprise the overall content of the paper you write for EDRD 829.

Assignments and/or Examinations

I. Term Paper – 60% of overall grade
Each student will choose to write one paper from a set of required options focusing on some aspect of literacy (See options below). Each option will be explained in class and each student will be given individual support in the

development of the paper. The choice for individual projects should be based on what has already been accomplished in previous graduate coursework as well as goals that have been set in the doctoral portfolio. The specific nature of each project will be determined through consultation with the professor. Papers should be 15 – 25 pages in length, not including a reference section, and include a title, and logical subheadings. Citations and references should conform to APA style. All students will present a brief oral summary of what they learned and accomplished through the paper during the final class sessions.

A. Conduct a literature review documenting the historical development of an area of literacy related to your field of interest (e.g., content literacy in mathematics, family literacy, adult literacy, multicultural literacy). Research the earliest recommendations and applications of literacy strategies and practices for this aspect of literacy and track the literature in this area to the present day. Bring the discussion into the current context by explaining and analyzing prevailing approaches and their historical antecedents.

B. What theories have been proposed to explain and impel approaches to literacy related to your field of interest? Describe and analyze one or more of these theories for their explanatory value as well as how they might serve as catalysts for research.

C. Pose a question related to an aspect of literacy in which you are interested (e.g., Why has it been difficult to infuse literacy into the math curriculum? What are the best ways to promote family literacy?) Answer the question by providing an historical perspective on the topic. Analyze how the topic was studied in the past and compare this to how it is studied today.

D. What foundational knowledge in literacy informs or could inform instructional approaches in the field of interest to you. Describe and analyze this critical foundational knowledge and demonstrate existing or potential connections to research supportable practices in your area.

II. Article Discussion Leadership – 20% of overall grade
Each student will be responsible for interpreting and engaging her/his peers in discussion around one of the required readings. (See assignment details in syllabus)

III. Conference Proposal – 10% of overall grade
Write a proposal to give either a paper or do a roundtable or poster session at a national or international conference. The focus of the conference should be literacy or related to your field of interest. The proposed paper must include a literacy component. Submit the proposal according to the conference guidelines. You are not required to attend the conference if the proposal is accepted; however, you are strongly encouraged to do so.

IV. Class Participation – 10% of overall grade
Students are expected to participate actively in each class by preparing for each class. Preparation entails completing all required readings and response heuristics (See below for details.). If an absence is necessary, please discuss it with the professor.

For each course reading, respond to the following prompts. Although you are not required to submit your responses in writing, you are required to bring your responses to class in order to participate actively in discussion.

- **Author's Most Significant Points**
   What are the author's points you found to be most significant?
- **Questions and Criticisms**
   What doubts, challenges, and lingering questions do you have as a result of reading the text?
- **Text-to-Self Connections**
   How does the reading contribute to knowledge building for your own professionalism?

GRADING

Assignment	Due Dates	Point Value
Term Paper & Presentation	**2/24 – form and topic** **4/6 -- 1st complete draft** **5/4 - final draft** **5/4 - presentations**	**60**
Article Discussion Leadership	**As assigned by the professor**	**20**
Conference Proposal & Submission	**Rolling dates depending on conference submission deadlines**	**10**
Class Participation	**Each class session**	**10**
	TOTAL	**100 pts**

Final grades are calculated as a percent of total points earned:

A   = 93% - 100%   93 -100 pts
A- = 90% - 92%   90 – 92 pts
B+ = 87% -   89%   87 – 89 pts

B = 80% - 86%   80 – 86 pts
C = 79% and lower   79 – fewer pts

*Written assignments will be submitted electronically. Redrafted assignments must include tracked changes.

PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS
See https://cehd.gmu.edu/students/polices-procedures/

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

Session	Topic	Assignments Due
1. **1/27**	**Course Introduction & Requirements**	Bring copy of syllabus to class
2. **2/3**	**Foundations of Literacy: A Primer** **Historical Perspectives**	Barry (2008) Walczyk et al. (2014) Moore, Readence, & Rickelman, (1983) Kamil (2012)
3. **2/10**	**Cognitive/Process Perspectives**	Roberts, Christo & Shefelbine (2011)
4. **2/17**	**Cognitive/Process Perspectives**	Nagy & Hiebert (2011)
5. **2/24**	**Cognitive/Process Perspectives**	Rasinsky et al. (2011)
6. **3/2**	**Cognitive/Process Perspectives**	Duke & Carlisle (2011)
7. **3/9**	**SPRING BREAK**	
8. **3/16**	**Socio-Cultural Perspectives**	Van Enk, Dagenais, & Toohey (2005) Rueda (2011)
9. **3/23**	**New Literacies Perspectives**	Street (2003) Kirkland & Hull (2011)
10. **3/30**	**New Literacies Perspectives**	Alvermann (2011) Leu et al (2015)
11. **4/6**	**Linguistic & Cultural Diversity Perspectives**	Verhoeven (2011) Calderon, Slavin, & Sanchez

		(2011)
12. 4/13	**Linguistic & Cultural Diversity Perspectives**	Janzen (2008) Bunch (2013) Gutierrez & Lee (2009)
13. 4/20	**Political Perspectives**	Moats (2007) Allington (2007) Pearson (2004)
14. 4/27	**Individual Conferences**	
15. 5/4	**Presentation of Term Projects**	Term Project due
16. 5/11	**TBA**	

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 STUDNETS

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 https://ds.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 https://its.gmu.edu/knowledge-base/blackboard-instructional-technology-support-for-students/.

- For information on student support resources on campus, see https://ctfe.gmu.edu/teaching/student-support-resources-on-campus

Notice of mandatory reporting of sexual assault, interpersonal violence, and stalking:

As a faculty member, I am designated as a "Responsible Employee," and must report all disclosures of sexual assault, interpersonal violence, and stalking to Mason's Title IX Coordinator per University Policy 1202. If you wish to speak with someone confidentially, please contact one of Mason's confidential resources, such as Student Support and Advocacy Center (SSAC) at 703-380-1434 or Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) at 703-993-2380. You may also seek assistance from Mason's Title IX Coordinator by calling 703-993-8730, or emailing titleix@gmu.edu.

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

ARTICLE DISCUSSION LEADERSHIP

Assignment

The purpose of this assignment is to provide you the opportunity to read, analyze, and lead your peers in discussion over a research article from the course readings.

Completion Procedures

1. Identify one article over which to lead discussion. The article should be taken from the ADL course readings and must not be one already assigned. There will be no overlap.

2. Read, analyze, and format its presentation around the following aspects of the article:

   - purpose
   - main points
   - type of research and methodology, if relevant
   - conclusions
   - implications for research and practice
   - personal responses and reactions

3. Discussants should also devise ways of engaging the class in critical conversation and reflection on the article. Demonstrations, simulations, role-plays, and debates are recommended.

4. PowerPoint slides, overheads, and/or handouts should accompany the article presentations and discussions.

6. Article discussion leaders should plan 30 minutes for their article discussions.

Evaluation

Article discussants will be evaluated based on (a) how well they planned and coordinated the presentation and discussion of the article; (b) how succinctly and understandably key information from the article was presented; and (c) the extent to which the discussants used engaging techniques for bringing all students into critical conversation about the article.

REQUIRED COURSE READINGS

Allington, R. (2007). *Whole-language high jinks: How to tell when "scientifically-based reading instruction" isn't* (Review). East Lansing, MI: Great Lakes Center for Education Research and Practice.

Alvermann, D.E. (2011). Popular culture and literacy practices. In M. Kamil, P.D. Pearson, E. Moje, & P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, volume IV* (pp. 541-560). New York: Routledge.
https://epdf.pub/handbook-of-reading-research-volume-iv.html

Barry, A. (2008). Reading the past: Historical antecedents to contemporary reading methods and materials. *Reading Horizons*, *49*(1), 31-52.

Bunch, G.C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge: Preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education*, *37*(1), 298–341.

Calderon, M., Slavin, R., & Sanchez, M. (2011). Effective instruction for English learners. *The Future of Children*, *21*(1), 103-127.

Duke, N.K., & Carlisle, J. (2011). The development of comprehension. In M. Kamil, P.D. Pearson, E. Moje, & P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, volume IV* (pp. 199-228). New York: Routledge.
https://epdf.pub/handbook-of-reading-research-volume-iv.html

Gutiérrez, K., & Lee, C.D. (2009). Robust informal learning environments for youth from nondominant groups: Implications for literacy learning in formal schooling. In L. Mandell Morrow, R. Rueda, & D. Lapp (Eds.), *Handbook of research on literacy and diversity* (pp. 216-232). New York: Guilford.
https://epdf.pub/handbook-of-research-on-literacy-and-diversity.html

Janzen, J. (2008). Teaching English language learners in the content areas. *Review of Educational Research*, *78*(4), 1010–1038.

Kamil, M. (2012). Current and historical perspectives on reading research and instruction. In K. R. Harris, S. Graham, and T. Urdan (Eds.), *APA educational psychology handbook: Vol. 3. Application to learning and teaching* (pp. 161–188)*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kirkland, D.E., & Hull, G.A. (2011). Literacy out of school: A review of research on programs and practices. In M. Kamil, P.D. Pearson, E. Moje, & P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, volume IV* (pp. 711-725). New York: Routledge. https://epdf.pub/handbook-of-reading-research-volume-iv.html

Leu, D. J., Forzani, E., Rhoads, C., Maykel, C., Kennedy, C., & Timbrell, N. (2015). The new literacies of online reading and comprehension: Rethinking the reading achievement gap. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *50*(1), 37-59.

Moats, L. (2007). *Whole-language high jinks: How to tell when "scientifically-based reading instruction" isn't*. Washington, DC: Thomas Fordham Institute.

Moore, D.W., Readence, J.E., & Rickelman, R.J. (1983). An historical exploration of content area reading instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *18*(4), 419-438.

Nagy, W.E., & Hiebert, E.H. (2011). Toward a theory of word selection. In M. Kamil, P.D. Pearson, E. Moje, & P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, volume IV* (pp. 388-404). New York: Routledge. https://epdf.pub/handbook-of-reading-research-volume-iv.html

Pearson P. D. (2004). The reading wars. *Educational Policy, 18*(1), 216-252.

Rasinski, T.V., Reutzel, D.R., Chard, D., & Linan-Thompson, S. (2011). Reading

fluency. In M. Kamil, P.D. Pearson, E. Moje, & P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook*

of reading research, volume IV (pp. 286-319). New York: Routledge.
https://epdf.pub/handbook-of-reading-research-volume-iv.html

Roberts, T.A., Christo, C., & Shefelbine, J.A. (2011). Word recognition. In M. Kamil,

P.D. Pearson, E. Moje, & P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research,*

volume IV (pp. 229-258). New York: Routledge.
https://epdf.pub/handbook-of-reading-research-volume-iv.html

Rueda, R. (2011). Cultural perspectives in reading: Theory and research. In M. Kamil,

P.D. Pearson, E. Moje, & P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research,*

volume IV (pp. 84-104). New York: Routledge.
https://epdf.pub/handbook-of-reading-research-volume-iv.html

Street, B. (2003). What's "new" in New Literacy Studies? Critical approaches to literacy

in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, *52*(2), 77-91.

van Enk, A., Dagenais, D., & Toohey, K. (2005). A Socio-cultural perspective on

school-based literacy research: Some emerging considerations. *Language and*

Education, *19*(6), 496-515.

Verhoeven, L. (2011). Second language reading acquisition. In M. Kamil, P.D. Pearson,

E. Moje, & P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, volume IV* (pp.

661-683). New York: Routledge.
https://epdf.pub/handbook-of-reading-research-volume-iv.html

Walczyk, J.J., Tcholakian, T., Igou, F., & Dixon, A.P. (2014). One hundred years of

reading research: Successes and missteps of Edmund Burke Huey and other

pioneers. *Reading Psychology*, *35*(7) 601-621.

ADL Readings

Adelantado-Renau, M., et al. (2019). Association between screen media use and

academic performance among children and adolescents: A systematic review and

meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatrics*, *173*(11). 1058-1067.

Brozo, W.G., Sulkunen, S., Shiel, G., Garbe, C., Pandian, A., & Valtin, R. (2014).

Reading, gender, and engagement: Lessons from five PISA countries. *Journal of

Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *57*(7), 584-593.

Craig, H. K., Zhang, L., Hensel, S. L., & Quinn, E. J. (2009). African American English-

speaking students: An examination of the relationship between dialect shifting

and reading outcomes. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *52*,

839-855.

Dole, J.A., Duffy, G.G., Roehler, L.R., Pearson, P.D. (1991). Moving from the old to the

new: Research on reading comprehension instruction. *Review of Educational

Research*, *61*(2), 239-264.

Goodman, K. (1967). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. *Journal of the

Reading Specialist*, *6*(4), 126–135.

International Literacy Association. (2018). *A case for children's rights to read*. Newark,

DE: ILA.

https://www.literacyworldwide.org/docs/default-source/resource-documents/the-

case-for-childrens-rights-to-read.pdf

International Literacy Association. (2019). *Meeting the challenges of early literacy

phonics instruction*. Newark, DE: ILA.

https://www.literacyworldwide.org/docs/default-source/where-we-stand/ila-meeting-challenges-early-literacy-phonics-instruction.pdf

Kintsch, W., & Mangalath, P. (2011). The construction of meaning. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, *3*(2), 346–370.

Learning Points Associates. (2004). *A closer look at the five essential components of effective reading instruction: A review of scientifically based reading research for teachers*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates. Author.
https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED512569.pdf

Leu, D.J., Kinzer, C.K., Coiro, J., Castek, J., & Henry, L.A. (2013). New literacies: A dual-level theory of the changing nature of literacy, instruction, and assessment. In D. E. Alvermann, N. J. Unrau, & R.B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (6th ed) (pp. 1150-1181). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

McVee, M.B., Dunsmore, K., & Gavelek, J.R. (2005). Schema theory revisited. *Review of Educational Research*, *75*(4), 531-566.

Palincsar, A.M. (1998). Social constructivist perspectives on teaching and learning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *49*(1), 345-375.

Pearson, P.D., & Hiebert, E.H. (2010). National reports in literacy: Building a scientific base for practice and policy. *Educational Researcher*, *39*(4), 286-294.

Peterson, P.E., Woessmann, L., Hanushek, E.A., & Lastra-Anadón, C.X. (2011). *Globally challenged: Are U. S. students ready to compete?* Boston, MA: Harvard's Program on Education Policy and Governance & Education Next

Shanahan, T., & Lonigan, C.J. (2010). The National Early Literacy Panel: A summary of

the process and the report. *Educational Researcher*, *39*(4), 279-285.

Shannon, P. (1983). The use of commercial reading materials in American elementary

schools. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *19*(1), 68-85.

Shannon, P. (2007). *Reading against democracy: The broken promises of reading*

instruction. Portsmouth, NH: Heineman.

Spiro, R. (1980). *Schema theory and reading comprehension: New directions*.

Champaign, IL: Center for the Study of Reading.

Van Sluys, K., Lewison, M., & Seely Flint, A. (2006). Researching critical literacy:

A critical study of analysis of classroom discourse. *Journal of Literacy Research*,

38(2), 197–233.

Venesky, R. (1987). A history of American reading textbooks. *The Elementary School*

Journal, *87*(3), 246-265.

Vogt, M.E., & Shearer, B.A. (2011). *Reading specialists and literacy coaches: Honoring*

the past, shaping the future. New York: Pearson.

Walsh, M. (2010). Multimodal literacy: What does it mean for classroom practice? *The*

Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, *33*(3), 211–239.