

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY 711 & CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION 916

Doctoral Research Program Proseminar

Credits: 3 hours. Meeting time: Wed., 9:30am-12. Meeting place: EDUC SCI 308

John Rudolph, Ph. D.
Office: 226A Teacher Education Bldg.
Phone: 265-3431
Fax: 263-9992
E-mail: jlrudolp@wisc.edu
Office hours: by appointment
Secretary: Bee Powers, 210 Teacher Education Bldg.
Phone: 263-4601, E-mail: powers@education.wisc.edu

Mitchell J. Nathan, Ph. D.
Office: Ed Sciences 1069
Phone: 262-0831, or 263-0563
Fax: 262-0843
E-mail: mnathan@wisc.edu
Office hours: Wed. 130-3, and by appointment
Secretary: Kelly Keiner, Ed Sciences Room 863-D,
Phone: 262-0844, E-mail: kjkeiner@wisc.edu

COURSE OVERVIEW

In the proseminar we will explore both the theoretical and pragmatic aspects of what it means to conduct educational research in the current historical climate. The course is organized as a doctoral-level seminar emphasizing group discussion and a collective approach to critical analysis of a set of weekly readings and class presentations. The approximate pace of the class is presented in the Class Schedule, below.

EXPECTATIONS, ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING CRITERIA

Students enrolled in this course for credit are expected to complete all of the required readings and assignments and to attend and participate in each class. Absences should be accompanied by a notification from the student, preferably by e-mail to both instructors prior to class. **Late assignments must be discussed with one or both instructors before they are due.**

Class Meeting Cancellation Notices

Occasionally, severe weather, illness, or other circumstances may require cancellation of a class meeting. If this is so, we will send out an email to the class email list. It will be the responsibility of each class member to ensure that they check the email that they used for their course registration for such a message.

Required Reading Materials for the Course

All readings required for the course are listed in the Readings section at the end of this document. Dates for completing reading assignments are listed in the Class Schedule and are subject to change. Books may be purchased for your convenience through the University Bookstore, as listed under this course number and section, or through some other vendor.

Additional required readings (articles and selected book chapters) are also listed at the end of this document. For your convenience, these readings may be obtained through your individual My UW account (go to <http://my.wisc.edu/>). Assistance with this can be obtained at the Center for Instructional Materials and Computing (CIMC), in the Teacher Education Building, 225 North Mills Street, 608-263-4750.

Thought Papers

Thought papers are assigned frequently (see attached Class Schedule) and limited in scope. A thought paper should be a maximum of 500 words. They provide an opportunity for each individual member of the class to delve into a particular aspect of a topic, to make broader connections, raise questions, or to develop critical views of the theories or approaches. Preparation of these papers before the class meeting can add greatly to each person's class experience, and to the developing community knowledge base and classroom culture. We encourage you to follow your own personal interests when writing these, and use them as a forum to develop your own ideas. These may be valuable starting points for classroom discussion and future projects.

Thought Papers are to be **posted by 12 noon Monday prior to the class day for which they are due**. You must use the Learn@UW online discussion board for this course, accessible at this link: <https://uwmad.courses.wisconsin.edu/>. By receiving these a few days before class, it is possible for the instructors and class discussion leaders (students, like yourself) to survey the thinking of the class and to prepare to address points that are raised.

Thought Papers are not graded for their content quality, but **handing them in each time is a requirement of the course**. Even a few missed Thought Papers will have a measurable impact on your final grade. You should also keep a copy for your records, to consult your ideas, and as a means of verification in the event we do not have a record of receiving a thought paper.

Class Participation

All students should come prepared to participate in class discussions, including posing questions and providing critical analyses of the week's readings or presentations, or to publicly reflect on their own efforts as they work through their assignments. While we can expect a healthy debate on some issues, we will demand that speakers demonstrate respect for others with whom they may disagree. We also ask that people monitor their own level of class contribution and allow for space for others to contribute to the class discourse. We will actively monitor this as well and may ask for those who tend to speak often to hang back and allow others to contribute.

Serving as Class Discussant

Each member of the class will have an opportunity to serve as the class discussant. The class discussant will take on a leadership role for that week and help to frame the week's activities. This may take several forms, including seeding discussion questions or statements from the readings, or introducing a guest speaker and preparing questions for the invited presentation. The specifics are presented in the Class Schedule. A sign-up sheet schedule will be passed around during the first class.

Assignments

There will be two major projects and a few more modest assignments throughout the semester. We describe these in broad terms here, and will elaborate on each of them as their due dates draw near.

Major Project #1: Departmental Mapping Project. You will be asked to work in groups to visually map the theoretical terrain covered by the faculty of your home department in the School of Education. By reading some of the published works of the various faculty, through discussions with your departmental peers and faculty, and through other means you deem appropriate, you will trace the various research programs and schools of thought that the faculty draw upon. Your departmentally affiliated group will present this in class (See Class Schedule). Details of this will be presented as the dates draw nearer.

Major Project #2: Writing a Grant Proposal. Many of the theoretical and practical issues that we have chosen to focus on this semester come together naturally when one produces a full-scale grant proposal that seeks external funding for one's own research activities. While the task may sound (and be) daunting, we will break down the elements of this process so that the parts can be addressed separately. Still, what matters in the end is how a grant proposal comes together in a coherent and self-supporting whole. Thus, we will place a premium on the construction of the proposal, and provide each student with ample opportunities for feedback from the instructors and from a carefully chosen peer. The Class Schedule provides the specific timeline for the various sub-parts of the final grant-writing project. These include (though are not limited to): Reading the guidelines for grant submission to funding agencies, collecting references, preparing a theoretical framework for the proposed work, specifying the research questions, laying out the proposed research methods, and preparing a budget. In addition, you will have a chance to carefully review and provide feedback on one other project from among your class peers. The penultimate draft is due at the end of the fall term as part of your final grade (see Class Schedule). Reviews will be prepared over the winter break. Presentations of the proposed research will take place during the spring, when students will also be required to hand in their revised grant proposal assignment.

Other assignments include:

- Preparing your curriculum vita (CV)
- Online tutorial on Human Subjects Protection
- Peer review of a grant proposal

Late assignments. Written assignments are due at the beginning of class time. Late assignments that have not been excused by one of the instructors prior to the due date will be lowered by one half of one letter grade (approximately 5 points) for each day it is late. However, no assignment will receive an F if it is turned in before the final day of classes.

Grading Criteria

Course grades will be based on student performance in the following areas:

Assignment #1: Dept mapping	30%
Assignment #2 (Grant proposal)	30%
Discussant role	10%
Class Participation	<u>30%</u>
Total	100%

POLICIES AND RESOURCES

Disability Reasonable Accommodation

If you qualify for accommodations because of a disability, please submit a letter to an instructor that outlines your request in a manner that is timely and consistent with established university policies for making such request so that your needs may be addressed.

Policies for accommodating disabilities are available through the McBurney Disability Resource Center, 903 University Ave., 608-263-2741 (phone), 263-6393 (TTY), 265-2998 (Fax), mcburney@uwmadmail.services.wisc.edu. For additional information, please see <http://www.mcburney.wisc.edu/>

Religious Reasonable Accommodation

Every effort shall be made to reasonably and fairly deal with all students who, because of religious obligations, have conflicts with scheduled exams, assignments, or required attendance, provided advance notification of the conflict is given. Whenever possible, students should give at least two weeks advance notice to request special accommodation.

Student Honesty and Rules of Conduct

Academic honesty requires that the course work (drafts, reports, examinations, papers) a student presents to an instructor honestly and accurately indicates the student's own academic efforts. These policies are available at <http://www.studentaffairs.wisc.edu/>

UWS 14 is the chapter of the University of Wisconsin System Administrative code that regulates academic misconduct. UW-Madison implements the rules defined in UWS 14 through our own "Student Academic Misconduct Campus Procedures." UWS 14.03 defines academic misconduct as follows:

"Academic misconduct is an act in which a student:

- (a) seeks to claim credit for the work or efforts of another without authorization or citation;
- (b) uses unauthorized materials or fabricated data in any academic exercise;
- (c) forges or falsifies academic documents or records;
- (d) intentionally impedes or damages the academic work of others;
- (e) engages in conduct aimed at making false representation of a student's academic performance;
- (f) assists other students in any of these acts."

If you are accused of misconduct, you may have questions and concerns about the process. If so, you should feel free to call Student Advocacy & Judicial Affairs (SAJA) in the Offices of the Dean of Students at 263-5700 or send an e-mail to dos@bascom.wisc.edu.

READINGS (* Books for the course)

- American Educational Research Association. (2003). Resolution on the Essential Elements of Scientifically Based Research. Adopted January 26, 2003.
- Bem, D. J. (2004). Chapter 10—Writing the Empirical Journal Article. In J. M. Darley, M. P. Zanna, & H. L. Roediger III (Eds.), *The Compleat Academic: A Career Guide* (2nd ed.) (pp. 185-219). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Berliner, D. C. (2002). Educational Research: The Hardest Science of All. *Educational Researcher*, 31, 18-20.
- Campbell, D. T. (2005). Ethnocentrism of Disciplines and the Fish-Scale Model of Omniscience. In S. J. Derry, C. D. Schunn & M. A. Gernsbacher (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary Collaboration: An Emerging Cognitive Science* (pp. 3-21). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- * Darley, J. M. Zanna, M. P. & Roediger, H. L. III (Eds.), *The Compleat Academic: A Career Guide* (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Eisenhart, M., & DeHaan, R. L. (2005). Doctoral Preparation of Scientifically Based Education Researchers. *Educational Researcher*, 34, 3-13.
- Eisenhart, M., & Towne, L. (2003). Contestation and Change in National Policy on SBR. *Educational Researcher*, 32, 31-38.
- Erickson, F., & Gutierrez, K. (2002). Culture, Rigor, and Science in Educational Research. *Educational Researcher*, 31, 21-24.
- Feuer, M. J., Towne, L., & Shavelson, R. J. (2002a). Scientific Culture and Educational Research. *Educational Researcher*, 31, 4-14.
- Feuer, M. J., Towne, L., & Shavelson, R. J. (2002b). Reply. *Educational Researcher*, 31, 28-29.
- Gieryn, T. F. (1999). Introduction. In *Cultural Boundaries of Science: Credibility on the Line* (pp. 1-35). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gieryn, T. F. (1999). Chapter 2: The U. S. Congress Demarcates Natural Science and Social Science (Twice). In *Cultural Boundaries of Science: Credibility on the Line* (pp. 65-114). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hollingsworth, J. R., & Hollingsworth, E. J. (2002). Major Discoveries in Biomedical Research Organizations: Perspectives on Interdisciplinarity, Nurturing Leadership, and Integrated Structure and Cultures. Paper presented at the Building Research Success Symposium, Toronto, Canada. Available at: <http://www.usask.ca/research/hollingsworth.shtml>
- * Labaree, David F. (2004). *The Trouble with Ed Schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Laudan, L. (1996). The Demise of the Demarcation Problem. In *Beyond Positivism and Relativism* (pp. 210-222). Boulder: Westview Press.
- Natriello, G. (2000). For the Record: Preparing reviews. *Teachers College Record*, 102.
- Natriello, G. (1996). For the Record: On the Role and Importance of Reviewers. *Teachers College Record*, 98.
- Olson, D. R. (2004). The Triumph of Hope Over Experience in the Search for “What Works”: A Response to Slavin, *Educational Researcher*, 33, 24-26.
- Pelligrino, J. W., & Goldman, S. R. (2002). Be Careful What You Wish For—You May Get It: Educational Research in the Spotlight. *Educational Researcher*, 31, 15-17.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (2004). Is the National Research Council Committee’s Report on SBR Scientific? On Trusting the Manifesto. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10, 62-78.
- Slavin, R. E. (2002). Evidence-Based Education Policies: Transforming Educational Practice and Research. *Educational Researcher*, 31, 15-21.
- Slavin, R. E. (2004). Education Research Can and Must Address “What Works” Questions. *Educational Researcher*, 33, 27-28.
- * Shavelson, R. J., Towne, L., & the Committee on Scientific Principles for Education Research. (Eds.). (2002). *Scientific Research in Education*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Steinberg, J. (2004). Chapter 8—Obtaining a Research Grant: The Granting Agency’s View. In J. M. Darley, M. P. Zanna, & H. L. Roediger III (Eds.), *The Compleat Academic: A Career Guide* (2nd ed.) (pp. 153-168). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2004). Chapter 9—Obtaining a Research Grant: The Applicant’s View. In J. M. Darley, M. P. Zanna, & H. L. Roediger III (Eds.), *The Compleat Academic: A Career Guide* (2nd ed.) (pp. 169-184). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- U. S. Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences. (2003). *Identifying and Implementing Educational Practices Supported by Rigorous Evidence: A User Friendly Guide*.
- Wineburg (2004). Ten Rules for Keeping Your Audience Awake. *Educational Researcher*, 33, 13-14.
- Zacks, J. M., & Roediger III, H. L. (2004). Chapter 7—Setting Up Your Lab and Beginning a Program of Research. In J. M. Darley, M. P. Zanna, & H. L. Roediger III (Eds.), *The Compleat Academic: A Career Guide* (2nd ed.) (pp. 135-152). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

CLASS SCHEDULE (subject to change)

Class	Dates	Readings for Today’s Discussion	Assignments and Classroom Activities
1	9/7	Labaree (2004), Ch. 1-4.	Come prepared to the first class to discuss this reading. Questions for discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the purpose of ed research? • What is the purpose of scientific research? • In your view, what is the relation of education to science?
2	9/14	Shavelson, Towne et al. (2002) Whole book; US Dept. of Ed. (2003).	Post your Thought Papers to the discussion board (500 word limit). Be prepared to share your ideas in class.
3	9/21	SET A: Slavin (2002); Olson (2004); Slavin (2004). ----- SET B: Feuer, Towne, and Shavelson (2002a); Pelligrino and Goldman (2002); Berliner (2002); Erickson & Gutierrez (2002); Feuer, Towne, and Shavelson (2002b) ----- COMMON READINGS: AERA (2003); Eisenhart, M. & Towne, L. (2003); Popkewitz (2004).	All read the common readings. We will assign each of you to read one of the two sets of commentaries (Set A or B). Post your Thought Papers to the discussion board. (The list looks long but is a short reading day.) Introduce Major Project #1: Departmental Mapping Project.
4	9/28	Laudan, L. (1996); Gieryn, T. F. (1999) Introduction and Ch. 2.	Post your Thought Papers to the discussion board. Time to check in on departmental mapping project. Please come prepared to summarize progress and discuss any challenges.
5	10/5	Labaree (2004), Ch. 6. Zacks & Roediger (2004; also DZR, Ch. 7).	Guest speakers on establishing a program of research. Discussant interviews speakers and reviews their CVs ahead to prepare for class introductions.
6	10/12	Wineburg (2004).	Groups present their departmental maps. Give a formal presentation (20 min plus 5-10 min discussion). Consider bringing handouts and using Powerpoint.
7	10/19	Steinberg (2004; also DZR Ch. 8); Sternberg (2004; also DZR Ch. 9); Read one (1) of the grant proposal guidelines for NSF; US Dept. of Ed & Spencer (URLs will be given out in class)	Read the DZR chapters and one of the guidelines for applying for research funds. Post Thought Paper; discussant prepares introductory comments. Introduce Major Project #2: Writing a grant proposal Give out URLs for <i>CHE</i> articles on CV preparation
8	10/26	<i>CHE</i> articles by the CV Doctor: chronicle.com/jobs/2005/07/2005072901c.htm chronicle.com/jobs/99/09/99091701c.htm chronicle.com/jobs/2000/10/2000102001c.htm chronicle.com/jobs/2002/10/2002101101c.htm chronicle.com/jobs/2003/09/2003092601c.htm Read the posted grants by Mitch and John.	Turn in a CV and bring 5 copies for group feedback. Turn in 1-page abstract of the research grant proposal (Part 1). Discussion in CVs,

9	11/2	Take the UW IRB tutorial, and get certified for human subjects research. Available at: info.gradsch.wisc.edu/research/compliance/humansubjects/	Guest speaker on writing, getting, running a first grant. Discussant interviews speaker and reviews the CV & papers ahead to prepare for class introduction.
10	11/9	Natriello (2000); Natriello (1996); Read one of the following (A) Manuscript by Nathan with reviews; (B) Manuscript by Rudolph with reviews.	Hand in a preliminary reference list (Part 2; min of 25 references in the accepted style of your discipline: APA, Chicago, etc.) Post impressions of the nature of reviewing to discussion board.
11	11/16	(No reading)	(No class. Work on Frameworks)
12	11/23	(No reading)	Turn in motivation and theoretical frame of the grant proposal (Part 3). Post REVISED abstracts and reference sections to discussion board. Discussant seeds class discussion based on abstracts. Peer reviewers should download abstracts and references for preparing feedback for next week.
13	11/30	Publishing scholarly articles: Bem (2004; also DZR Ch. 10); Read example manuscripts with reviews furnished by John and Mitch.	As reviewer, you are to prepare comments for your assigned proposal abstracts. Turn in comments to instructors and proposal authors. Rich Halverson Post your thoughts about being a reviewer. Discussant seed class conversation.
14	12/7	Campbell (2005); Hollingsworth & Hollingsworth (2002).	Turn in research questions and methods of conducting research of the grant proposal (Part 4). Discuss interdisciplinary research in education.
15	12/14	Eisenhart (2005); Labaree (2004), Ch. 5.	Turn in budget and budget justification (Part 5). Discuss graduate education.
Final		Final projects due Dec. 20th 2005	Turn in finished product by 5pm. Dec. 20.