

# EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY 711 & CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION 916

## Doctoral Research Program Proseminar

Credits: 3. Meeting time: T R 930-10:45. Meeting place: EDUC SCI 218 (1025 West Johnson St.)

Mitchell J. Nathan, Ph. D.  
Office: Educational Sciences 685 & 1069  
Phone: 263-0563 or 262-0831  
Fax: 262-0843  
E-mail: mnathan@wisc.edu  
Office hours: Wed. 130-230, and by appointment  
Secretary: Kelly Keiner, Ed Sciences Room 863-D,  
Phone: 262-0844, E-mail: kijkeiner@wisc.edu

Amy Ellis, PhD.  
Office: TEB, 476D and Educational Sciences, 693  
Phone: 263-1955  
Fax: 263-9992  
E-mail: aellis1@education.wisc.edu  
Office hours: Tuesday 11 – 12, and by appointment  
Secretary: Chris Kruger, TEB 476  
Phone: 263-5141, E-mail: kruger@education.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 the due dates draw near.

**Project #1: Interviews and Biographical Sketches.** You will be asked to interview at least three university members from your department or field of interest. These could include faculty members, research scientists or post-doctoral researchers, or even senior doctoral students finishing up their dissertation research. After conducting the interviews, write up a brief biographical sketch (maximum 2 pages) of each person. Include a description of the researcher's intellectual history, current work and interests, insights into what led the researcher to his or her current field of work, and the ways in which the researcher's work is related to the design principles of scientifically based research in education (SRE; Shavelson, Towne et al., 2002). Conclude the three biographical sketches with a description of what you learned across all three interviews, and a discussion of how the interviews influenced your own notions of research.

**Project #2: Original Research Project.** Many of the theoretical and practical issues that we have chosen to focus on this semester come together naturally when one designs and conducts original research (options 1 & 2, below), or develops a research proposal (option 3). While the task may sound (and be) daunting, we will break down the elements of this process so the parts can be addressed separately. Still, what matters in the end is how the study comes together in a coherent and self-supporting whole. Thus, we will place a premium on the construction and execution of the study or justification of the proposal, and we will provide each student with ample opportunities for feedback from the instructors and from a carefully chosen peer.

**Project #2** can consist of one of three different options: 1) A small (pilot) empirical study, with a final word limit of about 3500 words, 2) A theoretical or literature-based investigation, also with a final word limit of about 3500 words, or 3) a project description of a grant proposal, with a final word limit of about 8,000 words (15 pages). References are excluded from all word limits.

The Class Schedule provides the specific timeline for the various sub-parts of the final research project. In framing these, we tried, in a concise manner, to be inclusive of the 3 options listed, though we plan to elaborate on these as we approach each of the deadlines. The sub-parts include: (a) Development of a research topic, question, objective and motivation, along with a brief statement of the method or mode of inquiry, [for grant proposals, also include the identification of a funding source]; (b) Description of the theoretical framework / background and literature review that constitute the foundation of the proposed work; (c) Presentation and write-up of inquiry method and/or data collected and evidence used (with substantially more attention on the proposed method and its justification for those choosing option 3); (d) Write-up of the actual [or expected] results of preliminary analysis, as it relates to the research

questions and motivations of the study; and e) Conclusions, educational and scientific importance of your findings, limitations of the study, and ideas for future work [including, for those selecting option 3, an administration plan for how the work will be conducted, and explicit statements of intellectual merit and broader impacts as outlined in <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/1999/iin125/iin125.html> ]. The full final project write-up is due on December 12, and you will then present the entire project at the end of the semester. In addition, you will have a chance to carefully review and provide feedback on one other project from among your class peers during the spring semester.

**Other assignments include:**

- Preparing your curriculum vita (CV)
- Online tutorial on Human Subjects Protection
- Class presentations
- Peer reviews (Spring, 2007)

**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: Biographical Interview	30%
Assignment #2: Original Research	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](mailto: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](mailto: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.
- American Educational Research Association. (2006). Standards for Reporting on Empirical Social Science Research in *AERA Publications*. Adopted by the Council of the American Educational Research Association June 2006
- Anderson, G. L. (2002). Reflecting on Research for Doctoral Students in Education. *Educational Researcher*, 31(7), pp. 22–25
- Berliner, D. C. (2002). Educational Research: The Hardest Science of All. *Educational Researcher*, 31, 18-20.
- \* Darley, J. M. Zanna, M. P. & Roediger, H. L. III (Eds.), *The Compleat Academic: A Career Guide* (2<sup>nd</sup> 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.
- Gibelman, M., & Gelmen, S.R. (2001). Learning from the mistakes of others: A Look at scientific misconduct in research. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 37(2), 241 – 254.
- 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.
- Hostetler, K. (2005). What is ‘good’ educational research? *Educational Researcher*, 34(6), 16-21.
- Kadel, R. (2006). Ethics in ed tech research. *Learning & Leading with Technology*, 33(6), 34-35.
- Klingner, J. K., Scanlon, D., & Pressley, M. (2005). How to Publish in Scholarly Journals. *Educational Researcher*, Nov., 2005. 14-20.
- \* Labaree, David F. (2004). *The Trouble with Ed Schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Metz, M. H. & Page, R. N. (2002). The Uses of Practitioner Research and Status Issues in Educational Research: Reply to Gary Anderson. *Educational Researcher*, 31(7), 26-27.
- 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.
- Perlmutter, D. D. & Porter, L. (2005). Thinking Beyond the Dissertation. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, December 12, 2005. Available at <http://chronicle.com/jobs/2005/12/2005121201c.htm>
- 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.
- Stanovich, K. E. (2004). *How to Think Straight About Psychology*. New York: Allyn & Bacon. Chaps. 2, 3, & 5.
- 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). Must it Be This Way? Ten Rules for Keeping Your Audience Awake. *Educational Researcher*, 33, 13-14.

**CLASS SCHEDULE** (subject to change)

Class	Dates	Readings for Today’s Discussion	Assignments and Classroom Activities
1	9/5 & 9/7	Labaree (2004), Ch. 1-4.	<p>Come prepared to the first class to discuss this reading.</p> <p>Questions for discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the purpose of ed research?</li> <li>• What is the purpose of scientific research?</li> <li>• In your view, what is the relation of education to science?</li> </ul> <p><b>Introduce Asst #1:</b> Interviews and biographical sketches.</p>
2	9/12 & 9/14	Shavelson, Towne et al. (2002) Whole book; US Dept. of Ed. (2003).	<p>Post your Thought Papers to the discussion board (500 word limit). Be prepared to share your ideas in class.</p> <p><b>Introduce Asst #2:</b> Original research project.</p>
3	9/19 & 9/21	<p><b>Set A:</b> Slavin (2002); Olson (2004); Slavin (2004). ----- <b>Set B:</b> Feuer, Towne, and Shavelson (2002a); Pelligrino and Goldman (2002); Erickson &amp; Gutierrez (2002); ----- <b>Common Readings:</b> AERA (2003); Eisenhart, M. &amp; Towne, L. (2003); Popkewitz (2004).  <b>Optional Readings:</b> Berliner (2002); Feuer, Towne, and Shavelson (2002b)</p>	<p>All read the common readings. We will assign each of you to read one of the two sets of commentaries (Set A or B).</p> <p>Post your Thought Papers to the discussion board. (The list looks long but it is a short reading day.)</p>
4	9/26& 9/28	Stanovich Chpts. 2, 3, & 5.	<p><b>Asst #2a Due.</b> Research topic, objective and motivation, and planned method of inquiry (250-500 words).</p> <p>Post your Thought Papers to the discussion board.</p>
5	10/3 & 10/5	<p>Wineburg (2004).  <b>In class presentations</b> (10 min each): Present one of the biographical sketches you developed from the interviews.</p>	<b>Asst #1 Due.</b>
6	10/10 & 10/12	<p>Labaree (2004), Ch. 6; Darley, Ch. 7.</p>	<p>Post your Thought Papers to the discussion board.</p> <p>Take the UW IRB tutorial, and get certified for human subjects research. Available at: <a href="http://info.gradsch.wisc.edu/research/compliance/humansubjects/">info.gradsch.wisc.edu/research/compliance/humansubjects/</a></p>

7	10/17 & 10/19	AERA (2006);  <b>Ethics in educational research.</b> <i>Capital Times</i> Research misconduct article; Kadel (2006); Hostetler (2005).  <b>Optional:</b> Gibelman & Gelmen (2001)	<b>Asst #2b Due.</b> Theoretical framework, literature review (500-1000 words).
8	10/24 & 10/26	Gieryn, T. F. (1999) Introduction and Ch. 2.	Post your Thought Papers to the discussion board.  ( <a href="#">Mitchell may be out of town Thurs. </a> )
9	10/31 & 11/2	<b>In class presentations</b> (10 min each): Present your topic, motivation, method of inquiry and data sources.	<b>Asst #2c Due.</b> Method, data sources and evidence [or expected inquiry method] (500 words).
10	11/7 & 11/9	<b>No class meeting.</b> Work on data analysis.	( <a href="#">Mitchell is out of town Thurs. Amy may be out of town too.</a> )
11	11/14 & 11/16	Eisenhart (2005); Anderson, G. L. (2002); Metz & Page (2002); Labaree (2004), Chapt. 5.	<b>Asst #2d Due.</b> Preliminary findings [or expected results] (500-1000 words).
12	11/21	Perlmutter, D. D. & Porter, L. (2005).  (No class Thurs. Nov. 23)	Post your Thought Papers to the discussion board.
13	11/28 & 11/30	Darley Ch. 10; Klingner, Scanlon, & Pressley (2005).	<b>Asst #2e Due.</b> Conclusions, educational and scientific implications of your findings, limitations and future work [or administration plan, statements of intellectual merit and broader impacts]. (500 words)
14	12/5 & 12/7	Labaree (2004), Chapt. 7 & 8.	Post your Thought Papers to the discussion board.
15	12/12 & 12/14	<b>In class presentations of Final Projects - Part I</b> (10 min each + 5 min Q/A).	<b>Final Project (Asst #2) due at beginning of class December 12, 2006 (3500 words).</b>
<b>Final</b>	<b>12/19</b> 930-12	In class presentations of Final Projects - Part I ( <b>10 min each + 5 min Q/A</b> ).	<b>Final meeting in same classroom</b>