

**University of Texas at El Paso**  
**RED 6344: Seminar in Literacy (CRN 26974)**  
**Spring 2015**

**Instructor: Dr. Erika Mein**  
**Email: [elmein2@utep.edu](mailto:elmein2@utep.edu)**  
**Phone: 747-7673**  
**Office: Education 813**  
**Office hours: Tues & Thurs, 1-3:30pm**

**Wednesdays, 5:30-8:20 pm**  
**Location: EDUC 308**

**Course Description:**

Research in the field of literacy studies over the past three decades has increasingly looked at the ways in which literacy shapes and is shaped by social context, complicating our understandings of reading and writing both inside and outside of educational settings. This course explores the interrelationships between reading, literacy, and culture from critical, social, and historical perspectives. The course will draw on theoretical contributions from anthropology, sociology, psychology, and sociolinguistics to interrogate literacy/biliteracy research in a variety of educational settings. Methodological approaches for researching literacy/biliteracy in context will also be covered.

This will be a web-enhanced course, meaning you will have the opportunity to complete both face-to-face activities as well as online activities related to your own literacy research. The technologically-enhanced format also allows for the opportunity to engage in online discussions and peer review of writing via the discussion boards and online writing groups.

**Course Objectives:**

- To trace the history of literacy theory and research over the past 50 years
- To examine the conceptual underpinnings of sociocultural literacy research and practice, with a particular focus on the New Literacy Studies tradition
- To analyze the connections between multilingualism/bilingualism and literacy
- To understand critical approaches to literacy theory, research, and practice
- To be familiar with recent research on digital and multimodal literacies
- To employ critical and social approaches to literacy in framing research problems/questions and analyzing research literature

**Student Learning Outcomes:**

At the completion of this course, students will be able to:

- (1) Clearly articulate the key theoretical propositions behind the New Literacy Studies and social/critical approaches to literacy research;
- (2) Synthesize key concepts and findings in the literacy research literature;
- (3) Engage in and write about a systematic observation of literacy/biliteracy/multimodal practices in a particular context;
- (4) Facilitate a class discussion of key concepts from the literacy studies literature;
- (5) Produce a publication-quality literature review, theoretical paper, or research proposal.

## Course Requirements:

**Synthesis of the Readings (40%)** – In order to help facilitate both your understanding of the readings as well as class discussions about the readings, you will be asked to prepare a 500-750-word synthesis of the week's required readings. You will be required to write 8 short synthesis papers during the semester (out of a possible nine weeks); the primary audience will be your peers as well as the professor. As part of the synthesis you should: (1) analyze the key concept(s) presented by the authors; (2) identify themes that connect across the readings; and (3) include 2-3 critical questions that connect theory and research with policy and/or practice. Syntheses should be formatted in APA style. The synthesis will be due in Blackboard by Wednesday (day of class) at noon; you should also bring a copy (either hard copy or electronic) to class, as we will use them for peer review and discussion. (SLOs #1, 2)

**Class Discussion Facilitation (10%)** – As part of this course, you will also have the opportunity to work with a partner to lead a discussion related to one of the week's assigned texts. The idea is develop activities and discussion questions that facilitate your peers' learning and understanding of key concepts found in that week's readings, as applied in the selected article/chapter. You should send me a plan for your one-hour facilitation on the Sunday (by midnight) before your designated class session. The plan should be sent to [elmein2@utep.edu](mailto:elmein2@utep.edu), and you should copy your collaborators. The plan should include key concepts that will be targeted, 2-3 discussion questions, and at least one activity to facilitate student learning/understanding. (SLOs #1, 2, 4)

**Mini-Oral Presentations - Global Conversations in Literacy (10%)** – During the semester, you will be asked to participate in one live seminar (webinar) in Global Conversations in Literacy, a project sponsored by the Literacy Research Association and funded in part by the National Writing Project. As part of your participation, you should take notes on the seminar; you will then be asked to provide a summary to the class in the form of a 5-7 minute mini-oral presentation. The oral presentation should include the following: (1) key points from the seminar; (2) connections that you made between the seminar content and course readings/concepts; and (3) questions that you have related to the research/theory presented. As part of your oral presentation, you should provide your classmates with a short (1-page) handout that captures these points, and that also includes the title and speaker of the seminar. You will have the chance to select webinar/presentation dates on the first day of class. (SLOs #1, 2, 4)

The webinar choices include the following (seminar descriptions can be found at <https://globalconversationsinliteracy.wordpress.com/>):

Speaker	Seminar Title	Date/Time
Dr. Barbara Comber, Queensland University of Technology, Queensland, Australia	Literacy, Place and Pedagogies of Possibility	Sunday, Feb 1, <b>3:00pm</b> (MST)
Dr. Jackie Marsh, University of Sheffield, UK	Young Children's Online Practices: Past, Present and Future	Sunday, Feb 8, <b>1:00pm</b> (MST)
Dr. Jim Cummins, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada	Reversing Underachievement: The Rocky Road from Literacy Research to Policy and Practice	Sunday, March 22, <b>1:00 pm</b> (MST)

Dr. Raúl Alberto Mora, Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana, Colombia	Revisiting Today's Language Ecologies: New Questions about Language Use and Literacy Practices	Sunday, April 12, <b>5:00pm</b> (MDT)
To join webinar: <a href="https://sas.elluminate.com/m.jnlp?sid=221&amp;password=M.8631F22F3B67CB38E60FEA16E0B04A">https://sas.elluminate.com/m.jnlp?sid=221&amp;password=M.8631F22F3B67CB38E60FEA16E0B04A</a>		

**Research exercise (10%)** – For this assignment, you should plan to spend at least one hour in a site of your choice (community organization, home, public park, classroom) observing the literacy/biliteracy/multimodal practices of children, adolescents, or adults. You should do field notes on what you observe and on the setting/context. You should then “write up” your field notes. The write-up should include a detailed description of what you observed, along with a 300-400 word reflection where you pose questions, identify preliminary patterns you might have seen, and explain how your observations connect – or not – with the theory and research covered in the course. The research exercise is due in Week 6. (SLO #3)

**Course Project and Presentation (30%)** – The final course project will be a literature review paper focused on a literacy/biliteracy topic of your own interest. Your literature review should be based on a research (and researchable) question related to key concepts/theories covered in the course. You should summarize and synthesize at least 18-20 key sources related to your topic. The final paper should be 12-15 pages in length. You will also be asked to give a 5-7 minute oral presentation on your project during the final class session. (SLOs #1, 2, 3, 5)

**Grading:**

- A 90-100 points
- B 80-89 points
- C 70-79 points
- D 60-69 points
- F Below 59 points

**Course Expectations Regarding Participation:**

Participation by all students is crucial in a doctoral-level seminar course. You must come to class prepared to engage in critical dialogue about the readings. This means that you need to have not only completed the readings before class, but also to have engaged critically with the readings by asking questions, drawing connections among the readings (and with other readings both inside and outside of the course), and drawing connections to your own experience and research interests.

The content and structure of this course may lead to discussions that uncover the very different positions and perspectives we each bring with us to the classroom. It is crucial that we all take responsibility for creating a safe environment in which open and respectful dialogue can occur. This course should be a place in which we can discuss our differing beliefs and our questions without concern about being judged or having confidential information shared outside of the group. Being respectful and being open to learning with/from one another are central tenets of this course.

**A Note on Research:**

The purpose of this course is to prepare doctoral-level researchers to explore literacy and biliteracy practices across different contexts, including home, school, and community. Ethnographic inquiry

is central to this endeavor, and students will have the opportunity to practice ethnographic data collection through two assignments in this course: the adolescent literacy observation and the final project. No data collected as part of the adolescent literacy observation should in any way be used for purposes beyond the course assignment; in other words, it should not be used publicly in any way, i.e. for professional presentations or manuscripts. With respect to the final project, it is important to note that students who have not yet obtained approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for their research should not under any conditions present their research in any public outlet, for example, in a conference presentation, research colloquium, or publication.

**Attendance Policy:**

Because this is a web-enhanced course with reduced face-to-face meetings, absences for any reason are discouraged. If extenuating circumstances make it necessary for you to miss a class, arrive late, or leave early, please let the instructor know ahead of time; excessive absences (missing more than 15% of face-to-face class time) could result in your being dropped from the course.

**Disability Policy:**

If you have or believe you have a disability, you may wish to self-identify. You can do so by providing documentation to the Center for Accommodations and Support Services (CASS) located in Union E Room 106. Students who have been designated as disabled must reactivate their standing with CASS on a yearly basis. Failure to report to this office will place a student on the inactive list and nullify benefits received. If you have a condition which may affect your ability to exit safely from the premises in an emergency or which may cause an emergency during class, you are encouraged to discuss this in confidence with the instructor and/or the director of CASS. You may call 747-5148 for general information about the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

**Academic Ethics:**

Academic dishonesty is an assault upon the basic integrity and meaning of a University. Cheating, plagiarism, and collusion in dishonest activities are serious acts which erode the University's educational and research roles and cheapen the learning experience not only for the perpetrators, but also for the entire community. It is expected that UTEP students will understand and subscribe to the ideal of academic integrity and that they will be willing to bear individual responsibility for their work. Materials (written or otherwise) submitted to fulfill academic requirements must represent a student's own efforts.

Any act of academic dishonesty attempted by a UTEP student is unacceptable and will not be tolerated. Violations will be referred to the Dean of Students Office for possible disciplinary action. Students may be suspended or expelled from UTEP for such actions.

**Course Readings:**

*Required book:*

Gee, J. (2011). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideologies in discourses, 4<sup>th</sup> edition*. New York: Routledge. ISBN: 978-0415617765.

Heath, S.B. (1983). *Ways with words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN: 978-0521273190

Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN: 978-0521289610

These books can be purchased in the university bookstore or online via Amazon, Barnes and Noble, or half.com.

*Required articles/book chapters:*

- Campano, G., Ghiso, M.P., & Sánchez, L. (2013). "Nobody knows the...amount of a person": Elementary students critiquing dehumanization through organic critical literacies. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 48(1), 98-125.
- Freire, P. (1970). The adult literacy process as cultural action for freedom. *Harvard Educational Review*, 40(2), 205-225.
- Graff, H.J. & J. Duffy (2008). Literacy myths. In B.V. Street & N.H. Hornberger (eds.). *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 41-52). New York: Springer Science + Business LLC.
- Gutiérrez, K.D., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejada, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 6(4), 286-303.
- Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Skinner, D. and Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hornberger, N.H. (1989). Continua of biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research*, 59(3), 271-296.
- Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. London: Routledge. [select chapter]
- Luke, A. (2012). Critical literacy: Foundational notes. *Theory into Practice*, 51(1), 4-11.
- Luttrell, W. and Parker, C. (2001). High school students' literacy practices and identities, and the figured world of school. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 24(3), 235-247.
- Moje, E. and Luke, A. (2009). Literacy and identity: Examining the metaphors in history and contemporary research. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 44(4), 415-437.
- Moje, E....Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and Discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(1), 38-70.
- Moll, L.C., Sáez, R., & Dworin, J. (2001). Exploring biliteracy: Two student case examples of writing as a social practice. *The Elementary School Journal*, 101(4), 435-449.
- Snow, C.E., Burns, M.S., & Griffin, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Wissman, K., Costello, S., and Hamilton, D. (2011). 'You're like yourself': Multimodal literacies in a reading support class. *Changing English: Studies in Culture and Education*, 19(3), 325-338.

**Course Schedule:**

<b>1/21</b>	<b>Week 1 - Introduction to the course</b>
	Introductions Syllabus and course expectations
<b>WHAT IS LITERACY? HISTORICAL TRAJECTORY AND DEBATES OVER THE LAST HALF CENTURY</b>	
<b>1/28</b>	<b>Week 2 - The literacy crisis and its critics</b>
	Snow et al., <i>Preventing reading difficulties in children</i> (read executive summary & skim rest) [policy document]  Gee, Chapter 3  Graff and Duff, Literacy myths  <b>Due: Post synthesis on Blackboard by 1/28 at noon and bring copy to class</b>
<b>SITUATED APPROACHES TO LITERACY, BILITERACY, AND MULTIMODALITY</b>	
<b>2/4</b>	<b>Week 3 - Understanding literacy in context: <i>Ways with Words</i></b>
	Heath, <i>Ways with words</i> , Ch 1-7  <i>*Global Conversations in Literacy Presentation</i>  <b>Due: Post synthesis on Blackboard by 2/4 at noon and bring copy to class</b>
<b>2/11</b>	<b>Week 4 - Literacies and discourses/Discourses; Literacy events and practices</b>
	Gee, Chapters 1-2, 6 (pp. 5-25, 87-111)  Street, Chapters 1, 4, and 5  <i>*Global Conversations in Literacy Presentation</i>  <b>Due: Post synthesis on Blackboard by 2/11 at noon and bring copy to class</b>
<b>2/18</b>	<b>Week 5 - Critical literacy/ies</b>
	Freire, The adult literacy process as cultural action for freedom  Luke, Critical literacy  Campano et al., "Nobody knows the...amount of a person"***  <i>** Peer facilitation</i>  <b>Due: Post synthesis on Blackboard by 2/18 at noon and bring copy to class</b>
<b>2/25 ONLINE</b>	<b>Week 6 - Multimodal literacies</b>
	Kress, <i>Literacy in the new media age</i> , Ch. 1

	<p>Pahl &amp; Rowsell, Introduction, <i>Travel notes</i></p> <p>Wissman et al, Multimodal literacies</p> <p>Handout on writing up field notes</p> <p><b>Due: Post synthesis on Blackboard by 2/25 at noon</b></p> <p><b>Due: Post literacy/biliteracy observation and reflection on Blackboard by 3/1 at midnight</b></p> <p><b>Due: Post comments on two peers' observations by 3/3 at midnight</b></p>
<b>3/4</b>	<b>Week 7 - Biliteracy in context</b>
	<p>García, Bilingual education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, Ch 2</p> <p>Hornberger, Continua of biliteracy</p> <p>Moll, Sáez, &amp; Dworin, Exploring biliteracy**</p> <p><i>Informal presentations on literacy/biliteracy observations</i></p> <p><i>**Peer-led facilitation</i></p> <p><b>Due: Post synthesis on Blackboard by 3/4 at noon and bring copy to class</b></p>
<b>3/11</b>	<b>Week 8 - SPRING BREAK</b>
	No class
<b>3/18 ONLINE</b>	<b>Week 9 - Developing a literacy research question and mini-proposal</b>
	<p>Heath &amp; Street, <i>On ethnography</i>, pp. 1-26, 48-55</p> <p>*One-on-one conference with Dr. Mein</p> <p><b>Due: Post research proposal and question to online writing group by 3/22 at midnight</b></p> <p><b>Due: Post feedback on two peers' proposals by 3/24 at midnight</b></p>
<b>3/25</b>	<b>Week 10 - Literacies and identities</b>
	<p>Moje &amp; Luke, Literacy and identity</p> <p>Holland et al., Ch 2-3</p> <p>Luttrell &amp; Parker, High school students' literacy practices**</p> <p><i>*Global Conversations in Literacy Presentation</i></p>

	<p><i>**Peer-led facilitation</i></p> <p><b>Due: Post synthesis on Blackboard by 3/25 at noon and bring copy to class</b></p>
<b>4/1 ONLINE</b>	<b>Week 11 – Developing an annotated bibliography</b>
	<p>Handout, Creating annotated bibliographies</p> <p><b>Due: Annotated bibliography of 18-20 sources related to your research topic to your online writing group by 4/5 at midnight</b></p>
<b>4/8</b>	<b>Week 12 – Transnational and transfronterizo literacies</b>
	<p>Warriner &amp; Lam, Transnationalism and literacy</p> <p>de la Piedra &amp; Araujo, Literacies crossing borders**</p> <p><i>**Peer-led facilitation</i></p> <p><b>Due: Post synthesis on Blackboard by 4/8 at noon and bring copy to class</b></p>
<b>4/15 ONLINE</b>	<b>Week 13 – Constructing a literature review</b>
	<p>Jones &amp; Villa, Writing literature reviews</p> <p>Video: <a href="http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/tutorials/litreview/">http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/tutorials/litreview/</a></p> <p><b>Due: Post Draft #1 of your literature review paper to your online writing group by 4/15 at midnight</b></p> <p><b>Due: Post feedback on two peers' drafts by 4/19 at midnight</b></p>
<b>4/22</b>	<b>Week 14 – Literacies and hybridity</b>
	<p>Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, &amp; Tejeda, Third space</p> <p>Moje et al., Working toward third space in content area literacy**</p> <p><i>*Global Conversations in Literacy Presentation</i></p> <p><i>**Peer-led facilitation</i></p> <p><b>Due: Post synthesis on Blackboard by 4/22 at noon and bring copy to class</b></p>
<b>4/29 ONLINE</b>	<b>Week 15 – Developing the literature review</b>
	<p>One-on-one conference with Dr. Mein – bring hard copy of literature review paper</p> <p><b>Due: Post Draft #2 of paper to online writing group by 4/29 at midnight</b></p>

	<b>Due: Post feedback on two peers' drafts to online writing group by 5/3 at midnight</b> <b>-OR-</b> <b>Meet face-to-face with writing group to review drafts and provide feedback; send email notes to Dr. Mein by 5/3 at midnight</b>
<b>5/6</b>	<b>Week 16 - Wrapping up</b>
	Project presentations  <b>Final paper due on Blackboard by 5/13 at midnight</b>

### Rubrics

#### Rubric for Evaluating Syntheses (500-750 words)

Criteria	Possible points	Points earned
<b>Clear, coherent, and well-organized; Uses APA style correctly</b>	<i>1</i>	
<b>Demonstrates an understanding of the readings; provides relevant details and examples in support of ideas</b>	<i>2</i>	
<b>Makes thoughtful connections across the readings</b>	<i>1</i>	
<b>Makes sure to explain why certain points are interesting and makes sure to substantiate claims any made</b>	<i>1</i>	
<b>Total</b>	<i>5</i>	

## Rubric for Evaluating Literature Review

Criterion	Acceptable for Submission as Publication-quality Paper	Revise and Resubmit (Minor Revision Required)	Revise and Resubmit (Major Revision Required)	Reject
<b>Understanding of Audience</b>	The paper is directed toward scholars and/or professionals in the field of education.	The paper is generally directed toward scholars or professionals, but some material or aspects of tone/style are inappropriate for this audience.	The paper has a focused audience, but choice of material, tone, or style indicate an audience that are not scholars or professionals.	The paper does not have a focused audience.
<b>Foundation of Knowledge</b>	Paper demonstrates a professional command of the subject matter.	Paper demonstrates above average command of subject matter.	Paper demonstrates some general understanding of the subject matter.	Paper explains some concepts, but overlooks critical details.
	The scholarly conversation about the topic is analyzed and synthesized; paper shows how ideas are related.	Analysis, synthesis, or relationships among ideas are explored, but not as fully as they could be.	Analysis, synthesis, or relationships among ideas are only superficially explored.	Analysis, synthesis, or relationships among ideas are not provided.
<b>Organization of Ideas</b>	Introduction establishes the topic's importance, identifies the research question or theme, and establishes a thesis.	Introduction is missing one of the elements discussed in the "Acceptable for Publication" column.	Introduction is missing two of the elements discussed in the "Acceptable for Publication" column.	Introduction does not establish importance, identify focus of the paper, or establish a thesis.
	Major sections of body follow a logical sequence; organization within sections is logical and consistent. If section headings are used, they are clear and logically placed.	Major sections of body generally follow a logical sequence; organization within sections is basically logical, but may have some inconsistencies. If section headings are used, they are clear and logically placed.	Body of paper is not structured in a logical sequence, or not all sections or paragraphs follow a logical order. If section headings are used, they are vague and/or illogical.	The logical structure of the body of the paper is unclear or relies only on simple narrative; organization between paragraphs is difficult to determine. If section headings are used, they are vague and/or, illogical.
	Transitions between and within sections are effective.	Transitions are generally, but not always, effective.	Transitions are mostly ineffective.	Transitions are missing or are ineffective.
	Conclusion (or closing section) reiterates the main points, reiterates the thesis, and discusses implications for practice or future research.	Conclusion (or closing section) is missing one of the elements discussed in the "Acceptable for Publication" column.	Conclusion (or closing section) is missing two of the elements discussed in the "Acceptable for Publication" column.	Conclusion (or closing section) does not reiterate main points, reiterate thesis, or discuss implications of the research.

<b>Research Skill &amp; Development of Argument</b>	Literature review provides a professional and comprehensive synthesis of a complex body of information.	Literature review provides fairly strong synthesis of information; a few sources may seem inappropriate or unrelated; some opportunities to connect ideas across sources are not taken.	Literature review provides little or inadequate synthesis of information; sources are largely unrelated or inappropriate; or connections across sources are not made.	Literature review fails to provide adequate synthesis of information; sources are generally inappropriate or merely listed.
	Thesis makes a clear, strong, arguable claim that is clearly articulated, synthesizes research, and draws specific conclusions about the current scholarly conversation related to it.	Thesis makes a claim that could be stronger, more arguable, or more clearly articulated. The claim synthesizes research and draws general conclusions about it, but the body takes a few tangents.	Thesis does not make a strong, arguable, clearly articulated claim that synthesizes the research. Thesis is not fully supported by evidence and/or does not draw specific conclusions.	Thesis is difficult or impossible to identify or understand, is not supported by research, or is inappropriate in scope and direction.
	Evidence supports every claim made in the paper.	Evidence supports most claims made in the paper.	Evidence supports only some claims made in the paper.	Claims are offered without evidence.
	The review incorporates	The review incorporates at	The review incorporates	The review incorporates

	more than the minimum number of sources required; it uses a variety of reliable resources.	least the minimum number of sources required; it reflects the use of a smaller variety of resources, but most are reliable.	fewer than the minimum number of sources required; it depends too few types of resources, or uses too many unreliable sources.	much fewer than the minimum number of sources required, depends on one or two types of resource, or most of the resources used are unreliable.
<b>Writing Skill</b>	Paper demonstrates an excellent command of grammar, spelling, and mechanics and is free of distracting errors.	Paper demonstrates a good command of grammar, spelling, and mechanics and has only a few distracting errors.	Paper demonstrates a fair command of grammar, spelling, and mechanics, but has consistent patterns of error that should be addressed.	Paper has serious and consistent patterns of error in grammar, spelling, and mechanics that must be addressed.
	Writing style is clear and concise; sentence structure is varied; tone is consistent and appropriately professional/scholarly.	Writing style is generally clear and concise, but could benefit from further revision. Sentence structure could be more varied. Tone is generally consistent and professional/scholarly.	Writing style is generally understandable but wordy <b>or</b> under-explained. Sentence structure is noticeably repetitive. Tone is uneven or too conversational.	Writing style is very hard to understand in most of the text. Tone is uneven, inappropriate, excessively conversational, or unprofessional.
	Word use is appropriate and accurate.	Word use is generally appropriate and accurate. May have a few misused words.	There are frequent, noticeable errors or inappropriate uses of words.	There are frequent, noticeable errors or inappropriate uses of words.
	Paper has been thoroughly proofread and contains no errors.	Paper has only minor proofreading errors.	Paper has major proofreading errors.	Paper has major proofreading errors.
<b>Citations &amp; References</b>	Reference list and in-text citations follow APA format.	Reference list and in-text citations follow APA format, but there are a few minor errors.	Reference list and in-text citations follow APA format, but there are many minor errors or a few serious errors.	Reference list and in-text citations do not follow APA format.
	Reference list provides bibliographic information for every source mentioned in the paper. All listed sources are cited within the text, and all cited sources are listed in the reference list.	Reference list provides bibliographic information for almost every source mentioned in the paper. One source may be missing from either the reference list or the in-text citations.	Reference list is missing bibliographic information for some sources mentioned in the paper. More than one source may be missing from either the reference list or the in-text citations.	Reference list is missing bibliographic information for many sources mentioned in the paper. Sources not cited in the paper are present in the reference list, or sources cited in the paper are not listed in the reference list .
	In-text citations clearly and accurately identify every author whose ideas are referred to, discussed, summarized, paraphrased, or quoted.	In-text citations identify every author whose ideas are referred to, discussed, summarized, paraphrased, or quoted. One or two citations are vague or inaccurate.	In-text citations are present, but many are unclear, misplaced, or missing.	In-text citations are generally inconsistent, unclear, misplaced, or missing.
<b>APA Style</b>	Title page and any section headings follow APA format.	Title page and any section headings follow APA format, but have some errors.	Title page and any section headings do not follow APA format, or have many obvious errors.	Title page is missing or lacks key elements of APA style. Any section headings used do not follow APA format.
	An abstract of 100-150 words summarizes the purpose, major claims, and findings of the paper.	The abstract is slightly shorter or longer than recommended. Abstract may not mention one of the three elements discussed in the "Acceptable for Submission" column.	The abstract is much shorter or longer than recommended. Abstract may not mention two of the three elements discussed in the "Acceptable for Submission" column.	The abstract is missing or does not mention the three elements discussed in the "Acceptable for Submission" column.

Sources: APUS, <http://edweb.sdsu.edu/Courses/Ed690DR/grading/literaturereviewrubrique.html>, UTEP TED 5304

**\*\*Syllabus subject to change\*\***