University of Texas at El Paso
TED 5304(CRN 19017)
Scholarly Writing for Educators
Fall 2015 - Moodle
8/31-10/18 (7 weeks)

Dr. Stacey Duncan
Email: slduncan@utep.edu
Phone: 575.323.1861
Online Office Hours by Appt.

Course Description

The purpose of this course is to build and refine scholarly writing through the use of archival research, documented sources, and library databases. Students will work closely with peers and the professor to provide constructive feedback on one another's writing and to produce publication-quality papers. To that end, the course covers issues of conceptualization, argumentation and evidence, and citation and referencing. It also deals with style, audience, organization and mechanics, and relies heavily on peer review and editing.

This is an intensive, fully-online Moodle course that requires a significant investment of time on your part. You need to plan to invest at least 10-12 hours per week on reading, research, writing, and developing related skills. Please plan accordingly.

The course will cover topics related to academic writing, effective peer editing and review, research strategies, documentation, and the writing process. The format of the course will allow for virtual interactions via the discussion boards, where you will have the opportunity to post assignments, and it will allow you to engage in electronic peer review of one another's drafts.

Course Readings

Required:
Galvan, J.L. (2006). *Writing literature reviews: A guide for students of the social and behavioral sciences*. Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing. ISBN: 1884585868 (either edition)

Graff, G. and Birkenstein, C. (2007). *They say/I say: The moves that matter in academic writing*. New York: W.W. Norton. ISBN: 0393924092 or 039393361X (either edition)

Richards, J.C. & Miller, S.K. (2005). *Doing academic writing in education: Connecting the personal and the professional*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. ISBN: 0805848401

Recommended:
American Psychological Association (2009). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th Ed.) Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Student Learning Outcomes

In completing this course, students will:
- Produce a 10-15 page thesis-driven literature review paper on a current and compelling educational topic (self-chosen).
- Construct a solid, well-grounded academic argument (thesis) that is sufficiently supported by evidence from the research literature.
- Develop clear and concise summaries and syntheses of the research literature.
- Be able to use tools for online literature research, including library databases; to evaluate the credibility of sources; and to distinguish between scholarly sources and popular sources.
- Work cooperatively and collaboratively with peers in brainstorming topics, sharing information on sources, clarifying ideas, and providing substantive feedback on assignments and drafts.
- Reflect on their own histories and personal styles as writers in order to become aware of effective strategies for academic writing.
- Correctly employ APA style in the formatting of the paper, as well with in-text citations and references; include at least 18-20 scholarly sources in the paper.
- Demonstrate coherence and cohesion in the organization of their ideas and show an excellent command of language mechanics, including but not limited to sentence structure, word choice, and grammar.
- Show a clear understanding of audience through the use of an academic writing style/tone directed towards researchers and/or professionals in field of education.

Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

	Student Learning Outcome	Activities and Assessments
(1)	Produce a 10-15 page thesis-driven literature review paper on a current and compelling educational topic chosen by the student.	*Assignment 7.1 - Final draft of paper, graded according to the "TED 5304 Scholarly Paper Rubric" (see appendix)
(2)	Construct a solid, well-grounded academic argument that is sufficiently supported by evidence from the research literature.	*Assignments 2.6; 3.4; 4.2; 4.4; 5.2; 5.4; 7.1
(3)	Develop clear and concise summaries and syntheses of the research literature.	*Assignments 1.5; 2.4; 3.4; 4.4; 5.4; 7.1
(4)	Be able to use tools for online literature research, including library databases; to evaluate the credibility of sources; and to distinguish between scholarly sources and popular sources.	*Assignments 2.2; 3.3; 3.4; 4.4; 5.4; 7.1
(5)	Work cooperatively and collaboratively with peers in brainstorming topics, sharing information on sources, clarifying ideas, and providing substantive feedback on assignments and drafts.	*Assignments 1.2; 2.1; 2.5; 3.1; 4.1; 5.3; 6.1
(6)	Reflect on their own histories and personal styles as writers in order to become aware of effective strategies for academic writing.	*Assignments 1.3; 4.3; 7.3
(7)	Correctly employ APA style in the formatting of the paper, as well with in-text citations and references; include at least 18-20 scholarly sources in the paper.	*Assignments 3.3; 3.4; 4.4; 5.4; 7.1
(8)	Demonstrate coherence and cohesion in the organization of their ideas and show an excellent command of language mechanics, including but not limited to sentence structure, word choice, and grammar.	*Assignments 3.4; 4.2; 4.4; 5.2; 5.4; 7.1
(9)	Show a clear understanding of audience through the use of an academic style/tone directed towards researchers and professionals in the field of education.	*Assignments 3.4; 4.4; 5.4; 7.1

Course Requirements

Successful completion of this course will be based on several key elements:
- *Class assignments and quizzes* (35 points) – listed in Schedule and in Moodle
- *Final research paper (including proposal, two drafts and presentation)* (65 points) – details included in Schedule and in Moodle; rubric in Moodle.

Grading Criteria

The course will be assessed based on the following criteria:
A: 90 - 100, **B:** 80 - 89, **C:** 70 - 79, **D:** 60 - 69, **F:** <60

Communication Plan

Online courses offer excellent opportunities for collaboration and peer learning. I highly recommend that you engage in ongoing communication with your peers via your Writing Groups as well as the full-class discussion board, above and beyond the instances where I prompt (or require) you to do so. You are in the position to support one another and help each other through this process, and building a strong writing community with one another is one of the most valuable experiences that can emerge from your participation in this course.

In this course, you will also receive ongoing feedback on your writing as you go through the various stages of research and paper development. In addition to your final draft, there are certain assignments that you can expect to receive feedback on:

- Summary of Jimenez (2004) article (due Week 1)
- Synthesis of 3-5 articles (due Week 2)
- Draft of thesis statement (due Week 3)
- Paper proposal and annotated bibliography (due Week 3)
- Draft of paper (see below)

Feedback on these assignments will generally be returned within one week after the due date.

I will also provide extensive feedback on one draft of your paper. You can decide which draft you would like me to review; it can be an earlier draft or a later revision.

Attendance Policy

Because this course is fully online, lack of participation and communication for any reason may affect your success. If extenuating circumstances make it necessary for you to miss a posting date, or assignment submission, please let the instructor and your Writing Group know ahead of time; excessive lack of participation (missing more than 15% of online class time) may 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 Office of Disabled Student Services located in Union E Room 203.

Students who have been designated as disabled must reactivate their standing with the Office of Disabled Student Services 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 Disabled Student Services. You may call (915) 747-5148 for general information about the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Academic Ethics

Academic Honesty

The following are just a few reminders of things that you should be aware of:
- Any time you use material or **ideas** from any source – including journals/books, colleagues, websites, course materials – you must identify the source.
- Turning in even part of a paper that was used in another course is considered plagiarism, unless you have permission from both instructors.
- If you paraphrase or summarize a source, you must cite it.
- Collaboration means a group of people come together and devise a plan. Copying is taking someone else's words and using them in a way that is very similar or identical to way the originator used them. Copying is cheating.
- I would rather you stumble through and submit your honest work with all its imperfections than to copy the work or ideas of another without properly citing them.

University Statement on Academic Dishonesty (from the UTEP Handbook of Operating Procedures)

Academic dishonesty is prohibited and is considered a violation, according to the UTEP Handbook of Operating Procedures. It includes, but is not limited to cheating, plagiarism, and collusion.

Cheating may involve:
- Copying from or providing information to another student.
- Possessing unauthorized materials during a test.
- Falsifying research data on laboratory reports.

Plagiarism means the appropriation, buying, receiving as a gift, or obtaining by any means another's work and the unacknowledged submission or incorporation of it in one's own academic work offered for credit, or using work in a paper or assignment for which the student had received credit in another course without direct permission of all involved instructors.

Collusion involves:
- Collaborating with another person to complete an assignment without the professor's permission.
- Committing any academically dishonest act.

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.

*** **Syllabus is subject to change***

TED 5304: Evaluation Criteria for Scholarly Paper

Criterion	Acceptable for Submission as Scholarly Paper	Revise and Resubmit (Minor Revision Required)	Revise and Resubmit (Major Revision Required)	Reject
Understanding of Audience	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 indicates an audience that is not scholars or professionals.	The paper does not have a focused audience.
Foundational Knowledge	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.
Organization of Ideas	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.
Research Skill & Development of Argument	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 raw 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 more than the minimum number of sources required; it uses a variety of reliable resources.	The review incorporates at least the minimum number of sources required; it reflects the use of a smaller variety of resources, but most are reliable.	The review incorporates fewer than the minimum number of sources required; it depends too few types of resources, or uses too many unreliable sources.	The review incorporates 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.

Criterion	Acceptable for Submission as Scholarly Paper	Revise and Resubmit (Minor Revision Required)	Revise and Resubmit (Major Revision Required)	Reject
Writing Skill	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 **or** 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.
Citations & References	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.
APA Style	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 Teacher Education scholarly paper requirements.

Week 1	Content	Readings	Assignments
8/31 **-** **9/6**	Introductions Exploring our writing histories What is a literature review? Writing a good summary	Galvan; chpt 1-2 Graff & Birkenstein; intro Jimenez (2004) Richards & Miller; chpt 1	**Monday:** *-Orient yourself to the course in Moodle* *-Read Syllabus & Schedule* **Wednesday:** *-Post a brief introduction to your Writing Group (WG) by midnight.* *-Writing Journal #1: Post autobiographical sketch to WG by midnight. (2pts)* **Thursday:** *Complete Quiz #1 on Week 1 readings & content by midnight. (2pts)* **Sunday:** *1.6 Post summary of Jimenez (2004) article to WG by midnight. (2pts)*
Week 2			
9/7 **-** **9/13**	Introduction to library databases & RefWorks Distinguishing between popular & scholarly texts Evaluating source credibility Generating a topic for your paper Reading & note-taking	Graff & Birkenstein; chpts 1-2 Galvan; chpts 7-8	**Tuesday:** *2.1 Post feedback on the (Jimenez) summaries of 2 WG members under Week 1; please comment on the organization & presentation of their summary rather than the content itself (i.e., what was done well, what could have been better) by midnight. (2pts)* *2.2 Post online search exercise under Assignments (Week 2) (1pt)* **Wednesday:** *2.3 Post brainstorming of possible research topic(s) & question(s) to WG by midnight. (1pt)* **Thursday:** *2.4 Respond to 2 WG members regarding possible research topic(s) & question(s) by midnight. (2pts)* *2.5 Complete Quiz #2 on Week 2 readings & content by midnight. (2pts)*

			Sunday: *2.6 Identify 3 articles on your research topic & post a 1-3 paragraph synthesis of the articles by midnight. (3pts)*
	What is a good synthesis?		

Week 3			
9/14 - 9/20	Developing your thesis statement Constructing an annotated bibliography Writing a paper proposal	Richards & Miller; chpt 3 Galvan; chpts 3-4	**Monday:** *3.1 Read & respond to 2 WG members' syntheses under Week 2. (2pts)* **Tuesday:** *3.2 Post a draft of your revised thesis statement to WG by midnight. (1pt)* **Wednesday:** *3.3 Respond to all WG members' thesis statements by midnight. (1pt)* **Thursday:** *3.4 Complete Quiz #3 on Week 3 readings & content by midnight. (2pts)* **Sunday:** *3.5 **Paper Proposal with Annotated Bibliography** of 6-8 sources due to WG by midnight. (5pts)*

Week 4			
9/21 - 9/27	Pre-writing strategies (freewriting, outline) Organizing an argument Constructing solid introductions Quoting,	Graff & Birkenstein; chpts 3-5 Richards & Miller; chpt 4 Galvan; chpts 5-6, 9	**Monday:** *4.1 Post outline with supporting statements for your argument & evidence from the literature to WG by midnight. (1pt)* **Thursday:** *4.2 Writing Journal #2: Post response to "What kind of writer are you?" (based on Richards & Miller, pp. 15-20) to WG by midnight. (2pts)* **Sunday:** *4.3 Draft #1 due to WG by midnight. (5pts)*

| | summarizing, & paraphrasing

Citations & attributions | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Week 5** | | | |
| **9/28 - 10/4** | Coherence & cohesion

Developing your argument

Improving organization

Review of in-text citations & attributions

Checking for plagiarism | Graff & Birkenstein; chpts 6-7

Richards & Miller; chpt 5

Galvan; chpts 11-12 | **Tuesday:**
5.1 Post sentence cohesion exercise to WG by midnight. (1pt)
5.2 Post a reverse outline to WG by midnight, see link under Assignments for details. (1pt)

Thursday:
5.3 Submit paper draft to turnitin.com by midnight.
5.4 Read & respond to two WG members' drafts (under Week 4) using the "Peer Review" guidelines provided. You should provide in-depth comments & feedback on organization & content, as well as help with editing/mechanics. Peer reviews should be submitted by midnight. (2pts)

Sunday:
5.5 Draft #2 due to WG by midnight. (5pts)

Submit draft to professor via email anytime between Sept 18-Oct 2 for full review |

Week 6			
10/5 - 10/11	Peer review Revising & editing Refining organization of ideas/argument Writing Center	Graff & Birkenstein; chpts 8-10 Richards & Miller; chpt 6 Galvan; chpt 13	**Tuesday:** *6.1 Read & respond to two (2) WG members' drafts (under Week 5) using the "Peer Review" guidelines provided. You should provide in-depth comments & feedback on organization & content, as well as help with editing & mechanics. Due by midnight. (2pts)* **Sunday:** *6.2 Upload revised draft of paper to turnitin.com by midnight.*
Week 7			
10/12	Final draft Final reflection		**Tuesday:** *7.1 Final draft of paper due to WG & instructor by midnight. (50pts)* **Wednesday:** *7.2 Post a short presentation of your paper (5-7 slides or 3-5 minutes); include your research question(s) and an overview/highlights of your findings. See Presentation Options for alternatives. (5pts)* **Thursday:** *7.3 Final reflection due to full-class discussion board by midnight. (5pts)*