

EDUC 610
Reading and Writing Theory and Research
Fall 2004

Dr. Janet L. Powell
University Hall 418
760/750-4319
jpowell@csusm.edu

Office Hours:
Tuesday 4:30-5:30
Thursday 12:00-1:00
and by appointment

Mission Statement

The mission of the College of Education Community is to collaboratively transform public education by preparing thoughtful educators and advancing professional practices. We are committed to diversity, educational equity, and social justice, exemplified through reflective teaching, life-long learning, innovative research, and ongoing service. Our practices demonstrate a commitment to student centered education, diversity, collaboration, professionalism, and shared governance.

(Adopted by COE Governance Community October, 1997)

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Standards. *This course has been aligned with the Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Reading Certificate and Reading Specialist Credential (1998) as approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. These standards have been integrated thematically throughout the courses offered by the Literacy Program in the College of Education. Particularly, this course addresses the following standards: intervention strategies at early and intermediate levels (research-based intervention models); areas of study related to reading and language arts: certificate level; application of research-based and theoretical foundations; leadership skills and professional development; research methodology; areas of study related to reading and language arts: specialist level; analysis and application of research; and advanced professional perspective.*

Course Description. This course focuses on the in-depth and critical examination of (1) reading and writing processes and their interrelationships; (2) linguistic, cognitive, developmental and socio-cultural aspects of literacy; (3) current reading and writing research; and (4) the implications of current research for classroom practice, curriculum development and assessment.

Course Objectives:

- To gain a broad theoretical understanding of reading and writing development according to multiple perspectives.
- To examine research on reading and writing processes.
- To become familiar with and critically analyze research methodologies applied to research in reading and writing.
- To examine the implications of theories and research on reading and writing for classroom practice, curriculum development and assessment.
- To develop experience in writing a professional paper.

Required Texts and Readings:

American Psychological Association. (2000). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.). Washington, DC.

Powell, J. (2003). *EDUC 610: Reading and Writing Theory and Research...* Available at Copyserve.

* CopyServe is located in San Marcos at 745 Rancho Santa Fe Rd. (the corner of San Marcos and Rancho Santa Fe; look for the shopping center that contains Savon and City Bank, CopyServe faces San Marcos Blvd, open until 6:00) Tel. (760) 599-9923

Course Assignments:

Attendance and Participation: (50 points)

Ten points will be deducted for each 24 hour period in which assignments are late. Students are expected to arrive on time and participate in each session. Important: You cannot receive an “A” if you miss more than two classes. You cannot receive a “B” if you miss more than three classes.

Leading a Reader Response Discussion (100 points)

In pairs, present short overviews (15-20 minutes) of the readings for arranged class sessions and then lead a *critical* discussion (50-60 minutes) on those readings. *The discussion must include small and whole group activities, the use of handouts and overheads, and the reaction papers.*

Overview	10
Critical Discussion/Activity	60
Use of Reaction Papers	10
Overheads or Powerpoint and handouts	10
Closing/Summary	10

Reaction Papers (10 points each)

Reaction papers are due the same day as the readings. Prepare a typed, full (double spaced) page with a **bulleted** list of your opinions under the headings “positive” and “negative” for each of the assigned readings. Remember that these are *not summaries*. These papers are to be used during the class discussion so *they will not be accepted late*.

Final Paper (100 points) and Presentation (50 points)

Based on your classroom/school experiences, course readings and puzzling questions, select a question you would like to further investigate. Write a thesis proposal (six to eight pages) including:

- (1) A *brief introduction* of why you think this topic is relevant and how your study will contribute to the educational field (2 to 4 paragraphs).
- (2) Write a *literature review* – or a review of studies on what we know about this topic. Use subheadings and include at least 10 referred journal articles.
- (3) Include a reference page.

Prepare a 15 minute presentation on your paper. Include a handout with your question, a summary of what you learned in the literature review, and your reference page. Your question and subheadings for the literature review must be approved by the instructor. Your paper must be in APA format. When you turn in your final paper, you must include a paper with the signatures of two classmates who have responded to and edited your work on a first draft.

APA Formatting

Cover page	p. 10, 306
Levels of headings	p. 113, 307-8
Page numbers & headers	p. 12, 288
Writing numbers	p. 122
Citations in text	p. 207-214
Reference page	p. 215-281, 313
Block quotes	p. 121, 117-1
Multiple author citations	p. 208
Capitalization of words in titles	p. 95

EDUC 610: Tentative Schedule - Fall 2004

Date	Topic	Readings and Assignments
8-31	Course Overview Literacy Theory	
9-7	The Politics of Literacy: Opposing Viewpoints	Stanovich, K. E. (1999). Romance and reality (and responses). In California Reading Initiative's <i>Read All About It.</i> , Sacramento: California State Board of Education, pgs. 61-77 Taylor, D. (1998). <i>Beginning to Read and the Spin Doctors of Science.</i> Urbana, IL : National Council of Teachers of English, Prologue – Chapter 2
9-14	The Politics of Literacy: One Study's Influence	Foorman, B.R., Fletcher, J.M., Francis, D. J., Schatschneider, & Metha, P. (1999). The role of instruction in learning to read: Preventing reading failure in at-risk children. In California Reading Initiative's <i>Read All About It.</i> , Sacramento: California State Board of Education, pgs. 207-227.
9-21	The Politics of Literacy: One Study's Influence	Taylor, Chapters 14-16 Research question due
9-28	State Policies	McGill-Franzen, A. (2000). Policy and instruction. In Kamil, M., Mosenthal, P. B., Pearson P. D. and Barr, R. (Eds.) <i>Handbook of Reading Research.</i> New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers, pgs. 889-908.
10-5	State Policies	Valencia & Wixson (2000). Policy-oriented research. In Kamil, M., Mosenthal, P. B., Pearson P. D. and Barr, R. (Eds.) <i>Handbook of Reading Research.</i> New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers. pgs. 909-935.
10-12	State Policies	Au (2000). A multicultural perspective on policies for improving literacy achievement. In Kamil, M., Mosenthal, P. B., Pearson P. D., and Barr, R. (Eds.) <i>Handbook of Reading Research.</i> New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers, pgs. 835-851 List of references for paper due
10-19	Research on Home Literacy Experiences	Compton-Lilly, C. (2000). Staying on children: Challenging stereotypes about urban parents. <i>Language Arts</i> , 77, (5). National Council of Teachers of English, pgs. 421-427. Heath, S. B. (1983). <i>Ways with words.</i> Cambridge University Press. (prologue & chap.8).

10-26	Research on Literacy and Culture	McMillon, G.T., & Edwards, P.A. (2000). Why does Joshua “hate” school ... but love Sunday school? <i>Language Arts</i> , 78 (2), pgs. 111-120. Moje, E. B. (2000). .”To be part of the story”: The literacy practices of gansta adolescents. <i>Teachers College Record</i> , 102. Teachers College: Columbia University, 651-690.
11-2	Research on Literacy and Culture	Smith, F. (1988). <i>Joining the Literacy Club</i> . Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1-16. Flores, B., Cousin, P. T., Diaz, E. Transforming deficit myths about learning, language, and culture. <i>Language Arts</i> , 68. National Council of Teachers of English.
11-9	Research on Literacy Assessment	Torgesen, J. (1999). Catch them before they fall. In California Reading Initiative’s, <i>Read all about it!</i> Sacramento: California State Board of Education, pgs. 251-261. Taylor, D. (1993). Assessing the complexity of students’ learning: A student advocacy model of instructional assessment. <i>From the child’s point of view</i> . Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, pgs. 176-233. Draft of paper due
11/16	Research on Literacy Development and Diverse Students	Finders, M. (1997). When you’re in junior high, everything’s different. <i>Just girls: Hidden literacies and life in junior high</i> , Teacher College Press, pgs. 6-30. Lee, C. (2001). Is October Brown Chinese? A cultural modeling activity system for underachieving students. <i>American Educational Research Journal</i> , 38 (1), pgs. 97-141. Noll, E. (1998). Experiencing literacy in and out of school: Case studies of two American Indian Youths. <i>Journal of Literacy Research</i> , 30 (2), pgs. 205-232.
11-23	NO CLASS	
11-30	Presentations	
12-7	Presentations	Final Paper Due