

IL 2219: Disciplinary Literacy  
Syllabus (Spring 2019)  
University of Pittsburgh School of Education

---

---

**Instructor:** Emily Rainey, PhD  
**Office:** 5111 Posvar Hall  
**Email:** erainey@pitt.edu

---

---

### Course Description

This course will provide you with an introduction to build foundational knowledge on disciplinary literacy. As a class, we will examine empirical research, reports, and curricular materials to investigate the following questions:

- What are some of the ongoing scholarly conversations in education related to adolescent literacy and disciplinary literacy?
- How can a focus on disciplinary literacy be a lever for change in varied educational contexts?
- How can practitioners design and facilitate disciplinary literacy learning opportunities for young people?

By the end of this class, you will:

- Understand the importance of disciplinary literacy in K-12 school settings
- Know fundamental theories, concepts, and approaches to address critical issues in disciplinary literacy
- Analyze and create disciplinary literacy learning opportunities for K-12 learners
- Discuss the problem of disciplinary literacy with new perspectives and knowledge

### Course Readings

The course readings are organized into three sets.

1. The first module focuses on the theories and concepts underlying disciplinary literacy teaching and learning.
2. The second module focuses on various disciplinary discourse communities and their literacies.
3. The third module focuses on applying conceptions of disciplinary literacy in your professional work.

All articles and chapters will be available online. There is no required textbook for this course. However, I recommend that you purchase the following book for reference in this course and throughout your program:

- Graff, G., & Birkenstein, C. (2014). *“They say/I say”*: The moves that matter in academic writing (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: W. W. Norton.

### **List of Required Readings**

- Houseal, A., Gillis, V., Helmsing, M., & Hutchison, L. (2016). Disciplinary literacy through the lens of the Next Generation Science Standards. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 59(4), 377-384.
- Lee, C. D., & Spratley, A. (2010). Reading in the disciplines and the challenges of adolescent literacy. New York: Carnegie.
- Moje, E. B. (2010, Mar. 6). Disciplinary literacy: Why it matters and what we should do about it. Scholarly talk given at the National Reading Initiative Conference, New Orleans, LA. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Id4gKJ-wGzU&t=47s>
- Moje, E.B. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(2), 96-107.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (2013). *The college, career, and civic life (C3) framework for social studies state standards: Guidance for enhancing the rigor of K-12 civics, economics, geography, and history*. Silver Spring, MD: Author.
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core State Standards*. Washington, DC: Author.
- NGSS Lead States. (2013). *Next Generation Science Standards: For states, by states*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Rainey, E. C., Maher, B. L., Coupland, D., Franchi, R., & Moje, E. B. (2018). But what does it look like? Illustrations of disciplinary literacy teaching in two content areas. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 61(4), 371-379.
- Rainey, E., & Moje, E. B. (2012). Extending the conversation: Building insider knowledge: Teaching students to read, write, and think within ELA and across the disciplines. *English Education*, 45(1), 71-90.
- Rainey, E. C. & Storm, S. (2017). Teaching digital literary literacies in secondary English language arts. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 61(2), 203-207.
- Shanahan, C., & Shanahan, C. (2014). Does disciplinary literacy have a place in elementary school? *The Reading Teacher*, 67(8), 636-639.
- Shanahan, C., Shanahan, T., & Mischia, C. (2011). Analysis of expert readers in three disciplines: History, mathematics, and chemistry. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 43(4), 393-429.
- Wineburg, S., & Reisman, A. (2015). Disciplinary literacy in history: A toolkit for digital citizenship. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 58(8), 636-639.

Wolsey, T. D., & Lapp, D. (2017). *Literacy in the disciplines: A teacher's guide for grades 5-12*. Chapters 1 and 9. New York, NY: Guilford.

Wright, T. S., & Gotwals, A. W. (2017). Supporting kindergartners' science talk in the context of an integrated science and disciplinary literacy curriculum. *The Elementary School Journal*, 117(3), 513-537.

### **List of Additional Readings**

#### ***Cross-disciplinary frameworks and navigation:***

Castek, J., & Manderino, M. (2017). A planning framework for integrating digital literacies for disciplinary learning. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 60(6), 697-700.

Dean, T. R. (2016). What is a high school literacy specialist? *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 59(6), 652.

Håland, A. (2017). Disciplinary literacy in elementary school: How a struggling student positions herself as a writer. *The Reading Teacher*, 70(4), 457-468.

Lee, C. D. (2014). The multi-dimensional demands of reading in the disciplines. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 58(1), 9-15.

Moje, E. B. (2015). Doing and teaching disciplinary literacy with adolescent learners: A social and cultural enterprise. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 254-278.

#### ***Math:***

Bass, H. (2006). What is the role of oral and written language in knowledge generation in mathematics? Invited talk, Ann Arbor, MI.

Borasi, R., Siegel, M., Fonzi, J., & Smith, C. F. (1998). Using transactional reading strategies to support sense-making and discussion in mathematics classrooms: An exploratory study. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 29(3), 275-305.

Hillman, A. M. (2013). A literature review on disciplinary literacy: How do secondary teachers apprentice students into mathematical literacy? *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 57(5), 397-406.

Wimmer, J. J., Siebert, D., & Draper, R. (2017). Digital mathematics literacies. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 60(5), 577-580.

#### ***Literature:***

Lee, C. D. (2006). 'Every good-bye ain't gone': Analyzing the cultural underpinnings of classroom talk. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(3), 305-327.

- Lee, C. D., & Goldman, S. R. (2015). Assessing literary reasoning: Text and task complexities. *Theory into Practice, 54*(3), 213-227.
- Levine, S. (2014). Making interpretation visible with an affect-based strategy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 49*(3), 283-303.
- Reynolds, T., & Rush, L. S. (2017). Experts and novices reading literature: An analysis of disciplinary literacy in English language arts. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 56*(3), 199-216.
- Rainey, E. C. (2017). Disciplinary literacy in English language arts: Exploring the social and problem-based nature of literary reading and reasoning. *Reading Research Quarterly, 52*(1), 53-71.
- Smagorinsky, P. (2015). Disciplinary literacy in English/language arts. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 59*(2), 141-146.

***Natural sciences:***

- Brandt, C. B. (2008). Scientific discourse in the academy: A case study of an American Indian undergraduate. *Science Education, 92*(5), 825-847.
- Bricker, L. A., & Bell, P. (2011). Argumentation and reasoning in life and school: Implications for the design of school science learning environments. In M.S. Khine (Ed.), *Perspectives on Science Argumentation*. Springer.
- Brown, B. A. (2004). Discursive identity: Assimilation into the culture of science and its implications for minority students. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41*(8), 810-834.
- Brown, B. A., & Spang, E. (2008). Double talk: Synthesizing everyday and science language in the classroom. *Science Education, 92*(4), 708-732.
- Castek, J., & Beach, R. (2013). Using apps to support disciplinary literacy and science learning. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 56*(7), 554-564.
- Cervetti, G. N., Barber, J., Dorph, R., Pearson, P. D., & Goldschmidt, P. (2012). The impact of an integrated approach to science and literacy in elementary school classrooms. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49*(5), 631-658.
- Cervetti, G., & Pearson, P. D. (2012). Reading, writing, and thinking like a scientist. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 55*(7), 580-586.
- Fang, Z., & Wei, Y. (2010). Improving middle school students' science literacy through reading infusion. *The Journal of Educational Research, 103*(4), 262-273.
- Goss, M., Castek, J., & Manderino, M. (2016). Disciplinary and digital literacies: Three synergies. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 60*(3), 335-340.

Greenleaf, C. L., Litman, C., Hanson, T., Rosen, R., Boscardin, C. K., Herman, J., Schneider, S. A., Madden, S., & Jones, B. (2011). Integrating literacy and science in biology: Teaching and learning impacts of Reading Apprenticeship professional development. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(3), 647-717.

Hand, B., Hohenshell, L., & Prain, V. (2004). Exploring students' responses to conceptual questions when engaged with planned writing experiences: A study with Year 10 science students. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 41(2), 186-210.

Kohnen, A. M. (2013). Informational writing in high school science: The importance of genre, apprenticeship, and publication. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 57(3), 233-242.

Lesley, M. (2014). "Spacecraft reveals recent geological activity on the moon": Exploring the features of NASA Twitter posts and their potential to engage adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 57(5), 377-385.

Wilson-Lopez, A., & Minichiello, A. (2017). Disciplinary literacy in engineering. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 61(1), 7-14.

Yore, L., Bisanz, G. L., & Hand, B. M. (2003). Examining the literacy component of science literacy: 25 years of language arts and science research. *International Journal of Science Education*, 25(6), 689-725.

Yore, L. D., Hand, B. M., & Florence, M. K. (2004). Scientists' views of science, models of writing, and science writing practices. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 41(4), 338-369.

Yore, L. D., Hand, B. M., & Prain, V. (2002). Scientists as writers. *Science Education*, 86(5), 673-692.

### ***Social sciences:***

Bain, R. B. (2005). "They thought the world was flat?": Applying the principles of *How People Learn* in teaching high school history. In J. Bransford & S. Donovan (Eds.), *How students learn: History, mathematics, and science in the classroom*. Washington, The National Academies Press.

Bain, R. B. (2006). Rounding up unusual suspects: Facing the authority hidden in the history classroom. *Teachers College Record*, 108(10), 2080-2114.

Britt, J., & Ming, K. (2017). Applying disciplinary literacy in elementary geography. *The Geography Teacher*, 14(2), 68-76.

Gritter, K., Beers, S., & Knaus, R. W. (2013). Teacher scaffolding of academic language in an advanced placement US History class. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56(5), 409-418.

Monte-Sano, C. (2010). Disciplinary literacy in history: An exploration of the historical nature of adolescents' writing. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 19(4), 539-568.

Nokes, J. D. (2011). Recognizing and addressing the barriers to adolescents' "reading Like historians." *The History Teacher*, 44(3), 379-404.

Shreiner, T. L. (2014). Using historical knowledge to reason about contemporary political issues: An expert-novice study. *Cognition and Instruction*, 32(4), 313-352.

Wineburg, S. S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and the academy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28(3), 495-519.

### Course Assignments

Assignments	Point Value
Weekly online discussion	90
Midterm project	50
Graphic organizer for focal discipline	30
Constructive comments on classmate's project draft	20
Final project	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>290</b>

### Course Policies

#### Preparedness and Professionalism

You are expected to read all assigned readings and participate in discussions or activities for which the readings serve as a springboard. You will be expected to integrate aspects of readings into your assignments.

Remember, this is a professional course as well as an academic course. As part of course participation you should be demonstrating that you are learning and applying professional standards generally expected of educators in matters of timeliness and professional courtesy. Professionalism includes assuming the best intention of others and articulating critical feedback in a way that is constructive and kind.

#### Grading

Grades will be assigned on the basis of both process and product. The grading scale is:

A+ = 100 points	A = 94-99 points	A- = 90-93 points
B+ = 88-89 points	B = 84-87 points	B- = 80-83 points
C+ = 78-79 points	C = 74-77 points	C- = 70-73 points
Below 70 = failure		

## **Late Assignment Policy**

The nature and pace of this course requires that you do not fall behind in assignments. If an extension is needed for an assignment, this must be arranged before the due date and will be granted for only the most extenuating of circumstances. Otherwise, late work will not be accepted.

## **Revising Assignments**

You may revise and resubmit your midterm analysis project once. Resubmissions must be submitted **within 1 week** of receiving the graded assignment. When submitting a revised assignment, you should digitally highlight your revisions in the document.

## **Academic Integrity**

Academic integrity is a key component of professionalism. All students are expected to adhere to standards of academic honesty. Any student engaged in cheating, plagiarism, or other acts of academic dishonesty will be subject to disciplinary action. Any student suspected of violating this obligation for any reason during the semester will be required to participate in the procedural process, initiated at the instructor level, as outlined in the University Guidelines on Academic Integrity at <http://provost.pitt.edu/faculty-resources/academic-integrity-freedom/academic-integrity-guidelines>.

## **Grievance Policy**

The purpose of grievance procedures is to ensure the rights and responsibilities of faculty and students in their relationships with each other. The rights and responsibilities of faculty and students are described in the University's Academic Integrity Guidelines at: <http://www.bc.pitt.edu/policies/policy/02/02-03-02.html>

## **Diversity and Inclusion Statement**

I welcome students of all ages, backgrounds, beliefs, ethnicities, genders, gender identities, gender expressions, national origins, religious affiliations, sexual orientations, ability, and other visible and nonvisible differences. All members of this class are expected to contribute to a respectful, welcoming, and inclusive environment for every other member of the class.

## **Accommodations**

### **For Disability**

If you require special accommodations or classroom modifications, then please notify both me and Disability Resources and Services by the end of the first week of the term. The office of Disability Resources and Services is located in 140 William Pitt Union (412-648-7890 [voice or TDD]), and their website is at: <http://www.drs.pitt.edu>. If you have a physical, learning, or emotional disability, please let me know as early as you can so that I can accommodate you.

## For Religious Observances

If a due date conflicts with your religious holidays, please notify me of which dates will pose a conflict no later than the second week of class so we can make alternative arrangements.

## For Other Special Circumstances

If there are extenuating circumstances that impact your success, please contact me as soon as possible to schedule an appointment so that we can discuss them.

## Course Schedule

Week	Date	Guiding Questions	Readings to Complete	Assignments Due
<b>Module 1: What is disciplinary literacy? Why does it matter?</b>				
1	Jan. 7-13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What is disciplinary literacy? Why is it important?</li><li>• To what extent have you seen disciplinary literacy approaches to teaching in school?</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Houseal et al (2016)</li><li>• <a href="#">Moje</a> (2008)</li><li>• <a href="#">Moje</a> (2010) [Talk] 1:50-44:00</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Online post (due Sunday, 1/13)</li><li>• Create brief introduction video (due Sunday, 1/13)</li></ul>
2	Jan. 14-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What do you make of the Continuum of Literacy Specialization (Figure 1.1)?</li><li>• Have you ever observed a young child ask a disciplinary question?</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Wolsey &amp; Lapp (2017), Chapter 1</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Watch introduction videos of your classmates</li><li>• Online post (due Sunday, 1/20)</li></ul>
3	Jan. 21-27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Briefly describe a lesson that you have seen or that you have enacted yourself. Was it an example of disciplinary literacy teaching? Why or why not? If not, what would have made it more disciplinary?</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Shanahan &amp; Shanahan</a> (2014)</li><li>• <a href="#">Lee &amp; Spratley</a> (2010)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Online post (due Sunday, 1/27)</li></ul>
<b>Module 2: Disciplinary discourse communities and their literacies</b>				
4	Jan. 28-Feb. 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What is historical literacy?</li><li>• Create an account on the SHEG website and select a lesson to review. What makes it an example of disciplinary literacy teaching in history?</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Wineburg &amp; Reisman (2015)</li><li>• Rainey et. al (2018), pp. 371-375</li><li>• <a href="#">SHEG</a> curriculum</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Online post (due Sunday, 2/3)</li></ul>



5	Feb. 4-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do the C3 Standards reflect historical literacy practices and purposes?</li> <li>• To what extent does this vision for teaching history align with your experiences teaching/learning history?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">C3 Standards</a></li> <li>• Rainey mini-lecture video</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Online post (due Sunday, 2/10)</li> </ul>
6	Feb. 11-17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is scientific literacy?</li> <li>• To what extent does this vision for science teaching align with your experiences teaching/learning science?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Shanahan, Shanahan &amp; Misischia</a> (2011)</li> <li>• Rainey et al (2018), pp. 371-372, 376-378</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Online post (due Sunday, 2/17)</li> </ul>
7	Feb. 18-24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do the NGSS reflect scientific literacy practices and purposes?</li> <li>• What lessons can you draw from how Wright &amp; Gotwals introduced kindergartners to disciplinary literacy in science?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">NGSS</a></li> <li>• Wright &amp; Gotwals (2017)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Online post (due Sunday, 2/24)</li> </ul>
8	Feb. 25-Mar. 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is mathematical literacy?</li> <li>• Create an account on tedd.org and watch the true/false math equations video. To what extent is this an example of disciplinary literacy teaching in math?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Shanahan, Shanahan &amp; Misischia</a> (2011) – reread pp. 405 to end focusing on mathematicians</li> <li>• <a href="#">CCSS</a> standards for mathematical practice</li> <li>• <a href="#">Tedd teaching video</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Online post (due Sunday, 3/3)</li> </ul>
9	Mar. 4-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is literary literacy?</li> <li>• The authors argue that reading literature requires more than general comprehension. What do they mean?</li> <li>• Do you see this type of teaching with literature in your school context?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rainey &amp; Moje (2012)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Rainey &amp; Storm</a> (2017)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Online post (due Sunday, 3/10)</li> </ul>
	Mar. 11-17	Spring Recess		

**Module 3: How can you incorporate disciplinary literacy teaching into your teaching?**

10	Mar. 18-24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Common literacy teaching routines and strategies can be adjusted to provide disciplinary literacy learning opportunities for students. For your midterm, select and adapt a teaching strategy or instructional routine to meet disciplinary literacy goals. Use Wolsey &amp; Lapp's ideas for adapting KWL as a model.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wolsey &amp; Lapp (2017), Ch. 9</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Midterm Project (due Sunday, 3/24)</li> </ul>
11	Mar. 25-31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Choose a discipline to focus on for the remainder of the semester. What are the texts, tools, and practices of that discipline?</li> <li>What are ideas you have for teaching students to use the texts, tools, and practices of your focal discipline?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Select 2 pieces from the Additional Readings folder to read.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work on your graphic organizer. Nothing due this week.</li> </ul>
12	Apr. 1-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the texts, tools, and practices of your focal discipline?</li> <li>What are ideas you have for teaching students to use the texts, tools, and practices of your focal discipline?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Select 2 additional pieces from the Additional Readings folder to read.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Post your completed graphic organizer</li> <li>Revised Midterm Project (due Sunday, 4/7)</li> </ul>
13	Apr. 8-14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work on final project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revisit course readings from the semester</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft of final project (due Sunday, 4/14). Include 2-3 questions for peer feedback.</li> </ul>
14	Apr. 15-21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work on final project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revisit course readings from the semester</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review the drafted final project of a classmate (comments due Sunday, 4/21).</li> <li>Complete course</li> </ul>

				evaluation (due 4/21). Send proof of completion to me for 5 bonus points.
15 (partial)	Apr. 22-26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work on final projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revisit course readings from the semester</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final project (due <b>Friday, 4/26</b>)</li> </ul>

## Online Discussion Post Guidelines

You will have 9 informal online discussion posts to complete this semester. “Informal” in this context means that each post should be thoughtful and reflect your careful consideration of the week’s readings; yet, it is perfectly acceptable to pose ideas or ask questions that are unresolved and to make personal connections with the readings. As you write each post, you should respond to the weekly questions written in the course schedule.

Your weekly contribution to the online discussion has two parts.

**1) Initial post.** In your weekly post, you should seek to articulate how the readings affirm, challenge, or extend your thinking. You should strive to articulate well-reasoned claims and you should strive to avoid simply stating opinions or preferences that are not supported by course readings or education research more broadly.

**2) Response to classmates’ ideas.** In addition to posting a reflection, you should also substantively respond to at least one idea posed by a classmate. Substantive response includes drawing new connections about the posts of others, raising questions about the claims, evidence, and reasoning of others, and striving to generate “class-level” understandings based on the contributions of multiple people. The best online conversations are those that invite and celebrate divergent ways of thinking, so you should seek to “carry the ball” somewhere new when you pick it up. When drawing from the ideas of others, its good practice to acknowledge their contribution to your thinking.

All posts and responses are due by Sunday of each week. You can earn up to 10 points per week; your grade will be based on the quality of your initial post and your consideration of others’ ideas. Remember that this discussion should develop throughout the week, so post your initial response early and check back often.

Estimated length per post: 250-500 words (1-2 double-spaced pages)

Total possible points per week: 10

	<b>Meets (5 pts)</b>	<b>Approaching (2 pts)</b>	<b>Needs improvement (0 points)</b>
<b>Quality of initial post</b>	Initial post includes well-reasoned claims based in course readings. It is evident that the writer is carefully reading and synthesizing important ideas.	Initial post is focused on ideas of course readings. It appears that the writer has not read as carefully because the post mostly summarizes content, it leans too heavily on direct quotations, and/or it does not refer to all of the readings assigned that week.	Initial post does not engage with ideas from weekly readings or post is not completed on time.
<b>Quality of engagement with classmates</b>	Student substantively and directly engages with the ideas, questions, or reflections of classmates. This may be done in the initial post or within the comments feature of the course site.	Student refers to a classmate’s post. However, the interaction is not substantive.	Student does not engage with the ideas, questions, or reflections of classmates.

## Midterm Analysis Project Guidelines

Your midterm project will be to select a specific literacy instructional routine, strategy, or assessment tool with which you are relatively familiar. Possible examples include:

- instructional routines such as Reciprocal Reading, Reading/writing conferences, Questioning the Author, modeling, think-pair-share, specific vocabulary activities
- graphic organizer scaffolds such as RAFT or concept maps
- assessment tools such as Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI), Degrees of Reading Power, Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), exit slips

This assignment has three parts:

Part 1: Review the specific tool or approach and seek out who developed it, when it was developed, and what research (if any) exists to support its use. After a search, if you have trouble finding relevant research, then contact Dr. Rainey for help with additional search terms. Length: 1/2 page.

Part 2: How could the routine, strategy, or tool be used for disciplinary literacy teaching? What would need to change about it? How could it be used within a larger unit to meet disciplinary literacy goals? Draw on course readings. Length: 2-3 pages.

Part C: Works cited

Estimated length per paper: 750-1000 words (3-4 double-spaced pages) not including the works cited section.

Total possible points: 50

	<b>Exceeds (10 pts)</b>	<b>Meets (8 pts)</b>	<b>Approaching (6 pts)</b>	<b>Needs improvement (0 pts)</b>
<b>Focus</b>	Paper focuses on a specific literacy instructional routine/strategy/ tool	Paper mostly focuses on one literacy strategy/routine/tool	Paper has major moments of lack of focus	Paper does not include treatment of strategy/routine/tool
<b>Review of Research Base</b>	Paper synthesizes the research base of the strategy, including commentary about strength of the research base	Paper synthesizes the research base of the strategy	Paper gives some background about the development of the strategy; may not include analysis of research base or core studies related to it	Paper does not include review of research base
<b>Application of Concepts</b>	Paper uses concepts of disciplinary literacy teaching and learning to examine and extend the potential of an existing strategy/routine/tool; paper includes specific example of how the existing strategy can be	Paper uses concepts of disciplinary literacy teaching and learning to examine and extend the potential of an existing routine/strategy/tool; possibilities of use may remain vague or removed from actual practice, or the	Paper suggests ways of using the existing routine/strategy/tool; idea is not clearly in the service of disciplinary purposes	Paper does not suggest ways of using the existing routine/strategy/tool to meet disciplinary purposes

	adapted for disciplinary purposes	connections between the strategy and disciplinary purposes are not entirely clear		
<b>Synthesis of Course Readings</b>	Paper draws on extensive course readings and course themes to make an original claim about disciplinary literacy teaching and learning	Paper draws on multiple course readings to make a claim about disciplinary literacy teaching and learning	Paper relies on one or two course readings	Paper does not draw on specific course readings
<b>APA Format</b>	Paper lists all in-text and end references in APA format	Paper lists all references; there may be minor errors in APA or the works cited list at the end may be incomplete	Paper does not consistently use APA	Paper does not include references

## Graphic Organizer: Literacy in Focal Discipline

In this assignment, you will deeply explore the literacy practices and teaching approaches of an academic discipline of your choosing. The discipline you choose for this assignment should be the same discipline that you intend to focus on for your final project.

You should choose at least 4 new pieces to read in the “Additional Readings” folder and revisit the related readings you completed earlier in the semester. Then, use these readings to complete the graphic organizer template below. Be sure to cite the readings you are drawing upon as a part of your work.

**My focal discipline is:** \_\_\_\_\_

### Disciplinary Literacy in My Focal Discipline

Types of questions	Methods of inquiry	Types of texts	Disciplinary literacy practices

### Ideas for Teaching Students My Focal Discipline

	Specific Examples or Ideas	Notes/Questions
<b>Engaging</b> students in cycles of inquiry		
<b>Engineering</b> /scaffolding their success		
<b>Examining</b> words and ways with words		
<b>Evaluating</b> claims and ways with words'		

Total possible points: 30

## Final Analysis Project Guidelines

**OPTION 1:** For this assignment, you should analyze and adapt an existing lesson or short unit so that it will support students' disciplinary literacy learning in your current (or anticipated) professional context. You will need to select a specific lesson or short unit on which to focus. The starting materials can be ones that you have designed/taught, or they can come from a curricular source or publisher.

Part A: Select a focal lesson/unit. Attach it (scanned pages are fine).

Part B: Analyze the lesson or unit to determine the extent to which it already supports disciplinary purposes and practices. What will be most important to change in order to use this plan for disciplinary literacy teaching? Why? Connect your analysis to class readings. Length: 1.5-2 pages.

Part C: Adapt your focal materials to create a new lesson or short unit for disciplinary literacy teaching. Incorporate:

- Ways to engage students in disciplinary inquiry
  - What will students be investigating?
  - How will they investigate it?
  - What texts will they read and write?
- Ways to support students' success
  - How will you support students' disciplinary reading and writing?
  - How will you support their disciplinary talk?
- Ways of assessing students' learning
  - How will you gather information about what students are learning?
  - How will you gather information about how their disciplinary reading, writing, and reasoning is developing?

Part D: Justify your changes. Why have you made the specific decisions that you've made? How did you draw from and adapt the ideas in the class readings? What would you want to do next after this lesson/unit? Length: 2 pages.

Part E: Works cited

Total paper length will vary based on the length of the original materials selected.

Total possible points: 100



	<b>Exceeds (20 pts)</b>	<b>Meets (16 pts)</b>	<b>Approaching (12 pts)</b>	<b>Needs improvement (0 pts)</b>
<b>Analysis of Original Lesson (Part B)</b>	Project thoroughly analyzes an existing lesson or lesson set from a clear disciplinary literacy perspective. Analysis includes nuanced discussion of multiple ways that the lesson does and does not reflect disciplinary literacy goals and principles.	Project analyzes lesson from a clear disciplinary literacy perspective. Analysis includes some discussion of ways that the lesson does and does not reflect disciplinary literacy goals and principles.	Project analyzes lesson from a disciplinary literacy perspective, but the perspective may be unclear in some places. Analysis misses and/or confuses key aspects of disciplinary literacy.	Project does not analyze lesson from disciplinary literacy perspective.
<b>Lesson Revision (Part C)</b>	New lesson includes opportunities for students to engage students in disciplinary inquiry with texts. It includes ways that the teacher will support students' disciplinary reading, writing, and talk and assess their learning. It is clear that all aspects of the lesson are aligned with one another and in the service of disciplinary literacy.	New lesson includes opportunities for students to engage students in disciplinary inquiry with texts. It includes ways that the teacher will support students' disciplinary reading, writing, and talk and assess their learning. Most aspects of the lesson are aligned with one another and in the service of disciplinary literacy.	New lesson includes some opportunity for students to learn aspects of disciplinary literacy. A strong inquiry frame may be absent, or there may be major areas of misalignment (e.g., the texts are not suitable for answering the disciplinary question).	Project does not include new lesson, or there are not visible disciplinary literacy aspects embedded in the new lesson.
<b>Lesson Justification (Part D)</b>	Project thoroughly justifies why the changes have been made to the lesson based on disciplinary literacy goals and principles.	Project offers some justification of the changes that have been made based on disciplinary literacy goals and principles. Most claims are warranted and clear.	Project offers some justification for the changes that have been made. Some claims are warranted and clear, while others are vague, incomplete, or unwarranted.	Project does not justify major decisions about the new lesson design.
<b>Use of Course Readings (throughout)</b>	Project draws deeply on course readings and course themes to analyze existing lesson and to justify changes to the lesson. It is clear that the writer is using the course readings in a substantive way.	Paper draws on multiple course readings to analyze existing lesson and justify changes to the lesson. Sometimes there are missed opportunities to draw on course readings or	Paper draws on multiple course readings to analyze existing lesson and justify changes to the lesson. The majority of the citations are superficial (i.e., they read as if they are "tagged on" rather	Paper does not draw on specific course readings or only uses course readings superficially

		imprecisions in the way the readings are used.	than as if they are driving the thinking)	
<b>APA Format (throughout)</b>	Paper lists all in-text and end references in APA format	Paper lists all references; there may be minor errors in APA or the works cited list at the end may be incomplete	Paper does not consistently use APA	Paper does not include references

**OPTION 2:** For this assignment, you should design a lesson or short unit so that it will support students' disciplinary literacy learning in your current professional context. Then, try it out with your students and reflect on how it went. *You should only select this option if you are able to complete a full cycle of lesson design, lesson enactment, and lesson reflection by April 26.*

Part A: Design a lesson or short unit that will engage students in a disciplinary literacy within a disciplinary inquiry cycle. Incorporate:

- Ways to engage students in disciplinary inquiry
  - What will students be investigating?
  - How will they investigate it?
  - What texts will they read and write?
- Ways to support students' success
  - How will you support students' disciplinary reading and writing?
  - How will you support their disciplinary talk?
- Ways of assessing students' learning
  - How will you gather information about what students are learning?
  - How will you gather information about how their disciplinary reading, writing, and reasoning is developing?

Part B: Justify your lesson design. Why have you made the specific decisions that you've made? How did you draw from and adapt the ideas in the class readings? Length: 3 pages.

Part C: Enact the lesson or unit in your classroom. Attach a sample of student work here (scanned documents are fine).

Part D: Reflect on how your lesson/unit went. To what extent did students have opportunities to engage in a disciplinary inquiry cycle? How did you support their disciplinary literacy practices? What evidence do you have of student learning and engagement? What would you do differently next time? What questions does this experience raise for you about disciplinary literacy teaching? Connect your analysis to class readings as helpful. Length: 1.5-2 pages.

Part E: Works cited

Total paper length will vary based on length of lesson or short unit.

Total possible points: 100

	<b>Exceeds (20 pts)</b>	<b>Meets (16 pts)</b>	<b>Approaching (12 pts)</b>	<b>Needs improvement (0 pts)</b>
<b>Lesson Design (Part A)</b>	Designed lesson includes opportunities for students to engage students in disciplinary inquiry with texts. It includes ways that the teacher will support students' disciplinary reading, writing, and talk and assess their learning. It is clear that all aspects of the lesson are aligned with one another and in the service of disciplinary literacy.	Designed lesson includes opportunities for students to engage students in disciplinary inquiry with texts. It includes ways that the teacher will support students' disciplinary reading, writing, and talk and assess their learning. Most aspects of the lesson are aligned with one another and in the service of disciplinary literacy.	Designed lesson includes some opportunity for students to learn aspects of disciplinary literacy. A strong inquiry frame may be absent, or there may be major areas of misalignment (e.g., the texts are not suitable for answering the disciplinary question).	Project does not include new lesson, or there are not visible disciplinary literacy aspects embedded in the new lesson.
<b>Lesson Justification (Part B)</b>	Project thoroughly justifies lesson design based on disciplinary literacy goals and principles.	Project offers some justification of lesson design based on disciplinary literacy goals and principles. Most claims are warranted and clear.	Project offers some justification of lesson design. Some claims are warranted and clear, while others are vague, incomplete, or unwarranted.	Project does not justify major decisions about the lesson design.
<b>Lesson Reflection (Part D)</b>	Project thoroughly analyzes an existing lesson or lesson set from a clear disciplinary literacy perspective. Analysis includes nuanced discussion of multiple ways that the lesson does and does not reflect disciplinary literacy goals and principles.	Project analyzes lesson from a clear disciplinary literacy perspective. Analysis includes some discussion of ways that the lesson does and does not reflect disciplinary literacy goals and principles.	Project analyzes lesson from a disciplinary literacy perspective, but the perspective may be unclear in some places. Analysis misses and/or confuses key aspects of disciplinary literacy.	Project does not analyze lesson from disciplinary literacy perspective.
<b>Use of Course Readings (throughout)</b>	Project draws deeply on course readings and course themes to design and analyze the lesson. It is clear that the writer is using the course readings in a substantive way.	Project draws on multiple course readings to design and analyze the lesson. Sometimes there are missed opportunities to draw on course readings or imprecisions in the way the readings are used.	Project draws on multiple course readings to design and analyze the lesson. The majority of the citations are superficial (i.e., they read as if they are "tagged on" rather than as if they are driving the thinking).	Project does not draw on specific course readings or only uses course readings superficially.

<b>APA Format (throughout)</b>	Project lists all in-text and end references in APA format.	Project lists all references; there may be minor errors in APA or the works cited list at the end may be incomplete.	Project does not consistently use APA.	Project does not include references.
--------------------------------	---	--	--	--------------------------------------

## **Final Project Peer Feedback**

In April, I will pair you with one classmate, and you will act as peer reviewers for one another. You will exchange drafts of your final project with questions that you have about your work and offer one another specific, actionable, constructive feedback. As you write feedback to help your classmate develop their ideas, you should focus on the following:

- How clear is your classmate's vision of disciplinary literacy teaching?
- Do the revisions that your classmate is suggesting "add up" to disciplinary literacy teaching in your view?
- How well is your classmate supporting his/her ideas and claims? What suggestions would you offer for strengthening the connection to class readings?

Total possible points: 20

Additionally, I would like to hold virtual meetings with each of you to discuss your final project. We will schedule meetings in late March/early-mid April.