



University of
Pittsburgh

School of
Education

Doctor of Education (EdD) Program

EDUC 3009: SUPERVISED PRACTITIONER INQUIRY

Summer 2020 | Zoom Sessions 1:00-2:30p: May 16, June 6, June 27

INSTRUCTOR

Max Schuster, PhD | *Assistant Professor, Higher Education*
4318B Posvar Hall | 412-624-3087 | schustermt@pitt.edu

Instructor Communication: My goal is to reply to email or voice messages within 48 hours Monday-Friday.
Virtual Office Hours: My virtual office hours are scheduled by appointment. If you need to have a conversation with me about something in the course, I am glad to arrange phone or Zoom meetings as needed. Just send me an email with three or four possible times during the day Monday-Friday, and we will schedule a mutually convenient time to chat.

COURSE RATIONALE AND DESCRIPTION

This course is designed to prepare students in the EdD program to conduct a comprehensive and systematic analysis of professional and scholarly research literature to support doctoral-level writing projects. This level of inquiry includes an evaluation of primary sources, such as literature published in peer-reviewed, refereed journals as well as other reliable professional sources. The course is designed to provide guidance to students as they develop the foundation and framework to construct their scholarly inquiry projects.

COURSE AIMS AND OUTCOMES

- To provide students with a clear understanding of how to conduct a review of scholarly and professional knowledge
- To provide students with a framework to develop a review of scholarly and professional knowledge
- To help students understand the connection between the review of scholarly and professional knowledge and other components of writing
- To think critically about empirical research and scholarly work in order to promote an understanding of the importance of the review of scholarly and professional knowledge in academic and practice-based writing

COURSE LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- To understand general guidelines for analyzing and reviewing scholarship
- To understand how to synthesize literature in ways to create a cohesive overview that deepens contextual understanding of a student's problem of practice
- To practice providing and responding to scholarly feedback
- To complete a 15-page a review of scholarly and professional knowledge that will support students in framing problems of practice and serve as a foundation for inquiry projects

COURSE GRADES

Final grades for this class will be based on a satisfactory/no pass scale; no letter grade will be assigned.

REQUIRED COURSE MATERIALS

Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., Williams, J. M., Bizup, J., & Fitzgerald, W. T. (2016). *The craft of research* (4th ed.). University of Chicago Press. [available online through PittCat]

Guthrie, K. L. et al. (2013). Cultivating leader identity and capacity in students from diverse backgrounds. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 39(4). [available online through PittCat]

Machi, L. A., & McEvoy, B. T. (2016). *The literature review: Six steps to success* (3rd ed.). Corwin. [Note: Earlier editions are similar and can be purchased online at a lower cost; Pitt's Library will have a scanned copy available for your digital use as well]

Stevens, D. D. (2019). *Write more, publish more, stress less!: Five key principles for a creative and sustainable scholarly practice*. Stylus. [available online through PittCat]

*Other materials are available on Canvas.

Doctor of Education (EdD) Program Information

The University of Pittsburgh is a center for excellence in professional programs, and the School of Education school-wide Doctor of Education (EdD) program is grounded in this **commitment to excellence**. The program prepares working professionals to become **leader scholar practitioners** to develop *specialized knowledge in their area of concentration* and *apply their intellectual and practical skills to address and mitigate enduring problems affecting children, families, and communities*.

Program Learning Goals

As a result of attending the EdD program at Pitt, students and graduates become leader scholar practitioners who:

1. Identify problems of practice, including questions of equity, ethics, and justice.
2. Use data to inform decisions in daily operations and improvement projects.
3. Communicate and collaborate to work with diverse communities and build partnerships.
4. Lead change that improves practice.
5. Are committed to use improvement science to address problems of practice.

Doctoral Requirements

The **course** (EDUC 3009) is designed to support the development of the review of scholarship through specialized content and activities. In many ways, EDUC 3009 is like any other course – it operates with an instructor and a syllabus, supporting online content and specific activities designed to help you complete the *Review of Supporting Scholarship*. You will receive a grade (H, S, or U) for the course, based on your engagement and quality of work through the course experiences.

The paper that you complete in the course should be a final draft of the Review of Supporting Scholarship that is reviewed by your advisor for approval. There is a **milestone** form that must be formally signed by your advisor, ARCO coordinator, and EdD Director. The form is then filed with the EdD Coordinator so that the milestone may be recorded on the student's record. **Ideally, a student who successfully completes EDUC 3009 should be able to complete the milestone, but the two mechanisms are separate.**

POLICIES

Attendance

Regular and prompt attendance in the Saturday class sessions is an essential part of the educational experience in the EdD program. Each course meets only four times throughout the term; missing one of those sessions constitutes a significant portion of the time for face to face interaction with instructors and peers.

Although students are expected to attend all Saturday class sessions, working professionals sometimes find themselves in circumstances that cause them to miss these class meetings.

Exceptions may be made for a required **work-related commitment, illness, or valid emergency**. In such cases, students need to contact the course instructor to determine if there is any way to make up missed classwork.

If you are going to be absent for class because of a required work-related commitment, illness or valid emergency, please follow the following instructions:

1. Email the course instructor(s) with a copy Harriet Wortzman (hrp9@pitt.edu) and your advisor with the reason for missing the class.
2. Complete the course or instructor specific make up requirements for missed classes prior to the next class meeting.
3. Adhere to the acceptable reasons for missing class outlined in the policy above. Please note that they do not include vacation and/or personal events.

Incomplete Grades

For this course, an “I” (Incomplete) Grade will be granted only if the student has actively attended to the course requirements but needs extended time to complete the required work to meet minimum expectations. If an Incomplete grade becomes necessary, the instructor will require you to propose a plan of action outlining how you will complete the work within no more than one term from the end of the course (and preferably a shorter period of time).

Statement on Classroom Recording

To ensure the free and open discussion of ideas, students may not record classroom lectures, discussion and/or activities without the advance written permission of the instructor, and any such recording properly approved in advance can be used solely for the student’s own private use.

Disability Services

If you have a disability for which you are or may be requesting an accommodation, you are encouraged to contact both the instructor and Disability Resources and Services (DRS), 140 William Pitt Union, (412) 648-7890, drsrecep@pitt.edu. (412) 228-5347 for P3 ASL users, as early as possible in the term. DRS will verify your disability and determine reasonable accommodations for these courses.

Inclement Weather Policy

Only the Chancellor may officially close the Pittsburgh campus of the University. The University will remain open in all but the most extreme circumstances. Cancellation of classes **does not imply** that the University is closed.

The University offers an Emergency Notification Service (ENS) which is used to communicate with subscribers through voice, text, and email messages, as deemed appropriate in the event of an

emergency. For instructions on how to register, please refer to CSSD's website: <http://technology.pitt.edu/services/emergency-notification-service>.

Any changes to normal University operations will be announced as early as possible through the ENS, the University's official website (www.pitt.edu), Twitter (@PittTweet), and local news media outlets.

Academic Integrity Guidelines

All students are expected to adhere to the standards of academic honesty. Any student engaged in cheating, plagiarism, or other acts of academic dishonesty would 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](#).

Provided here is the School of Education [Academic Integrity Policy](#). Please read the policy carefully. The rights and responsibilities of faculty and students are described in the [University's Academic Integrity Guidelines](#).

Departmental Grievance Procedures

The purpose of grievance procedures is to ensure the rights and responsibilities of faculty and students in their relationships with each other. When a student taking a course in the Doctor of Education Program (EdD) believes that a faculty member has not met his or her obligations (as an instructor or in another capacity) as described in the Academic Integrity Guidelines, the student should follow the procedure described in the Guidelines by (1) first trying to resolve the matter with the faculty member directly; (2) then, if needed, attempting to resolve the matter through conversations with the EdD Program Director, Dr. Thomas Akiva tomakiva@pitt.edu; (3) if needed, next talking with the academic integrity officer of the school, Asst. Dean Shederick McClendon, samccclendon@pitt.edu; and (4) if needed, filing a written statement of charges with Asst. Dean McClendon.

The School of Education [Policies and Forms](#) page on the SOE website explains several policies and procedures, including academic probation, course repeats, leaves of absence, monitored withdrawal, transfer credits, and statute of limitations.

RESOURCES

Education Library Guide

See this Hillman Library [customized libguide](#), a gateway to resources for education students and faculty.

Religious Observances

See the [Provost's annual memo](#) about religious observances.

Emergencies

Do you have Pitt Police saved on your mobile phone? 911 works, or Pitt Police, 412-624-2121

Office of Diversity and Inclusion (ODI)

Resources, consultation, and bias incident reporting: <https://www.diversity.pitt.edu/>

Title IX office, resources regarding sexual harassment, gender-based discrimination, and sexual violence: <https://www.titleix.pitt.edu/>

Catalogs

The University Catalogs have comprehensive information about policies, programs, and courses. There are University-level policies and policies specific to the School of Education. Bookmark these links and review these documents periodically.

- [Pittsburgh Campus Graduate and Professional Studies](#)

Student Mental Health

Counseling Center, in the Wellness Center in Nordenberg Hall:
<https://www.studentaffairs.pitt.edu/cc/> Call 412-648-7930, any time.

Sexual Assault Response: 412-648-7856

Care and Resource Support Team (CARS): Email pittcares@pitt.edu or see:
<http://www.studentaffairs.pitt.edu/cars/>

ASSIGNMENT DESCRIPTION: REVIEW OF SUPPORTING SCHOLARSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE

A Note on Scaffolding: The course is designed to help students develop the review of supporting scholarship and professional knowledge in sections (referred to as “scaffolding”), creating a comprehensive document by the end of the course. Various sections of the document will be submitted to peer review teams for review and feedback. Using the guides provided by the instructor, students are expected to think critically about their peers’ work and provide useful, professional, and scholarly feedback about framing, organization, clarity, argument strength, as well as grammar, syntax, and APA style. Students are expected to respond to peer review comments and incorporate changes in their document. Sections of the document will also be submitted to the course instructor for review and feedback. The course schedule describes when sections are due to the course instructor as well as to peer reviewers. Please keep in mind that with each submission, you are required to address, revise, and rewrite all comments and suggestions made by peer review teams and the course instructor, and then add on the next section (e.g., submit introduction, receive feedback, address all comments, add theme #1, submit revisions of introduction with theme #1 added; repeat the cycle until the product for this course is completed).

The *Review of Supporting Scholarship* milestone requires students to engage with scholarly sources to gain a better understanding of the problem area in which their problem of practice is situated. By exploring the problem and problem area more broadly, students can develop a clearer understanding of a problem and how that problem has been considered in the scholarship of the field. The review should also include a summary of local context. This section applies learning from both the scholarship of the field and one’s professional practice to describe what they observe in practice and how this relates to the problem and the larger problem area. This exercise should help the student clearly define the problem of practice they wish to improve; and develop inquiry questions and aims to guide their scholarly inquiry. The review positions them to engage in more depth of inquiry related to their problem of practice and to engage in the remaining Practitioner Inquiry courses.

Contents: The *Review of Supporting Scholarship* should:

- Identify and/or conceptualize an important issue within a problem/topic area;
- Discuss relevant professional books, articles, and reports and peer-reviewed research that utilizes appropriate research methods;
- Discuss and synthesize various viewpoints and their relevant merits with regard to the problem/topic area:
 - How has the problem been investigated in the past?
 - What has been done to address the problem (e.g., interventions, improvement approaches)?
 - What has been learned about the problem?
 - What questions remain?

In general, this review is an extended argument. The starting point of the argument is what is already known (or at least, what is claimed), so it is essential to first understand what has already been accomplished in your problem area.

Format: We recommend a length of 15-20 pages (we recommend NOT going over 20 pages) plus references. It should include 10 references *as a minimum*. The document should follow APA style, version 7.

Problems and Solutions: We recommend you spend the bulk of your efforts (80-90% of the *Review* itself) on the problem area, problem of practice, and the context/system in which the problem resides. In some cases, you may want to review relevant interventions have been conducted and studied, which can be an important component; however, *finding solutions is the not the point of this exercise*. The review is meant to help you best understand and frame the problem, and to situate it in the scholarship of the field. You may want to mention the aims, inquiry questions, and/or potential solutions you might implement to address your problem in the concluding section of the *Review*.

Potential outline: You might organize your *Review of Supporting Scholarship* like this:

1. **Introduction** (2-3 pages)

The introduction should articulate the proposed problem of practice (refined from your previous milestone), the significance of the problem, and the scope of the inquiry. It should include some sort of guidance that helps the reader know what to expect; that is, foreshadowing or summarizing of the 3-4 main bodies of literature/knowledge to be reviewed. In many cases, a figure can complement this foreshadowing and help the reader understand the literature that exists related to the PoP. You may organize this section like this:

- a. Problem Statement (What is the larger problem/topic area of practice you are addressing?)
- b. Purpose of Review (What is the problem of practice you seek to learn more about through this review?)
- c. Foreshadowing (Foreshadow the 3 main bodies of knowledge the paper will review)

2. **Review of relevant scholarship and professional knowledge** (7-12 pages)

You should examine an ample body of relevant literature and professional knowledge (at least 10 [but typically 15-20] sources, including peer reviewed research articles as well as professional knowledge) that will help frame your problem of practice. The review should be succinct, comprehensive, and integrated and demonstrate a clear path of your

understanding of the problem area and how it is framing your understanding of the specific problem. It should not be a series of annotations or a paragraph-by-paragraph summary of individual articles or chapters. The review should demonstrate a clear path of your understanding of the problem area and how it is framing your understanding of the specific problem. Identify **three main themes** within the literature and develop three sections that are centered on those themes. Selected course readings provide further guidance and instruction on ways to synthesize the literature. The review may include interventions or approaches to addressing the problem but this should not be the main focus.

- a. Main theme/theory in the literature/prof knowledge #1 (1 - 3 pages)
- b. Main theme/theory in the literature/prof knowledge #2 (1 - 3 pages)
- c. Main theme/theory in the literature/prof knowledge #3 (1 - 3 pages)

3. **Context Review** (1-3 pages)

The context review applies the learning from scholarship and professional knowledge to the student's local context and ask them to describe what they see happening in practice. Students will apply Improvement Science notion of "seeing the system" to describe the context of their organization and the problem of practice. This section may include existing data from the organization, data gathered from empathy interviews, as well as their own perception.

4. **Conclusion** (1-2 pages)

The conclusion ties the review of scholarship and professional knowledge and the context review together. You should state how this review has helped shaped your problem of practice; however, please be mindful to avoid introducing new sources in this section. The conclusion should include:

- a. a clear definition the local problem of practice you wish to improve;
- b. inquiry questions or aims that will guide your scholarly inquiry on the problem.

NOTES ON PROVIDING PRODUCTIVE PEER REVIEW

Reviewing your peers' in-progress papers provides the opportunity to give valuable feedback that facilitates and further develops your peers' work. As a writer, you are afforded the opportunity to learn more about your paper's strengths and areas for improvement, allowing for the creation of stronger final product.

Engaging in this work as a peer reviewer requires you to be thoughtful and considerate of framing the paper's areas for improvement as well as its strengths. Peer reviews in this course will ultimately be guided by several questions on a review form (see Canvas). However, the following tips will assist you in being a thoughtful reviewer:

- **Give the paper sufficient time.** Providing a high-level of critical review requires that you schedule appropriate time to review the paper. Some folks find that sitting in a quiet space assists them in mentally preparing to engaging critically in the review.
- **Skim first.** Begin the process by quickly skimming the paper in order to get a general sense of it. You may want to highlight key words or arguments and summarize the main points. Skimming helps you tune into the paper better for your second read.
- **Utilize the course peer review table.** Answer the questions located in the form and take notes on major, moderate, and minor revisions that need to be made. Provide specific

recommendations for changes and improvements when possible. You should also consider utilizing the review and track changes feature in Microsoft Word.

- **Make it professional.** Writing is an intensely personal act for most people. Therefore, approach your review honestly, but considerately. One way to de-personalize is to frame everything from the standpoint of “the paper” instead of “the author” or “you.” For example, it is much more palatable for a writer to digest “The paper’s argument in the second section lacks sufficient cohesion; the paper might re-organize central ideas to resituate the section,” rather than “The author writes in an incohesive way in section two; you should work on more clearly organizing your ideas in this section of your paper.”
- **Be timely.** Be mindful of your colleagues’ time and submit reviews before or on the date indicated in the syllabus.
- **Review APA, style, and grammar.**

NOTES ON RECEIVING AND RESPONDING TO PEER REVIEW COMMENTS

Receiving feedback from a peer review is an opportunity to gain additional perspective. Be open to the feedback from your peers and be sure to address on the peer review table whether changes were made or not made and why. Bear in mind that throughout the revision process, you will need to edit, revise, or rewrite (potentially entire sections). Rewriting sections is not a bad thing. In fact, it is often a way to more precisely represent your argument. As you plan your time, incorporate time for rewriting; **everyone should expect to rewrite (which is different from line editing or revising) substantial sections of their papers during this course.** As you do this, always keep a saved version of your previous working drafts so that key ideas, thoughts, and language are not lost. You never know when you need to revisit previous material.

EDUC 3009: SUPERVISED PRACTITIONER INQUIRY COURSE SCHEDULE

Reading assignments have been incorporated into the course schedule to inform the development of the literature review and its relevant sections. Exemplar literature review articles are included on most weeks. Reading for this class may feel a little bit different than other courses you've experienced. As you take a look at the exemplar articles or chapters selected, I want you to read not necessarily for content (although for some of you the content will be helpful to the development of your topic), but rather for structure, organization, and argument. Think about how the authors are using literature to inform their argument, what styles or techniques they are using to form a deep understanding of the topic, and what strategies or techniques they use that you can borrow and incorporate into your own review in order meet the expectations of scholarly writing in the field of higher education.

**indicates reading available on Canvas*

Date	Readings/Webinars (due before class)	Assignment	Assignment Due Date
May 16 Zoom Meeting 1-2:30p	Machi, L. A., & McEvoy, B. T. (2016). <i>The literature review: Six steps to success</i> (3 rd ed.). Corwin. [Introduction and Chapters 1-3] Stevens, D. D. (2019). <i>Write more, publish more, stress less!: Five key principles for a creative and sustainable scholarly practice</i> . Stylus. [Chapters 1-2] *Zellers et al. (2008). Faculty mentoring programs: Reenvisioning rather than reinventing the wheel. <i>Review of Educational Research</i> , 78(3), 552-588. [Skim] Watch webinars 1 and 2	Course Introduction (Posted to Canvas Discussion Board) <i>Instructor Review:</i> Paper Outline	May 14 May 17
May 23	Machi, L. A., & McEvoy, B. T. (2016). <i>The literature review: Six steps to success</i> (3 rd ed.). Corwin. [Chapters 4-5] Stevens, D. D. (2019). <i>Write more, publish more, stress less!: Five key principles for a creative and sustainable scholarly practice</i> . Stylus. [Chapter 3] *Galvan, J. L., & Galvin, M. C. (2018). <i>Writing literature reviews: A guide for students in the social and behavioral sciences</i> (7 th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge. [Chapters 9-10.] Watch webinars 3, 4, and 5		

May 30	<p>Booth, W. C. et al. (2016). <i>The craft of research</i> (4th ed.). University of Chicago Press. [Chapters 3-6]</p> <p>Guthrie et al. (2013). Cultivating leader identity and capacity in students from diverse backgrounds. <i>ASHE Higher Education Report</i>, 39(4). [Skim]</p> <p>Rewatch webinar 5</p>	<p><i>Instructor Review:</i> Theme 1</p>	May 31
June 6 Zoom Meeting 1-2:30p	<p>Booth, W. C. et al. (2016). <i>The craft of research</i> (4th ed.). University of Chicago Press. [Chapters 7-8]</p> <p>*DeAngelo, L., Schuster, M. T., & Stebelton, M. (2016). California DREAMers: Activism, identity, and empowerment among undocumented college students. <i>Journal of Diversity in Higher Education</i>, 9(3), 216-230. [just read the introduction, context, and empirical and conceptual foundations]</p> <p>*Johnston-Guerrero, M. P. (2016). The meanings of race matter: College students learning about race in a not-so-postracial era. <i>American Educational Research Association Journal</i>, 53(4), 819-849. [just read the introduction and literature review]</p> <p>*Schuster, M. T. (2019). Learning culture: First-year student transition, institutional culture, and the bubble of trial adulthood. <i>Journal of College Orientation, Transition, and Retention</i>, 26(2), 1-26. [just read the introduction and literature review]</p>		
June 13	<p>Booth, W. C. et al. (2016). <i>The craft of research</i> (4th ed.). University of Chicago Press. [Chapters 9-10]</p> <p>Watch webinars 6 and 7</p>	<p><i>Instructor Review:</i> Introduction and Revised Theme 1</p>	June 14
June 20	<p>Booth, W. C. et al. (2016). <i>The craft of research</i> (4th ed.). University of Chicago Press. [Chapter 11]</p>	<p><i>Peer Review:</i> Introduction and Theme 1 (revised)</p>	Send draft to reviewer by June 21 and receive

			feedback on June 27
June 27 Zoom Meeting 1-2:30p		<i>Peer Review:</i> Themes 2 and 3	Send draft to reviewer by June 27 and receive feedback in class on June 27 through peer review workshop
July 4		<i>Instructor Review:</i> Themes 2-3 (revised)	July 5
July 11	Watch webinar 8		
July 18	Watch webinar 9	<i>Instructor Review:</i> Context/Conclusion	July 19
July 25		<i>Instructor Review:</i> Final Product	July 26