EFOP 2307: Politics and History of Higher Education

Instructor
Brett Ranon Nachman, PhD (he/him)
Assistant Professor, Educational Foundations, Organizations, and Policy
bnachman@pitt.edu | 5518 Posvar Hall

Class Session Times and Location: 4318 Posvar Hall

Syllabus Table of Contexts

- General Course Details (page 1)
- Course Policies (page 5)
- School of Education Policies (page 11)
- Grading and Assignment Overview (page 12)
- Assignment Descriptions (page 12)
- Course Calendar (page 20)
- Assignment Rubrics (page 23)

General Course Details

About Your Professor

I moved to Pittsburgh in Summer 2024, having prior served as an Assistant Professor at the University of Arkansas and, earlier, as a Postdoctoral Research Scholar at the Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research at NC State University. Beforehand I obtained my PhD from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, where I studied educational leadership with a concentration in higher education. I'm originally from Phoenix, AZ, where I lived throughout my childhood and undergraduate years. My research primarily focuses on autism in higher education, community college access and equity issues, and teaching and learning practices. I have also engaged in work around disability/higher ed more broadly, as well as LGBTQ+ campus climate issues. My teaching has extended to all levels of education, and I have held leadership roles at institutional and national levels across many organizations. My hobbies are numerous, from podcasting (yes, I have two) and reading, to working out and traveling.

Please call me *Brett*. If you're more comfortable with *Dr. Nachman* (pronounced KNACK-min) or *Dr. Brett*, that's okay, too. I use he/him pronouns. In my work I aim to reduce power dynamics and prefer first-name usage, though I recognize these proclivities vary based on how we grew up,

where we live and work, and what our identities entail. I also will ask you what name you would like me to use, whether it is what is listed on your university ID, your nickname, or a preferred name.

Course Description

From the University of Pittsburgh website: "This course surveys the perennial forces which have shaped the character of America's colleges and universities in situational control and governance. Curricular goals and organization, and faculty and student life are examined against the background of political, economic, religious, social and intellectual developments in American culture."

My addendum: This course will provide you with the opportunity to understand and engage with the historical context of American higher education in concert with other notable cultural and social events that have shaped our country. In many ways, this is a foundational higher education course that will provide you with a 30,000-foot view of the landscape; some topics will be addressed at a cursory level, others in more depth, and ultimately I hope this space allows for deep reflection, creative expression, and a sense of intentional inquiry. You will also be obtaining experience with elevating your academic writing at the graduate level, which will set you up well for future coursework.

Learning Outcomes

1. Obtain familiarity with the major structures and stakeholders of higher education
2. Recognize the intersection of social, political, cultural, and economic events that have impacted and operated alongside the American higher education system
3. Appreciate whose perspectives have been silenced and excluded from our colleges and universities
4. Critique historical and scholarly texts with a thoughtful eye
5. Demonstrate intellectual curiosity
6. Discuss controversial and intense topics with your community, all the while maintaining patience, kindness, and empathy
7. Develop compelling and well-researched papers, presentations, and other content
8. Refine skillsets as a consumer of information, deliver of knowledge, and contributor to conversations

Required Textbooks

Bastedo, M. N., Altbach, P. G., & Gumport, P. J. (Eds.). (2023). *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Thelin, J. R. (2019). *A history of American higher education. (3rd ed.)*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Readings Outside the Textbooks

In the world of academic research, it is very important to support authors' work. The best way we can handle that is through each person saving articles from their personal devices to count for unique downloads. Please save all of these articles below; click on the hyperlinks to access them via PittCat.

Chen, D. T. V., Wang, Y. M., & Lee, W. C. (2016). Challenges confronting beginning researchers in conducting literature reviews. *Studies in Continuing Education*, *38*(1), 47-60.

Coburn, C. K. (1988). The case against coeducation: An historical perspective. *Feminist Teacher*, 19-22.

Dancy, T. E., & Edwards, K. T. (2020). On labor and property: Historically white colleges, black bodies, and constructions of (anti) humanity. In C. A. Grant, A., N. Woodson, & M. J. Dumas (Eds.), *The future is Black* (pp. 31-46). Routledge.

Gándara, D., & Jones, S. (2020). Who deserves benefits in higher education? A policy discourse analysis of a process surrounding reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. *The Review of Higher Education*, *44*(1), 121-157.

Giliberti, M. (2011). The campus in the twentieth century: The urban campus in Chicago from 1890 to 1965. *Urbani Izziv*, *22*(2), 77-85.

"Giving feedback for peer review" (n.d.). *Purdue Owl*. https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/general_writing/the_writing_process/feedback/giving%20feedback_peer%20review.html

Graves, K. (2018). The history of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer issues in higher education. In M. B. Paulsen (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 33, pp. 127-173). Springer.

Gyure, D. A. (2008). The heart of the university: A history of the library as an architectural symbol of American higher education. *Winterthur Portfolio*, *42*(2/3), 107-132.

Hillman, N. W. (2016). Geography of college opportunity: The case of education deserts. *American Educational Research Journal*, *53*(4), 987-1021.

Hutchens, N. H., & Fernandez, F. (2023). Academic freedom as a professional, constitutional, and human right. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, *38,* 149-201.

Kisker, C. B. (2016). An inventory of civic programs and practices. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2016*(173)

Kohlbrenner, B. J. (1961). Religion and higher education: An historical perspective. *History of Education Quarterly*, *1*(2), 45-56.

Lowry, R. C. (2007). The political economy of public universities in the United States: A review essay. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, *7*(3), 303-324.

Luedke, C. L., & Corral, D. (2024). "The least I could do is get that four-year degree that they sacrificed so much for:" Undocumented Latina/o families and the college navigation process. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *95*(2), 149-171. [not available on PittCat yet; see Canvas to access PDF]

Marginson, S. (2018). And the sky is grey: The ambivalent outcomes of the California Master Plan for Higher Education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *72*(1), 51-64.

Moser, D. (2014). Captains of erudition: How the first-generation American university presidents paved the way for the student development profession. *Growth: The Journal of the Association for Christians in Student Development*, *13*(13), 3.

Mulcahy, R. P. (1986). The dark side of the Cathedral of Learning: The Turner case. *Western Pennsylvania History: 1918-2022*, 37-53.

Ogren, C. A. (2003). Rethinking the "nontraditional" student from a historical perspective: State normal schools in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *74*(6), 640-664.

Olson, K. W. (1973). The GI Bill and higher education: Success and surprise. *American Quarterly*, *25*(5), 596-610.

Parry, T. D. (2020). The radical experiment of South Carolina: The history and legacy of a reconstructed university. *The Journal of African American History*, *105*(4), 539-566.

Powell, A. G. (1976). University schools of education in the twentieth century. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *54*(1), 3-20.

Reynolds, K. C. (1997). Progressive ideals and experimental higher education: The example of John Dewey and Black Mountain College. *Education and Culture*, *14*(1), 1-9.

Sallee, M. W., & Yates, A. S. (2023). The ties that bind: Student mothers' social capital during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Review of Higher Education*. Advanced online publication.

Sampson, E. E. (1967). Student activism and the decade of protest. *Journal of Social Issues*, *23*(3).

Sanua, M. R. (2000). Jewish college fraternities in the United States, 1895-1968: An overview. *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 3-42.

Schwartz, R. A. (1997). Reconceptualizing the leadership roles of women in higher education: A brief history on the importance of deans of women. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *68*(5), 502-522.

Scott, J. C. (2006). The mission of the university: Medieval to postmodern transformations. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(1), 1-39.

Strohl, N. M., & Ris, E. W. (2023). The higher education generation: World War I and the Truman Commission's path to universal college access. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *98*(3), 269-283.

Singh, V. (2021). Inclusion or acquisition? Learning about justice, education, and property from the Morrill Land-Grant Acts. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, *43*(5), 419-439. [not available on PittCat; see Canvas to access PDF]

Torraco, R. J. (2016). Writing integrative literature reviews: Using the past and present to explore the future. *Human Resource Development Review*, *15*(4), 404-428.

Wang, H. (2020). The National Defense Education Act, the American Association of University Professors and the dilemma of academic freedom in the mid-twentieth century. *History of Education Review*, *50*(1), 67-79. [not available on PittCat; see Canvas to access PDF]

Wicker, P. D. (2024). Well-being and support network affiliations for Black and Indigenous college students during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Education Sciences*, *14*(8).

Wright, B. (1991). The 'untameable savage spirit': American Indians in colonial colleges. *The Review of Higher Education*, *14*(4), 429-452.

Zbrojewska, M. (2008). Dartmouth College v. Woodward-Freedom of contracts and private education. *Krakowskie Studia Międzynarodowe*, (1), 397-403.

Useful Resources

- *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*
- *Inside Higher Education*
- *Chronicle of Higher Education*

Course Policies

Attendance and Engagement

Your attendance and engagement in this course are important in illustrating your commitment to the material, and I recognize that participation manifests in a variety of ways (e.g., contributing to large group dialogues, participating in small group conversations, expanding on peers' discussion board posts, communicating with me outside of class, etc.). What I prioritize is that you actively engage with the course content, your assignments, and your peers.

Please come to class having read each of the assigned readings. You need not have read each article word for word, though I ask that you at least have a general understanding of the piece's takeaways and highlights. You will only get out of the course what you put into it, and engaging with the readings is one key illustration of course engagement.

Even as life happens and sometimes creates distractions, I expect students to be fully present in the classroom. I allow electronic devices for taking notes or looking up relevant content during classroom discussions, though devices are not to be used for non-classroom matters or during presentations from guest speakers, topical facilitations, lectures or other presentations (unless otherwise approved by me). You should not be sitting in class responding to emails, working on other classes, or handling work not connected back to course content. Should you need to address issues unrelated to class, I ask that you step out of the room.

Given the nature of this hybrid course, and fewer class sessions, each student is entitled to one (1) excused absence, so long as they share at least 24 hours in advance of why they are missing class due to sickness, family emergency, or professional commitment. Should you miss two classes (without sharing a day's notice of your reason for your absence, including a personal or family-related health issue), 5% of your overall class grade will be deducted. We can always determine a reasonable way for you to make up participation points in your absence should an emergency unfold. At least three class absences, regardless of the reason, may result in being dropped from the course.

Time Commitment
This is a master's-level course and thus demands that you re-envision this experience differently than what you may have experienced at the undergraduate level. Outside of our seven class sessions, each week will generally require about 6-8 hours of work. Much of this time will be spent on working on assignments, though will also be complemented by course readings, watching some videos, and working with peers at times. Not all readings must be read word for word, and the same with videos, requiring you as the learner to use your best judgment in how deeply to engage with the content.

Communication Policy
I value that we have an honest, thoughtful, and transparent rapport. My commitment to you is that I will provide formative feedback on your assignments, delivering comments within a 7-day period.

I want to make myself as accessible as I can to support your success, and also want to model best practices related to maintaining boundaries between work and leisure time. Most often we will engage via email (bnachman@pitt.edu) and I will respond to your message within 24 hours during weekdays. Should you send me an email beyond Saturday morning, I will generally not respond until Monday, unless it is an emergency that requires you to submit your assignment late. In that case, please put "EFOP 2307: URGENT" in the subject line. I employ these practices to illustrate the necessity of creating space away from email during weekends. Within all emails, I ask that you please mention the class title ("EFOP 2307") in the subject line.

At times I will send course announcements via Blackboard that should also be delivered to your email inbox. Given that this course has a heavy online component, I expect you to **check your Pitt email and Canvas at least once per day**. In that spirit, should I directly send you a message that requires a response, I also expect you to email me back in a timely fashion. I will be more understanding about a situation if you are actively reaching out to and communicating with me.

Please feel free to reach out to me to meet during my office hours (by appointment); this a great space to discuss assignments, course readings, and other topics related to your experience as a graduate student.

Throughout the course, please express your concerns and questions. I cannot fully appreciate or understand what may be unfolding in your class experience, or other parts of your life for that matter that may be causing stress or disruption, unless you communicate with me.
I also expect you to exchange phone numbers and email addresses with any peers with whom you may work on a team project. Participating on a team requires clear and consistent communication; it is your responsibility to share your needs and aspirations with your classmate when working on a project. Should you experience difficulties on your team, I will ask that you immediately set up a meeting involving your classmate(s), yourself, and me to address the issue.

Additionally, the University of Pittsburgh states that "each student is issued a University e-mail address (username@pitt.edu) upon admittance. This e-mail address may be used by the University for official communication with students. Students are expected to read e-mail sent to this account on a regular basis. Failure to read and react to University communications in a timely manner does not absolve the student from knowing and complying with the content of the communications. The University provides an e-mail forwarding service that allows students to read their e-mail via other service providers (e.g., Hotmail, AOL, Yahoo). Students that choose to forward their e-mail from their pitt.edu address to another address do so at their own risk. If e-mail is lost as a result of forwarding, it does not absolve the student from responding to official communications sent to their University e-mail address."

Writing Policy and Considerations

Within all assignments, I ask that you abide by the following guidelines:

- Use typed, double-spaced formatting using 12-point Times New Roman font with one-inch margins
- Feature your name, class number, professor title, and assignment title at the top of the page or on a separate title page
- Follow the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th edition)
- Use in-text citations and references whenever citing information that is not commonly known information
- Paraphrase information as much as possible, limiting quoted material to standout examples
- Provide evidence with any points you are making
- Recognize that academic writing requires re-writing; make sure to proofread your content before submitting.

Respect Policy

In our class we may discuss sensitive topics related to individuals' identities and experiences, or even divisive issues facing education and society more generally. Throughout, I ask that you do not generalize, communicate only about your own experiences, and do not speak *for* or *about* other individuals. Always expect best intentions when classmates share their perspectives.

We will utilize a portion of our first class toward developing additional community guidelines that we will all follow, sign, and re-evaluate later in the semester.

Reflections on Privileges, Identities, and Inequities

Education represents a generative space for learning and un-learning information, and I hope that this classroom experience provides a setting for challenging our ideas about the world. Much research that exists in the world is authored by white, cisgender men in privileged roles, and in this class, I work to highlight the perspectives of minoritized individuals. This means we are engaging with texts that address inequities. We will also explore, at times, disciplines outside of education that reflect the importance of exposure to a variety of experiences and ways of life.

I also work to be transparent about my privileges that shape my ways of being: notably, as a white, middle-class, cisgender man who possesses a terminal degree. These experiences intersect with navigating the world with multiple non-apparent, minoritized identities, including being disabled. I welcome this class to be a space where we continually make sense of our identities, as these often have direct implications on how we consume content, engage in conversation, challenge ideas, and process others in relationship to ourselves.

We are all in a continued state of *becoming*, as I like to describe it, and I ask that you come to this class with an open mind and heart. I want to recognize that sometimes being exposed to new ideas and perspectives, particularly those at odds with prior conceptions and information, may produce discomfort, and that is not inherently bad. In fact, that is learning in action. What is problematic when anyone causes harm to one another, intended or not. We will navigate as a class how to handle such a situation if or when that may emerge. I ask that we always assume best intentions and work to be mindful of others when communicating our ideas.

I also want to recognize that, per the University of Pittsburgh website, "the University of Pittsburgh does not tolerate any form of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation based on disability, race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, genetic information, marital status, familial status, sex, age, sexual orientation, veteran status or gender identity or other factors as stated in the University's Title IX policy. The University is committed to taking prompt action to end a hostile environment that interferes with the University's mission. For more information about policies, procedures, and practices, visit the Civil Rights & Title IX Compliance web page.

I ask that everyone in the class strive to help ensure that other members of this class can learn in a supportive and respectful environment. If there are instances of the aforementioned issues, please contact the Title IX Coordinator, by calling 412-648-7860, or e-mailing titleixcoordinator@pitt.edu. Reports can also be filed online. You may also choose to report this to a faculty/staff member; they are required to communicate this to the University's Office of Diversity and Inclusion. If you wish to maintain complete confidentiality, you may also contact the University Counseling Center (412-648-7930)."

Religious Observances

Per the University of Pittsburgh website, "The observance of religious holidays (activities observed by a religious group of which a student is a member) and cultural practices are an important reflection of diversity. As your instructor, I am committed to providing equivalent educational opportunities to students of all belief systems. At the beginning of the semester, you should review the course requirements to identify foreseeable conflicts with assignments, exams, or other required attendance. If at all possible, please contact me within the first two weeks of the first class meeting to allow time for us to discuss and make fair and reasonable adjustments to the schedule and/or tasks."

Classroom Standards

We will develop some of these collectively during our first in-person class day. Some standards I would like to establish include the following:

- Engage with your classmates
- Be attentive and listen with an open-minded perspective
- Ask questions and share input, though create space for classmates to share their perspectives

Deadlines and Late Work

All assignments, unless otherwise noted on the syllabus, are due on Canvas on Sunday at 11:59pm ET.

I will not accept assignments via email unless there is a technical issue within Blackboard, which will require you to document evidence of the submission process not working.

For each student I offer **one (1)** *no questions asked* extension opportunity, which enables you to email me (within 48 hours following the assignment due date) to ask for an assignment extension. You do not have to share the reason(s) behind the issue and request for an extension. From the time you email me, you would have 48 hours to submit the assignment with no deduction. Otherwise, for each 24 hours that passes beyond this extension time, 10% of the assignment will be automatically docked. You have the discretion of how and when to use this one-time specific extension opportunity. This opportunity *does not* apply for the final paper or final presentation associated with the course paper project.

If you anticipate in advance needing extra time to submit an assignment, you will need to email me *at least* 48 hours before the assignment is due, and 10% of the assignment will be automatically docked for each 24 hours that passes beyond the due date.

If you do not submit an assignment on time, and you have not already communicated with me in advance and/or already used your *no questions asked* extension opportunity, you will be docked 20% of the assignment for each 24 hours that passes beyond the due date.

Please communicate with me about your situation and potential need for an extension in advance.

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 in the program 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 chair/associate chair of the department; (3) if needed, next talking to the associate dean of the school; and (4) if needed, filing a written statement of charges with the school-level academic integrity officer. Dean Andrea Zito is the Associate Dean and Integrity Officer.

Grades

This course involves assigning letter grades to students. Each assignment is accompanied by a rubric featuring a variety of criteria. Please closely read and follow instructions, and recognize that these rubrics, while comprehensive, may not be exhaustive. Please ask questions of me in advance of the assignment to make sure you are on track. To give some further perspective to grading, here in some context:

"A" signifies work that clearly exceeds expectations. Written work falling into this category will demonstrate clarity of purpose, organization, and communication. It will also demonstrate original interpretation of course material.

"B" signifies work that meets expectations, meaning that all aspects of the assignment are completed, but it lacks some of the aspects of "A" work, particularly inconsistent preparation for class or written work that demonstrates less significant insight into the material or frequent grammatical errors.

"C" signifies work that is below expectations, all aspects of the assignment may not have been completed, work demonstrates little preparation for class, or written work that demonstrates little insight into material or grammatical issues that mar the work significantly.

"D" signifies minimal attention to assignments.

An "F" is assigned for incomplete work or any work that breaches University standards of academic integrity.

For clarity, here is how I will provide final grades:
A+ (97% and above); A (94% - 96.9%); A- (90% - 93.9%); B+ (87% - 89.9%); B (84% - 86.9%); B- (80% - 83.9%); C+ (77% - 79.9%); C (74% - 76.9%); C- (70% - 73.9%); D (60% - 69.9%); and F (below 60%).

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 may be used solely for the student's own private use.

School of Education Policies

Departmental Grievance Procedures

Per the University of Pittsburgh website, "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 in EFOP 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 chair/associate chair of the department; (3) if needed, next talking to the associate dean of the school; and (4) if needed, filing a written statement of charges with the school-level academic integrity officer."

Academic Integrity

As the University of Pittsburgh website indicates, "students in this course will be expected to comply with the University of Pittsburgh's Policy on Academic Integrity. 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. This may include, but is not limited to, the confiscation of the examination of any individual suspected of violating University Policy. Furthermore, no student may bring any unauthorized materials to an exam, including dictionaries and programmable calculators.

To learn more about Academic Integrity, visit the Academic Integrity Guide for an overview of the topic. For hands- on practice, complete the Academic Integrity Modules."

A Note about Artificial Intelligence Tools

In this course, academic dishonesty also extends to relying on artificial intelligence (AI) software like ChatGPT to craft information for you. Although in some spaces we can rely on AI in a generative manner, I do not allow students to draw on AI or related software to craft language in written or presentation content.

Disability Services

The University of Pittsburgh recognizes that, "if you have a disability for which you are or may be requesting an accommodation, you are encouraged to contact both your 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 this course."
As your instructor, I want to make sure that I can best leverage your success through a variety of supports. Disability is sometimes a tricky identity to navigate, especially in how, when, and with whom we disclose this information. As much as possible, I want to work with students individually to create supports that do not necessitate them to feel like they must disclose their disability, should they be uncomfortable to do so.

Class Meetings During University-wide Closure

As articulated in the University-wide Closure and Class Cancellation Policy, it is the policy of the University of Pittsburgh to remain open, but in rare instances, circumstances beyond the University's control may necessitate a closure of the University. Such circumstances may include severe weather, power outage, water main issues, and the like.

If feasible during a closure, I intend for our class to meet **remotely** at its regularly scheduled time. I would feature a Zoom link via a course announcement at least 8 hours before class time.

If the university is not closed and disruptive weather appears imminent, we may also switch to a remote Zoom meeting. Similarly, I would feature a Zoom link via a course announcement at least 8 hours before class time.

Grading and Assignment Overview

Assignment	*Weight*	*Deadline(s)*
Class Participation	10%	No deadline; throughout semester
Topical Facilitation	20%	Student picks class session of interest
Course Paper – Proposal	5%	Sun, Sept 14
Journal Article Review	5%	Sun, Sept 28
Book Club Group Summary 1	5%	Sun, Oct 12
Book Club Group Summary 2	5%	Sun, Oct 19
Book Club Group Summary 3	5%	Sun, Nov 2
Course Paper – Full Draft	15%	Sun, Nov 9
Peer Review on Final Paper	No grade	Thurs, Nov 20 to send paper to peer; Meet with peer virtually for the week of Nov 24 to discuss
Course Paper – Final Draft	20%	Sun, Dec 7
Final Presentation	10%	Mon, Dec 8 class session

Assignment Descriptions

Class Participation

First, please refer back to the attendance and engagement portion of the syllabus for expectations on your general presence and engagement in the course.

In my eyes, everyone starts off the semester with the opportunity to receive full points for participation. One may lose points, however, through any or all of these ways:

- Missing two or more class sessions
- Disrespecting peers or guest speakers through using electronic devices (unless otherwise approved by me) during lectures, facilitations, or other presentations
- Engaging in actions that cause harm to any other members of the course
- Arriving to class unprepared to discuss course readings

- Failing to consistently contribute comments or thoughts during class sessions *OR* taking space away from other peers' possibilities to contribute to course discussion

At the end of the semester, **via email by Sun, Nov 30**, you will be filling out a self-assessment where you will be reflecting on how you showed up in the course, what you contributed, and where you see areas of personal growth.

Book Club Group Summaries (5% of course grade each; each due on Oct 12, Oct 19, and Nov 2)

On three occasions this semester, you will have the opportunity to read and discuss a non-fiction book that relates to an issue, or multiple issues, facing American higher education in the 20th century and onward. These discussion periods will take place on the asynchronous weeks during the semester.

You will be dividing the book into three segments; you will handle one-third of it during each of the three meetings. Teams will include two or three people.

For each portion of the book, one team member will serve as the "non-fiction facilitator," coming to the session with at least four discussion questions that will guide the dialogue. By the end of the book club, each team member will have facilitated on one occasion; should your team have two people, you will share the third session. During each 60-90-minute Zoom meeting, you will use the time to address those questions and think about how concepts from the book make links to any topics covered in the course to date. Write these notes and reflections in a Google Doc. Aim to ask different questions with each of the three sessions.

With each date, the "non-fiction facilitator" will be submitting not only the discussion questions, but also a two-page, double-spaced summary of what the group conversed about. It will be *all team members'* responsibility to contribute to crafting the summary. Consider using the latter 30 minutes of the discussion to translate the notes into the summary. Needless to say, draw from your Google Doc to inform the summary.

On a separate page, at the end of the document, the facilitator for that specific summary will briefly denote each team member's contributions to the discussion and completion of the summary.

The bottom of the document will feature a screenshot featuring all team members in the Zoom meeting. I expect this form of documentation to show that everyone was in attendance.

The individual serving as the facilitator for the summary will also be the one to submit the assignment on Canvas.

You will use part of a class session to identify your book of interest**; one team member will email me with the name and a few-sentence explanation behind the selection of the book**. From there I will review your ideas and email you promptly with next steps.

Topical Facilitation

During most weeks when we have our class sessions, we will have the space for one Topical Facilitation. At the beginning of the semester, each student will sign up for a week that they are interested in covering. Most students will work in teams of two. It will then be the facilitators' role to facilitate a class discussion that not only makes sense of *at least one of* the course readings in a fun and compelling manner, but also sparks opportunities for dialogue and activities that are at least somewhat connected to the reading(s). The facilitators must accomplish all of the following:

- Provide a brief PowerPoint lecture on the reading(s), including the major takeaways
- Craft a prompt that will engage fellow students in discussion
- Create an activity (inspired by the topic) that will allow for further engagement of the issue; be creative and think outside the box!

Be sure to have a thorough understanding of the course reading(s). You can use that topic as a launching pad for making sense of a relevant contemporary issue. For instance, if the week's readings were to be centered on the role of college presidents in the 1800s, yes, you will need to focus on that historical context, though think of how the discussion and activity may make sense of issues facing college presidents today!

The facilitators may consider utilizing any of these tools or resources for developing their facilitation, as well as including within the facilitation. These are just examples and the facilitators may employ other resources as well!

- YouTube videos
- News articles
- Social media posts
- Blog posts
- Case studies
- Journal articles

Purpose of the assignment: Provide you the opportunity to engage with the material in a deeper manner, synthesizing your understandings into a presentation and activities to spark fruitful conversation with your peers.

Journal Article Review (5% of course grade; due Sun, Sept 28)

All scholars and scholar-practitioners must be able to consume and critically analyze research articles. This assignment works to orient you to engaging with academic scholarship and examine articles across a variety of criteria.

You will select a peer-reviewed, empirical journal article that relates to your topic of interest for your course paper, using this assignment as an opportunity to fully make sense of it. The purpose of the assignment is to provide you with the foundation to distill academic sources into their major takeaways, pull out important details, interrogate gaps and inconsistencies, identify opportunities for further exploration, and ultimately engage in thoughtful conversation across academic sources.

Please compose a 2-3-page paper (double-spaced) that examines the following factors associated with the paper:

- Introduction and Purpose
- Literature Review
- Research Questions
- Methodology (which methods did the author employ?)
- Data Collection
- Data Analysis
- Findings

In framing your paper, there is no need for inserting section headings to reflect each of these factors. Instead, I encourage you to frame your analysis in a narrative manner. Be sure to address the article's strengths and weaknesses related to its clarity of purpose, originality, use of sources, argument, methods used, presentation of findings, tone, and writing quality. I will also encourage you to allot a few sentences to discuss your process of analyzing the article and how you might approach this process differently moving forward as you engage with additional articles.

Make sure to include any references (on a separate page).

Reminders as you craft this assignment:

- Consider using a piece that will ultimately be a reference for your literature review assignment… and your project generally. Keeping everything streamlined may support your overall efforts.

Purpose of the assignment: Locate and process a relevant peer-reviewed journal article that will not only enhance your comfort in analyzing journal articles overall, but also further the development of your final project.

Course Paper (40% of course grade across all three components; see breakdown on page 12)

Here's an opportunity to explore a topic of interest over the course of the semester in a scaffolded manner, in which you will receive feedback from me (Dr. Brett) at different stages. You have two options to pursue (see below for further details).

It is also worth mentioning that by Thurs, Nov. 13 (assuming you submit your paper on time), you will have reviewed initial feedback from me and started to identify ways to make changes to the paper. You can share your recent full draft submission of the final paper, along with any ideas you have on how to make improvements, with your peer review partners. You will then virtually meet with these peer review partners, having received their paper as well, during the period of Nov 24 – Dec 2. It will be up to the students to create and develop the space to go through ideas.

Be sure to allocate time from Fri, Nov 21-Sun, Nov. 23 to have read through and left comments on the paper your peer sent you for the peer review. Make sure you have concrete comments and ideas to give to them during your meeting that you will both collaboratively set from Nov 24-Dec 2. I recognize that a few of these days fall during the Thanksgiving holiday, so you will want to

either meet before or after Thanksgiving. This peer review process is meant to be generative in offering constructive criticism that will help your colleagues enhance their work.

Course Paper Option A: Case Study Article

- If pursuing this option for the final project, a proposal will be due on Sun, Sept 14, a full draft will be due on Sun, Nov 9, and the final paper will be due Sun, Dec 7.
  - This option entails writing a manuscript, and ultimately intending to submit it to *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership (JCEL)*, which publishes case studies that could be used in classrooms or other settings that encourage discussions around educational leadership. In the case of this course, your article would relate to a contemporary issue within the world of higher education. You are welcome to draw on an issue connected to a popular media topic as serving as the article's foundation, though ultimately you will be developing a fictional scenario.
  - The **proposal** portion of the assignment is to give a brief overview of the topic you envision covering, inclusive of some key *historical moments* and associated issues, complete with citations. You will also give a preview of what the fictional scenario will be about, as well as a few initial ideas of teaching notes, classroom activities, and discussion questions (all components of the JCEL manuscript). Following your submission, I will give feedback that will enable you to focus or alter your direction.
  - The **full draft** is your opportunity to produce the complete paper. You will want to read many examples of published JCEL papers to inspire you in how to frame the various sections.
  - The **final paper** is an updated version of the full draft. You will draw on my comments to inform the changes you make to this paper. At the bottom of the final draft, you will need to include a *table* that features all of my comments from your full draft in one column, your response to each of those comments and how you addressed them in the paper in the second column, and the page number reflecting where you made those changes in the third column. This process mirrors what a revise and resubmit would be like when publishing in an academic journal.
  - The article will contain three primary components. First, the Case Narrative accounts for much of the content. Essentially, it serves as the story. Second, the Teaching Notes section engages in a conversation between the case and appropriate literature on the topic, as well as considers some implications for practice, geared toward the stakeholders who are viewed as the intended audience of the paper. Third, Classroom Activities and Discussion Questions offer opportunities for readers to employ activities that stem from the scenario and engage in meaningful dialogues stemming from the topic.
  - As illustrated in the submission guidelines, the manuscript (and thus the full and final drafts of the assignment) will be 15-20 double-spaced pages. Remember that this length is for the *main* narrative encompassing the three sections, and does not include references, the title page, abstract, etc. Although there are no hard and fast rules regarding how much space to allocate for each section, I would recommend that the Case Narrative accounts for no more than 50% of the paper length, whereas each the Teaching Notes & Classroom Activities and Discussion Questions encompass about 25%. I will not dock you based on not fitting an exact length for each section. I just

encourage you to use your best judgement and refer to other published papers for context.
- Make sure to include all of the mandatory paper components, as demonstrated in the submission guidelines. This will include an abstract, references, and a second document containing identifying information. Remember to double check everything.

Reminders:
- Read many published articles from *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership* to get a sense of how these pieces are written.
- Use context from your interview for this course as helpful information to ground some of your scenario, Teaching Notes, or Classroom Activities/Discussion Questions, though do not rely entirely on that situation for context. This is where I encourage you to draw from your understanding of the literature – also to be illustrated saliently in the Teaching Notes section you write – to inform the scenario.
- Remember that this paper, if published, could be used in higher education program classrooms, board meetings, educational centers, or other spaces aiming to discuss modern issues facing higher education. Think about the transferability of the lessons across various spaces.
- I ask that, following the semester, you submit your paper to *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, so that you may gain additional feedback and potentially see your article in print down the line, should it be accepted. Your assignment grade is *not* contingent on its submission, though I would welcome you letting me know if you end up submitting.

Reminders when reviewing my feedback:
- Remember that although I may only leave a comment once about a particular issue, it does not meant that is the *only* spot where the issue occurs. You must pinpoint those spaces for further improvement.
- You will need to address *all changes/suggestions* I offer; otherwise, you risk deductions to your assignment grade.

Purpose of the assignment: Gain experience in crafting a paper that could be submitted for publication, including developing a narrative based on a relevant issue and developing activities, questions, and reflections that can support other scholar-practitioners.

<u>Course Paper Option B: Literature Review</u>

- If pursuing this option for the final project, a proposal will be due on Sun, Sept 14, a full draft will be due on Sun, Nov 9, and the final paper will be due Sun, Dec 7.
  - This option entails writing a literature review that serves as not only a summary of the topic of interest to you, but also where you are critically engaging with the published work to make sense of the strengths, weaknesses, gaps, inconsistencies, and missed opportunities in how the topic has been written about.
  - Select a topic that relates to a pressing issue in the world of higher education, past, present, and/or future. You may draw on a topic that has been covered in our course explicitly (e.g., slavery, the rise of community colleges, finance), or something that

has not been addressed. What matters most is that you focus your scope accordingly; do not aim to cover the entire history and evolution of a broad topic like for-profit colleges. At the same time, avoid selecting something too niche or narrow that may not yield many sources (e.g., college athletes with emotional support cats). You should select a topic that is of interest to you, that you feel like you can gather enough rich sources, and that feels manageable to cover over the scope of the course paper.

- The **proposal** portion of the assignment is to give a brief overview of the topic you envision covering, inclusive of some key historical moments and associated issues, complete with citations. You will share what you aim to accomplish in your subsequent literature review, including the types of texts you will engage with, topics you will explore, and what you hope to discover. Following your submission, I will give feedback that will enable you to focus or alter your direction.
- The **full draft** is your opportunity to produce the complete literature review. You will want to craft an introduction that orients readers to the topic at hand and what makes the topic worthy of exploration. From there you will have multiple sections illustrative of different facets of the topic. You will be not necessarily summarizing individual articles, but rather engaging in a conversation among sources to tell the history and contemporary challenges and considerations associated with the topic. The full draft will be 10-14 pages long (not inclusive of references).
- The **final paper** is an updated version of the full draft. You will draw on my comments to inform the changes you make to this paper. At the bottom of the final draft, you will need to include a *table* that features all of my comments from your full draft in one column, your response to each of those comments and how you addressed them in the paper in the second column, and the page number reflecting where you made those changes in the third column. This process mirrors what a revise and resubmit would be like when publishing in an academic journal. The final draft will be 10-14 pages long (not inclusive of references).

Reminders as you craft the paper:

- The literature review must include a *synthesis* of literature, not where you go about describing each study one by one. In case you are not as familiar with the notion of synthesizing ideas/sources, what I mean is that you will want to show how multiple studies may examine the same topic, or component, and your sentence demonstrates what those connections are. This may either be explicitly listed in the text ("Both Johnson [2020] and Rogers et al. [2022] applied Astin's I-E-O model as a means to make sense of graduate students' experiences…") or evidenced by the use of multiple sources for the one sentence through in-text citations at the end. You may also have instances of showing how one study builds on the work of another or explores it from a different angle; make this salient! Help show the evolution of how a topic has been studied in the past, thus making it clearer how your work will chart new directions. Ultimately, with your literature review, you are not sharing details of studies one at a time, with paragraph 1 focused on Study A and paragraph 2 focused on Study B, and so forth. You are instead organizing your content topically and thus showcasing a variety of sources within each paragraph in a united manner.
- Critiquing an article requires more than just summarizing what the article was about and what the authors orchestrated. You will want to help the reader know what weaknesses,

missed opportunities, and lack of considerations were inherent in the author's work. In what ways are they shedding new insights into the topic? How effectively are they in constructing and maintaining an argument? While in the literature review section you are not sharing your personal interpretations, I encourage you to truly interrogate articles. Do not take everything you read at face value. Use those interpretations and questions to help influence your process of figuring out how all the pieces fit together in relaying the landscape of the topic.

- Provide an opening and closing to each paragraph and section.
- Double check your APA 7th Edition; the small details matter!
- Paraphrase **content in your own words**. I recognize this may be harder for some than others; here is a brief piece about paraphrasing without plagiarizing. At the end of the day, do not rely on other people or software to translate a piece of text into something slightly different. As graduate students, your role is to process the literature and share your insights on your own. Doing the work yourself can be challenging and difficult, but is necessary as scholars and scholar-practitioners. Remember that I am here to offer perspective or readings to consult in that process.
- Save quotes for the most powerful statements that you could not otherwise paraphrase.
- The best resource you can turn to in figuring out how to write a literature review is to actually just read the literature review of an article that you find to be straightforward, structured well, compelling, and enjoyable. Translate those elements into shaping the infrastructure and contents for your specific literature review.
- There is **no minimum or maximum number of citations, per se**; that said, 5-10 would *not* cut it (as that likely wouldn't give enough context to the landscape), and you also don't need to go overboard and have 40-50. Ultimately, you need enough citations to support the points you make. Should you be seeking some guidance, just read through the literature review section of a peer-reviewed journal article; for instance, look at one of the assigned pieces for this class.
- Although most of your sources should come from peer-reviewed journal articles, **you are welcome to use other sources**, such as book chapters, newspaper articles, magazine articles, dissertations, etc.

Reminders when reviewing my feedback:

- Remember that although I may only leave a comment once about a particular issue, it does not meant that is the *only* spot where the issue occurs. You must pinpoint those spaces for further improvement.
- You will need to address *all changes/suggestions* I offer; otherwise, you risk deductions to your assignment grade.

Purpose of the assignment: Make sense of an amalgamation of scholarship in a way that crystallizes the topic for other scholars.

Final Presentation (10% of course grade; due on Mon, Dec 8)

- This is your opportunity to summarize what you have covered in your final paper (whether taking the case study article or literature review route) and share the main takeaways with the rest of your class community! Be sure to possess a clear outline,

cover all of the major facets that you uncovered, and bring the energy! See rubric details for particular expectations.

Purpose of the assignment: Synthesize your final paper into a digestible presentation.

Course Calendar

Readings listed for the week indicate that you should have read them for that week. For example, for our Sept 15 class session, you should have already read Lowry (2007), Thelin (Chapter 2), and Zbrojewska (2008). Also, dates are subject to change, though will be communicated in advance for making appropriate adjustments.

Week	**Dates**	**Class Session (if applicable)**	**Topic**	**Readings to Handle Before Class Session**	**Guest Speaker(s)** – dates and presenters subject to change	**Assignment Due**
1	8/25-8/31	8/25 (in person)	**Module 1:** The Roots of Higher Ed (pre-American Revolution)	Bastedo et al., Chapter 1 on Ten Generations of American Higher Education Scott, 2006 Torraco, 2016	Writing Center and Pitt Libraries (in person)	
2	9/1-9/7	ASYNCH WEEK	**Module 1:** The Roots of Higher Ed (pre-American Revolution)	Chen et al., 2016 Gyure, 2008 Thelin, Chapter 1		
3	9/8 – 9/14	ASYNCH WEEK	**Module 1:** The Roots of Higher Ed (pre-American Revolution); continued	Dancy & Edwards, 2020 Kohlbrenner, 1961 Wright, 1991		Proposal for Course Paper due 9/14

4	9/15 – 9/21	9/15 (in person)	**Module 2:** Post-Revolution	Lowry, 2007 Thelin Chapter 2 Zbrojewska, 2008		
5	9/22 – 9/28	ASYNCH WEEK	**Module 3:** Civil War and Reconstruction	Coburn, 1988 Parry, 2020 Singh, 2021 Thelin Chapter 3		Journal Article Review due 9/28
6	9/29 – 10/5	9/29 (in person)	**Module 4:** Entering a New Century	Bastedo et al., Chapter 14 on Critical Race Analysis Thelin Chapters 4-5	Dr. Carrie Kortegast – Northern Illinois University (Zoom live)	
7	10/6 – 10/12	ASYNCH WEEK	**Module 4:** Entering a New Century; continued	Bastedo et al., Chapter 18 on Community Colleges Giliberti, 2011 Moser, 2014 Ogren, 2003		Book Summary 1 Due 10/12
8	10/13 – 10/19	ASYNCH WEEK	**Module 5:** Changing Tides	Powell, 1976 Sanua, 2000 Thelin Chapter 6		Book Summary 2 Due 10/19
9	10/20 – 10/26	10/20 (via Zoom)	**Module 5:** Changing Tides; continued	Mulachy, 1986 Reynolds, 1997 Schwartz, 1997	Dr. Ethan Ris – University of Nevada at Reno (Zoom live)	

				Wang, 2020		
10	10/27 – 11/2	ASYNCH WEEK	**Module 6:** GI Bill and the Mid-20th Century	Bastedo et al., Chapter 17 on Broad Access Institutions Graves, 2018 Olson, 1973 Thelin Chapter 7		Book Summary Due 11/2
11	11/3 – 11/9	11/3 (in person)	**Module 6:** GI Bill and the Mid-20th Century; continued	Bastedo et al., Chapter 8 on Activism and Social Movements in College "Giving Feedback for Peer Review" article Marginson, 2018	Dr. Katherine Cho – Loyola University (Zoom live)	Full Draft of Course Paper due 11/9
12	11/10 – 11/16	ASYNCH WEEK	**Module 7:** Post-Civil Rights and Reinvention	Hutchens & Fernandez, 2023 Sampson, 1967 Thelin Chapters 8-9	Dr. Frank Fernandez – University of Wisconsin-Madison (Zoom recording)	Send Course Paper Full Draft (revised) to Colleague for Peer Review; due 11/20
13	11/17 – 11/23	11/17 (in person)	**Module 8:** A New Century of Issues	Bastedo et al, Chapter 4 on The Professoriate in the Twenty-First Century Gándara & Jones, 2020	Dr. Daniel Corral - University of Toronto (Zoom live)	

				Luedke & Corral, 2024		
14	11/24 – 11/30	ASYNCH WEEK	**Module 8:** A New Century of Issues; continued; continued	Hillman, 2016 Thelin Chapter 10		
15	12/1 – 12/7	ASYNCH WEEK	**Module 8:** A New Century of Issues; continued	Kisker, 2016 Sallee & Yates, 2023 Wicker, 2024	Dr. Paris Wicker – University of Buffalo (Zoom live)	Final Paper of Course Paper due 12/7
16	12/8-12/14	12/8 (in person)				Final Presentation in class

Assignment Rubrics

Topical Facilitation (20% of course grade) – week to be determined based on schedule

	Outstanding (full)	Solid	Below Par
Content (60%)	The presenters feature a compelling session that **thoroughly and concretely** incorporates each of the following: • A summary of at least one of the course readings • Activities and conversation with the class that are relevant to the main topic • Clear takeaways for the class	The presenters feature an interesting session that **fairly thoroughly and concretely** incorporates each of the following: • A summary of at least one of the course readings • Activities and conversation with the class that are relevant to the main topic • Clear takeaways for the class	The presenters feature a session that **minimally addresses** and incorporates at least some of the following: • A summary of at least one of the course readings • Activities and conversation with the class that are relevant to the main topic • Clear takeaways for the class

Visuals (10%)	The presenters consistently feature clear and helpful visuals that summarize the content. Slides are neither too cluttered nor super bare. Text is easy to read.	The presenters mostly feature clear and explicit helpful. Sometimes slides have too much content. Text may be hard to read at times.	The presenters do not feature clear and helpful visuals. There may be a dearth or overabundance of content on screen. Text may be hard to read.
Organization (10%)	The presenters deliver material in a clear, logical, and purposeful manner that clearly flows.	The presenters deliver most material smoothly, though there are some instances that are hard to follow.	The presenters deliver content in a disjointed, hard-to-follow manner across many instances.
Length (10%)	The facilitation follows the 45-55-min guidelines	The facilitation lasts in the 40-45-min range or for 55-60 mins	The facilitation lasts less than 30 mins or more than 60 mins
Professionalism (10%)	The presenters avoid informal use of language.	The presenters only demonstrate informal language on a few occasions (e.g., using contractions, demonstrating passive tone [*did, go*], communicating in a manner that sounds conversational)	The presenters consistently demonstrates informal language.

Book Club Group (each of the three submissions is 5% of the course grade)

	Outstanding (full)	Solid	Below Par
Content (80%)	Team members include discussion questions closely relevant to the content at hand and provide a rich, in-depth analysis of the content they have covered. The	Team members include discussion questions somewhat relevant to the content at hand and provide a solid analysis of the content they have covered. The	Team members include discussion questions that are not relevant to the content at hand and/or provide a vague analysis of the content they have covered. The

	content is not only limited to summarizing the text, but also features team members' interpretations and reflections based on the discussion questions.	content is mostly limited to summarizing the text.	content is mostly limited to summarizing the text.
Clarity, Writing Quality (20%)	Team members feature clear sentence structure, precise word choice, and few to no grammatical, punctuation errors.	Team members feature mostly clear sentences, contain appropriate word choice, and/or have some instances of grammatical or punctuation errors.	Team members feature sentences that are unclear, contain inappropriate word choice, and/or have many instances of grammatical or punctuation errors.

Journal Article Review (5% of course grade) – due Sun, Sept 28

	Outstanding (full) – 1% of course grade	Solid – 0.75% of course grade	Below Par – 0.5% of course grade
Content (40%)	The author addresses all of the sections associated with a peer-reviewed journal article AND clearly references each of the criteria illustrated in the directions. The author presents their perspectives in a compelling manner that demonstrates their understanding of the article.	The author addresses *most* of the sections associated with a peer-reviewed journal article AND clearly references *most* of the criteria illustrated in the directions. The author presents their perspectives in a mostly compelling manner that demonstrates their understanding of the article.	The author addresses *only some* of the sections associated with a peer-reviewed journal article AND clearly references *some* of the criteria illustrated in the directions. The author does not indicate they deeply engaged with the article content.
Clarity, Writing Quality (20%)	The author features clear sentence structure, precise	The author features mostly clear sentences,	The author features sentences that are unclear,

	word choice, and few to no grammatical, punctuation errors.	appropriate word choice, and/or some instances of grammatical or punctuation errors.	inappropriate word choice, and/or many instances of grammatical or punctuation errors.
Organization (20%)	The author presents material in a logical, purposeful manner that clearly flows.	The author presents most material smoothly, though there are some instances that are hard to follow.	The author presents content in a disjointed, hard-to-follow manner across many instances.
Formatting, Length (10%)	The author meets the 2-3-page guidelines. All headings are appropriate.		The author exceeds 3 pages or writes under 2 pages. The paper is missing some headings.
Professionalism (10%)	The author avoids informal use of language.	The author only demonstrates informal language on a few occasions (e.g., using contractions, demonstrating passive tone [*did, go*], communicating in a manner that sounds conversational)	The author consistently demonstrates informal language.

Final Paper

Option A: Case Study, Proposal (5% of course grade) – due on Sun, Sept. 14

	Outstanding (full)	Solid	Below Par
Content (40%)	The author capably addresses all of the components associated with the proposal. First, there is a brief overview of the topic that the authors envision covering, inclusive of some key	The author capably addresses *most* of the components associated with the proposal. First, there is a brief overview of the topic that the authors envision covering, inclusive of some key	The author capably addresses *only some* of the components associated with the proposal. First, there is a brief overview of the topic that the authors envision covering, inclusive of some key

	historical moments and associated issues. The author also gives a preview of what the fictional scenario will be about, as well as shares a few initial ideas of teaching notes, classroom activities, and discussion questions. In-text citations are provided throughout, with a references section at the end of the paper.	historical moments and associated issues. The author also gives a preview of what the fictional scenario will be about, as well as shares a few initial ideas of teaching notes, classroom activities, and discussion questions. In-text citations are provided throughout, with a references section at the end of the paper.	historical moments and associated issues. The author also gives a preview of what the fictional scenario will be about, as well as shares a few initial ideas of teaching notes, classroom activities, and discussion questions. In-text citations are provided throughout, with a references section at the end of the paper.
Clarity, Writing Quality (20%)	The author features clear sentence structure, precise word choice, and few to no grammatical, punctuation errors.	The author features mostly clear sentences, appropriate word choice, and/or some instances of grammatical or punctuation errors.	The author features sentences that are unclear, inappropriate word choice, and/or many instances of grammatical or punctuation errors.
Organization (20%)	The author presents material in a logical, purposeful manner that clearly flows.	The author presents most material smoothly, though there are some instances that are hard to follow.	The author presents content in a disjointed, hard-to-follow manner across many instances.
Formatting, Length (10%)	The author meets the 2-page guidelines. All headings are appropriate.		The author exceeds 3 pages or writes under 2 pages. The paper is missing some headings.
Professionalism (10%)	The author avoids informal use of language.	The author only demonstrates informal language on a few occasions (e.g., using contractions, demonstrating	The author consistently demonstrates informal language.

		passive tone [*did, go*], communicating in a manner that sounds conversational)	

Option A: Case Study, Full Draft (15% of course grade) – due on Sun, Nov. 9

	Outstanding (full)	Solid	Below Par
Content (40%)	The author *thoroughly and thoughtfully* addresses all of the components across the entire paper, including a rich Case Narrative, grounded and meaningful Teaching Notes, and applicable Classroom Activities and Discussion Questions.	The author *mostly effectively* addresses all of the components across the entire paper, including a rich Case Narrative, grounded and meaningful Teaching Notes, and applicable Classroom Activities and Discussion Questions.	The author *somewhat effectively* addresses the paper's three components, including a Case Narrative, Teaching Notes, and Classroom Activities and Discussion Questions.
Clarity, Writing Quality (20%)	The author features clear sentence structure, precise word choice, and few to no grammatical, punctuation errors.	The author features mostly clear sentences, appropriate word choice, and/or some instances of grammatical or punctuation errors.	The author features sentences that are unclear, inappropriate word choice, and/or many instances of grammatical or punctuation errors.
Organization (20%)	The author presents material in a logical, purposeful manner that clearly flows.	The author presents most material smoothly, though there are some instances that are hard to follow.	The author presents content in a disjointed, hard-to-follow manner across many instances.
Formatting & Professionalism (10%)	The author avoids informal use of language.	The author only demonstrates informal language on a few occasions (e.g., using	The author consistently demonstrates informal language.

	AND APA is mostly accurate and consistently strong throughout paper.	contractions, demonstrating passive tone [*did, go*], communicating in a manner that sounds conversational) AND APA is somewhat accurate throughout paper.	AND/OR APA is inconsistent and mostly inaccurate (or absent) throughout paper.
Length (10%)	The author meets the 15-20-page guidelines for the main part of the manuscript. All headings are appropriate.		The authors exceeds 20 pages or writes under 15 pages for the main part of the manuscript. The paper is missing some headings.

Option A: Case Study, Final Paper (20% of course grade) – due on Sun, Dec. 7

	Outstanding (full)	Solid	Below Par
Content (40%)	The author *thoroughly and thoughtfully* addresses all of the components across the entire paper, including a rich Case Narrative, grounded and meaningful Teaching Notes, and applicable Classroom Activities and Discussion Questions.	The author *mostly effectively* addresses all of the components across the entire paper, including a rich Case Narrative, grounded and meaningful Teaching Notes, and applicable Classroom Activities and Discussion Questions.	The author *somewhat effectively* addresses the paper's three components, including a Case Narrative, Teaching Notes, and Classroom Activities and Discussion Questions.
Clarity, Writing Quality (10%)	The author features clear sentence structure, precise word choice, and few to no	The author features mostly clear sentences, appropriate word choice, and/or some instances of	The author features sentences that are unclear, inappropriate word choice, and/or many instances of

	grammatical, punctuation errors.	grammatical or punctuation errors.	grammatical or punctuation errors.
Organization (10%)	The author presents material in a logical, purposeful manner that clearly flows.	The author presents most material smoothly, though there are some instances that are hard to follow.	The author presents content in a disjointed, hard-to-follow manner across many instances.
Formatting and Length (10%)	APA is mostly accurate and consistently strong throughout paper. AND The author meets the 15-20-page guidelines for the main part of the manuscript. All headings are appropriate.	APA is somewhat accurate throughout paper.	APA is inconsistent and mostly inaccurate (or absent) throughout paper. AND/OR The author exceeds 20 pages or writes under 15 pages for the main part of the manuscript. The paper is missing some headings.
Professionalism (10%)	The author avoids informal use of language.	The author only demonstrates informal language on a few occasions (e.g., using contractions, demonstrating passive tone [*did, go*], communicating in a manner that sounds conversational)	The author consistently demonstrates informal language.
Quality in Addressing Revisions (20%)	The author thoroughly and capably addresses all of the recommendations from the prior	The author capably addresses many of the recommendations within the prior iterations of the paper.	The author only effectively addresses some of the recommendations within the prior

	iteration of the paper.		iterations of the paper.

Option B: Literature Review, Proposal (5% of course grade) – due on Sun, Sept. 14

	Outstanding (full)	Solid	Below Par
Content (40%)	The authors capably address all of the components associated with the proposal. See directions regarding the content expectations.	The authors capably address *most* of the components associated with the proposal. See directions regarding the content expectations.	The authors capably address *only some* of the components associated with the proposal. See directions regarding the content expectations.
Clarity, Writing Quality (20%)	The author features clear sentence structure, precise word choice, and few to no grammatical, punctuation errors.	The author features mostly clear sentences, appropriate word choice, and/or some instances of grammatical or punctuation errors.	The author features sentences that are unclear, inappropriate word choice, and/or many instances of grammatical or punctuation errors.
Organization (20%)	The author presents material in a logical, purposeful manner that clearly flows.	The author presents most material smoothly, though there are some instances that are hard to follow.	The author presents content in a disjointed, hard-to-follow manner across many instances.
Formatting, Length (10%)	The author meets the 2-page guidelines. All headings are appropriate.		The author exceeds 3 pages or writes under 2 pages. The paper is missing some headings.
Professionalism (10%)	The author avoids informal use of language.	The author only demonstrates informal language on a few occasions (e.g., using contractions, demonstrating passive tone [*did, go*], communicating in a manner that	The author consistently demonstrates informal language.

		sounds conversational)	

Option B: Literature Review, Full Draft (15% of course grade) – due on Sun, Nov. 9

	Outstanding (full)	Solid	Below Par
Content (40%)	The author capably addresses all of the components associated with the literature review. See directions regarding the content expectations.	The author capably addresses *most* of the components associated with the literature review. See directions regarding the content expectations.	The author capably addresses *only some* of the components associated with the literature review. See directions regarding the content expectations.
Clarity, Writing Quality (20%)	The author features clear sentence structure, precise word choice, and few to no grammatical, punctuation errors.	The author features mostly clear sentences, appropriate word choice, and/or some instances of grammatical or punctuation errors.	The author features sentences that are unclear, inappropriate word choice, and/or many instances of grammatical or punctuation errors.
Organization (20%)	The author presents material in a logical, purposeful manner that clearly flows.	The author presents most material smoothly, though there are some instances that are hard to follow.	The author presents content in a disjointed, hard-to-follow manner across many instances.
Formatting, Length (10%)	The author meets the 10-14-page guidelines. All headings are appropriate.		The author exceeds 14 pages or writes under 10 pages. The paper is missing some headings.
Professionalism (10%)	The author avoids informal use of language.	The author only demonstrates informal language on a few occasions (e.g., using contractions, demonstrating passive tone [*did, go*], communicating in a manner that	The author consistently demonstrates informal language.

		sounds conversational)	

Option B: Literature Review, Final Paper (20% of course grade) – due on Sun, Dec. 7

	Outstanding (full)	Solid	Below Par
Content (40%)	The author capably addresses all of the components associated with the literature review. See directions regarding the content expectations.	The author capably addresses *most* of the components associated with the literature review. See directions regarding the content expectations.	The author capably addresses *only some* of the components associated with the literature review. See directions regarding the content expectations.
Clarity, Writing Quality (10%)	The author features clear sentence structure, precise word choice, and few to no grammatical, punctuation errors.	The author features mostly clear sentences, appropriate word choice, and/or some instances of grammatical or punctuation errors.	The author features sentences that are unclear, inappropriate word choice, and/or many instances of grammatical or punctuation errors.
Organization (10%)	The author presents material in a logical, purposeful manner that clearly flows.	The author presents most material smoothly, though there are some instances that are hard to follow.	The author presents content in a disjointed, hard-to-follow manner across many instances.
Formatting, Length (10%)	The author meets the 10-14-page guidelines. All headings are appropriate.		The author exceeds 14 pages or writes under 10 pages. The paper is missing some headings.
Professionalism (10%)	The author avoids informal use of language.	The author only demonstrates informal language on a few occasions (e.g., using contractions, demonstrating passive tone [*did, go*], communicating in a manner that	The author consistently demonstrates informal language.

		sounds conversational)	
Quality in Addressing Revisions (20%)	The author thoroughly addresses all of the recommendations within the full draft portion.	The author capably addresses many of the recommendations within the full draft section.	The author only addresses some of the recommendations within the full draft section; parts are still unadjusted.

Final Presentation (10% of course grade) – due in class on Mon, Dec. 8

	Outstanding (full)	Solid	Below Par
Content (60%)	The presenter effectively summarizes the main takeaways from the paper, as well as concrete examples, that provide a rich and concrete understanding of the topic at hand. Content is explained clearly. The presenter engages the audience.	The presenter mostly effectively summarizes the main takeaways from the paper, as well as concrete examples, that provide a rich and concrete understanding of the topic at hand. Content is explained rather clearly. The presenter somewhat engages the audience.	The presenter does not effectively summarize the main takeaways from the paper, as well as concrete examples, that provide a rich and concrete understanding of the topic at hand. Content is not clear. The presenter may not engage the audience.
Visuals (10%)	The presenter consistently features clear and helpful visuals that summarize the content. Slides are not too cluttered nor super bare. Text is easy to read.	The presenter mostly features clear and explicit helpful visuals. Sometimes slides have too much content. Text may be hard to read at times.	The presenter does not feature clear and helpful visuals. There may be a dearth or overabundance of content on screen. Text may be hard to read.
Organization (10%)	The presenter delivers material in a clear, logical, and purposeful manner that clearly flows.	The presenter delivers most material smoothly, though there are some instances that are hard to follow.	The presenter delivers content in a disjointed, hard-to-follow manner across many instances.

Length (10%)	The presenter follows the 8-10-min guidelines.	The presenters speak in the 10-11 min or 7-8-min range.	The presenter speaks for less than 7 mins or more than 11 mins.
Professionalism (10%)	The presenter avoids informal use of language.	The presenter only demonstrates informal language on a few occasions (e.g., using contractions, demonstrating passive tone [*did, go*], communicating in a manner that sounds conversational)	The presenter consistently demonstrates informal language.