Location: Irvine Campus Room 105
Day and Time: Wednesdays 4pm-9:30pm (break 6:30-7)
Instructor: Jennifer Goldstein
Office: Irvine Campus Room 156
E-mail: jengoldstein@fullerton.edu
EMAIL GREATLY PREFERRED TO PHONE, SEE “RESPONSE TIME” BELOW
Phone: (657) 278-1727
Office hours: Wednesday 2pm-4pm and by appointment Monday and Thursday
Technical support: (657) 278-7777

Table 1: Education Unit Conceptual Framework
A. EDUCATION UNIT CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Mission
The College of Education is committed to the preparation and professional development of innovative and transformative educators who advance just, equitable, and inclusive education. As a professional community of scholar-practitioners, we promote creativity, collaboration, and critical thinking as fundamental to student achievement and success in a diverse and interconnected world.

Program Outcomes and Indicators
After successful completion of a program of study, our credential recipients and program graduates are:

1. Knowledgeable and Competent Specialists who
   a) demonstrate a strong foundation of knowledge
   b) implement effective practice
   c) use current technologies for teaching and learning

2. Reflective and Responsive Practitioners who
   a) advance just, equitable, and inclusive education
   b) make informed decisions
   c) participate in collaborative endeavors
   d) think critically and creatively

3. Committed and Caring Professionals who
   a) demonstrate leadership potential
   b) maintain professional and ethical standards
   c) engage in continuous improvement
PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS EXPECTED OF CANDIDATES
Faculty model and encourage all candidates to reflect dispositions that represent the values and attitudes expected of professionals in the field of education. These dispositions are based on the Education Unit’s conceptual framework and encompass several behavioral indicators within the three program outcomes. As candidates move through their programs it is expected they demonstrate these dispositions. Please review the full list of dispositions found at the faculty documents section of the COE website.

RESPONSE TIME
The instructor will usually respond to email within 24 hours Sunday-Thursday. The instructor is not online Friday-Saturday. Email is a far more effective means of communication than voicemail messages, which will be picked up within 48 hours.

CATALOGUE COURSE DESCRIPTION
Intended for doctoral students currently serving as curriculum and instructional leaders or preparing for this role, this course examines the philosophical foundations and contemporary approaches, processes, issues, and trends related to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the P-12 curriculum. Students explore the impact of political, economic, and social forces on curriculum development and problem-solve pragmatic solutions for managing and transforming curricular, instructional, and assessment practices.

STUDENT LEARNING GOALS AND RELATED OBJECTIVES
This section presents the course’s student learning goals and lists the learning objectives related to each goal. The objectives indicate the competencies candidates will develop by the end of the course.

Graduates of the Program will be:
I. Experts in Educational Leadership
   a. Who possess a deep understanding of the complex nature of learning and teaching so that they are able to guide and assist instructional practice.
   b. Who understand the needs of adult learners and can apply the theories found in the androgogy\(^1\) literature to the process of educational reform.
   c. Who are skilled users of techniques for forecasting, planning, and management of change processes in education including use of technology as a resource.
   d. Who are aware of cutting-edge technologies and how they can be used to enhance teaching, learning, and leadership of the educational enterprise.

II. Professionals Whose Practice is Informed by Scholarly Literature
   a. Who will critique informal ideas about best practice on the basis of the literature.
   b. Who will have a sense of the limits of the literature, as to its applicability to the work of educational professionals, its fundamental validity and reliability, and as to questions of which groups are empowered or marginalized by what is implied in the literature.
   c. Who will foster and encourage best practices within their organizations, based on critical analysis of scholarly literature.
   d. Who can develop with their colleagues and subordinates the ability to participate in communities of learning based on reflective practice and critique of the scholarly literature.
   e. Who can define, contrast, and evaluate the multiple perspectives presented in the scholarly literature regarding education.
   f. Who can critique proposals for research and/or program implementation.

\(^1\) As distinguished from pedagogy, the Greek root [ped] makes reference to children, andragogy references the art and science of teaching adults.
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g. Who can broker consultants and researchers in pursuit of organizational goals, independently assessing organizational needs and matching consultant/researcher skills and proposals to those needs.

III. Reflective Practitioners
   a. Whose professional experience is systematically engaged, compared, and critiqued in classroom and other learning experiences.
   b. Whose professional experience will be brought to bear on the areas of their study, finding relevance and application for principles derived from the literature.

II. Critical Thinkers
   a. Whose thinking is probabilistic, recognizing the indeterminacy of educational and social contexts.
   b. Whose professional thinking is marked by hypothetical reasoning, meaning that conclusions are remorselessly yet robustly tentative, open to falsification on the basis of new valid and reliable data.
   c. Who exhibit a bias for evidence in decision-making, preferring strongly evidence that is systematic and gathered from multiple sources and via sound means of collection, which are tested against the scholarly literature, and the realities of changing circumstances.

III. Change Agents
   a. Whose knowledge of research enables them to interpret findings, make judicious applications of research, and advise others in policy positions.
   b. Who are able to undertake first-hand investigations of local problems using applied research and appropriate methods for generating valid and reliable results.
   c. Who are able to select applied research that addresses significant questions and ground it within the general framework of the scholarly literature.
   d. Who use research results and a sophisticated understanding of organizational structures, cultures, and institutional networks to foster positive reform efforts within their organizations and across educational institutions.

VI. Self-Aware and Ethical Professionals
   1. Who will seek contexts and means for professional-life-long learning and connections with scholarly literature.
   2. Who will demand sophisticated feedback on their own performance and that of others, informed by scholarly understandings.
   3. Who understand that education is embedded in a network of social and political structures that can be influenced and also will exert powerful influences on the educational process at all levels.
   4. Who understand and support the ethical expectations of the education profession and strive to make their professional practice serve the needs of students and the community.

VII. Professionals Who Value Diversity
   a. Who understand how their life histories shapes their views about the literature, organizations, and groups and who understand how to create collaborative environments that welcome and serve diverse members—cultural/linguistic diversity, gender, ableness, and age-span differences.
   b. Who work to shape learning communities at their sites that are more humane and responsive to all students and are open to the wider community.

REQUIRED TEXTS
All articles/chapters are available on Titanium or Dropbox.
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Slayton, J. & Mathis, J. (2010). Building the leaders we need: The role of presence, learning conditions, and andragogy in developing leaders who can change the face of public pre-K through 12 education. *Advances in Educational Administration, 11*, 23–45.


Stiggins TBD


Recommended (optional) readings
Black & Wiliam TBD


**OTHER REQUIRED MATERIALS**
To be distributed periodically throughout semester.

**ATTENDANCE**
In the absence of compelling personal or professional obligations that could not be rearranged, students are expected to attend every class session. In the event of an unavoidable conflict, students are expected to notify the instructor in advance and are responsible for the learning objectives addressed in the missed session. Absences or frequent tardies/early departures will result in a loss of participation credit.

**GRADING POLICY AND GRADING STANDARDS FOR THE COURSE**
Your grade in this course is based on four things:
- Participation- 20 points
- Video Response - 20 points
- Inquiry Team Presentations - 30 points (15 points each)
- Reflection Paper - 30 points

_Syllabus subject to change at any time_
Total- 100 points

Course Grades:
A = 90 – 100 points
B = 80 – 89 points
C = 70 – 79 points

Plus and minus grades may be given at the end of the semester to recognize exemplary work (e.g., A+) or when accumulated points are at the extreme ends of the scale.

Students in the program are expected to perform at the doctoral level. Only courses in which grades of A+, A, A-, B+ or B are received may be applied toward degree requirements. Course grades of A+, A, or A- are assigned for outstanding scholarship. Grades of B+ and B are assigned for strong scholarship. Grades of B- may be accepted in partial satisfaction of degree requirements if the student has a grade point average of at least 3.0 in all courses applicable to the degree. Grades of C, D, or F will be assigned when scholarship does not meet course expectations for successful performance.

PARTICIPATION
Classes are structured on the belief that each student has important contributions to make and that learning is greatly enhanced through the social construction of knowledge. This course demands your active and thoughtful participation in order to fulfill the goals of the doctoral program and the course goals indicated above. Preparation for each seminar meeting is the foundation for scholarly dialog. Prior to each meeting, seminar members are required to read and reflect on the material to be discussed. It is mandatory that you attend every class and participate actively in the class discussions. Missing class, being late for class, or leaving class early will impact your grade. During class discussions, students are expected to demonstrate respect and tolerance for the diverse ideas, perspectives, and opinions held by others.

During the course, participants will:
- Be reflective practitioners.
- Engage in inquiry as stance.
- Be emerging scholars who engage in dialogue with texts and the authors read, including across multiple texts and across sessions of the course.
- Draw from their own experience, but situate those experiences within the larger scholarship and ground their opinions with concrete references to literature (which may include disagreement with literature!).
- Display respect for their colleagues, actively listening to the ideas of others by limiting sidebar conversations and making space for all participants to engage. Participants neither dominate nor shy away from the group’s discussion.
- Arrive on time and prepared!
- Submit work on time.
ASSIGNMENTS

In class performance task: Video Response
Occurs June 25
20 points

Students will watch a video, take a low-inference transcript, and then have time in class to write a letter regarding the observation. While such a letter cannot take the place of a face-to-face conversation, students will use the space of the letter to engage with course concepts to date. I will provide a rubric separately.

In-class Performance Task: REVISED Inquiry Team Presentations
July 23
30 points

You will conduct instructional inquiry with members of a team (K-5, 6-8, and 9-12/university) in the area of writing. Given the timing of this course, you will not be able to actually conduct instructional interventions; however, you will use student work samples to launch your team’s study of and reflection on the writing curriculum in your districts.

- **In class week 2 (6/11):** Those who are able to will bring writing samples for three specific struggling students in your class/school/district. Where are students now and where do they need to be? Using the analytical tool provided, score the samples. *(Note to elementary group: Modify the tool as needed if necessary to match your samples if the work is from primary grades.)* By the end of class, report out:
  1. What exactly do the kids know/not know in terms of paragraphs and sentences?
  2. If you had instructional time left with these students, what would you focus on and why? Select a common instructional focus (a high leverage skill gap) for these students as a group in the area of sentences or paragraphs based on the data you collect. Specify a very clear, measurable goal that students could achieve with your help.

- **In class week 3 (6/18):** Bring the writing curriculum from your district relevant to the instructional focus of sentences and/or paragraphs (any and all). Analyze, reporting out for the following:
  1. Compare – what’s common and what’s different across your districts?
  2. What curriculum, if any, are your districts promoting in the specific area of sentences and paragraphs?
  3. Put these two pieces together. How and to what extent do these curricula address what you identified as gaps when you analyzed student work? In other words, to what extent are the things that you identified that students do not know addressed in these curricula?

There is then **one team product due on 7-23** (with a final individual reflection due 7-25, discussed separately, below). You will make a short PowerPoint presentation (15 minutes max) with handouts for the class. Group work products are the result of work of all group members, and everyone in the group can stand behind them.

Tell us a brief, concise, story of what you learned about the implications for leadership of student improvement in the era of Common Core.

Syllabus subject to change at any time
1. Remind us about the relationship between what your sample students could and could not do and the current curricular demands in your districts.

2. How, if at all, do you anticipate the curriculum to shift in your district moving forward with Common Core, and how would those shifts affect the students whose work you examined?

3. How, if at all, will writing assessments at various levels (classroom, district, state) capture what your students can and cannot do? How, if at all, will these assessments inform teaching practice and curriculum choices in order for your students to learn the things you determined that they could not do?

4. What have you learned about student needs in writing/literacy/ELA from your inquiry work and that of your classmates?

5. What are the implications of all of this for leadership of curriculum and instructional practice at the district, building, and classroom level? What is your stance towards (beliefs about) these implications, and what action can/will you take moving forward?

This assignment shows the practical connection with the work world and addresses the following CPSEL(s):

- CPSEL # 1 Development and Implementation of a Shared Vision
- CPSEL # 2 Instructional Leadership

Reflection Paper
Due July 30
30 points

This is your opportunity to reflect on what you have learned in the course. Below are questions that you must answer (and some may be added as we go), but you can add reflection on anything else of your choosing related to the course content.

1) What did you learn from the inquiry team process about the students, yourselves, assessments, the written/expected curriculum, and working in a group?

2) What did you learn about facilitating teacher development related to your curricular area or culturally sustaining pedagogy? Specifically, how would you facilitate teacher learning in the future in this area (for example with coaching of math, teacher inquiry in science, or reflective practice in cultural sustenance)?

I will provide a rubric separately.

Note that Participation makes up the remaining 20 points towards 100 and is discussed in its own section of the syllabus, above.

This assignment shows the practical connection with the work world and addresses the following CPSEL(s):

- CPSEL # 1 Development and Implementation of a Shared Vision
- CPSEL # 2 Instructional Leadership

LATE ASSIGNMENTS
Except in extreme, unavoidable circumstances, papers are due in both hard and e-copy by the start of class; points will be deducted from late papers.
TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

Class 1: June 4
Topic: Course Intro, Course Frame: Leaders as Teacher Educators

Read (in class): Slayton & Mathis

Class 2: June 11
Topic: Ongoing professional learning: rethinking “professional development”
The role of reflective practice and andragogy

Read ahead:
Webster-Wright
Cochran-Smith & Lytle

Optional:
Rodgers

In-class:
Knowles et al.

** BRING STUDENT WRITING SAMPLES!!

Class 3: June 18
Topic: Professional growth: PLCs, inquiry teams, and other team-based models
The role of formative assessment of student learning

Read ahead:
Tyre (*Atlantic*)
Talbert

Optional:
Stein & Coburn
Snow-Gerono
Coburn & Turner
Grossman et al.
Ferandez & Chokshi

In-class:
Stiggins

** BRING Local writing curriculum documents

Class 4: June 25
Topic: Professional growth: coaching, mentoring, and other individual-based models
The role of giving feedback to teachers on practice

Read ahead:
Achinstein & Athanases
Rivera-McCutchen & Panero
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Optional:
Taylor
Feiman-Nemser
Carver

Due: In-class performance task: Video response

Class 5: July 2
Topic: “Performance management”: the new teacher evaluation
The role of multiple measures of teaching effectiveness

Read ahead:
TBD

Optional:
Hatch

In-class:
TBD

Class 6: July 9
Topic: Developments in curriculum: The Common Core
The role of culturally sustaining pedagogy

Read ahead:
Ladson-Billings
Paris & Alim
PACE Report, “Getting to the Core” (available at the PACE website)

Optional:
Stein & Nelson

GUESTS: Rhonda Cameron & Christine Olmstead, OCDE

Class 7: July 16
Topic: Distributing leadership for student learning

Read ahead:
Goldstein (2004)
Goldstein (2009)

Optional:
Goldstein (2013)

In class:
Spillane (2006)

Class 8: July 23
Topic: Inquiry team presentations

Due:

Syllabus subject to change at any time
Inquiry team presentation

July 25th (NO CLASS!)
Due: Reflection Paper
**Course Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Read Ahead</th>
<th>Read in Class</th>
<th>Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (6/4)</td>
<td>Course Intro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Frame: Educational Leaders as Teacher Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (6/11)</td>
<td>Ongoing professional learning: rethinking “professional development”</td>
<td>Webster-Wright</td>
<td>Knowles et al.</td>
<td>Student writing work samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The role of andragogy and reflective practice</td>
<td>Cochran-Smith &amp; Lytle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (6/18)</td>
<td>Professional growth: PLCs, inquiry teams, and other team-based models</td>
<td>Talbert</td>
<td>Local writing curriculum documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The role of formative assessment of student learning</td>
<td>Tyre (Atlantic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional: Rodgers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (6/25)</td>
<td>Professional growth: coaching, mentoring, and other individual-based models</td>
<td>Achinstein &amp; Athanases</td>
<td>Stiggins</td>
<td>In-class performance task: Video response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The role of giving feedback to teachers on practice</td>
<td>Rivera-McCutchen &amp; Panero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional: Taylor Feiman-Nemser Carver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (7/2)</td>
<td>The purposes of teacher evaluation</td>
<td>Danielson &amp; McGreal Darling-Hammond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The role of formative and summative assessment of teachers, and multiple measures of teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>Hatch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional: Stein &amp; Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional: Goldstein (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (7/23)</td>
<td>Inquiry team presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td>In-class performance task: Inquiry team presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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UNIVERSITY INFORMATION

1. **Titanium**
   As a registered student you are enrolled in Titanium. You may access Titanium for all your classes by clicking on your student portal, found on the CSUF website. Problems? Contact (657) 278-5619. If you still need more help, contact (657) 278-7777. Check Titanium weekly, the night before class, for any pertinent or last minute, updated information.

2. **Students with Special Needs**
   Please inform the instructor during the first week of classes about any disability or special needs that you may have that may require specific arrangements related to attending class sessions, carrying out class assignments, or writing papers or examinations. According to California State University policy, students with disabilities must document their disabilities at the Disability Support Services (DSS) Office in order to be accommodated in their courses.

3. **Academic Dishonesty Policy**
   Academic dishonesty includes such things cheating, inventing false information or citations, plagiarism, and helping someone else commit an act of academic dishonesty. It usually involves an attempt by a student to show a possession of a level of knowledge or skill which he/she in fact does not possess. Cheating is defined as the act of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for work by the use of any dishonest, deceptive, fraudulent, or unauthorized means. Plagiarism is defined as the act of taking the work of another and offering it as one’s own without giving credit to that source. An instructor who believes that an act of academic dishonesty has occurred (1) is obligated to discuss the matter with the student(s) involved; (2) should possess reasonable evidence such as documents or personal observation; and (3) may take whatever action (subject to student appeal) he/she deems appropriate, ranging from an oral reprimand to an F in the course. Additional information on this policy is available from University Policy Statement 300.021 found at the UPS section of the Academic Senate website.

4. **Two week plan for distant instruction should on-campus instruction be interrupted**
   In case of instruction interruption, please check the course website for weekly instructional activities, which may include multimedia presentations, discussion forums, group work (to be conducted via Titanium groupings), and text and electronic readings. For additional information, please call the California State University, Fullerton Campus Operation and Emergency Closure Information Line: 657-278-4444

5. **Emergency Contact**
   In the event of emergency, contact the University Police at (657) 278-3333. Additional information can be found at the CSUF Emergency Preparedness website.

6. **Library Support**
   Pollak Library Assistance available for Online Students with online instruction guidelines are available on the CSUF library website.
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7. **Policy on Retention of Student Work**
All student work will be retained for one year following the end of the course.

ASSIGNMENT RUBRICS

**EDD 621A Summer 2014 – Video Response Assignment (20 points possible)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary (A+/A)</th>
<th>Good (A-/B+/B)</th>
<th>Weak (B-/C+)</th>
<th>Does Not Meet Standard (C-F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content (12 points)</strong></td>
<td>Fully responds to prompt.</td>
<td>Responds to prompt.</td>
<td>Loosely responds to prompt.</td>
<td>Does not respond to prompt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of course content to date, and applies and/or extends that understanding in novel ways.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a clear and accurate understanding of course content to date.</td>
<td>Demonstrates some understanding of course content to date, though limited.</td>
<td>Does not present an understanding of course content to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logic &amp; Organization (4 points)</strong> (from CSUF COE Writing Standards)</td>
<td>Develops ideas cogently, organizes them logically within ¶’s, connects them with effective transitions; clear and logically consistent organization relating all ideas together.</td>
<td>Develops unified and coherent ideas within paragraphs with generally adequate transitions; clear overall organization relating most ideas together.</td>
<td>Develops and organizes ideas in paragraphs that are not necessarily connected with transitions; some overall organization, but some ideas may seem illogical and/or unrelated.</td>
<td>Does not develop ideas cogently, organize them logically within paragraphs or connect them with clear transitions; uneven or ineffective overall organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control of Language (4 points)</strong> (from CSUF COE Writing Standards)</td>
<td>Exact control of language, including effective word choice and sentence variety; superior facility with the conventions of standard written English.</td>
<td>Clear and effective control of language, including word choice and sentence variety; competence with the conventions of standard written English.</td>
<td>Intermittent control of language, including word choice and sentence variety; minor errors in standard written English.</td>
<td>Intermittent or poor control of language, including word choice and sentence variety; major errors in standard written English impeding understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EDD 621A Summer 2014 - Inquiry Team Presentations (30 points possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content (20 points)</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Does not meet standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>You clearly present the following:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly clear</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- what your sample students could and could not do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the relationship between this skill gap and the current curricular demands in your district(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the way your designed assessment would provide needed additional information regarding this skill gap to classroom teachers in order to design instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>You present compelling analysis of the following:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>No analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- how current writing assessments at various levels (classroom, district, state) capture what your students can and cannot do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- how these assessments inform teaching practice and curriculum choices in order for your students to learn the things you determined that they could not do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- how you anticipate Common Core curriculum shifts and related assessments (SBAC) to affect the students whose work you examined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>You present reflection on the following:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td>No reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- what you learned about student needs in writing/literacy/ELA from your inquiry work and that of your classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the implications of all of this for leadership of curriculum and instructional practice at the district, building, and classroom level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- your stance towards (beliefs about) these implications, and the action you can/will take moving forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logic &amp; Organization (5 points)</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Does not meet standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develops ideas cogently, organizes them logically, and connects them with effective transitions.</td>
<td>Mostly well organized</td>
<td>Very loosely organized</td>
<td>Disorganized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses clear and logically consistent organization relating all ideas together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teamwork (5 points)</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Does not meet standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All members of the team come across as one voice.</td>
<td>Mostly unified team</td>
<td>Little unity evident</td>
<td>Team members work at cross purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of all members in the work is evident (which does not mean that all members must present).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDD 621A Summer 2014 - Reflection Paper (30 points possible)

This is your opportunity to reflect on what you have learned in the course. Below are questions that you must answer, but you can add reflection on anything else of your choosing related to the course content.

1. What did you learn from the inquiry team process about the students, yourselves, assessments, the written/expected curriculum, and working in a group?
2. What did you learn about facilitating teacher development related to your curricular area or culturally sustaining pedagogy? Specifically, how would you facilitate teacher learning in the future in this area (for example with coaching of math, teacher inquiry in science, or reflective practice in cultural sustenance)?
3. If any of the literature we read will inform your dissertation work, please explain how (if not already answered in #2).
4. What did you learn (good and bad) about structuring adult learning from our process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Does not meet standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content (20 points)</strong></td>
<td>Addresses the required questions.</td>
<td>Addresses the required questions.</td>
<td>Loosely addresses the required questions.</td>
<td>Does not address the required questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Embraces an inquiry stance (the space of “not knowing”).</td>
<td>Demonstrates comfort with “not knowing.”</td>
<td>Demonstrates some comfort with “not knowing.”</td>
<td>Does not demonstrate any comfort with not knowing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of course content to date, and</td>
<td>Demonstrates a clear and accurate understanding of course content to</td>
<td>Demonstrates some understanding of course content to date, though</td>
<td>Does not present an understanding of course content to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>applies and/or extends that understanding in novel ways.</td>
<td>date.</td>
<td>limited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logic &amp; Organization (5 points)</strong></td>
<td>develops ideas cogently, organizes them logically within ¶’s, connects them with effective transitions; clear and logically consistent organization relating all ideas together</td>
<td>develops unified and coherent ideas within paragraphs with generally adequate transitions; clear overall organization relating most ideas together</td>
<td>develops and organizes ideas in paragraphs that are not necessarily connected with transitions; some overall organization, but some ideas may seem illogical and/or unrelated</td>
<td>does not develop ideas cogently, organize them logically within paragraphs or connect them with clear transitions; uneven or ineffective overall organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(from COE Writing Standards)</td>
<td><strong>Control of Language (5 points)</strong></td>
<td>exact control of language, including effective word choice and sentence variety; superior facility with the conventions of standard written English</td>
<td>clear and effective control of language, including word choice and sentence variety; competence with the conventions of standard written English</td>
<td>intermittent control of language, including word choice and sentence variety; minor errors in standard written English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>