

Rhode Island College
Feinstein School of Education and Human Development
Department of Educational Studies

Course:

SED 555: Literacies in the Disciplines

Course Information:

Pre-requisites: The course is one of 5 required courses in the M.Ed. program core. To take this course, a student must be accepted into the M.Ed./A.S.T.L. program and have completed the preceding core courses in the program (SED 551, SED 552, SED 553, SED 554).

Catalog description: Students examine the theory as well as the research and practice of teaching the multiple literacies of academic disciplines, with particular focus on diverse learners. A field study is conducted.

Relationship to the Professional Program

In-service teachers study contemporary theory and research broadly related to issues of literacy. Teachers analyze literacy materials from their own classrooms. They also design, implement and analyze literacy-based lessons. They conduct field study to look closely at two of their learners, with particular attention to the analysis of students as readers and writers. The readings provide theories, concepts and examples for analysis in the field studies. The work of the course is conducted within a community of like-minded professionals who collaborate in sharing their expertise as well as the challenges of their work. The work of this course builds on the skills and knowledge developed in the preceding core courses, especially the familiarity with practitioner research, theories of learning, and social and cultural factors in schooling.

Course Texts and Materials:

Daniels, H. & S. Zemelman. (2004). Subjects matter. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Maxwell, R.J. (1996). Writing across the curriculum in middle and high schools. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Additional readings will be distributed.

Access to the internet will be required to access web-based materials and to contribute weekly postings to the Course Blog.

Outcomes:

By the end of the course, candidates will be able to:

1. Explain contemporary issues, conceptions and theories of literacy, both reading and writing, of relevance for teaching (K 1; P 1; NBPTS: 1, 4);
2. Apply contemporary research and theories of literacy to the analysis of their students (K 1, 3; P 1, 3; NBPTS: 1, 2, 3, 4);
3. Integrate research and theories of literacy with knowledge of students' diversity for planning of instruction (K 1, 2, 3, 4; P 1, 2, 3, 4; NBPTS: 1, 2, 3, 4);
4. Collaborate with colleagues in the planning of literacy-based teaching, and the examination and analysis of the reading and writing of their own and other candidates' students (K 1, 2, 3, 4; P 1, 2, 3, 4; NBPTS: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5).

Course Requirements

Assignments:

Course Blog and Participation include attendance and preparedness, and active participation in discussions, both online and in class. Every member of the class will be expected to post to the Course Blog at least 24 hours before each class meeting.

Analysis of a Teaching Text is an examination of one of the course texts used in your teaching. In-class activities will provide tools and concepts for the various elements of this activity. Full description of this assignment will be distributed in class.

Literacy-based Lesson Plans will be designed, based on course materials, for your own teaching. You will choose a reading activity and a writing activity to integrate into your teaching. You will submit two plans, copies of student work, and a reflective assessment of the rationale, design, and outcomes for each of the lessons. Full description of this assignment will be distributed in class.

Study of Literacy-based Lessons will be an examination of your literacy-based teaching. For this project, you will observe students' literacy activity, analyze students' work in relation to the implementation of your literacy-based lessons, and apply course concepts and readings to the interpretation of students' literacy activity.

Full description of this project will be distributed in class and will include an assessment rubric.

Performance Assessments:

Assignments	Outcome	Conceptual Framework	NBPTS Core Propositions
Course Blog	1, 2, 3	K 1, 2; P 2, 4.	5
Text Analysis	1, 2, 3, 4	K 1, 2, 3; P 1	1, 2, 3, 4.
Literacy-based Lesson Plans	1, 2, 3, 4	K 1, 2, 3, 4; P 1, 2, 3, 4.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Study of Literacy-Based Teaching	1, 2, 3, 4	K 1, 2, 3, 4; P 1, 2, 3, 4.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5

Course Evaluation:

Course grades are based on the following:

Course Blog and Class Participation	20%
Analysis of a Teaching Text	10%
Literacy-based Lesson Plans	30%
Study of Literacy-Based Lessons	40%

A rubric will be provided for the Student Case Studies Project.

The calculation of final grades will be based on this percentage scale:

94-100	A
90-93	A-
87-89	B+
83-86	B
80-82	B-

Rubric for Study of Literacy-Based Lessons

CATEGORY	7 or 8 points	5 or 6 points	3 or 4 points	1 or 2 points
Descriptive Language	Language is consistently used with careful precision and evident respect for learners and their learning activity.	Language is mostly used with careful precision and evident respect for learners and their learning activity.	Language is sometimes used with careful precision and evident respect for learners and their learning activity.	Language is almost never used with careful precision and evident respect for learners and their learning activity.
Description of Context	Description of the context richly frames the discussion and supports the analysis and interpretation of data.	Description of the context helps to frame the discussion and to provides some support for the analysis and interpretation of data.	Description of the context is somewhat disconnected from the discussion and provides limited support for the analysis and interpretation of data.	Description of the context adds little to the discussion and fails to support the analysis and interpretation of data.
Amount of Information	All topics are addressed and all questions answered with enough material and explanation about each.	All topics are addressed and most questions answered with enough material and explanation about each.	All topics are addressed, and most questions answered with some material and explanation about each.	One or more topics were not addressed.
Quality of Analysis	Discussion clearly presents the data and analysis and includes several supporting details and/or examples.	Discussion clearly presents the data and analysis and includes some supporting details and/or examples.	Discussion relates to the data, but gives insufficient analysis or not enough details and/or examples.	Discussion presents inadequate data and analysis.
Concept(s) from Readings	Any Concept from the course reading is fully explained and the application of the concept to the case study is clear.	Any Concept from the course reading is fully explained and the application of the concept to the case study is somewhat clear.	Any Concept from the course reading is somewhat explained but the application of the concept to the case study is somewhat unclear.	Any Concept from the course reading is not well explained and the application of the concept to the case study is unclear.
Reflection	Reflection offers important insights into the process and results of conducting the instruction.	Reflection offers some insights into the process and results of conducting the instruction.	Reflection offers limited insight into the process and results of conducting the instruction.	Reflection offers no insights into the process or results of conducting the instruction.
Organization	Discussion is very well-organized with well-constructed sections and paragraphs.	Discussion is organized with either well-constructed sections or well-constructed paragraphs.	Discussion is organized, but paragraphs are not well-constructed.	The discussion is not well-organized at the section or paragraph level.
Mechanics	No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.	Almost no grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.	A few grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors.	Many grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors.

Course Resources

Web resources:

For content reading strategies for middle and high school teaching:

<http://www.wested.org/cs/sli/print/docs/685>
<http://www.alliance.brown.edu/topics/literacy.shtml#item12634807a>
<http://knowledgeloom.org/adlit/index.jsp>
<http://www.readingonline.org>

For writing ideas:

<http://www.writingproject.org>
<http://www.ncte.org>

For ELL-related materials, including video presentations, powerpoints, and ELP standards:

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/bilingual/htmls/elp_standards.htm
<http://www.cal.org/resources>

Print resources:

- Alexander, P.A. & Murphy, P.K. (1998). "Profiling the differences in students' knowledge, interest, and strategic processing." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90, pp.435-447.
- Allen, J. (1999). *Words, words, words: Teaching vocabulary in grades 4-12*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Alvermann, D. (1999). "Modes of inquiry into studying engaged reading." In J. Guthrie & D. Alvermann (Eds.), *Engaged reading: Processes, practices, and policy implications* (pp. 134-149). NY: Teachers College Press.
- Applebee, A. N. (1993). *Literature in the secondary school: Studies of curriculum and instruction in the United States*. NCTE Research Report No. 25. NCTE.
- Atwell, N. (1998). *In the middle: New understandings about writing, reading and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Au, K.H. & Raphael, T. E. (2000). "Equity and Literacy in the Next Millennium." *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35, 170-188.

- Bartholomae, D. & A. Petrosky. (1986). *Facts , artifacts and counterfacts: Theory and method for a reading and writing course*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Beck, I.L., Fletcher, J.M., Foorman, B.R., Francis, D. J., Lyon, G. R., McKeown, M.G. Noats, L.C.& Whitehurst, G. J. (2002). *The keys to literacy*, Patton, S. & Whitehurst, G. L. (Eds.) Council for Basic Education: Available on Line: <http://www.c-b-e.org/PDF/KeystoLiteracy2002.pdf>
- Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education Regarding Public High Schools and Ensuring Literacy for Students Entering High School in Rhode Island. (2003). *High school summit report*. Retrieved October 6, 2003, from <http://www.ridoe.net/careerdev/hsregulations.htm>
- Britton, James. (1986). "A quiet form of research." In D. Goswami & P. Stillman (Eds.) *Reclaiming the classroom: Teacher research as an agency of change*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Brown, J. & E. Stephens. (1999). *Handbook of content literacy strategies: 75 practical reading and writing ideas*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- Countryman, J. (1992). *Writing to learn mathematics: Strategies that work, K-12*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Daniels, H. & S. Zemelman. (2004). *Subjects matter: Every teacher's guide to content-area reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Greenleaf, C., R. Schoenbach, C. Cziko, F. Mueller. (2001). Apprenticing adolescents to academic literacy. *Harvard Educational Review* 71(1): 79-129.
- Gray, J. (2000). *Teachers at the center*. Berkeley, CA: NWP.
- Hynd, C. (1999). "Instructional considerations in middle and secondary schools." In J. Guthrie & D. Alverman (Eds.), *Engaged Reading: Processes, practices, and policy implications* (pp. 81-104). NY: Teachers College Press.
- Lenz, K. & Ehren, B. (2003). "Strategic content literacy initiative: Focusing on reading in secondary schools," U of Kansas Center for Research on Learning.
- National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges. (2003). *The neglected "R": The need for a writing revolution*. Princeton: NJ: College Entrance Examination Board.
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices. (2005). *Reading to achieve: A governor's guide to adolescent literacy*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

- National Reading Panel. (2000). Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. Website: <http://www.nationalreadingpanel.org/>
- New England Common Assessment program (NECAP). (2005). Grade span expectations, (GSE) and Grade level expectations (GLE) for Reading and Writing.
- Newkirk, T. (Ed.) ((1986). *Only connect: Uniting reading and writing*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Nystrand, M. & Gamoran, A. (1991). "Student engagement: When recitation becomes conversation." In H. Waxman & H. Walberg (Eds.) *Contemporary research on teaching*. Berkeley: McCutchan.
- Opitz, M.F. (1998). *Literacy instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students: A collection of articles and commentaries*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2004). *PreK-12 literacy policy*.
- Rhode Island Office of Higher Education. (2005). *RI Public Higher Education's Entry-Level Reading and Writing Expectations*. In draft.
- Rigg, P. and Allen, V. (Eds.). (1989). *When they don't all speak English: Integrating the ESL student into the regular classroom*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Routman, R. (1996). *Literacy at the crossroads: Crucial talk about reading, writing, and other teaching dilemmas*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Schoenbach, R.,C. Greenleaf, C. Cziko, L. Hurwitz. (1999). *Reading for understanding: A guide to improving reading in middle and high school classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schoenbach, R., J. Braunger, C. Greenleaf, C. Litman. (2003). Apprenticing adolescents to reading in subject-area classrooms. *Phi Delta Kappan* 85(2): 133-138.
- Tovani, C. (2000). *I read it, but I don't get it: comprehension strategies for adolescent readers*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Tovani, C. (2004). *Do I really have to teach reading? Content comprehension, Grades 6-12*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Wilhelm, J. (1997). *"You gotta BE the book": Teaching engaged and reflective reading with adolescents*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Young, A. & T. Fulwiler. (Eds.) (1986). *Writing across the disciplines: Research into practice*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Zemelman, S., H. Daniels and A. Hyde. (1998). *Best practice: New standards for teaching and learning in America's schools* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.