

University of Calgary
Werklund School of Education
Graduate Programs in Education



EDER 603.23 L09 Writing Educational Research
Winter 2016

Instructor: Sarah Elaine Eaton, Ph.D.

Virtual Office: <https://connectmeeting.ucalgary.ca/saraheaton/>

Phone: 403-244-9015

Email: seaton@ucalgary.ca

Skype: SarahElaineEaton

Office Hours / Virtual Office Hours: By appointment

Term Dates: January 11, 2016 – April 13, 2016

Special Dates:

- February 14 – 21, 2016 - Reading Week. No classes. University open.
- February 15, 2016 – Alberta Family Day. No classes. University closed.
- Friday, March 25, 2016 – Good Friday. No classes. University closed.

Adobe Connect Sessions:

There will be three synchronous Adobe Connect sessions (research check points) throughout the term. Each session will be scheduled for one hour and will be recorded. Additional individual or small group Adobe Connect sessions may be scheduled with the instructor as needed.

- Wednesday, January 13, 2016 - 5:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
- Wednesday, February 24, 2016 - 5:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
- Wednesday, March 30, 2016 - 5:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

This course will focus on examining and developing the skills associated with crafting an academic report and discussion on research data. Topics include genres and purposes of academic writing, as well as venues for presentation and publication. An academic paper is more than a compilation of relevant literature, attending information and a conclusion.

An acceptable paper, whether intended for an academic or a professional audience, and whether a report of findings or a theoretical-philosophical argument, takes a clearly defined idea, situates it in the current literature, and supports it with a well-structured discussion. The principal intentions of this course are to introduce students to the various structures of academic and professional papers and to provide support in their efforts to craft, present and potentially publish their written work.

A traditional approach to writing educational research involves first learning *about* writing, then learning to write. Learners first study sample texts, analyzing them and then dissecting them, examining their structure, argument and style. The next step often involves producing an original piece of writing that mimics the style, tone and structure of the sample text. The final step is to integrate elements of the student's own voice and style with elements of the texts they have previously studied. The rationale behind this approach is that the student must first learn what counts as excellent writing by learning about writing. Only then are they prepared to write themselves.

This course takes a non-traditional approach to learning to write for scholarly or professional purposes. Students will focus on writing, offering feedback to peers, revising, and incorporating feedback. That is to say, students will spend the majority of their time in this course focused on learning to write for research purposes.

Students take on three key roles during this course:

- 1) **Writer** – Crafting an original work intended for sharing in a public forum is a key task in this course.
- 2) **Reviewer** – Developing your skills offering substantive and supportive feedback to peers to help them improve their writing so that they too, are successful in sharing their work in a public forum as another key task.
- 3) **Reviser** – Learning to thoughtfully consider and incorporate feedback, responding to the recommendations of peer reviewers is the third key task that students engage in during this course. As scholars and professionals, we recognize that our work is stronger when we incorporate revisions from trusted colleagues whose intention is to help us succeed.

Assumptions:

We take this non-traditional approach in part, because we assume that students have already learned about writing through their own professional journey and previous studies. Given that students have already taken previous research courses, we assume that they have learned how to read and dissect a research article.

We expect that students enrolled in this course already have a solid grasp of concepts such as:

- General and specialized writing
- Reporting and interpreting
- Fact-based writing and speculation
- Professional journals and academic journals
- Empirical and interpretive research
- Peer-reviewed (open, blind, and double-blind) and Non-refereed

Given this previous experience, we will focus on taking students to the next level. In other words, we will focus on supporting students as they produce their own original research writing, with the potential to publish that writing as a journal article or conference paper, thus building writing skills as a researcher and as a professional.

Likewise, Belcher (2009) contends revision and improving drafts is an essential component of scholarly writing with a focus on the macro aspects of writing, such as developing a succinct and logical argument with a clearly organized structure. The emphasis in the course will be on the micro aspects of academic and professional writing, peer revision and ultimately preparation for publishing or sharing your work to a broader academic or professional audience.

Learner Outcomes:

Through participation in this course, you will have the opportunity to:

- Participate and contribute to our online scholarly community of inquiry during synchronous sessions and asynchronous discussions
- Select and examine draft academic papers from peers in the field and analyze structures
- Produce authentic, original academic or professional writing in the form of a manuscript or conference paper through assigned learning tasks
- Provide constructive feedback to peers

- Revise and re-submit authentic writing based on feedback

COURSE DESIGN AND DELIVERY:

This course will take place on-line via D2L and Adobe Connect. This method provides for key opportunities to discuss and debate the complexities of educational research, however, it also demands a high level of commitment to D2L posts in order to fully benefit from the information being presented. While the course has been designed with a definitive structure regarding topics for discussion, readings and assignments, it should also be noted that due to the nature of the course and of research, we may be working on different things at different times.

To get the most out of the course students are encouraged to participate in the asynchronous learning tasks using the D2L learning environment and synchronous whole-class Adobe Connect sessions. When unable to participate live due to the time difference or unforeseen circumstances, inform the instructor in advance and propose and implement a plan to participate (e.g., watch the recordings, submit a brief reflection, and actively contribute to the follow-up online discussion). We recognize the importance of working in collaboration with others and learning with others in a scholarly community of inquiry and have designed learning tasks accordingly. Active participation is encouraged and will yield the greatest outcomes in terms of the quality of the learning experience.

How to Access Desire2Learn and videos/tutorials:

<http://elearn.ucalgary.ca/desire2learn/d2l> extra info

Required Readings:

Belcher, W. L. (2009). *Writing your journal article in 12 weeks: A guide to academic publishing success*. SAGE Publications, Inc. URL: <http://www.sagepub.com/books/Book231055#tabview=title>

Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. (2010). (Sixth ed.). Washington, D.C: American Psychological Association.

Online resources (no cost):

Basics of APA Style (Tutorial): <http://www.apastyle.org/learn/tutorials/basics-tutorial.aspx>

U of C Graduate Studies Calendar (Section on Academic Honesty and Plagiarism)

<http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/k-2-1.html>

University of Calgary Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board (CFREB), Online:

<http://www.ucalgary.ca/research/researchers/ethics-compliance/chreb>

TCPS 2 - CORE Tutorial

<http://www.ucalgary.ca/research/research-services-office-rso/ethics-compliance/tcps2-core-tutorial>

Suggested supplementary readings:

Workbook Forms to accompany Belcher's text - <http://www.wendybelcher.com/pages/WorkbookForms.htm>

LEARNING TASKS OVERVIEW:

LEARNING TASK NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF LEARNING TASK	PERCENT OF FINAL GRADE	GROUPING FOR TASK
Learning Task # 1	Community of Practice and Knowledge Production DUE: Ongoing – Assessed at the end of the course.	30%	Individual
Learning Task # 2	Journal or conference selection and rationale DUE: Sunday, Jan. 31 by 11:30 p.m. Mountain Time	30%	Individual or group
Learning Task # 3	Final Paper – Manuscript DUE: Wednesday, April 13 by 11:30 p.m. Mountain Time	40%	Individual or group

WEEKLY COURSE SCHEDULE:

This schedule may change to meet the emerging needs and dynamics of the participants in the course.

Date	Topic	Readings and Tasks	Important Dates
Week 1 Jan. 11 to 17, 2016	Course Introduction & Starting your writing	<p>Course overview, assign studio groups, assuming the class is sufficiently large.</p> <p>Readings: Belcher: Weeks 1 and 2</p> <p>Discussion Board Requirements: Introductions Select a paper from a previous graduate course you have taken. Post it to D2L and explain why and how you plan to adapt it for publication in an academic or professional journal or as a conference paper.</p> <p>Post a copy of the paper you plan to transform from a graduate-level research paper for a course into a manuscript or conference paper on the D2L discussion board this week. In addition, place a copy in the D2L dropbox called "Starting point: Chosen paper." Your final manuscript for LT5 may be compared against the paper you submit at this early point in the course to ensure you have made substantive changes and improvements to it since the beginning of the course.</p>	<p>Adobe Connect Session #1: Wednesday, January 13, 2016</p> <p>5:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.</p>
Week 2 Jan. 18 to 24, 2016	Examining journals & abstract presentations	<p>Readings: Belcher: Weeks 3 and 4</p> <p>Discussion Board Requirements:</p>	

		Respond to the D2L question posed relating to the assigned reading(s). Cite specific details or quotations from your chosen reading to demonstrate that you read it. Use APA standards for citations, quotations and referencing.	
Week 3 Jan. 25 to 31, 2016	Reviewing related literature & ethical considerations	Readings: Belcher: Week 5 Discussion Board Requirements: Respond to the D2L question posed relating to the assigned reading(s). Cite specific details or quotations from your chosen reading to demonstrate that you read it. Use APA standards for citations, quotations and referencing.	Due: Learning Task 2: Sunday, Jan. 31 by 11:30 p.m. Mountain Time
Week 4 Feb. 1 to 7, 2016	Advancing your argument Strengthening structure, opening and concluding	Readings: Belcher: Week 6 Discussion Board Requirements: Respond to the D2L question posed relating to the assigned reading(s). Cite specific details or quotations from your chosen reading to demonstrate that you read it. Use APA standards for citations, quotations and referencing.	
Week 5 Feb. 8 to 14, 2016		Readings: Belcher: Week 7 Discussion Board Requirements: Respond to the D2L question posed relating to the assigned reading(s). Cite specific details or quotations from your chosen reading to demonstrate that you read it. Use APA standards for citations, quotations and referencing.	
Week 6 Feb. 15 to 21, 2016	Reading Week - February 14 – 21, 2016. No classes. University open.		
Week 7 Feb. 22 to 28, 2016	Strengthening structure, opening and concluding	Readings: Belcher: Week 8 Discussion Board Requirements: In lieu of discussion board postings, please attend the Adobe Connect session.	Adobe Connect Session #2: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 - 5:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
Week 8 Feb. 29 to Mar. 6, 2016	Giving, getting and using peer feedback	Readings: Belcher: Week 9 Discussion Board Requirements: DRAFT manuscript – Posted in D2L and	Due: Draft of your manuscript on D2L by Sunday, March 6

		<p>shared with your peer reviewer due Sunday, March 6 by 4:30 p.m. Mountain Time</p> <p>Note: Your draft must be at least 5 pages, <i>exclusive</i> of your title page, abstract and references. Submit your work in Word (.doc or .docx) format only. Please ensure your draft includes a list of references (in addition to the 5-page minimum of content).</p>	
Week 9 Mar. 7 to 13, 2016	Giving, getting and using peer feedback	<p>Readings: None this week.</p> <p>Discussion Board Requirements: None this week. Conduct a thorough review of at least one peer's work.</p>	
Week 10 Mar. 14 to 20, 2016	Giving, getting and using peer feedback	<p>Readings: Belcher Weeks 10 and 11</p> <p>Discussion Board Requirements: Respond to the D2L question posed relating to the assigned reading(s). Cite specific details or quotations from your chosen reading to demonstrate that you read it. Use APA standards for citations, quotations and referencing.</p>	
Week 11 Mar. 21 to 27, 2016	Presenting your final paper	<p>Readings: Belcher Week: "X"</p> <p>Discussion Board Requirements: None this week. Focus on completing LT5</p> <p>Note: Friday, March 25, 2016 – Good Friday. No classes. University closed</p>	
Week 12 Mar. 28 to Apr. 3, 2016	Presenting your final paper	<p>LT#3 – Continue revising research report based on peer feedback.</p> <p>Discussion Board Requirements: In lieu of discussion board postings, please attend the Adobe Connect session.</p>	Adobe Connect Session #3: Wednesday, March 30, 2016 - 5:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
Week 13 Apr. 3 to 10, 2016	Next Steps	<p>Discussion Board Requirements (Studio Group):</p> <p>Sharing and showcasing final projects: Post your own project on D2L as a new thread. Review and respond to classmates' projects with supportive and substantive reflections and feedback.</p> <p>Final course reflections: Comment on your</p>	

		key learnings from the course and how you plan to implement what you learned in your own professional context.	
Last Day of Term – April 13, 2016	Course conclusion	LT#3 – Submit research report via D2L Dropbox to instructor for evaluation.	LT#3 – Final paper DUE April 13, 2016 by 11:30 p.m. or earlier

CHANGES TO SCHEDULE:

Please note that changes to the schedule may occur in response to student questions and conversations.

Learning Task 1: Community of Practice and Knowledge Production

Due Date: Ongoing until April 13, 2016

Percentage of the Final Grade: 30%

Description

Students are expected to engage fully in the online community of scholarship through original posts that clearly reflect you have completed the weekly assigned readings, and you are engaging with peers in collaborative and supportive dialogue. The instructor may consult the D2L statistics function to analyze students' contributions to the discussion board.

Students are encouraged to submit their *first* contribution for the discussion board as soon as possible, but Wednesday of each week at the latest. Please note that following the completion of the weekly discussion, the discussion board may be closed for that week and students will be unable to make contributions in arrears. The discussion board for each week will close on Sunday at 20:00 Mountain Time.

A core component of this course relates to working collaboratively providing peer feedback to a small group of your colleagues' work as part of a community of practice. The peer feedback should include clear suggestions for improvement to both the conceptual and technical elements of the work. In your peer feedback, you want to explore the content from a professional point of view, critically tying it to relevant literature. Students understand that critiquing others' work is not incumbent upon having expertise in the content area and that an effective, substantive and productive review that helps their peers to achieve even greater excellence in research writing is the ultimate goal and this can be achieved even without expertise in a particular topic. As such, your instructor will be assessing the quality of your peer reviews and may request you to submit a copy of peer feedback to ensure that the peer feedback is productive and supportive.

Assessment Criteria:

To get credit for class participation, students are expected to participate on a regular and on-going basis, contributing to the weekly discussions in a timely manner, and providing timely concrete feedback to peers in studio group.

Technical requirements:

Citations and references use APA standards.

Criteria	Does not meet requirements (C+ or lower)	Meets Requirements for Scholarly Performance (B- to B+)	Exemplary Scholarly Performance: Meets All and Exceeds Some Requirements (A- to A+)
Constructive Uses of Authoritative Sources	Readings are summarized with little or no critical analysis or thoughtful interpretation Or You do not provide concrete evidence of having engaged with the course material.	Information sources are critically evaluated and writing demonstrates recognition that even the best ideas are improvable. You cite or quote specific details from the article.	You draw upon content from the readings by citing or quoting specific passage(s). You supplement these with additional information sources, as evidence for helping others build knowledge and deepen their understanding.
Democratizing Knowledge	You add your contribution with little recognition of others in the group.	You recognize and praise everyone's work and help others find needed information.	You treat all participants as legitimate contributors to the shared goals of the community; all have a sense of ownership of knowledge advances achieved by the group.
Epistemic Agency	You demonstrate a personal sense of direction, power, motivation, and responsibility.	You mobilize personal strengths to set forth your ideas and to negotiate a fit between personal ideas and ideas of others.	You mobilize personal strengths to set forth your ideas and to negotiate a fit between personal ideas and ideas of others, using contrasts to spark and sustain knowledge advancement rather than depending on others to chart that course for you.
Idea Diversity	You participate in brainstorming different ideas.	You play an active role in putting forward different ideas to create a dynamic environment.	You play an active role in putting forward different ideas to create a dynamic environment in which contrasts, competition, and complementarity of ideas is evident, creating a rich environment for ideas to evolve into new and more refined forms.

Improvable Ideas	You accept or reject ideas as truth on the basis of logical argument and evidence.	You treat all ideas as factual, informed by argument and evidence, and improvable.	You treat all Ideas as improvable by aiming to mirror the work of great thinkers in gathering and weighing evidence, and ensuring that explanations cohere with all available evidence.
Knowledge Building Discourse	Your contribution to discourse allows participants to express and gain feedback on their ideas, defend different points of view, arrive at conclusions.	Your contribution to discourse serves to identify shared problems and gaps in understanding.	Your contribution to discourse serves to identify shared problems and gaps in understanding and to advance understanding beyond the level of the most knowledgeable individual.
Scholarly Writing	Your writing is not scholarly in nature or you do not use APA style or standards.	Your writing is mostly scholarly in style and tone. You use APA Style (i.e. citations for information sources) with some editing considerations to achieve clarity.	You write in a clear and scholarly manner, with a consummate command of APA style and standards.
APA citations	<p>You tend not to cite sources using APA standards.</p> <p>Your citations do not include precise page numbers when appropriate.</p>	You consistently cite sources using APA standards with very few errors.	You consistently cite sources using APA standards, paying particular attention to details, resulting in error-free citations.
Due dates for postings	You do not contribute to the discussion board by the weekly deadlines.	You post to the discussion board on the day the weekly posts are due, or the day prior to the deadline.	You post to the discussion board at least two days in advance of when the weekly posts are due, giving others ample opportunity to engage with you in the online discussion.

Quantity and quality of postings	You post fewer than twice per week OR Your posts are cursory in nature.	You meet the requirements of one original post per week of your own and one substantive post to a peer. Your contributions to demonstrate scholarly discourse and deepening of your mastery of the topic.	You exceed the minimum posting requirements with multiple substantive and engaging posts every week that demonstrate deep levels of scholarly discourse and deepening of your mastery of the topic. You are actively engaging with others to create an online community of ongoing, research-informed dialogue.
Peer Feedback/Studio Groups	You provide minimal analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the written work with limited suggestions for improvement. You tend to some feedback on none or few of the following areas: technical aspects (e.g., APA), readability (e.g., flow, structure, clarity) and ideas. Your feedback is difficult to understand at times, creating uncertainty about how to improve the writing.	You provide an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the written work through some suggestions for improvement. You provide some feedback on most of the following areas: technical aspects (e.g., APA), readability (e.g., flow, structure, clarity) and ideas. You present your feedback in a way that is meaningful and supportive.	You provide a detailed analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the written work through concrete suggestions for improvement. It is abundantly clear that you engaged a close reading of the text by tending to detailed feedback on each of the following areas: technical aspects (e.g., APA), readability (e.g., flow, structure, clarity) and ideas. You present your feedback in a way that is meaningful and supportive while also challenging your colleague to rework her/his writing.

Learning Task 2: Journal or conference selection and rationale**Due date:** Sunday, Jan. 31, 2016 by 11:30 p.m. Mountain Time**Percentage of Final Grade:** 30%**Objectives:**

- To help you clarify and commit to a journal or conference for which you intend to tailor your final writing project (LT#3).
- To help advance your thinking around how to transform your chosen paper into a manuscript that may be read by a broader public audience.
- To help you understand the technical requirements of preparing a manuscript for submission to a journal or conference (e.g. word count, page limit, formatting requirements, etc.)

Description:

In the written submission, you want to (see rubric below for further details):

- Clearly name the journal/conference, including a link to the website.
- Identify the requirements for publication in that journal/presentation in that conference (e.g., page/word limits and citation style)
- Provide a rationale for choosing this journal/conference; how your topic/approach fits within that journal/conference; and the work you believe you need to do to prepare your manuscript for submission to that journal/conference.

Refer to Belcher, W.L. (2009) pages 99-130 to help you with this learning task.

Technical requirements:

- Submit your work in the LT2 Dropbox in D2L, unless otherwise directed by your instructor.

Assessment Criteria:

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Does not meet requirements (C+ or lower)</i>	<i>Meets Requirements for Scholarly Performance (B- to B+)</i>	<i>Exemplary Scholarly Performance: Meets All and Exceeds Some Requirements (A- to A+)</i>
Journal or conference	You have not made a clear selection of a journal or conference that might be suitable for your manuscript. OR The journal or conference you have selected is a poor match for your topic.	You have selected a journal or conference that relates directly to your topic.	You have selected a journal or conference that is a precise match with your topic, thus increasing the likelihood that your manuscript might be selected for publication.

Peer review	There is no readily available evidence that the journal or conference you have selected is peer-reviewed.	You have selected a journal or conference that is peer reviewed.	You have selected a journal or conference that is blind peer-reviewed or double-blind peer reviewed.
Rationale	You do not provide a clear explanation of why you have chosen this journal or conference for your manuscript.	You provide a solid explanation of why you have chosen this journal or conference for your manuscript.	You provide a logical and persuasive rationale, detailing not only why you have chosen this journal, but also reflecting on what your likelihood of being published in this journal is, given what you have learned about it.
Required length	You do not demonstrate knowledge of the lengths of submissions required by this publisher (e.g. word count or page limit.)	You demonstrate a general knowledge of the required submission length for your chosen publisher.	You indicate precisely the specific submission length not only for the publication, but also provide a description of the type of article you intend to submit, based on the options available from the publisher.
Style	You do not indicate what manuscript submission style (e.g. APA, MLA, etc.) the publication requires.	You demonstrate a general knowledge of the submission style (e.g. APA, MLA, etc.) required by the publisher.	You indicate precisely what submission style is required by the publisher (e.g. APA, MLA, etc.) and comment on how you intend to meet this requirement.
Paper revision Plan	You do not provide an explanation of how you plan to transform your chosen paper into a manuscript suitable for publication in your selected journal or conference OR Your explanation is vague, overly brief or lacks detail.	You provide an explanation of how you plan to transform your paper into a manuscript that would be suitable for publication in your selected journal or conference.	You provide an in-depth and detailed explanation of how you will transform your paper into a manuscript that would be highly suitable for the journal or conference you have selected. You provide explicit examples of what you will need to change and how you plan to go about it.

Evidence of graduate level publication	You provide no evidence that this publication has, or intends to, include work from graduate level scholars.	You provide clear evidence that this publication has accepted, or intends to accept, submissions from graduate students.	You provide details or examples of work written (or co-written) by graduate students that your chosen journal or conference has published in the past. OR, you provide evidence that you have submitted a query to the editor to ask about this.
Likelihood of acceptance	You do provide little to no evidence that your manuscript has a likelihood of being accepted by your chosen publication.	You provide some evidence that your manuscript might be considered by your chosen publication (e.g. not receive an outright rejection) OR Your likely response from the editors is "Revise with substantive revisions".	You provide strong evidence that your manuscript is likely to be considered for publication with only minor revision. You substantiate this claim by providing acceptance rates for the publication or other evidence to show that your manuscript has a strong likelihood of being genuinely considered for publication.
Overall Quality	The overall quality of your work does not meet the level expected of graduate level scholars.	The overall quality of your work meets the expectations for graduate students.	Overall, your work is of exemplary quality that might only be expected of experienced professionals.

Learning Task 3: Final Paper – Manuscript & Response to Peer Feedback**Due date:** Wednesday, April 13, 2016 by 11:30 p.m. Mountain Time**Percentage of Final Grade:** 40%**Objectives:**

- To prepare a manuscript suitable for submission to your chosen journal or conference, taking into consideration feedback you have received from your peer(s).
- To learn how to prepare a response to peer review

Description:

Your own original manuscript that is suitable for submission to an academic journal for consideration for publication. The topic must clearly address a problem of practice or a research question. Your manuscript is based on a previous paper submitted as graduate work, but has *significantly transformed* from a paper submitted to a professor for a grade into a manuscript worthy for consideration for publication and consumption by a public audience such as fellow researchers or practitioners.

You demonstrate awareness and knowledge of preparing a piece of research writing for publication and have developed an understanding of the publishing process.

Note that your final submission for this course will be compared against what you posted to the D2L discussion board in the early stages of the course.

As part of the submission process, and to mirror when you re-submit a paper to a journal that requested revision and resubmission, you will also need to tend to the peer feedback your colleagues provided. This should be approximately **1-page** description of how you incorporated, and took into consideration the feedback from your peers for your manuscript.

To experience this process of submitting a manuscript receiving feedback and communicating with an editor, considering peer feedback is a requirement, rather than an option. We are obliged to demonstrate that we have not only carefully read the feedback that our reviewers have offered us, but also to show precisely how we revised our work based on their suggestions. This is normally done through a written Revision Letter, usually to the editor, who then compares our response to the reviewer's recommendations to ensure we have respectfully considered the feedback and used it to improve our work.

Note that you are not required to accept every recommendation made by your reviewer. You may respectfully decline to make certain revisions, providing you offer a valid professional and academic reason why. Refer to Belcher (2009, pp. 303-319; starting at bottom of 303 – "Responding to a Revise and Resubmit Notice") to prepare a response to your peer reviewer.

* Throughout the term, as you share your work with your colleagues, you may find the table in Belcher (2009, p. 305) particularly helpful to keep track of how you plan to improve/have improved your work based on the feedback you received from your reviewer. You may find the sample letters on pages 314-315 helpful in preparing your response letter.

** Submitting the exact same paper for two courses counts as *academic plagiarism*. Students are expected to have made a significant evidence to transform a previous piece of graduate-level writing submitted as a course

paper into a professional or academic manuscript showcasing your original contributions to practice and/or research.

You are encouraged to dialogue with your instructor throughout the writing process.

Note that even though the journal or conference paper you have selected may:

- Require a format other than APA, for the purposes of this learning task you are expected to submit your work following APA standards.
- Allow or require for submissions of longer than 15 pages for the body of your submission, for the purposes of this learning task, *your instructor requests a submission of 15 pages maximum*. Should you wish to pursue publication of your manuscript following the end of the course, you would further revise your work to meet the author guidelines required by the publisher.

Technical requirements:

- Presented in Word (.doc or .docx) format.
- Follows APA formatting standards.
- Includes an appropriate cover page in APA format.
- Double-space your work.
- Times New Roman, 12-point font.
- Maximum 15-pages for the body of the text. Remember that because most manuscripts do not include appendices, neither should your final paper. Include all key content within the 15-page body of your paper.
- Please also include the following (not part of page count): cover page; abstract; references; 1-page peer review response; and details of publication/conference requirements (in bullet point form, include the link to the journal/conference).
- Submit your work in the D2L Dropbox for this learning task and also post a copy on the discussion board for peer sharing.

Assessment Criteria:

Note: This rubric is consistent across all sections of this course.

Criteria	Does not meet requirements (C+ or lower)	Meets Requirements for Scholarly Performance (B- to B+)	Exemplary Scholarly Performance: Meets All and Exceeds Some Requirements (A- to A+)
Authentic, Professional Writing	Your work loosely attempts to write within the guidelines stated in your journal/conference selection.	Your work adheres to most writing guidelines expressed in your stated journal/conference selection.	Your work clearly adheres to all writing guidelines as expressed in your stated journal/conference selection and demonstrates excellence in professional writing.

Organization & Structure	<p>The title is vague or non-descriptive.</p> <p>Your writing is not clearly organized. No clear structure is discernible. Main ideas are difficult to identify.</p>	<p>A clear title to the work is provided.</p> <p>Your article is clearly organized.</p> <p>Ideas are clearly expressed.</p>	<p>Title is direct, clear powerful invitation describing article, suggesting argument or implications; includes searchable keywords in title.</p> <p>Your work provides a compelling opening (anecdotal, subject, critical, significance, historical or argumentative) and conclusion that summarizes in a powerful way pointing beyond the article.</p> <p>Your article is clearly organized with explicit headings and subheadings for structure.</p>
Introduction	<p>No discernible introduction, or the introduction is poorly written.</p>	<p>The paper starts with a clear introduction that clearly identifies the point of your paper.</p>	<p>Your paper starts with a gripping first sentence. The introduction clearly establishes the value of your paper.</p> <p>The introduction serves as a "road map" to the reader; articulates originality, the topic's novelty, appeal, timely interest, what's new about the work and draws upon relevant literature.</p>

Context	No clear context for the research is provided.	Your research is clearly situated within the current and historical research or professional context, relating it to previous work conducted in the field.	<p>Clearly describes the context for the problem of practice (e.g., may be related to previously completed literature review, your own classroom problem, an innovation you would like to design or try out, an action-research project, capstone project idea, etc.).</p> <p>Your research is clearly situated within the current and historical research or professional context, relating it to previous work conducted in the field.</p> <p>Your work adds an original and fresh perspective to the ongoing conversation and debate on your chosen topic.</p>
Significance	Presents no clear rationale.	Clearly describes the rationale for the work, linking it to the particular journal or conference chosen.	Clearly describes the rationale for the work, linking it to the particular journal or conference chosen. Articulates the difference this work is intended to make for other professionals or scholars and demonstrates why readers should care about it. Also clearly indicates who the intended audience is.
Conclusion	A conclusion is not provided or the conclusion is poorly constructed.	The conclusion clearly and succinctly summarizes the argument.	Summarizes argument and restates the article's relevance to literature. The conclusion points beyond the article to the larger context, highlighting its significance and provides direction for future research.
References	Contains few or incomplete references. Pays little attention to APA standards.	Contains cited references with few APA errors.	Contains a complete list of references, accurately cited using APA format.

Final copy	<p>Non-scholarly writing is presented, or final work is not submitted by the deadline.</p>	<p>Presents scholarly writing. Errors are minor and APA style is followed.</p> <p>Final submission is approximately 15 pages, exclusive of title page, references, appendices, and is double-spaced, with 1-inch margins, in a serif font such as Times Roman or Times New Roman, 12 pt. font, as per APA guidelines.</p>	<p>Presents exemplary scholarly writing that requires little to no editing and demonstrates adherence to APA standards.</p> <p>Final submission is approximately 15 pages, exclusive of title page, references, 1-page peer review response and journal/conference details, and is double-spaced, with 1-inch margins, in a serif font such as Times Roman or Courier, 12 pt. font.</p>
Response to Peer Feedback	<p>You provide little to no evidence that you have read your reviewer's feedback in detail OR you dismiss the reviewer's feedback without just cause.</p> <p>You provide little to no evidence that you intend to revise your manuscript based on your reviewer's suggestions.</p> <p>You reject all the feedback given your reviewer OR your response lacks professionalism.</p>	<p>You provide evidence that you have read your reviewer's feedback in detail and have considered his or her suggestions.</p> <p>You provide evidence that you intend to make changes to improve your manuscript based on the review you received.</p> <p>You may respectfully decline to incorporate certain recommendations and offer an explanation as to why.</p>	<p>You provide strong evidence that you have read your reviewer's feedback in detail, carefully considering each suggestion.</p> <p>You provide exemplary and detailed evidence of precisely how you intend to make changes to improve your manuscript based on the review you received.</p> <p>You may respectfully and diplomatically decline to incorporate certain recommendations and offer a professional or academic reason as to why, with details.</p>

GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION: GRADING SCALE

Distribution of Grades*			
Grade	GP Value	Percent	Graduate Description
A+	4.0	95 - 100	Outstanding
A	4.0	90 - 94	Excellent - superior performance showing comprehensive understanding of the subject matter
A-	3.7	85 - 89	Very good performance
B+	3.3	80 - 84	Good performance
B	3.0	75 - 79	Satisfactory performance. <i>Note: The grade point value (3.0) associated with this grade is the minimum acceptable average that a graduate student must maintain throughout the program as computed at the end of each year of the program.</i>
B-	2.7	70 - 74	Minimum pass for students in the Faculty of Graduate Studies
C+	2.3	65 - 69	All grades below B- are indicative of failure at the graduate level and cannot be counted toward Faculty of Graduate Studies course requirements.
C	2.0	60 - 64	
C-	1.7	55 - 59	
D+	1.3	50 - 54	
D	1.0	45 - 49	
F	0.0	< 45	

*Based upon Faculty of Graduate Studies 2015/2016 Calendar, "Distribution of Grades"

It is at the instructor's discretion to round off either upward or downward to determine a final grade when the average of term work and final examinations is between two letter grades.

Werklund School of Education Appeals Policy and Process

- <http://werklund.ucalgary.ca/gpe/werklund-school-education-appeals-policy-amp-process>

Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRIs)

Students are strongly encouraged to complete course evaluations for each course taken in their program. Student feedback on their experience in a course is taken very seriously by the Werklund School of Education in timetabling and staffing courses. Student feedback via the Course Evaluation is used to monitor the quality of teaching, the quality of students' learning experiences and the quality of course design in Graduate Programs in Education.

Students are advised to become familiar with the Faculty of Graduate Studies policies and the University of Calgary support services in these areas: intellectual property, academic integrity, plagiarism, research ethics, effective writing, and English language proficiency. Information about these topics is available through the following web addresses:

- **Plagiarism + academic misconduct:** <http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/grad/current/gs-o.html>
- **Intellectual Honesty:** <http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/grad/current/gs-m.html>
- **Integrity:** <http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/grad/current/gs-r.html>

- **Research Ethics:** <http://www.ucalgary.ca/research/researchers/ethics-compliance>
- **My Grad Skills:** <http://grad.ucalgary.ca/mygradskills>
- **Intellectual Property:** <http://grad.ucalgary.ca/current/managing-my-program/academic-integrity/intellectual-property>
- **Student Success:** <http://www.ucalgary.ca/ssc/>

Graduate Studies Calendar, Excerpts on Plagiarism:

O.1.a) Definitions

1. Plagiarism - Plagiarism involves submitting or presenting work as if it were the student's own work when it is not. Any ideas or materials taken from another source written, electronic, or oral must be fully and formally acknowledged.

(b) Parts of the work are taken from another source without reference to the original author.

(c) The whole work (e.g., an essay) is copied from another source, and/or,

(d) A student submits or presents work in one course which has also been submitted in another course (although it may be completely original with that student) without the knowledge of or prior agreement of the instructor involved.

O.1.b) Penalties, can include and are not limited to:

1. Failing Grade - A student may be given a failing grade in either an exercise or course in which that student is found guilty of plagiarism, cheating or other academic misconduct. A student may not avoid a failing grade by withdrawing from the course.

2. Disciplinary probation.

3. Suspension.

4. Expulsion.

Copyright: All material used in the course is for the sole use of the individual and should not be recopied in either print or digital format. For copyright guidelines, including those relating to photocopying and electronic copies, please refer to the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) fair dealing guidelines: <http://library.ucalgary.ca/copyright>

Academic Accommodations – It is the students' responsibility to request academic accommodations. If you are a student with a documented disability who may require academic accommodations and have not registered with Student Accessibility Services, please contact them at 403-220-6019. Students who have not registered with Student Accessibility Services are not eligible for formal academic accommodations. More information about academic accommodations can be found at www.ucalgary.ca/access.

Accommodations on Protected Grounds other than Disability

Students who require an accommodation in relation to their coursework or to fulfill requirements for a graduate degree, based on a protected ground other than disability, should communicate this need, preferably in writing, to their Instructor or the appropriate Associate Dean, Department Head or the department/faculty designated contact person. Students who require an accommodation unrelated to their coursework or the requirements for a graduate degree, based on a protected ground other than disability, should communicate this need, preferably in writing, to the Vice-Provost (Student Experience). For additional information on support services and accommodations for students with disabilities, visit www.ucalgary.ca/access/.

Campus Security provides a range of services intended to promote and facilitate a safe and secure learning and living environment, e.g. the SafeWalk program for students attending classes on campus. For more information

please visit <http://www.ucalgary.ca/security/> or telephone 403-220-5333.

The **Freedom of Information Protection of Privacy Act (FOIPP)** prevents instructors from placing assignments or examinations in a public place for pickup and prevents students from access to exams or assignments other than their own. Therefore, students and instructors may use one of the following options: return/collect assignments during class time or during instructors' office hours, students provide instructors with a self-addressed stamped envelope, or submit assignments, or submit/return assignments as electronic files attached to private e-mail message.

Emergency Evacuation Assembly Points - For both the Education Tower and Education Block, use the Scurfield Hall Atrium (Primary) or Professional Faculties Food court. See:
<http://www.ucalgary.ca/emergencyplan/assemblypoints>

