



Course Number and Section: EDCI 657.41B
Course Title: Content Area Literacy
Semester: Spring 2016

Instructor: Kay Hong-Nam, Ph.D.
Office: Metroplex—Room 122
Office Hours: Metroplex : Wednesday immediately before and after class
 Commerce: By appointment
Email: Kay.hongnam@tamuc.edu
Phone: (903) 468-3236 Use Email, cell phone is for emergencies only, please leave a message
 *To meet face to face with the instructor during office hours, schedule an appointment via email.

Course Information

Materials—Textbooks, Online Readings, and Optional Supplementary Readings:

Textbooks Required (Purchase Online):

APA. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed.)*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
 Draper, R. J. (2010). *(Re)Imagining Content-Area Literacy Instruction*. New York: Teachers College Press.
 Israel, S. E., Collins Block, C., Bauserman, K. L., & Kinnucan-Welsch, K. (2005). *Metacognition in literacy learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
 One current content area reading textbook (2004-2014) that will be provided by the instructor.

Required Online Readings provided by the instructor:

Conley, M. W. (2009). Chapter 25: Improving adolescent comprehension: Developing comprehension strategies in the content areas. In S. E. Israel & G. G. Duffy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 531-550). New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis.
 Nist, S. L., & Simpson, M. L. (2000). Chapter 35: College studying. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr, R. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in Reading: Volume III* (pp. 645-666). Mahwah, NJ: Earlbaum.
 Shanahan, C. (2009). Chapter 11: Disciplinary comprehension. In S. E. Israel & G. G. Duffy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 240-260). New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis.
 Wade, S. E., & Moje, E. B. (2000). Chapter 33: The role of text in classroom learning. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr, R. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in Reading: Volume III* (pp. 609-627). Mahwah, NJ: Earlbaum.
 Wilkinson, I. A. G., & Son, E. H. (2011). Chapter 16. A dialogic turn in research on learning and teaching to comprehend. In M. Kamil, P. D. Pearson, E. B. Moje, & P. P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in Reading: Volume IV* (pp. 359-387). New York: Routledge.

Optional English Language Learner Readings:

Ariza, E. N. W. (2006). *Not for ESOL teachers: What every classroom teacher needs to know about the linguistically, culturally, and ethnically diverse student*. Boston: Pearson.
 Batalova, J., Fix M., & Murray, J. (2007). *Measures of Change: The Demography and Literacy of Adolescent English Learners—A Report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
http://carnegie.org/fileadmin/Media/Publications/Measures_of_Change.pdf
 Boyd-Batstone, P. (2006). *Differentiated early literacy for English language learners: Practical strategies*. Boston: Pearson.
 Cruz, B. C., & Thornton, S. J. (2009). *Teaching social studies to English language learners*. New York: Routledge.
 Echevarria, J., & Graves, A. (2007). *Sheltered content instruction: Teaching English language learners with diverse abilities*. Boston: Pearson.
 Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2008). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model (3rd ed.)*. Boston: Pearson.
 Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2010). *Making content comprehensible for elementary English learners: The SIOP model*. Boston: Pearson.

- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2010). *Making content comprehensible for secondary English learners: The SIOP model*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2010). *The SIOP mode for teaching mathematics to English learners*. Boston: Pearson.
- Esquivel, G. B., Oades-Sese, G. V., & Jarvis, M. L. (2010). *Culturally sensitive narrative interventions for immigrant children and adolescents*. New York: University Press of America.
- Francis, D., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Kieffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006). *Practical Guidelines for the Education of English Language Learners: Research-Based Recommendations for Serving Adolescent Newcomers*. (Under cooperative agreement grant S283B050034 for U.S. Department of Education). Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction
http://carnegie.org/fileadmin/Media/Publications/ell_newcomers.pdf
- Francis, D., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Kieffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006). *Practical Guidelines for the Education of English Language Learners: Research-Based Recommendations for the Use of Accommodations in Large-Scale Assessments*. (Under cooperative agreement grant S283B050034 for U.S. Department of Education). Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.
http://carnegie.org/fileadmin/Media/Publications/ell_assessments.pdf
- Francis, D., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Kieffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006). *Practical Guidelines for the Education of English Language Learners: Research-Based Recommendations for Instruction and Academic Interventions*. (Under cooperative agreement grant S283B050034 for U.S. Department of Education). Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.
http://carnegie.org/fileadmin/Media/Publications/ell_interventions_01.pdf
- Freeman, Y. S., & Freeman, D. E. (2009). *Academic language for English learners and struggling readers: How to help students succeed across content areas*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Haley, M. H., & Austin, T. Y. (2004). *Content-based second language teaching and learning: An interactive approach*. Boston: Pearson.
- Kersaint, G., Thompson, D. R., & Petkova, M. (2009). *Teaching mathematics to English learners*. New York: Routledge.
- Rea, D. M., & Mercuri, S. (2006). *Research-based strategies for English language learners: How to reach goals and meet standards, K-8*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Reiss, J. (2005). *Teaching content to English language learners: Strategies for secondary school success*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Short, D. J., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners*.
<http://carnegie.org/fileadmin/Media/Publications/PDF/DoubletheWork.pdf>
- Vogt, M., & Echevarria, J. (2008). *99 ideas and activities for teaching English learners with the SIOP model*. Boston, Pearson.

Optional Reading for Strategy Resources:

- Bromley, K., Irwin-DeVitis, L., & Modlo, M. (1995). *Graphic organizers*
- Chamot, A. U., Barnhardt, S., & El-Dinary, P. B. (1999). *The learning strategies handbook*. New York: Longman.
- Frank, C. B., Grossi, J. M., & Stanfield, D. J. (2006). *Applications of reading strategies within the classroom*
- Herrell, A., & Jordan, M. (2002). *50 active learning strategies for improving reading comprehension*
- Johns, J. L., & Berglund, R. L. (2002). *Strategies for content area learning*
- Johns, J. L., & Berglund, R. L. (2006). *Strategies for content area learning*
- Johns, J. L., Lenski, S. D., & Berglund, R. L. (2006). *Comprehension and vocabulary strategies for the elementary grades*
- Lubliner, S. (2005). *Getting into words: Vocabulary instruction that strengthens comprehension*
- McKenna, M. C. (2002). *Help for struggling readers: Strategies for grades 3-8*
- Sturtevant, E. G., & Linek, W. M. (2004). *Content Literacy: An Inquiry-Based Case Approach*
- Sadler, C. R. (2001). *Comprehension strategies for middle grade learners*
- Stephens, E. C., & Brown, J. E. *A handbook of content literacy strategies*
- Tierney, R., & Readence, J. (2000). *Reading strategies and practices: A compendium*
- Tierney, R., Readence, J., & Dishner, E. K. (1990). *Reading strategies and practices: A compendium*
- Tompkins, G. E. (2004). *50 Literacy Strategies Step by Step*
- Tompkins, G. E., & Blanchfield, C. (2004). *Teaching vocabulary: 50 creative strategies, grades K-12*
- Tompkins, G. E., & Blanchfield, C. (2008). *Teaching vocabulary: 50 creative strategies, grades K-12*
- Vogt, M., & Echevarria, J. (2008). *99 ideas and activities for teaching English learners with the SIOP model*. Boston, Pearson.
- Wood, K. D., & Taylor, D. B. (2006). *Literacy strategies across the subject areas*
- Wormeli, R. (2005). *Summarization in any subject: 50 techniques to improve student learning*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Course Description: Examination of research on learning in the content curriculum areas of science, math, social studies, and music; emphasis on strategies content area teachers may use to foster content area learning.

Student Learning Outcomes:

1. Students will comprehend, analyze, and critique assigned readings related to metacognition, content literacy, and disciplinary learning. Further, students will engage in: writing to learn activities, dialogue with colleagues, problem solving, and collaborative/reflective inquiry as it relates to teaching, learning, English Language Learners (ELLs), and professional development.
2. Students will role play authors of content area literacy textbooks in order to compare and contrast perceptions of current themes/trends in teaching and learning in content areas. They will then write critiques of content area textbooks and write letters to the authors making suggestions for revisions.
3. Students will learn about the content literacy lesson cycle and apply it by serving as topic facilitators.
4. Students will learn about and engage in conference proposal evaluation processes.
5. Students will propose and engage in an individual project that extends their learning about content area literacy, increases their growth as a researcher, and/or helps them meet professional goals.
6. Students will review metacognition, content literacy, and disciplinary learning concepts by presenting unique creative syntheses.
7. Students will document progress on their doctoral residency plans and share that progress with the class.
8. Students will self-evaluate knowledge gained in the course and personal/professional growth from a metacognitive perspective.

Course Requirements and Assignments:

Outcome 1 (15% of final grade). Demonstrate comprehension, critical analysis, in depth discussion (online and in class), and synthesis of assigned readings related to metacognition, content literacy, disciplinary learning, and ELLs. Formative assessment of performance and growth will occur weekly. Summative assessment will occur on the Final Written Evaluation.

Outcome 2 (15% of final grade). Author Role Play and Letter to Author: Role play the author of a content area textbook during each class. Access the appropriate Author Role Play format in doc sharing and complete it as you read. You will be expected to espouse the beliefs and suggested practices of your author based on your reading of their textbook on specific topics. At the end of the semester, you will write a critical evaluation of your content area textbook based on the knowledge you've gained in the course and comparisons with other content area textbooks. This critical evaluation will be written in the form of a letter to the author (see model Letter to Author under document sharing). Email the final revised letter to the author with a copy to the instructor.

Outcome 3 (15% of final grade), Topic Facilitation: Facilitate peer learning on topics from the required readings using the concepts of unique research based Before, During, and After content literacy strategies. Prepare a content reading lesson on your topic identifying and explaining the before, during, and after strategies. The before and during strategies should be presented one class session prior to the actual discussion. The before reading strategy should provide activation and assessment of participant's prior knowledge WITHOUT FLUFF. The during strategy should provide a guide for self monitoring of comprehension, identifying and understanding important concepts, as well as preparation for critical thinking about the readings. The after strategy should engage all seminar participants in discussion that leads to understanding of important concepts and critical evaluation of readings. An outline of your lesson plan should be provided to the instructor via email a minimum of one week prior to presenting your before and during strategies. After lesson plans are reviewed and approved by the instructor, revise the lesson plan and post it on eCollege under Doc Sharing "Outcome #3: Lesson Plans" for everyone to see. After facilitating the final discussion, complete the Topic Facilitation Self Evaluation form found under "Outcome #3" in Doc Sharing and submit it via email to the instructor.

MAXIMUM TIME ALLOTMENT FOR BEFORE AND ASSIGNMENT OF DURING—15 MINUTES.

MAXIMUM TIME ALLOTMENT FOR AFTER—60 MINUTES.

Outcome 4 (10% of final grade), Conference Proposal Evaluation: Sign up to review ALER Conference Proposals (Dr. Hong-Nam will provide conference proposals only if you are unable to be accepted as a reviewer). Create an individual written first draft evaluation for each conference proposal, then begin working with a peer review group on the "Conference Proposal Peer Review" link under Course Home. During the writing process, you will conference with at least two of your classmates in a revision/editing group. This process requires you to proactively contact classmates and form revision/editing triads. We will discuss/form the revision/editing groups in class; however, be aware, you must actively communicate to ensure that you give and receive feedback from your group in a timely manner. Final drafts of conference proposal evaluations are to be posted on eCollege under Doc Sharing "Outcome #4 Conference Proposal Evaluation." Each individual will submit in one

document their first draft/s, the revised final draft/s, and a reflective analysis on what you've learned via email to the instructor.

Outcome 5 (15% of final grade), Individual Project: Choose one of the following individual projects (note: all projects will be presented to seminar participants either face to face or electronically for discussion and feedback. All written products presented face to face will be posted on eCollege under 'Individual Projects' under Course Home. All written products presented electronically will be posted, discussed, and revised under the "Individual Project" link under Course Home. After projects have been revised based on feedback from peers, each individual will submit in one document their first draft, the final draft, and a self evaluated rubric to the instructor via email. Rubrics are posted under Doc Sharing "Outcome #5: Individual Project."

A. Prepare and submit a conference proposal for ALER, IRA, LRA, AERA, SERA, TALE, or any other **state, regional, national, or international** level professional education conference approved by the instructor.

B. Prepare one research literature review paper on an approved topic that incorporates seminal and current research from high quality, first or second tier, peer reviewed journals. The research literature search results and articles must be approved by the instructor before writing the paper. A list of research articles that you propose to cover must be brought to the second class meeting. The paper should be 8 to 10 pages in length and follow APA format. To bring the research literature review full circle and to give you practice presenting research findings, as if you were defending a dissertation or presenting at a national conference, you will give a formal presentation on your literature review that will include a PowerPoint.

Suggested Topics:

- Working with English Language Learners or Culturally Diverse Learners in Content Area Literacy
- Affective Dimensions in Content Literacy or Disciplinary Learning (Attitude, Interest, Motivation)
- Assessment in Content Literacy
- Research Based Strategies for Content Area Literacy in one or more disciplines such as: Mathematics, Art, Music, Science, Social Studies, Teacher Education, etc.
- Research Based Strategies for Differentiated Instruction in Content Literacy
- Integrating Curriculum and/or Literature in Content Areas
- Research Based Strategies for Comprehension, Studying, Vocabulary and Concept Development, Writing to Learn, or Working with Struggling Readers in Content Areas
- Technology Integration in Content Area Teaching and Learning
- Or any other topic that relates to metacognition, content literacy, and/or disciplinary learning

C. Prepare a dialogue journal for a professional book that you selected and was approved by the instructor. On the first page of the journal write an introduction for the book/s that includes your rationale for selection. While reading complete your dialogue journal. At the end of the journal write a book review including a critique of the content and explain how you will apply what you have learned to your current or future practice. You will present your "end of journal" book review and provide a handout to seminar participants.

D. Use APA format to propose, prepare, and present an individual project that incorporates a professional project that you would like to pursue. For example, you may pursue a research project, write a grant proposal, write an article, create a strategy log, prepare an inservice program for teachers, prepare a conference presentation, etc. The only limits are your imagination and instructor approval. Specific requirements include:

- A one page written proposal (draft and final) for each seminar participant describing:
 1. What you want to do
 2. Why you want to do it
 3. How the project connects to the concepts of metacognition, content literacy, or disciplinary learning
 4. Steps you will use to approach and complete the project
 5. A projected time line delineating each step
- Interim group sharing for perception checking, problem solving, and revision.
- Written criteria for peer feedback for each seminar participant.
- Presentation of completed project to seminar participants.

Outcome 6 (10% of final grade), Creative Synthesis: Individually or in a small group, create and share in class a unique creative synthesis of your learning about content area literacy, metacognition, and/or disciplinary learning. After completing the presentation, submit a self-evaluated rubric via email to the instructor. Rubrics are posted under Doc Sharing "Outcome #6: Creative Synthesis."

Outcome 7 (10% of final grade), Doctoral Residency Progress: Document progress on your doctoral residency plan. Share your plan verbally on the second night of class. On the last night of class, share your accomplishments verbally and bring documentation. Include a list of these activities on your final written evaluation.

Outcome 8 (10% of final grade), Final Written Evaluation: Access the format in Doc Sharing and prepare a final written evaluation that addresses each outcome, evaluates each requirement, evaluates personal/professional growth, and suggests a final grade for the course. The final written evaluation must be submitted via email to the instructor by midnight on May 8, 2016. **NOTE: I will return the document to you UNGRADED if you do not assign yourself a letter grade.**

Grading: Criteria for each requirement will be stipulated by the instructor in rubrics posted on eCollege under Document Sharing. Students will collaboratively generate standards for each criterion. The following holistic scoring format will be adapted for each course requirement:

- 5 = Highly Impressive - well above average in thought, organization, and professional choices as evidenced by products handed in. In control of own decision-making and learning processes.
- 4 = Commendable - in command of thought, organization, and professional choices as evidenced by products handed in. Developing good control of own decision-making and learning processes.
- 3 = Average - probably functional in terms of thought, organization, and professional choices as evidenced by products handed in; but in need of more instruction. Developing some control of own decision-making and learning processes.
- 2 = Developing - somewhat lacking in thought, organization, and responsibility as evidenced by products handed in. Not consistently aware of professional choices. Little control of own decision-making and learning processes. In need of some remediation.
- 1 = Questionable - lacking in thought and organization as evidenced by products handed in. Lack of awareness of professional choices. Little to no control of own decision-making and learning processes. In need of major remediation.
- 0 = Not Attempted – no product handed in or presented to document work.

Final course grades will be determined jointly by the student and the instructor based on the student's self evaluation, the instructor's judgment, and the following scale:

- A All requirements completed with at least a 4.5 average score
- B All requirements completed with at least a 3.5 average score
- C All requirements completed with at least a 2.0 average score
- F Some or all requirements completed with below a 2.0 average score

Technology Requirements

Students **must have access to email and the Internet**, either at home, work, or TAMU-C campus. TAMU-C provides students with free email accounts that must be accessed for information sent from the university. Further, eCollege will be utilized for: announcements, some required readings, document sharing, email, turning in assignments via drop box, and grading. High speed internet access/connection, not dial-up, is highly recommended. You must have MS Word and MS PowerPoint to create and hand in assignments. A flash drive is highly recommended for in class sharing of Power Point presentations. Additionally, the following hardware and software are necessary to use eCollege:

- Our campus is optimized to work in a Microsoft Windows environment. This means our courses work best if you are using a Windows operating system (XP or newer) and a recent version of Microsoft Internet Explorer (6.0, 7.0, or 8.0).
- Your courses will also work with Macintosh OS X along with a recent version of Safari 2.0 or better. Along with Internet Explorer and Safari, eCollege also supports the Firefox browser (3.0) on both Windows and Mac operating systems.
- It is strongly recommended that you perform a "Browser Test" prior to the start of your course. To launch a browser test, log in to eCollege, click on the 'myCourses' tab, and then select the "Browser Test" link under Support Services.

Access and Navigation

This course will be facilitated using eCollege, the Learning and Management System used by Texas A&M University-Commerce. To access readings, rubrics, etc., go to: <https://leo.tamuc.edu/longin.aspx> You will need your CWID and password to log in to the course. If you do not know your CWID or have forgotten your password, contact: IT Support Services at 903-468-6000 (during business hours), the HelpDesk at 1-866-656-5511 (toll-free 24/7), or the HelpDesk at helpdesk@online.tamuc.org

Communications and Support

It is best to contact the instructor via email at Kay.hongnam@tamuc.edu. You should receive a response within 2 to 3 working days. DO NOT email the same question repeatedly if you do not receive a response immediately. Responses will typically be sent to your leo email account. When engaging in online discussions, please remember the Core Rules of Netiquette as follows:

- Rule 1: Remember the Human
- Rule 2: Adhere to the same standards of behavior online that you follow in real life
- Rule 3: Know where you are in cyberspace
- Rule 4: Respect other people's time and bandwidth
- Rule 5: Make yourself look good online
- Rule 6: Share expert knowledge
- Rule 7: Help keep flame wars under control
- Rule 8: Respect other people's privacy
- Rule 9: Don't abuse your power
- Rule 10: Be forgiving of other people's mistakes
- Rule 11: Adhere to timelines for all postings and responses

Course and University Procedures

Course Specific Procedures

Preparation, Participation, Knowledge, and Professionalism: Check your Leo email and eCollege at least twice a week for updates, assignments, and notifications. Bring a copy (hard or electronic) of the readings to each face-to-face class session. Complete assignments prior to class as all work is due at the beginning of class. Note that some assignments will require out-of-class and/or online work prior to in-class discussion. Be prepared to discuss, question, analyze, critique, and debate readings, research, and other class assignments. Voluntarily participate regularly in class and online discussions. Demonstrate professional behavior in all you do. Lack of preparation, participation, and/or professionalism (please see the Code of Student Conduct in the Texas A&M University-Commerce Student's Guidebook) may result in removal from class or lowering of your final grade. Plagiarism may result in dismissal from the doctoral program. See the following link for an explanation of plagiarism <http://www.mydistancecourses.org/owl/course/view.php?id=29>

Attendance: Although class meets officially from 4:30 to 10:00 pm, if many people cannot make it to class by 4:30 pm, we will start at 5:00 pm and take only one 15 minute break. However, Dr. Hong-Nam will be available from 4:30 to 5:00 pm for individual concerns. Attend all classes. Arrive on time and remain until class is dismissed. If you cannot make it to class on time due to professional responsibilities, discuss this with the instructor after the first class to create a make-up plan. If you must miss a class due to a professional responsibility and know ahead of time, discuss this with the instructor on the first night of class to create a make-up plan. If you must miss a class due to an unforeseen excused absence or professional responsibility, email or phone the instructor before class. Then create a written make-up proposal and submit it within one week of the occurrence via email to the instructor. Do not complete the proposed make up work until you receive approval from the instructor. Once approval from the instructor has been granted for makeup work, it must be completed within two weeks to receive credit. Make-up work will not be permitted for unexcused absences. Each unexcused absence will lower final grades by one letter. Missed assignments, lack of make-up work, etc. will also negatively impact final grades. For a definition of an excused absence, please see the Texas A&M University-Commerce Catalog or Student's Guidebook.

Suggested Make Up Assignment for an Excused Absence: Prepare a dialogue journal for the readings you missed discussing in class. Then suggest options for other in class discussions missed. For example, you could prepare an additional reaction paper on a self-selected professional journal article concerning issues pertinent to teaching and learning in your discipline, content area, grade level, and/or professional responsibilities. A reaction paper should be **one to two typed pages** and conform to APA 6th edition. The reaction paper should include: a content summary of the article, your reaction to its contents, and a discussion of how you will implement what you learned (include a copy of each article). **Articles selected must be approved by the instructor prior to writing reaction papers.**

University Specific Procedures:

ADA Statement: The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal anti-discrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you have a disability requiring an accommodation, please contact:

Office of Student Disability Resources and Services
Texas A&M University-Commerce
Gee Library 132
Phone (903) 886-5150 or (903) 886-5835
Fax (903) 468-8148
StudentDisabilityServices@tamuc.edu
[Student Disability Resources & Services](#)

Student Conduct: All students enrolled at the University shall follow the tenets of common decency and acceptable behavior conducive to a positive learning environment. See the Code of Student Conduct in the Student Guidebook at <http://www.tamuc.edu/CampusLife/documents/studentGuidebook.pdf>.

Inclement Weather: In case of inclement weather, cancellation of classes will be announced via PAWS (Pride Alert Warning System), the university homepage, and on KETR 88.9 FM. Please check your email immediately for instructor verification of class cancellation and check eCollege for alternative assignments.

Bibliography

Any chapter from an Education Related Handbook of Research.

- Abu-Rabia, S. (2003). The influence of working memory on reading and creative writing processes in a second language. *Educational Psychology, 23*(2), 209-223.
- Alexander, P. A. (2006). The path to competence: A lifespan developmental perspective on reading. *Journal of Literacy Research, 37*(4), 413-436.
- Alexander, P. A., & Fox, E. (2011). Adolescents as readers. In M. Kamil, P. D. Pearson, E. B. Moje, & P. P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in Reading: Volume IV* (pp. 157-176). New York: Routledge.
- Alexander, P. A., Murphy, P. K., Buehl, M. M., & Sperl, C. T. (1998). The influence of prior knowledge, beliefs, and interest on learning from persuasive text. In T. Shanahan & F. V. Rodriguez-Brown (Eds.), *Inquiries in literacy theory and practice: Forty-seventh yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 167-181). Chicago: The National Reading Conference.
- Anderson, V., Chan, C. K. K., & Henne, R. (1995). The effects of strategy instruction on the literacy models and performance of reading and writing delayed middle school students. In K. A. Hinchman, D. J. Leu, & C. K. Kinzer (Eds.), *Perspectives on literacy research and practice: Forty-fourth yearbook of The National Reading Conference* (pp. 180-189). Chicago: The National Reading Conference.
- Anderson-Levitt, K. (2004). Reading lessons in Guinea, France, and the United States: Local meanings or global culture? *Comparative Education Review, 48* (3), 229-253.
- Bean, T. W. (2000). Chapter 34: Reading in the content areas: Social constructivist dimensions. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr, R. (Eds.). *Handbook of Research in Reading: Volume III* (pp. 629-644). Mahwah, NJ: Earlbaum.
- Bean, T. W. & Readence, J. E. (2002). Adolescent literacy: Charting a course for successful futures as lifelong learners. *Reading Research and Instruction, 41*(3), 203-210.
- Borasi, R., Siegel, M. & Fonzi, J. (1998). Using transactional reading strategies to support sense-making and discussion in mathematics classrooms: an exploratory study. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 29*, 275-303.
- Brooks, W. (2006). Reading representations of themselves: Urban youth use culture and African American textual features to develop literary understanding. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*(3), 2-392.
- Broughton, M. A. (2002). The performance and construction of subjectivities of early adolescent girls in book club discussion groups. *Journal of Literacy Research, 34*(1), 1-38.
- Cammack, D. W. (2002). Literacy, technology, and a room of her own: Analyzing adolescent girls' online conversations from historical and technological literacy perspectives. The fifty first yearbook of The National Reading Conference (pp. 129-141). Oak Creek, WI: The National Reading Conference.
- Chambers Cantrell, S., & Hughes, H. K. (2008). Teacher efficacy and content literacy implementation: An exploration of the effects of extended professional development with coaching. *Journal of Literacy Research, 40*, 95-127.
- Clarke, L. W. (2006). Power through voicing others: Girls' positioning of boys in literature circle discussions. *Journal of Literacy Research, 38*(1), 53-79.
- Coiro, J., & Dobler, E. (2007). Exploring the online reading comprehension strategies used by sixth-grade skilled readers to search for an locate information on the Internet. *Reading Research Quarterly, 42*(2), 214-257.
- DeVoogd, G., Patterson, L., Baldwin, S., Brenz, S., & Hirtle, J. (1998). Finding common ground: Democracy, critical literacy, and technology in four diverse learning contexts. In T. Shanahan & F. V. Rodriguez-Brown (Eds.), *Inquiries in literacy theory and practice: Forty-seventy yearbook of The National Reading Conference* (pp. 415-427). Chicago: The National Reading Conference.
- Dixon-Kraus, L. (2001). Using literature as a context for teaching vocabulary. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 45*,

310-318.

- Dougherty Stahl, K. A. (2008). The effects of three instructional methods on the reading comprehension and content acquisition of novice readers. *Journal of Literacy Research, 40*, 359-393.
- El-Hindi, A. E., & Childers, K. D. (1997). Metacognitive awareness, attributional beliefs and learning strategies of at-risk college readers. In C. K. Kinzer, K. A. Hinchman, & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Inquiries in literacy theory and practice: Forty-seventh yearbook of The National Reading Conference* (pp. 127-135). Chicago: The National Reading Conference.
- Evans, K. S. (1994). Group dialogue journals as a means of exploring preservice teachers' changing beliefs about content-area literacy. In C. K. Kinzer & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Multidimensional aspects of literacy research, theory, and practice: Forty-third yearbook of The National Reading Conference* (pp. 112-119). Chicago: The National Reading Conference.
- Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Lapp, D. (2009). *In a reading state of mind: Brain research, teacher modeling, and comprehension instruction*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Fox, E., & Alexander, P. A. (2009). Chapter 10: Text comprehension: A retrospective, perspective, and prospective. In S. E. Israel & G. G. Duffy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 227-239). New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis.
- Gaskins, R. W. (1996). "That's just how it was": The effect of issue-related emotional involvement on reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 31*(4), 386-405.
- Graham, S., & Hebert, M. (2010). Writing to read: Evidence for how writing can improve reading. http://carnegie.org/fileadmin/Media/Publications/WritingToRead_01.pdf
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). Writing next—Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. <http://carnegie.org/fileadmin/Media/Publications/PDF/writingnext.pdf>
- Graves, M. F., & Lian, L. A. (2002). On-line resources for fostering understanding and higher-level thinking in senior high school students. *The fifty first yearbook of The National Reading Conference* (pp. 204-215). Oak Creek, WI: The National Reading Conference.
- Hagood, M. C. (2002). Critical literacy for whom? *Reading Research and Instruction, 41*(3), 247-266.
- Hinchman, K. A., & Moje, E. B. (1998). Conversations: Locating the social and political in secondary school. *Reading Research Quarterly, 33*(1), 117-128.
- Hinchman, K. A., Payne-Bourcey, L., Thomas, H., & Chandler Olcott, K. (2002). Representing adolescents' literacies: Case studies of three white males. *Reading Research and Instruction, 41*(3), 229-246.
- Hinchman, K. A., & Sheridan-Thomas, H. K. (2008). *Best practices in adolescent literacy instruction*. New York: Guilford.
- Hong-Nam, K., & Page, L. (2014). Investigating metacognitive awareness and reading strategy use of Korean university students. *Reading Psychology, 35*(3), 1-26.
- Israel, S. E., & Duffy, G. G. (2009). *Handbook of research on reading comprehension*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis.
- Ivey, G. (1999). A multicase study in the middle school: Complexities among young adolescent readers. *Reading Research Quarterly, 34*(2), 172-191.
- Jimenez, R. T. (1997a). The facilitating effects of transfer on the reading comprehension of bilingual latina/o students. In C. K. Kinzer, K. A. Hinchman, & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Inquiries in literacy theory and practice: The forty-seventh yearbook of The National Reading Conference* (pp. 147-155). Chicago: The National Reading Conference.
- Jiménez, R.T. (1997). The strategic reading abilities and potential of five low-literacy Latina/o readers in middle school. *Reading Research Quarterly, 32*(3), 224-243.
- Jones, K. (2003). Culture reinvented as management: English in the new urban school. *Changing English: Studies in Reading and Culture, 10* (2), 143-153.
- Jones, S. (2004). Shaping identities: The reading of young bilinguals. *Reading: Literacy & Language, 38*(1), 40-45.
- Konopak, B. C., Wilson, E. K., & Readence, J. E. (1994). Examining teachers' beliefs, decisions, and practices about content-area reading in secondary social studies. In C. K. Kinzer (Ed.), *Multidimensional aspect of literacy research, theory, and practice: Forty-third yearbook of The National Reading Conference* (pp. 127-136). Chicago: The National Reading Conference.
- Lalik, R., & Oliver, K. L. (2007). Differences and tensions in implementing a pedagogy of critical literacy with adolescent girls. *Reading Research Quarterly, 42*(1), 46-70.
- LeBigot, L., & Rouet, J. (2007). The impact of presentation format, task assignment, and prior knowledge on students' comprehension of multiple online documents. *Journal of Literacy Research, 39*(4), 445-470.
- Massey, D. D. (2009). Self-regulated comprehension. In S. E. Israel & G. G. Duffy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 389-399). New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis.
- Mayers, P. (1994). Experiencing a novel: The thoughts, feelings, and motivation of adolescent readers. In C. K. Kinzer & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Multidimensional aspects of literacy research, theory, and practice: Forty-third yearbook of The National Reading Conference* (pp. 325-334). Chicago: The National Reading Conference.
- McCafferty, S. G. (2002). Adolescent Second Language Literacy: Language-culture, literature, and identity. *Reading*

- Research and Instruction*, 41(3), 279-288.
- Moje, E. B. (1994). Life experiences and teacher knowledge: How a content teacher decides to use literacy strategies. In C. K. Kinzer & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Multidimensional aspects of literacy research, theory, and practice: Forty-third yearbook of The National Reading Conference* (pp. 153-161). Chicago: The National Reading Conference.
- Moje, E. B. (1996). "I teach students, not subjects": Teacher-student relationships as contexts for secondary literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 31(2), 172-195.
- Moje, E. B. (2002). Re-framing adolescent literacy research for new times: Studying youth as a resource. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 41(3), 211-228.
- Moje, E. B., Stockdill, D., Kim, K., & Kim, H. (2011). The role of text in disciplinary learning. In M. Kamil, P. D. Pearson, E. B. Moje, & P. P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in Reading: Volume IV* (pp. 453-486). New York: Routledge.
- Moran, J., et. al. (2008). Technology and reading performance in the middle-school grades: A meta-analysis with recommendations for policy and practice. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 40, 6-58.
- Moss, B. (2003). *Exploring the literature of fact: Children's nonfiction trade books in the elementary classroom*. New York: Guilford.
- Neuman, S. B., & Celano, D. (2006). The knowledge gap: Implications of leveling the playing field for low-income and middle-income children. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 46(2), 176-201.
- O'Brien, D. G., & et al. (1995). Why content literacy is difficult to infuse into the secondary school: Complexities of curriculum, pedagogy, and school culture. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30(3), 442-463.
- Palmer, B. M. (1995). Comprehension calibration of college freshmen and college seniors. In K. A. Hinchman, D. J. Leu, & C. K. Kinzer (Eds.), *Perspectives on literacy research and practice: Forty-fourth yearbook of The National Reading Conference* (pp. 205-211). Chicago: The National Reading Conference.
- O'Sullivan, M. (2003). The development of effective strategies to teach reading among unqualified primary teachers in a developing country context. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 11(2), 129-141.
- Pappas, C. C. (2006). The information book genre: Its role in integrated science-literacy research and practice. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 41(2), 226-250.
- Patel Stevens, L. (2002). Making the road by walking: The transition from content area literacy to adolescent literacy. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 41(3), 267-278.
- Purcell-Gates, V., Duke, N. K., & Martineau, J. A. (2007). Learning to read and write genre-specific text: Roles of authentic experience and explicit teaching. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 42(1), 8-45.
- Schallert, D. L., Meyer, D. K., & Fowler, L. A. (1995). The nature of engagement when reading in and out of one's discipline. In K. A. Hinchman, D. J. Leu, & C. E. Kinzer (Eds.), *Perspectives on literacy research and practice: Forty-fourth yearbook of The National Reading Conference* (pp. 119-125). Chicago: The National Reading Conference.
- Schellings, G. L. M., & Hout-Wolters, B. H. A. M. V. (1995). Main points in an instructional text, as identified by students and by their teachers. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30(4), 742-56.
- Sheehy, M. (2002). Illuminating constructivism: Structure, discourse, and subjectivity in a middle school classroom. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 37(3), 278-308.
- Siegel, M., & Fonzi, J. M. (1995). The practice of reading in an inquiry-oriented mathematics class. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30(4), 632-673.
- Slater, W. H. (1998). The effects of 11th graders' opinions on their interpretation of conflicting arguments. In T. Shanahan & F. V. Rodriguez-Brown (Eds.), *Inquiries in literacy theory and practice: Forty-seventh yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 157-166). Chicago: The National Reading Conference.
- Stahl, S. A. (1996). What happens when students read multiple source documents in history? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 31(4), 430-456.
- Sturtevant, E. G. (1996). Lifetime influences on the literacy-related instructional beliefs of experienced high school history teachers: Two comparative case studies. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 28(2), 227-257.
- Sturtevant, E. G. (1997). Teaching contexts and literacy decisions in mathematics and science: A focus on three beginning teachers during years 1 and 2. In C. K. Kinzer, K. A. Hinchman, & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Inquiries in literacy theory and practice: The forty-seventh yearbook of The National Reading Conference* (pp. 237-249). Chicago: The National Reading Conference.
- Sturtevant, E. G., Boyd, F. B., Brozo, W. G., Hinchman, K. A., Moore, D. W., & Alvermann, D. E. (2006). *Principled practices for adolescent literacy: A framework for instruction and policy*. Mahwah, NJ: Earlbaum.
- Taboada, A., & Guthrie, J. T. (2006). Contributions of student questioning and prior knowledge to construction of knowledge from reading information text. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 38(1), 1-35.
- Wang, J. H., & Guthrie, J.T. (2004). Modeling the effects of intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, amount of reading, and past reading achievement on text comprehension between U.S. and Chinese students. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(2), 162-186.
- Wood, E., & et al. (1995). Evaluating the effects of training high school students to use summarization when training includes analogically similar information. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 27(4), 605-626.

- Worthy, J., & Beck, I. L. (1995). On the road from recitation to discussion in large-group dialogue about literature. In K. A. Hinchman, D. J. Leu, & C. K. Kinzer (Eds.), *Perspectives on literacy research and practice: Forty-fourth yearbook of The National Reading Conference* (pp. 312-324). Chicago: The National Reading Conference.
- Yopp, R. H., & Yopp, H. K. (2006). Informational texts as read-alouds at school and home. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 38(1), 37-51.
- Zhang, S., & Duke, N. (2008). Strategies for internet reading with different reading purposes: A descriptive study of twelve good internet readers. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 40, 128-162.

EDCI 657 Course Schedule**Spring 2016****Dr. Kay Hong-Nam, Instructor**

2/3	Meet in MPLX 122 4:30 to 10:00 pm
2/17	Meet in MPLX 4:30 to 10:00 pm
3/02	Meet in MPLX 4:30 to 10:00 pm
3/16	Spring Break (No Class)
3/30	Meet in MPLX 4:30 to 10:00 pm
4/13	Meet in MPLX 4:30 to 10:00 pm
4/27	Meet in MPLX 4:30 to 10:00 pm

Note: Additional online assignments will be due on dates not yet listed in the course schedule. Decisions on due dates will occur on the first night of class to accommodate students' schedules.