

**University of Calgary Werklund School of Education  
Graduate Programs in Education**

**EDER 603.23 L06  
Writing Educational Research  
Spring 2018**

**Instructor:** Sarah Elaine Eaton, Ph.D.

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

**Phone:** 403-220-6378

**Email:** seaton@ucalgary.ca

**Skype:** SarahElaineEaton

**Office Hours / Virtual Office Hours:** By appointment

**Academic Coordinator:** Dr. Sylvie Roy, MED Teaching English as an Additional Language

**Spring Term Dates:** Monday, May 14 – Tuesday, June 26, 2018

Special Dates: Monday, May 21 – Victoria Day (University closed)

**Adobe Connect Sessions**

There will be two synchronous Adobe Connect sessions (recorded) during the term:

Monday, May 14, 2018 - 6:00 - 7:30 p.m. Mountain Time

Monday, June 4, 2018 - 6:00 - 7:30 p.m. Mountain Time

Additionally, students may request individual consultations via Adobe Connect to ask questions about the course or consult about your individual work.

**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 about research for scholarly or professional purposes. Students will focus on writing, offering feedback to peers, revising, and incorporating feedback.

Students take on three key roles during this course:

1. **Writer** - Crafting an original work intended for sharing in a public forum.
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.
3. **Reviser** - Learning to consider and incorporate peer feedback thoughtfully. 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 journeys and previous studies. Given that students have taken 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 these concepts:

- 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 that revising 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 in and contribute to a scholarly community of inquiry through synchronous sessions and asynchronous discussions
- Select and examine academic papers in the field and analyze them structurally
- Engage in the full process of producing a paper structured and formatted as a journal manuscript or a conference paper, through assigned learning tasks
- Provide constructive feedback to and receive such feedback from peers

## COURSE DESIGN AND DELIVERY

This course will take place on-line via D2L and Adobe Connect. This method provides opportunities to discuss the complexities of educational research; however, it also demands a high level of commitment to D2L posts in order to fully benefit from the ideas presented. Although the course has been designed with a structure of topics for discussion, readings, and assignments, it should also be noted that, due to the nature of research, you and your peers might be working on different things at different times.

To get the most out of the course, students are encouraged to participate in the asynchronous discussions, with the entire class and in pairs, and in synchronous whole-class Adobe Connect sessions. When unable to participate live due to a time zone difference or unforeseen circumstances, students are asked to inform the instructor in advance and propose and implement a plan to participate (e.g., watch the recordings, 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](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.

<http://www.sagepub.com/books/Book231055#tabview=titl>

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

## 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):

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

TCPS 2 – CORE Tutorial: <http://www.calgary.ca/research/research-services-office-rso/ethics-compliance/tcps2-core-tutorial>

### Optional supplementary readings

Workbook to accompany Belcher's text:

<http://www.wendybelcher.com/pages/WorkbookForms.htm>

The instructor may post suggestions for additional supplementary on D2L.

### LEARNING TASKS OVERVIEW

TASK #	DESCRIPTION OF LEARNING TASK	% OF FINAL GRADE	GROUPING FOR TASK
LT # 1	Engagement in the Learning Community DUE: Ongoing - Assessed at the end of the course	30%	Individual
LT # 2	Draft abstract with rationale for journal or conference selection DUE: Thursday, May 31 by 11:30 pm Mountain Time	30%	Individual or group
LT # 3	Final Paper - Manuscript DUE: Tuesday, Jun 26 by 11:30 pm Mountain Time	40%	Individual or group

**All work is to be submitted in Word format via the D2L Dropbox, unless specified otherwise by the course instructor. Please do not e-mail copies of your work unless you receive a specific request to do so.**

**WEEKLY COURSE SCHEDULE**

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

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Readings &amp; Activities</b>	<b>Tasks &amp; Dates</b>
Week 1 - Monday, May 14 to Sunday, May 20	Course introduction, starting your writing & argumentation	Course overview, formation of writing/review groups  Readings: Belcher Weeks 1, 2 & 3  Selection of previous course paper for adaption as a journal or conference paper; preliminary selection of a journal of conference to which you could submit your final manuscript.	Post your previous course paper in designated D2L forum; respond to class/small group discussion questions  Adobe Connect #1: Monday, May 14 - 6:00 - 7:30 p.m. Mountain Time
<b>Monday, May 21 – Victoria Day – No classes due to holiday</b>			
Week 2 (short week) Tuesday, May 22 – Sunday, May 27	Journal/ conference selection, reviewing literature	Readings: Belcher Weeks 4, 5 & 6  Selection of one journal article or conference paper that you find skillfully written and related to your topic of interest; begin drafting your abstract and explanation of journal/conference selection.	Post selected article/ conference paper on D2L and submit to D2L Dropbox; respond to class/small group discussion question(s)
Week 3 Monday, May 28 to Sunday, June 3	Structure	Readings: Belcher Week 6, 7 & 8  Complete and post/submit your abstract and explanation of journal or conference selected	Submit LT #2, Thursday., May 31 by 11:30 pm Mountain time – Submit work in Word format to D2L Dropbox  Independent reading/writing for most of the week
Week 4 Monday, June 4 to Sunday, June 10	Presenting evidence, opening & concluding	No discussion board posts this week. Instead, plan on attending the Adobe Connect Meeting.	Adobe Connect #2: Monday, June 4 - 6:00 - 7:30 p.m. Mountain Time
Week 5 Monday June 11 to Sunday, June 17	Getting feedback, editing	Readings: Belcher Weeks 9 & 10  Receive and provide peer feedback	Post draft of your paper by Mon, June 11 by 5:00 p.m. Mountain time; read and provide feedback to a peer by the end of the week.

Week 6 Monday, June 18 to Sunday, June 24	Finalizing	Readings: Belcher Week 11  Feedback and editing	Engage in final feedback round and editing
Week 7 Monday, June 25 to Tuesday, June 26	Debriefing	Sharing of finalized manuscripts  Engage with your peers about their manuscripts.  Last day of class for Spring semester: Tuesday, June 26.	Post LT3 to D2L for peer sharing and submit LT #3 to D2L Dropbox.  Due date: Tuesday, June 26 by 11:30 p.m. Mountain time.

### Changes to Schedule

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

### Learning Task 1: Engagement in the Learning Community (Due: Ongoing; weighting: 30%)

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 are engaging with peers in collaborative, supportive dialogue. The instructor may consult D2L statistics to view students' rate of posting to the discussion board.

Students are encouraged to submit their **first weekly contribution** to the discussion board as soon as possible, but **by Wednesday of each week at the latest**. Please note that, by 8:00 pm Mountain time each Sunday, the discussion board may be closed for the preceding week.

A core component of this course relates to working collaboratively providing peer feedback to a small group of your colleagues' work. This reflects the actual process of preparing and submitting a manuscript for consideration for a journal or a conference. 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.

### Learning Task #1 Assessment Criteria

As you write and revise drafts of your manuscript (LT2), you are expected to complete assigned readings, actively participate in D2L discussions (asynchronous learning), as well as engage fully in the Adobe Connect sessions (synchronous learning).

Your participation should be consistent with collective knowledge building principles – with an emphasis on the constructive use of authoritative resources, democratizing knowledge, idea diversity and knowledge building discourse. Engaging in ongoing community discourse in ways that are in alignment with knowledge building principles helps to deepen conversation, moving it from general sharing into a knowledge building activity that enables all members of the community to advance in understanding and deepen their scholarship.

Criteria	Fails to meet requirements (C+ and lower)	Meets some requirements (B- to B)	Meets all requirements (B+ to A-)	Meets all and exceeds some requirements (A to A+)
<b>Asynchronous Learning (D2L Discussions)</b>				
<b>Constructive use of authoritative sources</b>	<p>Readings are summarized with little or no critical analysis or thoughtful interpretation AND/OR concrete evidence of having engaged with the course material is not provided.</p> <p>Writing is not scholarly. APA style is not used to cite sources or limited adherence to APA standard.</p>	<p>Information sources are critically evaluated and writing demonstrates recognition that even the best ideas are improvable; details from articles are cited and/or quoted.</p> <p>Written in mostly scholarly style but requires editing to achieve clarity. Use of APA style requires editing.</p>	<p>Citations to and/or quotations of specific passages, supplemented by additional information sources are evidence of purposeful, substantive peer support and building of the learning community.</p> <p>Written in mostly scholarly style. Consistent use of APA style with some editing required.</p>	<p>Discussion postings are succinct, but rich in content helping others build knowledge and deepen their understanding. They are not only full of thought, insight, and critical analysis, but also make clear connections among issues, readings, discussion, and personal context/situations.</p> <p>Written in clear and scholarly manner. Consistent use of APA style and citation protocols for all sources.</p>

<b>Idea Diversity Democratizing Knowledge</b>	<p>Discussion postings are sparsely made in untimely manner and seldom provide new insights to the discussions. You seldom put forward or discuss new ideas. You add contribution with little recognition of others in the group or contribute late/not at all and therefore outside of the discourse.</p>	<p>Discussion postings are often made in timely manner and sometimes provide new insights to the discussions. You play a role in discussing ideas to create a dynamic learning environment.</p>	<p>Discussion postings are mostly made in timely manner and often provide new insights to the discussions. You play an active role in putting forward different ideas to create a dynamic learning environment. You recognize and praise everyone's work and help others find needed information.</p>	<p>Discussion postings are made in a timely manner and consistently provide new insights to the discussions. You play an active role in putting forward different ideas to create a dynamic environment in which contrasts, competition and complementarity of ideas is evidence for ideas to evolve into new and more refined forms. 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.</p>
<b>Improvable Ideas &amp; Fostering Knowledge Building Discourse</b>	<p>The replies to other's postings are sparsely made and seldom:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend other postings</li> <li>• Motivate the group for extended discussion</li> <li>• Serves to identify or defend different points of view</li> </ul> <p>You accept or reject ideas as truth with little or no discussion to further argument or seek explanations and evidence.</p>	<p>The replies to other's postings sometimes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend other postings</li> <li>• Motivate the group for extended discussion</li> <li>• Serves to identify or defend different points of view</li> </ul> <p>You treat some ideas as improvable, sometimes informed by some argument and evidence.</p>	<p>The replies to other's postings often:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend other postings</li> <li>• Motivate the group for extended discussion</li> <li>• Serves to identify shared problems and gaps in understanding</li> </ul> <p>You treat all ideas as improvable, informed by argument and evidence.</p>	<p>The replies to other's postings frequently:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend other postings</li> <li>• Motivate the group for extended discussion</li> <li>• Serves to engage peers in scholarly discourse, identify shared problems and gaps in understanding to advance group understanding.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p>



<b>Regularity of Posting</b>	Contributions to discussions are irregular, infrequent or not timely.	Most postings to the discussion board are timely and sufficient, giving others in the class some time to respond. You respond to other people's postings.	Postings to the discussion board are timely and frequent, and balanced between original thoughts about the readings and responses to other people's postings.	Postings to the discussion board are consistently timely and frequent, and balanced between original thoughts about the readings and responses to other people's postings.
<b>Synchronous Learning (Adobe Connect Sessions)</b>				
<b>Scholarly Discourse and Online Presentations</b>	<p>Discourse during synchronous sessions is limited and seldom helps to identify or defend different points of view.</p> <p>Ideas shared do not demonstrate insights from the course readings.</p> <p>Does not demonstrate understanding of topics.</p>	<p>Discourse during synchronous sessions serves to identify or defend different points of view.</p> <p>Present ideas demonstrating insights from some of the course readings.</p> <p>Demonstrates some understanding of topics.</p>	<p>Discourse during synchronous sessions serves to identify shared problems and gaps in understanding.</p> <p>Present ideas drawing on readings from the course.</p> <p>Demonstrate scholarly engagement, understanding of topics and leadership of knowledge building community.</p>	<p>Discourse during synchronous sessions is literature-informed and serves to engage peers, identify shared problems and gaps in understanding and to advance group understanding.</p> <p>Present literature-informed ideas drawing on readings from the course and extended through other relevant sources.</p> <p>Demonstrate deep scholarly engagement, mastery of topics, and model leadership of a knowledge building community.</p>

	When unable to participate live, limited contributions made to pre- and post synchronous session activities (e.g., work with studio group to support pre-session preparations, prepare an audio recording and slide for the session, watch the recordings, submit a brief reflection/presentation in D2L, and actively contribute to any follow-up discussion).	When unable to participate live, inform the instructor in advance and contribute to some of the pre- and post synchronous activities (e.g., work with studio group to support pre-session preparations, prepare an audio recording and slide for the session, watch the recordings, submit a brief reflection/presentation in D2L, and actively contribute to any follow-up discussion).	When unable to participate live, inform the instructor in advance and enact a plan to contribute pre- and post synchronous session (e.g., work with studio group to support pre-session preparations, prepare an audio recording and slide for the session, watch the recordings, submit a brief reflection/presentation in D2L, and actively contribute to any follow-up discussion).	When unable to participate live, inform the instructor in advance and enact a coherent plan to contribute pre- and post synchronous session (e.g., work with studio group to support pre-session preparations, prepare an audio recording and slide for the session, watch the recordings, submit a brief reflection/presentation in D2L, and actively contribute to any follow-up.
<b>Peer Review and Feedback</b>				
<b>Timely &amp; Constructive Feedback</b>	Peer review was provided in an untimely or superficial manner.	Peer review provides some basic information and insight.	Peer review is done in a timely manner and provides substantial information.	Peer review is done in a timely manner and provides critical but constructive insights.
<b>Scholarly Communication</b>	Peer review does not communicate well how the authors might make changes for their writing.	Peer review somewhat communicates the strengths and the places for improvements.	Peer review is well-written. It communicates the strengths as well as the places for improvements well.	Peer review is well-written, resembling scholarly reviews for journals. It communicates the strengths as well as the places for improvements exceptionally well.

**Learning Task 2: Rationale for Journal or Conference Selection with a Draft Abstract**

(Due: Thursday, May 31 by 11:30 pm Mountain Time; Weighting: 30%)

This assignment aims to help you identify a journal or conference for which you intend to tailor your final writing project (LT#3), and begin the process of preparing your article. In drafting an abstract, you will begin to map out for final paper and advance your thinking about how to transform your initially chosen course essay into a manuscript that may be read by a broader public audience. The assignment will also 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.)

In your submission, you should identify the journal or conference selected (please include a link to the journal/conference website); outline the requirements for publication in that journal/conference (e.g., page/word limits and citation style); and explain why you chose that journal/conference. Questions to consider include how your topic fits within that journal/conference, why your approach and focus are suitable for it; ; and the work you believe you need to do to prepare your manuscript for submission to that journal/conference. Refer to Belcher (2009) pages 99-130 to help you with this learning task.

**Learning Task #2 Assessment Criteria**

**Submit your work in the LT2 Dropbox AND post it to the appropriate discussion form on D2L.**

Criteria	Fails to meet requirements (C+ and lower)	Meets some requirements (B- to B)	Meets all requirements (B+ to A-)	Meets all and exceeds some requirements (A to A+)
Topical and Disciplinary Fit	A specific journal or conference is not identified OR the selection is a poor match for the paper's topic, focus, approach.	The journal or conference selected relates somewhat to the paper's topic.	The journal or conference selected relates directly to the paper's topic, focus, approach, and is based in a relevant scholarly field.	
Peer Review	The scholarly nature of the selected journal or conference is not evident, notably through a peer review process.	The selected journal or conference uses some sort of peer review process.	The selected journal or conference uses a clearly articulated process for peer review.	The selected journal or conference uses a blind or double-blind peer review process to evaluate submissions.
Journal/Conference Choice	There is no clear explanation of the choice of journal or conference.	The choice of journal or conference is clearly	A solid explanation of the choice of journal or	The choice of journal or conference is explained

		explained.	conference is provided, clarifying the fit with the manuscript under development.	logically and persuasively, and the likelihood of being accepted into this source, given what you have learned about it, is noted.
Required Length	Knowledge of length restrictions stipulated by the publisher is not evident. AND/OR Student submits a paper that does not respect publisher's requirements.	A general awareness of the expected submission length is articulated.	Expectations about the submission length are explained.	Precise expectations about the submission length are noted and the type of submission to be made, based on options offered by the publisher, are explained.
Style and Standards	Student do not indicate what formatting style (e.g., APA, MLA, etc.) is required by this publication/conference AND/OR Student shows a general disregard for publishing styles and standards.	Student shows a general awareness of publishing style and standards.	The formatting style (e.g., APA, MLA, etc.) of the publication/ conference is noted.*	
Revision Plan	Explanation of plans to transform the initial essay into a journal/ conference manuscript is not provided in the	The rationale offers a general explanation of how the initial essay will be transformed into	The rationale offers a clear plan to transform the essay into a manuscript	A detailed explanation of plans to transform the essay into a

	rationale or remains vague.	a suitable manuscript.	that would be suitable for the journal or conference provided in the rationale, including explicit examples of what needs to be changed and how.	manuscript that would be highly suitable for the journal or conference is provided in the rationale, including explicit examples of what needs to be changed and how.
Evidence of Graduate Student Publication	There is no evidence in the rationale that this publication has included or intends to include work from graduate level scholars.		Clear evidence that this publication has accepted or intends to accept submissions from graduate students is provided in the rationale.	Details about (e.g., citations of) work (co-) written by graduate students and accepted by the selected journal or conference are provided in the rationale, OR there is evidence of a query to and response from the editor about this matter.
Clarity and Completeness of the Abstract	The drafted abstract lacks information about some key manuscript sections AND/OR has some points that lack clarity	The drafted abstract is generally clear and coherent.	The drafted abstract articulates ideas clearly and includes a comment about all apparent key	The draft abstract articulates ideas clearly, encourages the audience to read the

			sections and points to be covered in the final manuscript.	entire manuscript, and covers all key sections and points to be explored in the final manuscript.
Overall Quality	The overall quality of the writing here does not meet the level expected at the Master's level.	The overall quality of this written work meets the minimum expectations at the Master's level.	The overall quality of this written work meets the expectations at the Master's level.	Overall, this work is of exemplary quality that might only be expected of more experienced scholars.

**\*PLEASE NOTE:** Even if a journal or conference specifies a different style for citations, references, and section headings, please continue to use APA formatting in your written work for this course.

**Learning Task 3 (LT3): Final Manuscript & Response to Peer Feedback** (Due date: Tuesday, June 26 by 11:30 p.m. Mountain time. (Weighting: 40%))

Note: Your LT3 submission includes two separate files, both in Word format:

- a. Your final paper (manuscript)
- b. Your 1-page response to reviewers.

### Final paper

Through this assignment, you will prepare a manuscript suitable for submission to your chosen journal or conference. Part of that process is requesting and considering review feedback about your own written work, and providing feedback to peers. This assignment will involve those elements.

In preparing your manuscript, you should keep in mind the focus, aims, scope, and requirements of the journal or conference that you have selected. The topic explored in your manuscript must address a problem of practice, a conceptually oriented question, or a research-oriented question. Your manuscript will be based on a paper submitted in a previous Master's course in this program, but will be *significantly transformed* into a manuscript worthy for consideration for publication in a scholarly journal or conference proceedings. Through this assignment, you will demonstrate knowledge about preparing a piece of research writing for publication and will

develop 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.

**Important note:** Submitting the same paper for two courses is a form of *plagiarism*. Students are expected to have *significantly transformed* a previous paper submitted for a Master's course into a scholarly manuscript, showcasing an original contribution to practice, conceptualization/theorization or research. You are encouraged to engage with your instructor throughout the drafting process.

Note the following **technical points** in preparing this assignment:

- Even if the selected journal or conference requires a format other than APA (e.g., MLA, Chicago), please adhere to APA throughout your manuscript.
- Publications vary widely in the maximum allowable length for manuscripts. Regardless of the maximum allowed by the journal or conference that you select for this course, ensure that your manuscript does not exceed 3,750 words or 15 pages (**excluding** cover page, abstract and references). Do not include appendices. Should you wish to pursue publication of your manuscript following this course, you will revise your manuscript further to meet author guidelines stipulated by the publisher more closely.
- Prepare (format) your work according to APA standards.
- Include a cover page with required information and your finalized abstract in APA format (**excluded** from page/word count).
- Post your final manuscript in the appropriate discussion forum on D2L and submit it, along with the one-page summary of points made by the reviewers of your manuscript and how you responded to them in your manuscript, via the LT3 Digital Dropbox.
- Submit your final paper as a Word file (.doc or .docx).

## Response to Reviewers

You are expected to solicit and attend to peer and instructor feedback about your draft manuscript. 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 pp. 314-315 helpful in preparing your response letter.

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 reason for your decision. As part of this assignment, you will include a short (no more than **one page**) description of feedback points provided and how you responded to them as you developed your manuscript. Refer to Belcher (2009, pp. 303-319, starting at bottom of p. 303 on "Responding to a Revise and Resubmit Notice") to prepare this response to your peer reviews.

You may single-space your Response to Reviewers.

Please do not submit a cover page, abstract or references with your one-page Response to

Reviewers.

The instructor reserves the right to request that students revise and resubmit their work if it does not meet requirements.



**Learning Task #3 Assessment Criteria****Note: This rubric is consistent across all sections of this course.**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Fails to meet requirements (C+ and lower)</b>	<b>Meets some requirements (B- to B)</b>	<b>Meets all requirements (B+ to A-)</b>	<b>Meets all and exceeds some requirements (A to A+)</b>
<b>Structure &amp; Quality</b>				
<b>Authentic, Professional Writing</b>	<p>Your work loosely attempts to write within the guidelines stated in your journal/conference selection.</p> <p>Writing is not professional or scholarly.</p>	<p>Your work adheres to most writing guidelines expressed in your stated journal/conference selection.</p> <p>Sometimes your writing is professional or scholarly, but needs further refinement.</p>	<p>Your work adheres to writing guidelines as expressed in your stated journal/conference selection. Your work demonstrates high quality professional writing.</p>	<p>Your work clearly adheres to all writing guidelines as expressed in your stated journal/conference selection. Your work demonstrates excellence in professional writing.</p>
<b>Organization and Structure</b>	The title is vague or non-descriptive.	A clear title to the work is provided.	Title is a direct and clear and includes searchable keywords.	Title is a direct, clear, powerful invitation describing the article, suggesting argument of implications, and includes searchable keywords.
	Your writing is not clearly organized, with no clear structure discernible. Headings (if used) do not reflect APA. Main ideas are difficult to identify.	Your article is organized, using APA headings for structure Ideas are clearly expressed.	Your article is clearly organized with explicit APA headings and sub-headings for structure.	Your article is superbly organized with explicit APA headings and sub-headings for structure.
<b>Introduction</b>	Your paper starts with a first sentence that does not draw in the reader, is redundant; is weak or poorly written.	Your paper starts with a clearly written first sentence that draws in the reader.	Your paper starts with a strong first sentence that draws in the reader.	Your paper starts with a gripping first sentence.

	No discernible introduction, or the introduction is poorly written.	The paper starts with a clear introduction that clearly identifies the point of your paper	The introduction establishes the value of your paper. The introduction serves as a “road map” to the reader, and articulates originality, and draws upon relevant literature.	The introduction clearly establishes the value of your paper. The introduction serves as a “road map” to the reader, and articulates originality, appeal, and timeliness, and draws upon relevant literature.
<b>Context / Literature Review</b>	No clear context for the research is provided.	Your research is clearly situated within the current and historical research or professional context.	Clearly describes the context for your work, situating it definitively within professional or research practice.	Your research is clearly situated within a current research or professional context, relating it to previous work conducted in the field.
	Your literature review is scant or does not draw on high quality sources.	Your literature review relates your paper to previous work conducted in the field, drawing mainly from high quality sources.	Your work includes a substantive literature review, grounded in high quality source, showing how your contribution adds an original perspective to the ongoing conversation and debate on your chosen topic.	Your work includes a substantive literature review, drawing exclusively from high quality sources, showing how your contribution adds an original and fresh perspective to the ongoing conversation and debate on your chosen topic.
<b>Significance</b>	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.	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. Clearly indicates the

				intended audience.
<b>Conclusion</b>	A conclusion is not provided or the conclusion is poorly constructed.	The conclusion clearly and succinctly summarizes the argument.	Summarizes the argument and restates the article's relevance to literature. The conclusion points beyond the article to the larger context, highlighting is significance, and provides direction for future research.	Summarizes the argument and restates the article's relevance to literature. The conclusion points beyond the article to the larger context, highlighting is significance, and provides direction for future research. Links back to the introduction and purpose of the work.
<b>References &amp; Citations</b>	Contains few or incomplete citations and references; or the list of References is "padded" or inflated. Pays little attention to APA standards.	Contains accurate citations and references with few APA errors.	Contains accurate citations and a complete list of references, cited using APA format. Few to no APA errors.	Stands as an exemplar of excellence with regards to citing and referencing, paying close attention to the finer points of APA.
<b>Final Copy</b>	Non-scholarly writing is presented; or your work far exceeds the recommended 15 pages / 3750 words or final work is not submitted by the deadline.	Presents scholarly writing. Errors are minor and APA style is followed.  Final manuscript is approximately 15 pages / 3,750 words (or shorter, if consistent with the publication guidelines conference paper is prepared), exclusive of title page, abstract, and references.	Presents exemplary scholarly writing that requires little editing.  Final manuscript is 15 pages / 3,750 words (or shorter, if consistent with the publication guidelines), exclusive of title page, abstract, references.	Presents exemplary scholarly writing that requires no editing.  Final manuscript is 15 pages / 3,750 words (or shorter, if consistent with the publication guidelines), exclusive of title page, abstract, references.
	Your work contains many APA errors or does not follow APA.	APA style is followed for formatting and style.	Your work demonstrates adherence to APA standards including for formatting and style.	Your paper stands as an exemplar of APA standards for formatting and style.

<b>Peer review and feedback</b>				
<b>Nature of feedback</b>	Peer review was provided in an untimely or superficial manner.	Peer review provides some basic information and insight.	Peer review is done in a timely manner and provides substantial information.	Peer review is done in a timely manner and provides critical but constructive insights.
<b>Scholarly Communication</b>	Peer review does not communicate well how the authors might make changes for their writing.	Peer review somewhat communicates the strengths and the places for improvements.	Peer review is well-written. It communicates the strengths as well as the places for improvements well.	Peer review is well-written, resembling scholarly reviews for journals. It communicates the strengths as well as the places for improvements exceptionally well.
<b>Response to Feedback</b>	<p>You provide little to no evidence that you have read your reviewers' feedback in detail or dismiss the reviewers' feedback without just cause; or you provide little to no evidence that you intend to revise your manuscript based on your reviewers' suggestions; or you reject most or all of the feedback given by your reviewers' or your response lacks professionalism.</p>	<p>You provide some evidence that you have read your reviewers' feedback in detail and have considered their suggestions.</p> <p>You provide evidence that you intend to make changes to improve your manuscript based on the reviews that you received.</p> <p>You may respectfully decline to incorporate certain recommendations and offer an explanation as to why.</p>	<p>You provide evidence that you have read your reviewers' 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 reviews that 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>	<p>You provide strong evidence that you have read your reviewers' 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 reviews that 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**

<b>Distribution of Grades*</b>			
<b>Grade</b>	<b>GP Value</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Graduate Description</b>
<b>A+</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>95 - 100</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>90 - 94</b>	<b>Excellent - superior performance showing comprehensive understanding of the subject matter</b>
<b>A-</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>85 - 89</b>	<b>Very good performance</b>
<b>B+</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>80 - 84</b>	<b>Good performance</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>75 - 79</b>	<b>Satisfactory performance.</b> <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>B-</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>70 - 74</b>	<b>Minimum pass for students in the Faculty of Graduate Studies</b>
<b>C+</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>65 - 69</b>	All grades below B- are indicative of failure at the graduate level and cannot be counted toward Faculty of Graduate Studies course requirements.
<b>C</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>60 - 64</b>	
<b>C-</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>55 - 59</b>	
<b>D+</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>50 - 54</b>	
<b>D</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>45 - 49</b>	
<b>F</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>&lt; 45</b>	

*\*Based upon Faculty of Graduate Studies 2017/2018 Calendar*

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>

**Graduate Programs in Education Deferral of Term Work Policy**

- URL: [https://werklund.ucalgary.ca/gpe/files/gpe/deferral-of-term-work-for-instructors-students\\_final\\_0.pdf](https://werklund.ucalgary.ca/gpe/files/gpe/deferral-of-term-work-for-instructors-students_final_0.pdf)

**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.

### Student Mental Health

The University of Calgary recognizes the pivotal role that student mental health plays in physical health, social connectedness and academic success, and aspires to create a caring and supportive campus community where individuals can freely talk about mental health and receive supports when needed. We encourage you to explore the excellent mental health resources available throughout the university community, such as counselling, self-help resources, peer support or skills-building available through the SU Wellness Centre (Room 370, MacEwan Student Centre, [ucalgary.ca/wellnesscentre/counselling/personal/](http://ucalgary.ca/wellnesscentre/counselling/personal/)) and the Campus Mental Health Strategy website ([ucalgary.ca/mentalhealth](http://ucalgary.ca/mentalhealth)).

### Academic Integrity

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 Students' Association:** <https://gsa.ucalgary.ca>
- **Student Ombuds Office:** <https://www.ucalgary.ca/ombuds/>

### 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](http://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/](http://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.