GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION & HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
Ph.D. IN EDUCATION PROGRAM

EDUC802, Section 001, Fall 2010
Leadership Seminar

Instructor:	S. David Brazer
Phone:	703-993-3634
Fax:	703-993-3643
Website:	http://www.taskstream.com
e-mail:	sbrazer@gmu.edu
Mailing address:	George Mason University
	4400 University Drive, MSN 4C2
	Fairfax, VA 22030-4444

Office hours: Mondays and Wednesdays, 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Schedule Information

Location: Robinson A107

Meeting times: 7:20 – 10:00 p.m.

Catalog Course Description: EDUC 802 (3:3:0)

Intensive study of leadership, emphasizing decision and change processes, and assessment and development of leadership skills.

Additional Course Description

We will explore leadership from different perspectives and put leadership into the broader context of education organizations (i.e., schools and districts) and the social and political environment of U.S. education.

Nature of Course Delivery

Class sessions will involve a substantial amount of discussion interspersed with student and instructor presentations on specific topics. The course is not so much "delivered" as co-created by our working together.

General Goals

Content
It is my intent that students will learn how leadership is analyzed and discussed within the context of a larger organization. Although we will read one book on leadership that adopts a psychological perspective largely separated from organizational context, this is not the perspective that I favor. I believe it is important for students of leadership to understand that no one leads in isolation and that leadership is constrained by important organizational factors. The theory base that is a major portion of course content can be applied to leadership in all fields in education. I expect students to bridge between that theory base and leadership examples and their own areas of interest.

Teaching and Learning
Each class will include a variety of activities and exercises. Out-of-class work will rely in part on the use of TaskStream. Specific process goals for the class are as follows:

1. Classes will reflect a balance of activities that encourage high quality, ethical leadership. To promote an atmosphere that allows us to accomplish this, we will:
    a. Start and end on time;
    b. Maintain (flexibly) a written agenda reflecting objectives for each class;
    c. Agree to disagree respectfully during class discussions;
    d. Strive to be open to new ideas and perspectives; and
    e. Listen actively to one another.

2. Student work will reflect what is expected from scholar leaders. Students are expected to:
    a. write papers that are well researched, proofread, submitted in a timely fashion, and conform to APA guidelines;
    b. lead class when called upon to do so and prepare diligently for class leadership;
    c. participate actively in class discussions in a manner that challenges the best thinking of the class; and
    d. provide constructive feedback to others both on their ideas and on their written work, striving to learn from each other and to test each other's ideas.

3. We will endeavor to create a classroom climate that approximates what we know about learning organizations. It is therefore important that we create a space that allows participants to try out new ideas and voice opinions without fear of ridicule or embarrassment. The hallmark of a learning organization is a balance between openness and constructive feedback; hence, everyone is expected to:
    a. come fully prepared to each class;
    b. demonstrate appropriate respect for one another;
    c. voice concerns and opinions about class process openly;
    d. engage in genuine inquiry;
    e. recognize and celebrate each other's ideas and accomplishments; and
    f. show an awareness of each other's needs.

Course Objectives

Students taking this course will:
1. be introduced to some of the major social and political challenges facing U.S. education in coming decades;
2. understand the Bolman and Deal (2008) theoretical framework for understanding organizational behavior and outcomes;
3. use a psychology-based model for understanding individual leaders and reflect on these leaders' experiences; and
4. learn to work collaboratively as scholars.

Student Outcomes

Successful students will emerge from the course with the ability to:
1. communicate as an informed scholar interested in bridging research to practice;
2. criticize the analysis and findings of other scholars;
3. apply a theoretical framework to specific cases of leadership, including one's own experiences and aspirations; and
4. lead informed, scholarly discussions in a manner similar to doctoral portfolio reviews and proposal and dissertation defenses.

Relationship of Course Goals to Program Goals

As a General Culture course in the Ph.D. in Education Program, EDUC is intended to develop students' scholarly abilities and perspectives. In that vein, it helps to develop students' capacity to conduct independent research by the time they complete course work in the Program.

Course Materials

Required Readings

Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership*. New York: Basic Books.

Glass, G.V. (2008). *Fertilizers, pills, and magnetic strips: The fate of public education in America.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

The required texts are available in the GMU Bookstore in the Johnson Center.

Recommended:

The American Psychological Association (2009). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th edition). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Classroom Materials

You will probably wish to take notes from class discussions and activities. Laptop computers are welcome, provided you are not engaged in distracting activities such as using wireless connections to check e-mail or irrelevant websites during class time. Of course, traditional note-taking materials such as pen and paper are always welcome.

Outside-of-Class Resources

Online access is vital for the potential distance learning aspects of the course and is important if we experience a university shutdown because of the weather or other problems. **All students are required to activate and monitor their GMU e-mail accounts**. If you are uncertain about how to do this, please see me. It is my expectation that you will be fully competent to send and receive e-mail messages **with attachments**. If your computer at school or home has spam blocking that will prevent you from seeing messages with attachments, you are responsible for addressing this problem immediately.

All students are required to use http://www.taskstream.com as part of this course. This is an Internet site at which I will post vital information for the course and through which we will communicate from time to time. Samples of student work will be archived on this site for purposes of course, program, and college assessment.

It is my expectation that all students have access to standard word processing software that can be read by Microsoft Office 2007.

Course Requirements, Performance-based Assessment, and Evaluation Criteria

Attendance
Students are expected to attend every class for its entirety. Maximum class participation points will be earned by students who attend all classes, are on time and do not leave early.

General Expectations
Consistent with expectations of the Ph.D. in Education Program, grading is based heavily on student performance on written assignments. Overall, written work will be assessed using the following broad criteria:

1. application of concepts reflected in class discussion and readings;
2. original thinking and persuasiveness; and
3. the ability to write in a clear, concise, and organized fashion.

Additionally, a portion of the class grade will be based on participation and the contribution you make to class discussions. The overall weights of the various performances are as follows:

Written Assignments: 70 Points
Four papers are required in this course, one of which is written as a small group. I expect students to edit their papers carefully, meaning that two or more drafts will be necessary to create a well-polished final product. There will be opportunities in class to engage in peer review of written work. To take full advantage, students must come to class with complete drafts on the dates indicate in the tentative class schedule.

Class Leadership: 15 Points
Every student will have the opportunity to lead or co-lead a portion of at least one class session. Class leadership requires coordination with me and with a student partner, if partnering becomes necessary. If you are absent on your scheduled day for class leadership, you will not earn any points in this category. It may be possible to make up class leadership, but that would be at my discretion.

Class Participation: 15 Points
Students are expected to participate actively in class discussions, in group activities, and in serving as critical friends to other students. Attendance is expected for all classes. **If you must be absent, please notify me by e-mail or phone.** More than one absence may result in a reduction in participation points. Arriving at class more than 30 minutes late or leaving more than 30 minutes before the end of class may result in loss of points.

Submitting Written Work
All assignments must be submitted electronically, through TaskStream. TaskStream is an online assessment system used by the College to collect student work, provide feedback to students, and maintain an ongoing record of student assessment data.

Late work: I expect all students to submit their work on time, meaning no later than by midnight of the due date. I recognize that sometimes emergencies arise, so I allow papers to be submitted **up to 48 hours late**. I will not assess a paper submitted more than 48 hours late and the student will earn a zero for that assignment. Papers due on a day when you are absent must be submitted via TaskStream by the due date.

Rewrites: Students may rewrite a paper (other than the final paper) and re-submit the paper for re-grading within one week of receiving the paper back. I recommend that students not consider re-writing papers with scores of 3.6 or higher. If you wish to discuss your work, I am willing to do so at a time of mutual convenience. The re-write option is not available for papers submitted more than 48 hours late for the first submission.

Grading Scale:

A+	=	100 points	B	=	80 – 84 points
A	=	95-99 points	C	=	75 – 79 points
A-	=	90-94 points	F	=	below 75 points
B+	=	85-89 points			

College of Education and Human Development Statement of Expectations
- Students are expected to exhibit professional behavior and dispositions.
  http://cehd.gmu.edu/assets/docs/cehd/Dispositions%20for%20a%20Career%20Educator.pdf
- Students must follow the guidelines of the University Honor Code. See
  http://academicintegrity.gmu.edu/honorcode/ for the full honor code
- Students must agree to abide by the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing. See
  http://mail.gmu.edu and click on Responsible Use of Computing at the bottom of the screen.

Students with disabilities who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with the
GMU Disability Resource Center (DRC) and inform the instructor, in writing, at the beginning
of the semester. See www.gmu.edu/student/drc or call 703-993-2474 to access the DRC.

Tentative Weekly Schedule (subject to change)

Date	Topics	Reading/Writing Assignments
August 31	- Introduction to the course and to each other - What makes for an engaging class?	
Sept. 7	- Context matters - What do we mean by "education reform"? - First impressions of the Fullan model of leadership - Preparing for Paper #1 - Writing well	Glass, Preface – ch. 3 Fullan, Preface – ch. 1
Sept. 14	- Student class leadership #1 - Changing habits, changing demographics - In the mind of the leader: values, relationships, flexibility	Glass, chs. 4 – 6 Fullan, chs. 2 – 4
Sept. 21	- Student class leadership #2 - Crowding out education finance - Criticizing the Fullan model - Who are leaders and how do they think? - Personal Best interviews: How'd it go? - Peer review Paper #1	Glass, chs. 7 Fullan, 5 – 7
Sunday, Sept. 26		**Paper #1: Personal Best due** (Note: papers are due on Sundays recognizing that students who work full time do most of their course work on weekends. A Sunday due date improves my ability to return your papers in a timely fashion.)

Date	Topics	Reading/Writing Assignments
Sept. 28	• Sharing personal best cases • Applying Glass and Fullan to your area of interest • Preparing for Paper #2	Take a breather
Oct. 5	• <u>Student Class Leadership #3</u> • Criticizing the Glass perspective on prospects for public education in the U.S. • Time to prepare paper #2	Glass, chs. 8 – 10
Sunday, Oct. 10		**Paper #2: Leadership Case due**
Oct. 12 No Class	**Columbus Day Recess**	Note the longer-than usual reading assignment due next week.
Oct. 19	• <u>Student Class Leadership #4</u> • First impressions of the Gardner model • Leadership profiles: Are these leaders? Would you follow? How? • Who is a leader and what do they <u>do</u>? • Preparing for Paper #3	Gardner, chs. 1 – 10
Oct. 26	• <u>Student Class Leadership #5</u> • Leadership in different settings for different purposes • Can one lead without really trying? • Criticizing the Gardner model • Peer review Paper #3	Gardner, chs. 11 – 15
Sunday, October 31		**Paper #3: Book Review due**
Nov. 2	• Reflections: ➢ Are your perspectives on leadership evolving? ➢ What does it mean to be a scholar leader? ➢ Have you led, are you leading, will you lead?	Take a breather
Nov. 9	• <u>Student Class Leadership #6</u> • What is an organization? • Origins and meaning of organizational structure • "Clockwork"	B & D, chs. 1 – 5

Date	Topics	Reading/Writing Assignments
Nov. 16	• Student Class Leadership #7 • Origins and meaning of human resources • HR skills of Gardner leaders	B & D, chs. 6 – 8
Nov. 23	• Student Class Leadership #8 • Origins and meaning of organizational politics • Is Glass merely naïve?	B & D, chs. 9 – 11
Nov. 30	• Origins and meaning of organizational culture • Considering schools and other educational institutions through the four frames • Peer review Paper #4	B & D, chs 12 – 14
Sunday, Dec. 5		**Paper #4: Platform of Beliefs due**
Dec. 7	• Glass, Fullan, and Gardner reconsidered through the four frames • Wrap up	

Paper #1: Personal Best
20 Points

Due Sunday, September 26, 2010 via TaskStream

<u>**Rationale**</u>
Students in the doctoral program come from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds, and have a variety of professional interests. To discover attributes of effective leadership in these varied disciplines, and perhaps some attributes that effective leaders share across disciplines, we will borrow a research activity from a classic leadership work.

<u>**Process**</u>
This assignment borrows from James Kouzes and Barry Posner's book, *The Leadership Challenge*. As a part of their studies of leaders and followers, they asked leaders to write a **personal best case**, which they then discussed to discover themes about leader behavior. For this paper, identify one person who works in your specialization who you believe to be an effective leader. Interview this person about a **personal best** experience involving **leadership**. Some questions included in the K&P study included the following:
- What characterized the situation? Who was involved? Where and when did it take place? Who initiated the situation?
- What motivated you to get involved? How did you challenge yourself and others?
- How did you build enthusiasm and excitement? How did you involve others and foster collaboration? How did you build trust and respect?
- What principles and values guided you and others? How did you set an example?

<u>**Product**</u>
The first part of this paper is the personal best <u>description</u>, which you should write-up based on your interview. Include a brief description of your method for learning about the personal best case (i.e., how you chose the participant, whether or not your interviewed her/him, etc.). To complete the paper, use the leadership model Fullan presents in chapter 1 of his book <u>as an analytic tool</u> to examine the case. In Fullan's terms, in what ways did this leader excel in the situation you described above, and what leadership attributes or behaviors most contributed to making this a "best?" Finally, in conclusion, what lessons did **you** learn about leadership in your specialization from analyzing the experience, and how useful did you find the Fullan model as a tool for analysis?

Structure your paper in the following way:
1. Write an introductory paragraph that starts out broadly and narrows down to a <u>one-sentence thesis</u> that is the last sentence of the paragraph. Your thesis states your main argument (i.e., what you plan to demonstrate or prove in your paper).
2. Write each body paragraph such that the topic sentence relates directly to your thesis and that the significance of the paragraph in terms of your thesis is clear.
3. Conclude with a paragraph that begins with your re-worded thesis and broadens out to explain what you learned and the usefulness of the Fullan model.

This is a short paper (6 +/- pages), which must conform to APA format in all respects. Come to class prepared to **share** your case!

Personal Best Assessment Rubric

Criteria:	Exceeds Expectations—4	Meets Expectations—3	Approaching Expectations—2	Falls Below Expectations—1
Thesis & introduction (10%) The introduction draws the reader into the topic of the paper and the thesis lays out the author's specific burden of proof.	The paper starts with a clear and concise statement of purpose and an introduction that draws the reader into the paper and ends with a clear and compelling thesis. The introduction provides a clear roadmap for the reader, foreshadowing what the paper is intended to cover.	The paper starts with a brief introduction that alludes to the purpose of the paper, contains a thesis, and provides a general foreshadowing of what is to be included.	The introduction provides some indication of the purpose of the paper, but lacks a thesis and/or provides inadequate or confusing information about what is to be shared.	There is no clear introduction or purpose.
Description of personal best case (25%) The reader needs just enough information to understand the case. This portion of the paper is nearly equal to, but certainly not greater than the analysis.	The case is described thoroughly, including an accounting of the "personal best" situation and details about why this was selected as a personal best case.	The case is described thoroughly, but detail is lacking on why the case represents a "personal best"	Description of the case is incomplete or poorly constructed	Description of the case is largely missing or wholly inadequate.
Description of method (10%)	The paper includes a brief but thorough description of the method, including a discussion of the participant interviewed; interview process; and analysis.	The paper includes a brief description of method, but details on some aspects of how the study was conducted are unclear.	The paper includes some discussion of method, but details on one or more aspect of how the study was conducted are omitted.	The methods section is omitted or wholly inadequate.
Case analysis (30%) This is the heart of the paper because it conveys what you learn by applying the Fullan model.	Fullan's model is very briefly summarized and then used to thoroughly assess how the case exemplifies effective leadership.	Fullan's model is used adequately to assess how the case exemplifies effective leadership.	Analysis is weak or incomplete, or superficially considers the Fullan model.	Analysis is unrelated to the case, is largely missing, or wholly inadequate.
Conclusion, implications (15%)	Clear and specific lessons are derived from the case relating to leadership in the specialization. The efficacy of the Fullan model as a tool for assessing leadership practice is persuasively discussed.	General lessons are presented relating to leadership in the specialization, and the efficacy of the Fullan model as a tool for assessing leadership practice.	Lessons relating to the candidate's experiences and future leadership development are superficial	Lessons learned and implications of the case are largely missing or wholly inadequate.
Organization of paper (5%)	Paper is powerfully organized and fully developed	Paper includes logical progression of ideas aided by clear transitions	Paper includes brief skeleton (introduction, body, conclusion) but lacks transitions	Paper lacks logical progression of ideas
Mechanics and APA (5%)	The paper is nearly error-free which reflects clear understanding and thorough proofreading	The paper contains occasional grammatical, word choice, and APA errors.	The paper contains repeated grammatical, word choice, and APA errors.	Frequent errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, and APA format.

Classroom Research Conducted by Students

"Classroom research" usually takes the form of within-course assignments that are intended to provide students an opportunity to practice various research methods such as interview, observation, and survey techniques, as well as data analysis. Classroom research projects are often limited in scope and time (e.g., within one academic semester), and do not lead to generalizable knowledge. Such projects should not put the subjects at more than minimal risk, and data generated as a result of such projects must be recorded confidentially by the students (i.e., with no names, social security or I.D. numbers, or any other codes that can be linked to a list of names).

Classroom research projects are considered "classroom exercises" and are not subject to review by the HSRB. They do not require review unless the student researcher or faculty supervisor anticipates publishing the results or presenting the research at a professional meeting.

Standards of Ethical Research for Classroom Research

Regardless of the status of our work (i.e., it is not considered "research" under federal guidelines), standards of ethical research are still quite relevant.

Federal policy **(the Common Rule)** is designed to ensure minimal standards for the ethical treatment of research subjects. The major goal is to limit harm to participants in research. That means that no one should suffer harm just because she or he became involved as subjects or respondents in a research project. ETHICAL RESEARCH rests on three principles:

- RESPECT for persons' autonomy, meaning the researcher gives adequate and comprehensive information about the research and any risks likely to occur, understandable to the participant, and allows the participant to voluntarily decide whether to participate.
- BENEFICENCE, meaning the research is designed to maximize benefits and minimize risks to subjects and society.
- JUSTICE, meaning that the research is fair to individual participants and does not exploit or ignore one group (e.g., the poor) to benefit another group (e.g., the wealthy). (cf: The Belmont Report)

Research produces benefits valued by society. Regulatory oversight seeks to ensure that any potential harm of the research is balanced by its potential benefits.

The nature of this project does not involve any circumstances that could harm an individual involved, though procedures to ensure confidentiality are warranted. We will not ask participants to sign a formal informed consent document, although you should be aware that informed consent is a process, not a piece of paper. As such, you are expected to adhere to the following guidelines:

- Identify yourself as a GMU student who is performing an activity to fulfill a course requirement. Identify the course specifically.

- Provide the name of the supervising faculty member to contact for questions.

- Identify how you will record notes from the conversation, and provide assurance that you are the only person who will have access to these data. (DO NOT record the name of the interviewee on any written document; assign a pseudonym.)

- Discuss the process you will follow with the participant (i.e., you will conduct the interview using a set of questions, which you may share; you will record notes to use as evidence in the write up of their case; you will use this case as data to analyze in a paper about leadership behavior; you may include some illustrative quotes or paraphrased comments in your paper, but will not use their name of the name of the school or work setting). The paper will be shared only with the instructor and possibly students in this class. Research notes will not be shared.

- Participants must be informed that their participation is completely voluntary, that they can skip any questions they do not wish to answer, and that they can stop answering questions at any time.

EDUC 802—Student Class Project

Student's Name:	EDUC 802 – LEADERSHIP SEM.
Instructor: S. David Brazer (sbrazer@gmu.edu)	Fall 2010
Project Title -- Personal Best Leadership Case analysis	

Project Description: students will interview leaders in their field about a situation that they believe to be their "leadership best." Cases will be used to analyze attributes of effective leaders.

RESEARCH PROCEDURES: Students will interview subjects in an appropriate setting, using a set of pre-determined questions. They will first review the purposes and procedures involved, including procedures used to ensure confidentiality; seek subject consent; and answer any questions. Data used in their analysis may include direct or paraphrased quotations, along with general information about the case.

CONFIDENTIALITY/ANONYMITY: Pseudonyms will be used for subject and setting. Field notes will not be seen by anyone other than the student, and will not include any identifiable information. Papers will be read by the instructor and may be shared with one or more students in class for comparative analysis.

CERTIFICATIONS

This study does not involve any discernable risks.

Participation is completely voluntary and you can skip any questions you do not wish to answer, or stop answering questions at any time. You may also withdraw your consent at any time without consequence.

Information collected in this study will be used for fulfilling a classroom assignment; results of this project will not be published or presented at a professional meeting.

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE:

STUDENT'S SIGNATURE	DATE
PARTICIPANT'S SIGNATURE	DATE

Paper #2: Leadership Case
15 Points

Due, Sunday, October 10, 2010 via TaskStream

Rationale
There are a wide variety of rather persistent leadership dilemmas in schools and other organizations. As students of leadership, and as aspiring leaders who seek to promote positive change in schools and other organizations, it is useful to describe some of these situations thoroughly as cases for analysis in leadership education and development.

Process
With a small number of collaborators (ideally peers who share your interests in leadership in your specialization), you will be crafting a case involving a leader's role in organizational change. The paper itself should be modeled on the submission guidelines outlined by the editors of the *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*. From the JCEL website: *Cases are reviewed with the following criteria in mind:*
- *Focuses on pertinent and timely issues of educational leadership.*
- *Relevant to graduate students preparing for educational leadership roles and for educational professionals currently in these roles.*
- *Useful in graduate teaching environments.*
- *Presents a practical and realistic problem that requires the integration of knowledge within and/or across disciplines.*
- *Stimulates self-directed learning by encouraging students to generate questions and access new knowledge.*
- *Provides the description of a problem that can sustain student discussion of alternative solutions.*
- *Describes the context in a rich fashion, including the individuals in the case.*
- *Encourages the clarification of personal and professional values and beliefs.*
- *Authenticates the connection of theory to practice.*
- *Includes teaching notes that facilitate the use of the case for leadership development.*
- *Is clearly written with specific objectives.*

Product
Following the submission guidelines for JCEL, all cases should include the following:
- *Title*, *Author Information* – Title & author's name and institutional affiliation (on APA-formatted cover page)
- *Abstract* - A short 100 word abstract describing the topic(s) of the case and a brief synopsis of the case. (The abstract is not included in the word limit.)
- *Text* - Sections should be typed in Times Roman font (12 pt) with page numbers centered at the bottom of the page.
- *Teaching Notes -* All cases should include a one (1) page "Teaching Notes" that outlines how the material might be used in professional preparation programs for leaders. (Not included in the word limit.)
- *References* - References should follow the style in the fourth edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association.* (Not included in the word limit.)

The paper must not exceed 2,000 words, the limit set by *JCEL*.

Leadership Case Assessment Rubric

Criteria:	Exceeds Expectations—4	Meets Expectations—3	Approaching Expectations—2	Falls Below Expectations—1
Abstract (15%)	A clear and concise 100 word abstract describing the topics of the case and providing a synopsis of the case is included.	A 100 word abstract describing the topics of the case and providing a synopsis of the case is included, but it is somewhat hard to follow or omits important information.	An abstract is included, but it either exceeds recommended length or fails to provide a clear description of the case.	The abstract is either missing or not at all useful in describing the case.
Text of case (40%)	A well thought out and stimulating case that meets most or all elements of a JCEL case is provided.	A case that satisfies many elements of a JCEL case is provided.	A case dealing with the leader's role in change is provided, but it lacks detail and fails to satisfy many of the elements of a JCEL case.	The case description is either missing of fails to satisfy virtually any of the elements of a JCEL case.
Teaching notes (25%)	A well thought out single page of teaching notes is provided, suggesting sound approaches on how the case may best be used to develop effective leadership in the specialization.	A page of teaching notes is provided, suggesting approaches on how the case may best be used to develop effective leadership in the specialization.	Teaching notes are provided, but are either hard to follow or suggest approaches on how the case may be used that are unclear or do not make sense given the facts of the case.	Teaching notes are omitted or fail to connect well to any aspects of the case presented.
References (10%)	The reference list is complete and nearly error-free, which reflects clear understanding APA format.	The reference list is missing one or more references, includes references not cited, and/or has minor APA errors.	Missing multiple references and/or difficulty conforming to APA rules.	Frequent omissions and errors in APA format.
Organization of case (5%)	The case is powerfully organized and fully developed	The case includes logical progression of ideas aided by clear transitions	The case is rough; writing is unclear and/or lacks transitions	The case is virtually impossible to understand; it lacks logical progression of events or ideas
Mechanics (5%)	The case is nearly error-free which reflects clear understanding and thorough proofreading.	The case has occasional grammatical errors and questionable word choice.	The case contains errors in grammar and punctuation, but spelling has been proofread.	The case contains frequent errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation.

Paper #3: Book Review of *Fertilizers, Pills, and Magnetic Strips* OR *Leading Minds*
20 Points

Due Sunday, October 31, 2010 via TaskStream

Rationale
One skill that is important to doctoral work is being able to analyze and criticize published work both in terms of the contribution the work makes to the knowledge base, and in methodological terms. For this paper, you will produce a scholarly review of Glass's *Fertilizers, Pills, and Magnetic* Strips **or** Gardner's *Leading Minds* from the perspective of a leader in your field. This paper has dual goals: To help you hone your skills in summarizing and analyzing literature, and to practice communicating this in writing to an academic audience.

Process
Think about how the book you have chosen contributes to the knowledge base, the technical soundness of the work, and its contribution to your understanding of issues involving leadership in your specialization. (Ask yourself: In what ways does this book help leaders in my field?)

As a guide, structure your review as if you were planning on submitting it to an academic journal such as the *Education Review*, an online journal of book reviews (http://edrev.asu.edu/).

Product
A review should include first, a brief summary of what the book was about and its key contributions to the knowledge base. (This is important because you can assume that the reader of the review has not yet read the book.) But a book review is not just a regurgitation of the book. Your evaluation should answer the questions: How useful was the book, and to whom? Touch on questions such as:

- Is the book well done? Did the author achieve his/her goal?
- Does the book present useful ideas in a coherent fashion? Was it well written, were the analyses and conclusions intelligently fashioned?
- Do you care? Is this book about a problem or question that scholars and/or practitioners might find useful? Is there merit in the arguments offered?
- Did you learn something from reading this book? Does it contribute to the knowledge base? Is it a valuable read for scholars / practitioners?
- What were the primary limitations of the work? What questions are left unanswered, that you believe should have been addressed? What topics are ignored that you believe should have been addressed?
- Would you recommend the book to others? To whom? Why?

The review should not exceed eight (8 +/-) typewritten, double-spaced pages. (As a guideline, the summary of the book itself should be about a third of the paper.)

Book Review Assessment Rubric

	Exceeds Expectations—4	Meets Expectations—3	Approaching Expectations—2	Falls Below Expectations—1
Introduction (15%) Introduction orients the reader to the purpose of the paper and introduces the book you are reviewing.	Introduction briefly describes the book reviewed, the purpose of the review itself, and foreshadows significant findings through a clear and well thought out thesis.	Introduction briefly describes the book reviewed, provides an adequate description of the purpose of the review, and/or an adequate thesis.	Introduction is vague and does not adequately orient the reader to the book reviewed or the purpose of paper.	Introduction is either missing or insufficient; there is little consideration of reader's perspective.
Summary of book (20%) Review includes a brief summary of the contents of the book to help situate the reader.	The book is described briefly yet thoroughly, with clear explanation of the author's purpose and perspective, and a delineation of the main ideas offered in the book.	The book is described adequately, with some attempt to identify the author's purpose and perspective and some delineation of important content offered in the book.	The description of the book is incomplete or poorly constructed; little attempt is made either to identify the purpose or the main points offered.	Description of the book is largely ignored or wholly inadequate.
Evaluation of the book (40%) Review includes an evaluation of the merits of the book	An evaluation of the book is presented, discussing most of the evaluative questions outlined in the assignment description in a coherent and convincing manner.	An evaluation of the book is included that adequately touches on many of the important evaluative questions outlined.	An evaluation of the book is included, touching on some evaluative questions, but doing so in a shallow or unconvincing fashion.	The evaluation of the book is extremely limited or wholly ignored.
Conclusions (15%) Paper closes with a restatement of the thesis, a brief summary of the review, and a recommendation to future readers.	Conclusion follows logically from the body of the paper and is persuasive. It summarizes main points made in the review, and includes a clear recommendation regarding the utility of the book for leaders in your field.	The conclusion is adequate; it provides a brief summary that is largely consistent with the body of the review, and a recommendation regarding the utility of the book.	Conclusion provides a summary of some of the main points offered in the paper, but is unclear and not especially persuasive.	Paper ends without a discernable conclusion.
Organization of paper (5%)	Paper is powerfully organized and fully developed	Paper includes logical progression of ideas aided by clear transitions	Paper includes brief skeleton (introduction, body, conclusion) but lacks transitions	Paper lacks logical progression of ideas
Mechanics and APA (5%)	Nearly error-free which reflects clear understanding and thorough proofreading	Occasional grammatical errors and questionable word choice	Errors in grammar and punctuation, but spelling has been proofread	Frequent errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation

Paper #4: Personal Platform of Beliefs
15 Points

Due Sunday, December 5, 2010 via TaskStream

Rationale
This exercise is derived from the Maine School Leadership Network, which developed the Platform of Beliefs exercise as a tool they use with leaders as a way of helping them identify the core beliefs that form the foundation of their decision-making and professional practice. We believe that it is important for you to identify and reflect on such beliefs as doctoral students.

Process
Each person approaches a reflective exercise like this somewhat uniquely, based on past experiences, knowledge, and hopes for the future. To create your platform, consider the following as guiding questions:
- Identify three or so core beliefs that are important to you based on your examination of leadership this term.
- For each of these, explain why each belief is important, and how it relates to the other beliefs.
- Then for each belief, expand on it by including a few principles that describe what the belief means and how it appears in practice. What are people actually doing when this belief is manifested in behaviors?

Products
Your Platform of Beliefs is a work in progress; as you progress in the program and in your leadership practice, you will return to it and continue to reflect on what it means, to you, to lead. The platform should include the following:

- Your core beliefs about effective leadership (situated in your area of specialization), with an explanation of why each belief is important; and
- Your specific leadership goals as a doctoral student.
- A discussion of how your beliefs and goals are grounded in theory and/or research.

This is a short reflection (3-4 pages), which must conform to APA format.

Platform of Personal Beliefs Assessment Rubric

Criteria:	Exceeds Expectations—4	Meets Expectations—3	Approaching Expectations—2	Falls Below Expectations—1
Description of core beliefs (40%)	The platform includes a clear and thorough description of your core beliefs about effective leadership in your specialization.	The platform includes a description of core leadership beliefs that are at least loosely related to leadership in your specialization.	The platform includes description of at least some leadership beliefs, but these are generic or somewhat vague	Core beliefs are missing or so poorly stated that they are hard to discern
Reflection on importance (20%)	The platform includes a clear and thorough reflection on why these beliefs are important to you personally, and/or to leaders in your specialization field.	The platform includes a reflection on why these beliefs are important that at least loosely relates to your core beliefs.	The reflection on why these beliefs are important is evident, but vague or insufficient in detail.	The reflection is missing, poorly developed, or hard to connect to the beliefs presented.
Delineation of goals (20%)	The platform includes specific, well thought out leadership goals to guide your development as a doctoral student (and beyond).	Leadership goals for doctoral study are presented.	Leadership goals are evident, but they are poorly developed or vague	Goals are missing or so poorly stated that they are hard to discern.
Support (10%)	Specific, developed ideas and/or evidence from theory or research are used to support your platform	Supporting theory or research is used to support some elements of the platform but is weakly developed in spots	Platform uses supporting ideas and/or evidence sparsely, or includes claims that are weakly supported by available evidence	Few to no solid supporting ideas or evidence , or inclusion of claims that are directly contradictory to available evidence
Organization of paper (5%)	Paper is powerfully organized and fully developed	Paper includes logical progression of ideas aided by clear transitions	Paper includes brief skeleton (introduction, body, conclusion) but lacks transitions	Paper lacks logical progression of ideas
Mechanics (5%)	Nearly error-free which reflects clear understanding and thorough proofreading	Occasional grammatical errors and questionable word choice	Errors in grammar and punctuation, but spelling has been proofread	Frequent errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation