

George Mason University  
College of Education and Human Development  
Literacy and Reading

---

**EDRD 829-001 Advanced Foundations of Literacy Education**

**3 credits, Spring 2018**

**Mondays, 4:30 – 7:10**

**Innovation Hall 211, Fairfax Campus**

---

**PROFESSOR:** Dr. Bill Brozo  
**Office:** 1406 Thompson  
**Hours:** by appointment  
**Phone:** 703-993-3894  
**Email:** wbrozo@gmu.edu  
**Mailing Address:** MSN 4B3, Graduate School of Education, George Mason University  
Fairfax, VA 22030

**PREREQUISITE(S)**

EDUC 800, EDRS 810, or permission of instructor.

**UNIVERSITY CATALOG COURSE DESCRIPTION**

**Advanced Foundations of Literacy Education** explores advanced foundational theory, research, and methodology across the broad field of literacy both nationally and internationally. Includes analysis of historical and current trends, research, practice, and policy in literacy. Individual projects will connect literacy to students' areas of interest. Appropriate for PhD in Education students in any specialization. Offered by Graduate School of Education. May not be repeated for credit.

**COURSE OVERVIEW**

Not Applicable

**COURSE DELIVERY METHOD**

This course will be taught from an inquiry-oriented perspective. Lecture, class discussion, and role plays will be employed to understand and critique literacy theory, research, policy, and practice. Students will also have the opportunity to develop and

explore their own questions about literacy that are meaningful to them, given their work to this point in the doctoral program.

## **LEARNER OUTCOMES AND OBJECTIVES**

This course is designed to enable students to do the following:

1. Read, critique, and synthesize theoretical and research literature
2. Engage in critical class discussion on required course readings
3. Craft a proposal to present at an international or national conference
4. Write a term paper based on course options and student's own interests and give a short presentation on what was learned.

## **PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS**

Not Applicable

## **REQUIRED TEXTS**

The syllabus lists required readings, which may be accessed through GMU Library electronic databases.

Recommended text:

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

## **COURSE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

Students are expected to submit all assignments on time in the manner outlined by the instructor.

**Important Note:** Regardless of the assignment you choose, your paper must be original for this course. If relevant, you may draw on ideas from previous work, but only 10% of a paper completed for another course may comprise the overall content of the paper you write for EDRD 829.

## **Assignments and/or Examinations**

### **I. Term Paper – 70% of overall grade**

Each student will choose to write one paper from a set of required options focusing on some aspect of literacy (See options below). Each option will be explained in class and each student will be given individual support in the development of the paper. The choice for individual projects should be based on what has already been accomplished in previous graduate coursework as well as goals that have been set in the doctoral portfolio. The specific nature of each project will be determined through consultation with the professor. Papers should be 15 – 25 pages in length, not including a reference section, and include a title,

and logical subheadings. Citations and references should conform to APA style. All students will present a brief oral summary of what they learned and accomplished through the paper during the final class sessions.

- A. Conduct a literature review documenting the historical development of an area of literacy related to your field of interest (e.g., content literacy in mathematics, family literacy, adult literacy, multicultural literacy). Research the earliest recommendations and applications of literacy strategies and practices for this aspect of literacy and track the literature in this area to the present day. Bring the discussion into the current context by explaining and analyzing prevailing approaches and their historical antecedents.
- B. What theories have been proposed to explain and impel approaches to literacy related to your field of interest? Describe and analyze one or more of these theories for their explanatory value as well as how they might serve as catalysts for research.
- C. Pose a question related to an aspect of literacy in which you are interested (e.g., Why has it been difficult to infuse literacy into the math curriculum? What are the best ways to promote family literacy?) Answer the question by providing an historical perspective on the topic. Analyze how the topic was studied in the past and compare this to how it is studied today.
- D. What foundational knowledge in literacy informs or could inform instructional approaches in the field of interest to you. Describe and analyze this critical foundational knowledge and demonstrate existing or potential connections to research supportable practices in your area.

## **II. Conference Proposal – 20% of overall grade**

Write a proposal to give either a paper or do a roundtable or poster session at a national or international conference. The focus of the conference should be literacy or related to your field of interest. The proposed paper must include a literacy component. Submit the proposal according to the conference guidelines. You are not required to attend the conference if the proposal is accepted; however, you are strongly encouraged to do so.

## **III. Class Participation – 10% of overall grade**

Students are expected to participate actively in each class by preparing for each class. Preparation entails completing all required readings and response heuristics (See below for details.). If an absence is necessary, please discuss it with the professor.

For each course reading, respond to the following prompts. Although you are not required to submit your responses in writing, you are required to bring your responses to class in order to participate actively in discussion.

- **Author’s Most Significant Points**  
What are the author’s points you found to be most significant?
- **Questions and Criticisms**  
What doubts, challenges, and lingering questions do you have as a result of reading the text?
- **Text-to-Self Connections**  
How does the reading contribute to knowledge building for your own professionalism?

## GRADING

Assignment	Due Dates	Point Value
<b>Term Paper &amp; Presentation</b>	<b>2/19 – form and topic 4/9 -- 1<sup>st</sup> complete draft 4/30 - final draft 4/30 &amp; 5/7 - presentations</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Conference Proposal &amp; Submission</b>	<b>Rolling dates depending on conference submission deadlines</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Class Participation</b>	<b>Each class session</b>	<b>10</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100 pts</b>

Final grades are calculated as a percent of total points earned:

A	= 93% - 100%	93 -100 pts
A-	= 90% - 92%	90 – 92 pts
B+	= 87% - 89%	87 – 89 pts
B	= 80% - 86%	80 – 86 pts
C	= 79% and lower	79 – fewer pts

**\*Written assignments will be submitted electronically. Redrafted assignments must include tracked changes.**

### PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS

See <https://cehd.gmu.edu/students/polices-procedures/>

## PROPOSED CLASS SCHEDULE

Note: Faculty reserves the right to alter the schedule as necessary, with notification to students.

Session	Topic	Assignments Due
1. 1/22	Course Introduction & Requirements	Bring copy of syllabus to class
2. 1/29	Foundations of Literacy: A Primer  Historical Perspectives	Manguel (1996) Venezky (1987) Barry (2008)
3. 2/5	Historical Perspectives	Vogt & Shearer (2010) Walczyk et al. (2014) Moore, Readence, & Rickelman, 1983
4. 2/12	Political Perspectives	Learning Point Associates (2004)  Pearson (2004) McGill-Franzen (2000) Shannon (1983) (2007)
5. 2/19	Political Perspectives	Shanahan & Lonigan, 2010 Pearson & Hiebert, 2010
6. 2/26	Political Perspectives	Moats (2007) Allington (2007)
7. 3/5	Cognitive Psychological Perspectives	Goodman (1967) Spiro (1980) McVee, Dunsmore, & Gavelek, 2005
8. 3/12	SPRING BREAK	
9. 3/19	Cognitive Psychological Perspectives	Dole et al (1991) Kintsch & Mangalath (2011)
10. 3/26	Social Constructivist Perspectives	Palincsar (1998) Van Enk, Dagenais, & Toohey (2005)
11. 4/2	International Literacy Studies Perspectives	Peterson, Woessmann, Hanushek, Lastra-Anadón (2011) Open Letter in Guardian (2014) Brozo et al (2014)

<b>12. 4/9</b>	<b>New Literacies Perspectives</b>	van Sluys, Lewison, & Seely Flint (2006) Street (2003) Leu et al (2015) Walsh (2010)
<b>13. 4/16</b>	<b>Linguistic &amp; Cultural Diversity Perspectives</b>	Calderon, Slavin, & Sanchez (2011) Craig, Zhang, Hensel, & Quinn (2009) Janzen (2008) Bunch (2013)
<b>14. 4/23</b>	<b>Individual Conferences</b>	
<b>15. 4/30</b>	<b>Presentation of Term Projects</b>	<b>Term Papers due</b>
<b>16. 5/7</b>	<b>Presentation of Term Projects</b>	
<b>17. 5/11</b>	<b>TBA</b>	

**\*Note: Faculty reserves the right to alter the schedule as necessary, with notification to students.**

## **CORE VALUES COMMITMENT**

The College of Education and Human Development is committed to collaboration, ethical leadership, innovation, research-based practice, and social justice. Students are expected to adhere to these principles: <http://cehd.gmu.edu/values/>.

## **GMU POLICIES AND RESOURCES FOR STUDNETS**

### *Policies*

- Students must adhere to the guidelines of the Mason Honor Code (see <https://catalog.gmu.edu/policies/honor-code-system/>).
- Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing (see <http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/policies/responsible-use-of-computing/>).

- Students are responsible for the content of university communications sent to their Mason email account and are required to activate their account and check it regularly. All communication from the university, college, school, and program will be sent to students **solely** through their Mason email account.
- Students with disabilities who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with George Mason University Disability Services. Approved accommodations will begin at the time the written letter from Disability Services is received by the instructor (see <http://ods.gmu.edu/>).
- Students must follow the university policy stating that all sound emitting devices shall be silenced during class unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.

### *Campus Resources*

- Support for submission of assignments to Tk20 should be directed to [tk20help@gmu.edu](mailto:tk20help@gmu.edu) or <https://cehd.gmu.edu/aero/tk20>. Questions or concerns regarding use of Blackboard should be directed to <http://coursesupport.gmu.edu/>.
- For information on student support resources on campus, see <https://ctfe.gmu.edu/teaching/student-support-resources-on-campus>

**For additional information on the College of Education and Human Development, please visit our website <https://cehd.gmu.edu/students/> .**

## **COURSE READINGS**

Allington, R. (2007). *Whole-language high jinks: How to tell when “scientifically-based*

- reading instruction” isn’t* (Review). East Lansing, MI: Great Lakes Center for Education Research and Practice.
- Barry, A. (2008). Reading the past: Historical antecedents to contemporary reading methods and materials. *Reading Horizons*, 49(1), 31-52.
- Behrman, E.H. (2006). Teaching about language, power, and text: A review of classroom practices that support critical literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 49(6), 490-498.
- Brozo, W.G., Sulkunen, S., Shiel, G., Garbe, C., Pandian, A., & Valtin, R. (2014). Reading, gender, and engagement: Lessons from five PISA countries. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 57(7), 584-593.
- Bunch, G.C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge: Preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education*, 37(1), 298–341.
- Calderon, M., Slavin, R., & Sanchez, M. (2011). Effective instruction for English learners. *The Future of Children*, 21(1), 103-127.
- Craig, H. K., Zhang, L., Hensel, S. L., & Quinn, E. J. (2009). African American English-speaking students: An examination of the relationship between dialect shifting and reading outcomes. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 52, 839-855.
- Dole, J.A., Duffy, G.G., Roehler, L.R., Pearson, P.D. (1991). Moving from the old to the new: Research on reading comprehension instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 61(2), 239-264.
- Goodman, K. (1967). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. *Journal of the Reading Specialist*, 6(4), 126–135.



- Janzen, J. (2008). Teaching English language learners in the content areas. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4), 1010–1038.
- Kamil, M. (2012). Current and historical perspectives on reading research and instruction. In K. R. Harris, S. Graham, and T. Urdan (Eds.), *APA educational psychology handbook: Vol. 3. Application to learning and teaching* (pp. 161–188). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kintsch, W., & Mangalath, P. (2011). The construction of meaning. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 3(2), 346–370.
- Learning Points Associates. (2004). *A closer look at the five essential components of effective reading instruction: A review of scientifically based reading research for teachers*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates. Author.
- Leu, D. J., Forzani, E., Rhoads, C., Maykel, C., Kennedy, C., & Timbrell, N. (2015). The new literacies of online reading and comprehension: Rethinking the reading achievement gap. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 50(1), 37-59.
- Leu, D.J., Kinzer, C.K., Coiro, J., Castek, J., & Henry, L.A. (2013). New literacies: A dual-level theory of the changing nature of literacy, instruction, and assessment. In D. E. Alvermann, N. J. Unrau, & R.B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (6<sup>th</sup> ed) (pp. 1150-1181). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Manguel, A., (1996). *A history of reading*. New York; Viking.
- McGill-Franzen, A. (2000). *The relationship between reading policy and reading instruction: A recent history*. Albany, NY: National Research Center on English Learning & Achievement

- McVee, M.B., Dunsmore, K., & Gavelek, J.R. (2005). Schema theory revisited. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(4), 531-566.
- Moats, L. (2007). *Whole-language high jinks: How to tell when “scientifically-based reading instruction” isn’t*. Washington, DC: Thomas Fordham Institute.
- Moore, D.W., Readence, J.E., & Rickelman, R.J. (1983). An historical exploration of content area reading instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 18(4), 419-438.
- Palincsar, A.M. (1998). Social constructivist perspectives on teaching and learning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49(1), 345-375.
- Pearson P. D. (2004). The reading wars. *Educational Policy*, 18(1), 216-252.
- Pearson, P.D., & Hiebert, E.H. (2010). National reports in literacy: Building a scientific base for practice and policy. *Educational Researcher*, 39(4), 286-294.
- Peterson, P.E., Woessmann, L., Hanushek, E.A., & Lastra-Anadón, C.X. (2011). *Globally challenged: Are U. S. students ready to compete?* Boston, MA: Harvard’s Program on Education Policy and Governance & Education Next
- Shanahan, T., & Lonigan, C.J. (2010). The National Early Literacy Panel: A summary of the process and the report. *Educational Researcher*, 39(4), 279-285.
- Shannon, P. (1983). The use of commercial reading materials in American elementary schools. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 19(1), 68-85.
- Shannon, P. (2007). *Reading against democracy: The broken promises of reading instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: Heineman.
- Spiro, R. (1980). *Schema theory and reading comprehension: New directions*. Champaign, IL: Center for the Study of Reading.
- Street, B. (2003). What's "new" in New Literacy Studies? Critical approaches to literacy

- in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 52(2), 77-91.
- van Enk, A., Dagenais, D., & Toohey, K. (2005). A Socio-cultural perspective on school-based literacy research: Some emerging considerations. *Language and Education*, 19(6), 496-515.
- van Kleeck, A., & Schuele, C.M. (2010). Historical perspectives on literacy in early childhood. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 19, 341–355.
- Van Sluys, K., Lewison, M., & Seely Flint, A. (2006). Researching critical literacy: A critical study of analysis of classroom discourse. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 38(2), 197–233.
- Venesky, R. (1987). A history of American reading textbooks. *The Elementary School Journal*, 87(3), 246-265.
- Vogt, M.E., & Shearer, B.A. (2011). *Reading specialists and literacy coaches: Honoring the past, shaping the future*. New York: Pearson.
- Walsh, M. (2010). Multimodal literacy: What does it mean for classroom practice? *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 33(3), 211–239.
- Walczyk, J.J., Tcholakian, T., Igou, F., & Dixon, A.P. (2014). One hundred years of reading research: Successes and missteps of Edmund Burke Huey and other pioneers. *Reading Psychology*, 1-21.