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EDUC-L239 is a general education course that examines one of the most exciting interdisciplinary topics of our day: the role that language has in creating, maintaining, and changing social structures and educational practices. Language is one of the most fundamental ways that we use to connect with each other. In a globalized age, inter-connectedness has ensured that multi/bilingualism, code-switching and code-mixing, dialects, heritage languages, language policy, language death, and first and second language learning are of critical importance to education at all levels. The course will use the campus and local community as a classroom for exploring current language-related issues that have significant impact on formal and informal education and that are pertinent to practical situations in education as well as in other professions. The participants will forge connections as tutors and conversation partners for English learners and plan intergenerational family literacy activities for our community partners.

The class will meet weekly for at least one hour to discuss the assigned readings and to debrief on activities in the community. The rest of the time will be allotted to service-learning assignments and preparation for the intergenerational family literacy night. Some of the students will be assigned as tutors to work with school-aged English Learners; others will work with adult English Learners (approx. 15 hours). Community partners have been contacted, and the details are now being established with the assistance of Nicole Schonemann and the Service-Learning Program. Additionally, students will plan an intergenerational family literacy night and invite their tutees and conversation partners to bring their families for an evening of fun literacy activities designed to encourage family interaction. This course will also be an Honors course listed by the Hutton Honors College, the School of Education Direct Admit Scholars Program. It is currently under review for affiliation with the 2013 Themester of the College of Arts & Sciences, which will explore topics related to “Connectedness: Networks in a Complex World.”

Social processes and resources have been identified as important factors in understanding social setting as a dynamical system, and may be the most important factors in determining how youth experience a program (Tseng & Seidman, 2007). One of the major issues facing research in service learning and community engagement is identifying research approaches to better understanding the impact of service learning on student and on community partners. The proposed study is based on the hypothesis that lessons learned from studying interaction in social settings in the out-of-school sector will provide fresh insight into the evaluation of service learning. Our preliminary research questions are: How does service learning in higher education create opportunities for high-quality social interaction between teachers, students and community partners? What are the characteristics of service-learning and related instruction in the following domains: Joint Productive Activity, Contextualization, Instructional Conversation, Teaching Complex Thinking, and Language and Literacy Development across the Curriculum?

Patton has noted that increasing rigor in qualitative research in service-learning evaluation entails getting past “lessons learned” to methodological rigor (Patton, 2012). This pilot addresses these concerns by using instruments that have been subjected to validation measures and can be used to show concurrent validity, although not right away. The IUPUI Civic-Minded Graduate survey and the Five Standards for Effective Pedagogy observation rubric offer significant promise for advancing the scholarship of service-learning. The outcomes of this work will contribute to the assessment of student learning at Indiana University by helping to establish the usefulness of these instruments for evaluating service-learning.

We will pilot a case study of effective pedagogy with quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis. The observation rubric employed will be integrated into the formative evaluation scheme for the course, thus encouraging the students to take a
participatory role in the evaluation of the quality of learning taking place. We will employ an observation rubric developed from the Standards Performance Continuum (Doherty, Hilberg, Epaloose, & Tharp, 2002) (see Appendix). The domains of Joint Productive Activity, Contextualization, Instructional Conversation, Teaching Complex Thinking, and Language and Literacy Development across the Curriculum, each of which are derived from sociocultural educational theory, form the basis of the Five Standards for Effective Pedagogy (Tharp, Estrada, Dalton, & Yamauchi, 2000; Rueda, Goldenberg, & Gallimore, 1992). In Joint Productive Activity, participants co-facilitate learning by working together on meaningful, productive activity. Contextualization entails helping participants to make meaning by connecting curriculum to the experiences and skills that they bring from the homes and communities. Teaching Complex Thinking entails challenging participants to undertake tasks of increasing cognitive complexity, and Instructional Conversation means facilitating and teaching through dialogue. The Standards Performance Continuum has demonstrated high reliability and validity and is currently being used for research purposes (Doherty, Hilberg, Epaloose, & Tharp, 2002). A total of four observations will be conducted during the semester.

In addition to using the rubric to evaluate the teaching and learning activities of the course, we will use the rubric as a tool for prompting student discussions about the quality of teaching and learning. The students will use the rubric to evaluate the class and to self-evaluate their tutoring activities with the English Learners in the community setting.

We will conduct use the Civic-Minded Graduate Survey (Steinberg, Hatcher, & Bringle, 2011) to collect pre- and post-course data on student attitudes toward community service. The theoretical framework for the survey addresses three areas: identity, educational experiences and civic experiences. The survey asks students to respond to statements in ten core domains (volunteer opportunities, academic knowledge and technical skills, contemporary social issues, listening, diversity, consensus-building, valuing community engagement, self efficacy, social trustee of knowledge, and behavioral intentions). Three validation studies to-date have cross-validated the CMG scale with the CMG Narrative prompt and the CMG interview. We will modify the CMG Narrative Prompt for the final reflection paper assignment. A small group of students (3–4) will be interviewed after the class is finished.

Additional data will be collected in the form of student work, which will include their English Learner Case Study assignments. This work will ask the students to analyze the speech of their tutees or conversation partners, discuss phonological and syntactical differences, and make pedagogical recommendations. Other student work to be collected will be weekly reflection journals and a final reflection paper. Students will receive narrative prompts throughout the semester to guide their reflection writing.

The success of this project will be measured on several dimensions. Since the course is new, we will add additional questions that ask students to rate their service-learning experience and report whether or not they would recommend this course to their peers. The CMG Scale and Narrative Prompt can be used for formative assessment in class, and students will be asked to rate their experiences using these materials as well. The success of the course will be also be evaluated through community partner evaluations and through an evaluation of the family literacy night by the participants who attend. The results of the project will be disseminated through academic presentations and publications for scholars of service learning and the study of teaching and learning. We will present our results at local conferences and at regional conferences such as Campus Compact Indiana.
Budget narrative

A. SALARIES AND WAGES

Graduate hourly worker [4 hrs X $12.50 X 18 weeks per semester] 900 900
Intergenerational family literacy night costs [snacks, supplies for crafts activities] 125
Regional conference travel costs 75

TOTAL COSTS 1,025 975

GRAND TOTAL: $2000

Graduate Hourly Worker: We are requesting funding for Tara Kelley to assist with the research and programmatic activities associated with EDUC-L239. Research activities include administering surveys and course documents and observing class activities using the Five Standards for Pedagogy rubric. Programmatic activities include assisting with organizing service-learning activities, including preparation for the intergenerational family literacy night. In the spring semester, research duties will include assisting with data analysis and write-up. Tara will be funded to work 4 hours per week for 36 weeks (fall and spring semesters) at $12.50/hour. The total requested is $900 per semester for a total of $1800.

Intergenerational Family Literacy Night Costs: Funding for the family literacy night will be used to purchase light refreshments for attendees and supplies for craft activities. The total request is $125.

Regional Conference Travel Costs: We are requesting $75 to use for travel mileage to regional conferences such as the Indiana Campus Compact in Spring 2014.

Research plan and timeline [August 2013-July 2014]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of findings/planning for future research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix: Standards Performance Continuum: A Rubric for Observing Classroom Enactments of CREDE’s Standards for Effective Pedagogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT OBSERVED</th>
<th>EMERGING</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>ENACTED</th>
<th>INTEGRATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Definition</strong></td>
<td>The standard is not observed.</td>
<td>One or more elements of the standard are enacted.</td>
<td>The teacher designs and enacts activities that demonstrate a partial enactment of the standard.</td>
<td>The teacher designs, enacts, and assists in activities that demonstrate a complete enactment of the standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Productive Activity</strong></td>
<td>Joint Productive Activity is not observed.</td>
<td>Students are seated with a partner or group, AND (a) collaborate or assist one another, OR (b) are instructed in how to work in groups, OR (c) contribute individual work, not requiring collaboration, to a joint product.</td>
<td>The teacher and students collaborate on a joint product in a whole-class setting, OR students collaborate on a joint product in pairs or small groups.</td>
<td>The teacher and a small group of students collaborate on a joint product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language &amp; Literacy Dev.</strong></td>
<td>Language &amp; Literacy Development is not observed.</td>
<td>The teacher (a) explicitly models appropriate language; OR (b) students engage in brief, repetitive, or drill-like reading, writing, or speaking activities; OR (c) students engage in social talk while working.</td>
<td>The teacher provides structured opportunities for academic language development in sustained reading, writing or speaking activities.</td>
<td>The teacher designs and enacts instructional activities that generate language expression and development of content vocabulary, AND assists student language expression and development through questioning, rephrasing, or modeling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher designs, enacts, and assists in language development activities that demonstrate skillful integration of multiple standards simultaneously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT OBSERVED</td>
<td>EMERGING</td>
<td>DEVELOPING</td>
<td>ENACTED</td>
<td>INTEGRATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextualization</strong></td>
<td>Contextualization is not observed.</td>
<td>The teacher (a) includes some aspect of students’ everyday experience in instruction, OR (b) connects classroom activities by theme or builds on the current unit of instruction, OR (c) includes parents or community members in activities or instruction.</td>
<td>The teacher makes incidental connections between students’ prior experience/knowledge from home, school, or community and the new activity/information.</td>
<td>The teacher integrates the new activity/information with what students already know from home, school, or community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenging Activities</strong></td>
<td>Challenging Activity is not observed.</td>
<td>The teacher (a) accommodates students’ varied ability levels, OR (b) connects student comments to content concepts, OR (c) sets and presents standards for student performance, OR (d) provides students with feedback on their performance.</td>
<td>The teacher designs and enacts activities that connect instructional activities to academic content OR advance student understanding to more complex levels.</td>
<td>The teacher designs and enacts activities that are connected to academic content; assists and uses challenging standards to advance student understanding to more complex levels; AND provides students with feedback on their performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher designs, enacts, and assists in contextualized activities that demonstrate skillful integration of multiple standards simultaneously.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher designs, enacts, and assists in challenging activities that demonstrate skillful integration of multiple standards simultaneously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Conversation</td>
<td>NOT OBSERVED</td>
<td>EMERGING</td>
<td>DEVELOPING</td>
<td>ENACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Conversation is not observed.</td>
<td>The teacher (a) responds to student talk in ways that are comfortable for students, OR (b) uses questioning, listening or rephrasing to elicit student talk, OR (c) converses with students on a nonacademic topic.</td>
<td>The teacher converses with a small group of students on an academic topic AND elicits student talk with questioning, listening, rephrasing, or modeling.</td>
<td>The teacher designs and enacts an instructional conversation (IC) with a clear academic goal; listens carefully to assess and assist student understanding; AND questions students on their views, judgments, or rationales. All students are included in the IC, AND student talk occurs at higher rates than teacher talk.</td>
<td>The teacher designs, enacts, and assists in instructional conversations that demonstrate skillful integration of multiple standards simultaneously.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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