

EDU 7901 Advanced Educational Research Design  
Oakdale Campus Room 6  
Summer 2016 (7/8-8/11)  
Instructor: Autumn T. Cyprès  
Department of Administrative and Instructional Leadership  
Office Phone: (718) 990-2503 (513 Sullivan Hall)  
E-mail: [cypresa@stjohns.edu](mailto:cypresa@stjohns.edu)

### **Course Objectives:**

The primary objective of this course is to produce a draft of your dissertation proposal suitable for your committee's review. In this course we examine guidelines for research design in education and issues related to research design. The objectives are accomplished through reading texts on research design, reflective articles, published research studies, and a practical assignment where individuals engage in the design of a research study. This course is a hybrid of face to face and online instruction. **Please note that the due dates and times are strict and there is no room for negotiation. If you miss a time or date for a discussion post, or any other assignment, you will get zero credit for the assignment.**

In person meeting dates: July 8, 9, August 4, 5

### **Required:**

1. Briggs, A., Coleman, M. & Morrison, M. (2014). *Research Methods in Educational Leadership and Management*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
  2. Duarte, N. *Resonate: Present visual stories that transform audiences*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
  3. *The APA manual of style* (6<sup>th</sup> edition)
  4. Articles posted on Blackboard
  5. DAIL PHD handbook, DAIL Dissertation proposal template, Dissertation template, and *A complete dissertation handout*; all posted on Blackboard
4. Required videos  
NANCY DUARTE TED TALK:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UfQF3DXG-S4>  
AMY CUDDY TED TALK:  
[https://www.ted.com/talks/amy\\_cuddy\\_your\\_body\\_language\\_shapes\\_who\\_you\\_are?language=en](https://www.ted.com/talks/amy_cuddy_your_body_language_shapes_who_you_are?language=en)

## **Course Calendar**

**July 8** (face to face) A little about each other

About Blackboard

What a colloquium looks like

Crafting research questions

IRB <http://www.stjohns.edu/about/administrative-offices/provost/grants-and-sponsored-research/human-participants-irb-animal-use-research>

Watch the Stanford Prison Experiment though amazon

**July 9** what is a dependable dissertation question?

**July 10** analysis of articles due via email to instructor by midnight- there are three posted in the content section (Tooms, et. al ; Murphy, Hallinger)

**July 11** The purpose of this is to think about how you distill an idea so that others understand with clarity. Please Watch Nancy Duarte TED talk- Describe a STAR moment that you remember from a presentation you have seen relative to your professional life. (Think board meetings, classes, or anything relative to work-entertainment does not count-) Why was this so memorable to you? How do you think you can make a 15 minute discussion of your dissertation proposal interesting to parents and community members in a governing board meeting?

**July 13** Wednesday post due by midnight **(10 points)**

**July 15** Friday response to two other posts due by midnight **(10 points)**

**July 18** Monday Muddy Question—what hallmarks have you seen in your readings of conceptual frameworks that were memorable? What hallmarks have you seen that not memorable? Why is a conceptual framework important? Reference readings from both to support your argument.

**July 20** Wednesday Response to Monday Muddy Question Post due by midnight **(10 points).**

**July 22** Response to two other posts due by midnight **(10 points)**

**July 25** Monday Conceptual frameworks must be posted by midnight **(10 points)**

**August 1** Three strengths / three confusions of each classmates post due by midnight **(10 points)**

**August 5** face-to face (4:30pm) Best draft of first three chapters of potential dissertation due in hardcopy **(30 points)**. Presentations of dissertation proposal and group feedback

**August 6** Class meets face to face (10 am). Presentations of dissertation proposal and group feedback

## **Grading points and scale**

90 points are possible:

Monday Muddy Questions 20

Response to colleagues post 20

Conceptual framework post 10

3 strengths /3 confusions post 10

Dissertation proposal paper 30

A 100- 90%

B 89-80%

C 79-70%

D 69-60%

## **Questions for Article Analysis**

GUIDELINES: In two to three double –spaced pages, and using APA format, evaluate each article for

- a. How did the authors organize their manuscript so that the reader could understand the information?
- b. How did the authors go about explaining their rationale for the subject they are exploring?
- c. How clearly did the authors frame the problem statement?
- d. How was the research question framed in order to make sense to the reader?
- e. How clearly did the authors link the problem statement and rationale to relevant empirical research?

- f. What ways did the authors use to explain how their method(s) are suited to answer the research question?
- g. How did the authors demonstrate their data analyses?
- h. How did the authors and have linked these to the problem statement and / or research questions
- i. Are the conclusions and recommendations valid in you opinion? Defend your answer? ( why do you think this?)
- j. What do you think the authors forgot or ignored?

### **Grading Rubric for Muddy Question Discussion Posts**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Outstanding 10-9 Points</b>	<b>Acceptable 8-7 Points</b>	<b>Unacceptable 6-0 Points</b>	<b>Total</b>
Organization	<p>Answers are detailed, organized, and easy to read</p> <p>Consistency in third person voice</p>	<p>Answers have spotty evidence of detail, somewhat organized, and contain multiple run on sentences</p> <p>Consistency in first person voice</p>	<p>Answers are not detailed, not organized, and rambling,</p> <p>No consistency in third or first person voice</p>	
Depth	<p>Analysis contains multiple links to student's own research interests and student's research question</p> <p>Answers specifically cite one item from each</p> <p>a)Semmlers dissertation, b)Grasser's dissertation proposal, and c) The Briggs, et. al book</p>	<p>Analysis contains few links to student's own research interests and student's research question.</p> <p>Answers specifically cite an item from two of the three below:</p> <p>a)Semmlers dissertation, b)Grasser's dissertation proposal, and</p>	<p>Little or no links are made to student's own research interests and student's research question</p> <p>Answers do not cite items from each</p> <p>a)Semmlers dissertation, b)Grasser's dissertation proposal, and c) The Briggs, et. al book</p>	

		c) The Briggs, et. al book		
Relevancy	At least three real world professional experiences unique to student's day to day work are mentioned.	1-2 real world professional experiences unique to student's day to day work are mentioned.	No mention or connection to student's day to day work.	
Total				

### Grading Rubric for response to colleague post

	<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>10-9 Points</b>	<b>8-5 Points</b>	<b>4-0 Points</b>	<b>Total</b>
Organization	<p>Items a-j are answered with detailed, organized, and easy to read arguments</p> <p>Consistency in the use of third person voice</p> <p>At least two colleagues are given responses</p>	<p>Answers have spotty evidence of detail, somewhat organized, and contain multiple run on sentences</p> <p>Consistency in the use of first person voice</p> <p>At least two colleagues are given responses</p>	<p>Answers are not detailed, not organized, and rambling,</p> <p>No consistency in third or first person voice</p> <p>Only one colleague is responded to in a post</p>	

Depth	Analysis contains multiple links to student's own research interests and student's research question	Analysis contains few links to student's own research interests and student's research question	Little or no links are made to student's own research interests and student's research question	
Relevancy	At least three real world professional experiences unique to student's day to day work are mentioned.	1-2 real world professional experiences unique to student's day to day work are mentioned.	No mention or connection to student's day to day work.	
Total				

### Grading Rubric for Article Analysis Papers

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Outstanding 10-9 Points</b>	<b>Acceptable 8-7 Points</b>	<b>Unacceptable 6-0 Points</b>	<b>Total</b>
Organization	Answers are detailed, organized, and easy to read  Consistency in third person voice	Answers have spotty evidence of detail, somewhat organized, and contain multiple run on sentences Consistency in first person voice	Answers are not detailed, not organized, and rambling, No consistency in third or first person voice	

Depth	Analysis contains multiple links to student's own research interests and student's research question	Analysis contains few links to student's own research interests and student's research question	Little or no links are made to student's own research interests and student's research question	
Clarity	Answers provide evidence of multiple and varied editorial efforts to ensure paragraphs are concise, free of passive language, and tightly constructed.	Answers contain run on sentences.  Answers contain shifts from first to third person.  Grammar/spelling errors are present	Lack of evidence of editorial efforts to ensure paragraphs are concise,, free of passive language, and tightly constructed  Grammar/spelling errors are repleat.	
Total				

### **Grading Rubric for Dissertation Proposals**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Outstanding 30-25 Points</b>	<b>Acceptable 24-19 Points</b>	<b>Unacceptable 18-0 Points</b>	<b>Total</b>
Organization	Contains all parts as listed in the dissertation template and in example  APA style is used	Contains some but not all parts as listed in the dissertation template and in example APA style is used	Contains some but not all parts as listed in the dissertation template and in example  organization is unclear	

			APA style is not used	
Depth	Each section is detailed and a robust reference section of relevant authentic literature is present	Some sections are detailed and a robust reference section of relevant authentic literature is present	Some sections are detailed and there is not a robust reference section of relevant authentic literature is present	
Clarity	Conceptual framework is relevant to the question and easy to understand	Conceptual framework is not relevant to the question but easy to understand	Conceptual framework is not relevant to the question and not easy to understand	
Total				