



COURSE CHANGE PROPOSAL

USC Columbia, Lancaster, Salkehatchie, Sumter & Union campuses

CCP

INSTRUCTIONS: This form is used to make changes to a course number, title, 4-letter designator, credit hours, pre- or co-requisites, description, delivery location or delivery method, or to delete a course. If the change affects the interests of another unit or campus, letters of concurrence from those units must be attached. The form is available online at www.sc.edu/provost/acadprog.

Date: October 22, 2010

Campus: Columbia College/School: Education

Department (if applicable): Ed. Leadership & Policies

Undergraduate Graduate

OLD COURSE INFORMATION

Course Designation: EDLP 809
4-letter Designator Prefix Course Number Suffix

Credit Hours: 1-3 Variable Fixed # Times Course Can Be Taken: 1

Course Title: Field Problems in School Administration

Cross-listed with which course? NA
4-letter Designator Prefix Course Number Suffix

Course Prerequisites/Corequisites: None

Course Delivery Location: USC Campus Off-Campus site
(If an off-campus delivery change is being requested, attach a completed Off-Campus Delivery (OCD) form.)

Course Delivery Method: Traditional Delivery Distance Technology Delivery (streaming video, web-based, CD/DVD)
(If distance technology delivery is being requested, attach a completed Distance Education Delivery (DED) form.)

Proposed Effective Term for change to database/bulletin:

Year: 2011 Fall Spring May Session Summer I Summer II

PROPOSED CHANGE

Delete Course: Effective Term Year: _____ Fall Spring May Session Summer I Summer II

Change Course Title to: Field Problems in Educational Administration

Change Course Designator to: _____

Change Course Number to: _____

Change Credit Hours to: _____

Change Prerequisites/Corequisites to: _____

Change Course Description/Content (Please attach a completed two-column Bulletin Change Form.)

Add or Change Delivery Location (Please attach a completed Off-Campus Delivery (OCD) Form.)

Add or Change Delivery Method to Distance Education (Please attach a completed Distance Education Delivery (DED) Form.)

Other Change (Specify): _____

IMPACT ON OTHER ACADEMIC UNITS & CAMPUSES

Does the proposed course affect the curriculum, students or academic interest of any other unit at USC Columbia or on a USC Regional Campus? Yes No

Identify which unit(s)/campus(es) _____

(If yes, please attach letters of concurrence from relevant units and/or the Office of System Affairs.)

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS (The following documents must be attached to this form before submission)

- Course syllabi (Provide old syllabus and changed syllabus)
- "Before" and "After" bulletin description on two-column Bulletin Change Form (BCH)
- Justification Form (JUS)
- Letters of concurrence (if appropriate)

CONTACT INFORMATION

Contact Person:

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><u>Katherine Chaddock</u> <i>Print name</i></p> <p><u>Chaddock@mailbox.sc.edu</u> <i>Email Address</i></p> <p><u><i>Katherine Chaddock</i></u> <i>Signature</i></p> | <p><u>Chair, EDLP</u> <i>Title</i></p> <p><u>7-2636</u> <i>Phone Number</i></p> <p><u>10/21/10</u> <i>Date</i></p> |
|--|--|

REQUIRED APPROVALS

Department Chair:

Katherine Chaddock
Print name

Chaddock@mailbox.sc.edu
Email Address

Katherine Chaddock
Signature

7-6236
Phone Number

10/21/10
Date

Academic Dean:

Print name

Email Address

Signature

Phone Number

Date

FacSenate Cours&Curric/
Dean of the Graduate
School (as appropriate)

Print name

Email Address

Signature

Phone Number

Date

Date of Faculty Governance Approval (if appropriate)

- Graduate Council Faculty Senate



JUSTIFICATION FORM

USC Columbia, Lancaster, Salkehatchie, Sumter & Union campuses

JUS

INSTRUCTIONS: Please attach a statement explaining the justification for the proposed program or course action. This form is available online at www.sc.edu/provost/acadprog.

Date: October 22, 2011

Campus: Columbia College/School: Education

Department (if applicable): Ed. Leadership and Policies

Undergraduate

Graduate

This course, EDLP 809, is used by both the students in the Higher Education Administration programs and those in the K-12 Education Administration program. However, the current title, referencing "School Administration," indicates only only student field work in the K-12 area. A reference to Education Administration is more inclusive of both K-12 and higher education administration. Additionally, this change establishes consistency with the bulletin description narrative.



BULLETIN CHANGE FORM

BCH

USC Columbia, Lancaster, Salkehatchie, Sumter & Union campuses

INSTRUCTIONS: Please attach the proposed language changes exactly as they are to appear in the Bulletin. A two-column format showing both the old wording (left column) and the new wording (right column) is required. This form is available online at www.sc.edu/provost/acadprog.

Date: October 22, 2010
Campus: Columbia College/School: Education
Department (if applicable): Ed. Leadership & Policies
Proposed Effective Term for change to database/bulletin:
Year: 2011 Fall Spring May Session Summer I Summer II
Bulletin Version: Graduate Undergraduate
Internet or web link to Bulletin Entry: http://bulletin.sc.edu/search_advanced.php?cur_cat_oid=9&

CURRENT BULLETIN LANGUAGE

(text to be deleted in new version show as strikethrough)

Please note that text should be formatted in Word to show strikethrough. Then, cut and paste the text into the space below.

NEW LANGUAGE OR PROPOSED CHANGE TO BULLETIN

(new text shown as underlined)

EDLP 809 - Field Problems in School Administration
Credits: 1-3
Opportunity for in-depth study of selected field problems in educational administration, utilizing research and other techniques.

EDLP 809 - Field Problems in Educational Administration
Credits: 1-3
Opportunity for in-depth study of selected field problems in educational administration, utilizing research and other techniques.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Contact Person: Katherine Chaddock Chair, EDLP
Print name
chaddock@mailbox.sc.edu 7-2636
Email Address Phone Number
Katherine Chaddock 10/21/2010
Signature Date

REQUIRED APPROVALS (for Bulletin Changes not associated with an academic program or curriculum)

Office for Authority for Bulletin Section: _____
Print name Signature Date

Email Address Phone Number

EDLP 809
Field Problems in Educational Administration:
Foundations of Inquiry in Educational Leadership and Administration
Spring, 2011

Meeting Time: Tuesdays, 4:15-9:30 January 4th-February 15th,
plus one-hour of online-discussion work weekly
University of South Carolina: Low Country Graduate Center

Doyle Stevick,
Assistant Professor
Educational Leadership and Policies
Director, Office of International and Comparative Education
318 Wardlaw Hall
College of Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
stevick@mailbox.sc.edu
office: 803-777-4158
department: (803) 777-3802
home: 803-834-4467
fax: (803) 777-3090

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course addresses the systems and theoretical frameworks that support and inform the process of inquiry. The focus is on how researchers think about the world and proceed to research phenomena within it. By identifying these broader philosophical and theoretical positions, we hope to better understand how those worldviews inform and shape the process of inquiry.¹

COURSE OBJECTIVES

- Develop an understanding of the philosophies upon which different research paradigms and epistemologies are founded, particularly positivism, postpositivism, interpretivism, critical theory, feminism, critical theories of race, queer theory, and postmodernism.
- Learn to see research through different lenses.
- Learn to think critically about research and research epistemologies.
- Learn to think as a social scientist.

¹ The specific language in this section and the next was borrowed from Dr. Gerardo R. López of Indiana University, whose syllabus for this subject (readings, assignments and conceptualization) provided much of the foundation for this course.

- Learn to critically question taken-for-granted assumptions about research and research methodology.

Required Books:

Crotty, M. (2004). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Schwandt, T.A. (2007). *The SAGE Dictionary of Qualitative Inquiry*, 3rd. ed.

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS

Readings, Attendance and participation (20 points)

Reading points are allocated when you report that you have read the required articles/book chapters before they are to be discussed in class. You are on the honor system and will report the total to me at the end of the course meetings. Excluding group work, there are 16 required articles or chapters. Reading points are as follows:

| <u>Required Readings</u> | <u>Total Points</u> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| 16 | 10 |
| 15 | 9 |
| 14-13 | 8 |
| 12-11 | 5 |
| 10 or less | 0 |

All students come to class prepared for discussion, having read the assigned readings, and prepared to ask and answer questions about the readings during class. Monitor your own level of participation to ensure that respect for others' viewpoints is demonstrated and to avoid dominating conversations, on the one hand, and ensure that your contributions are not passed over by remaining silent.

You will also earn a grade for the number of times you attend. Attendance counts for 10 points of the total. For each class missed, I will deduct 2 points. If you miss more than 2 class sessions, you will not receive any points for attendance. You are on the honor system and will report the total to me at the end of the course meetings. If you attend only one half or less of a class, you cannot count that as a full class, but only as some percentage of the class. Excuses will ***only*** be given for serious emergencies. Absence from class for a religious holy day is excusable, but I must be notified of such an absence in advance.

Team Presentation (40 points)

For this assignment, you will be divided into teams. Each team will be assigned to one of five research systems: constructionism/interpretivism, critical theory, race-based, feminism and queer theory. I will assign your team to one of these five frameworks at random. The presentation must cover the following items:

1. the general philosophical orientation or purpose of the framework
2. how issues of validity are gauged or negotiated within the framework
3. how issues of reliability are gauged or negotiated within the framework
4. how issues of generalizability are gauged or negotiated within the framework
5. how issues of sampling are gauged or negotiated within the framework
6. other general methodological issues
7. ontology of the framework (i.e., nature of reality)
8. axiology of the framework (i.e., the role of values or ethics)

A one-page summary must be provided to all members of the class.

The presentation must also include an example of what a **research study** would look like based on the paradigm. The topic or scope of the proposed study is entirely up to the group.

Presentations should be planned for *at least* ninety minutes and taking time for discussion/activities is certainly encouraged! You will be graded not on the length of your presentation, but on the overall quality and comprehensiveness of your discussion. As the semester proceeds, the grading for team presentations will get harder. That is, the first group to present will be graded more leniently than the last group—since members of the last group have been able to learn from previous presentations.

Course Paper (40 points)

You are required to write a final paper in this course. You will analyze your intended dissertation topic from the lens of two different epistemologies or theoretical perspectives discussed in class. (You may substitute a leadership practice, policy decision, or educational dilemma, if you wish; you may also use more than two epistemologies/theoretical perspectives if they are done with sufficient depth.) Assuming the role of “researcher,” you will describe—in as much detail as possible—how you would research your topic given the frameworks chosen. I am primarily interested in how methodological issues (e.g., validity, generalizability, sampling, etc.) are impacted by the theoretical perspectives chosen—as well as the similarities and/or differences in your methods/methodology as you transition from one lens to the other. It should be approximately 10-12 pages long, excluding citations.

All papers must use APA style (6th edition) for citing within the text and for the references list. APA manuals are located at the library or you may purchase one at the university bookstore (you will need one for your dissertation, so this would be a good investment). All papers must have a reference list/bibliography. Papers must use at least three citations from the readings.

GRADING RUBRIC:

A total of 200 points are available through the assignments. The points required to earn a grade are listed below:

| | |
|-----------|--|
| A | 90-100 |
| B+ | 87-89 |
| B | 80-86 |
| C+ | 77-79 |
| C | 70-76 |
| F | Anything below 70 points will receive a grade of F |

The grade of **B** represents work that is of *good* quality and meets course requirements. The grade of **A** represents work that is of *exceptional* quality and exceeds course requirements.

COURSE SCHEDULE & READINGS

I. INTRODUCTION TO COURSE (1/4)

Required for all students:

Crotty, M. (2004). Introduction: The research process. In *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*, (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crotty, M. (2004). Positivism: The march of science. In *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*, (pp. 18-41). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

II. (1/11) POSTPOSITIVISM AND OTHER EPISTEMOLOGIES

Required for all students:

Meynell, H. (1995). Feyerabend's method. *Philosophical Quarterly*, 28, 242-252.

Lagemann, E. C. (2005). Does history matter in education research?: A brief for the humanities in an age of science. *Harvard Educational Review*, 75(1).

Group work: Work through the Crotty chapters and an article from your assigned topic in preparation to begin group work.

III. CONSTRUCTIONISM AND INTERPRETIVISM (1/18)

Required for all students:

- Crotty, M. (2004). Constructionism: The making of meaning. In *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*, (pp. 42-65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crotty, M. (2004). Interpretivism: For and against culture. In *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*, (pp. 66-86). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crotty, M. (2004). Interpretivism: The way of hermeneutics. In *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*, (pp. 87-111). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Group work:

- Josselson, R. (1995). Imagining the real. In R. Josselson and A. Lieblich (Eds.), *Interpreting experience: The narrative study of lives* (pp. 27-44). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. (1985). Postpositivism and the naturalist paradigm: Is the naturalistic paradigm the genuine article? In *Naturalistic Inquiry* (pp. 14-69). Beverly Hill, CA: Sage.
- López, G. R. (2001). The value of hard work: Lessons on parent involvement from an (im)migrant household. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(3), 416-437.

IV. CRITICAL THEORY (1/25)

Required for all students:

- Crotty, M. (2004). Critical Inquiry: The Marxist heritage. In *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*, (pp. 112-138). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). Teacher-student relations and the politics of caring. In *Subtractive Schooling* (pp. 61-113). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Group work:

- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.), (pp. 279-313). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McKenzie, K.B., & Scheurich, J.J. (2004). Equity traps: A useful construct for preparing principals to lead schools that are successful with racially diverse students. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(5), 601-632.
- McKenzie, K.B., & Scheurich, J. J. (2004). The corporatizing and privatizing of schooling: A call for grounded critical praxis. *Educational Theory*, 54(4), 431-443.
- Scheurich, J. J. & Imber, M. (1997). Educational reforms can reproduce societal inequities: A case study. In *Research Method in the Postmodern* (pp. 8-28). New York: Falmer.

V. CRITICAL THEORIES OF RACE (2/1)

Required for all students:

- Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.), (pp. 257-278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pillow, W. (2004). Race-based methodologies: Multicultural methods or epistemological shifts? In G. R. Lopez & L. Parker (Eds.), *Interrogating racism in qualitative research methodology* (pp 181-202). New York: Peter Lang.

Group work:

- Pizarro, M. (1998). Chicana/o power! Epistemology and methodology for social justice and empowerment in Chicana/o communities. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 57-80.
- Rains, F.V. (1998). Is the benign really harmless?: Deconstructing some "benign" manifestations of operationalized white privilege. In J.L. Kincheloe, S.R. Steinberg, N.M. Rodriguez, & M.N. Chennault (Eds.) *White reign: Deploying whiteness in America*. New York: Palgrave.
- Scheurich, J. J. & Young, M. D. (1997). Coloring epistemologies: Are our research epistemologies racially biased? *Educational Researcher*, 26(4), 4-16.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. (1990). Chapter 10: Toward an Afrocentric feminist epistemology. Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment. New York: Routledge, 201-220.
- Scheurich, J. J. (1997). Toward a white discourse on white racism. Research Method in the Postmodern, 119-131.
- Bernal, D. D. (2002). Critical race theory, Latino critical theory, and critical raced-gendered epistemologies: Recognizing students of color as holders and creators of knowledge. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 105-126.
- Cruz, C. (2001). Toward an epistemology of a brown body. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(5), 657-669.
- Teranishi, R. T. (2002). Asian Pacific Americans and critical race theory: An examination of school racial climate. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 35(2), 144-154.

VI. FEMINISM (2/8)

Required for all students:

- Crotty, M. (2004). Feminism: Re-visioning the man-made world. In *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*, (pp. 160-182). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Smulyan, L. (2000). Feminist cases of nonfeminist subjects: Case studies of women principals. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13(6), 589-609.
- Villenas, S., & Moreno, M. (2001). To valerse por si misma between race, capitalism and patriarchy: Latina mother-daughter pedagogies in North

Carolina. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(5), 671-687.

Group work:

Bloom, L.R. Stories of one's own: Nonunitary subjectivity in narrative representation. In S.B. Merriam and Associates (Eds.) *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis* (pp. 289-309). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Olesen, V. L. (2000). Feminisms and qualitative research at and into the millennium. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln, (Eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Luttrell, W. (1993). Working-class women's ways of knowing: Effects of gender, race, and class. In L. A. Castenell, Jr. & W. F. Pinar (Eds.), *Understanding Curriculum as Racial Text: Representations of Identity and Difference in Education* (pp. 153-178). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Visweswaran, K. (1997) Histories of feminist ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, (26) 591-621.

Skrla, L. (2000). Mourning silence: Women superintendents (and a researcher) rethink speaking up and speaking out. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13(6), 611-627.

VII. QUEER THEORY (2/15)

Required for all students:

Dilley, P. (1999). Queer Theory: Under construction. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 12(5), 457-472.

Nixon, D. & Givens, N. (2004). Miss, you're so gay: Queer stories from trainee teachers. *Sex Education*, 4(3), 217-237.

Group work:

Lugg, C. (2003). Sissies, faggots, lezzies, and dykes: Gender, sexual orientation and new politics of education? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(1), 95-134.

Rhodes, R. A. (1997). Crossing sexual orientation borders: collaborative strategies for dealing with issues of positionality and representation. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 10(1), 7-23.

Jensen, R. (1997). Privilege, power, and politics in research: A response to "Crossing sexual orientations" *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 10(1), 25-30.

Blackburn, M. V. (2005). Agency in borderland discourses: Examining language use in a community center with Black queer youth. *Teachers College Record*, 107(1), 89-113.

EVALUATION OF FINAL PAPER

NAME _____

| Criteria | Strongly Agree 5 | Agree 4 | Undecided 3 | Disagree 2 | Strongly Disagree 1 |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Student demonstrates a strong understanding of concepts studied this semester | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. Student is able to effectively articulate the key ideas of at least two theoretical perspectives in the paper | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. Discussion of theoretical perspectives was comprehensive and complete. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. Student demonstrates critical reflectiveness of--and engagement with-- key ideas/concepts of theoretical perspectives. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5.. Analysis raises insights about the impact of theoretical perspectives on research | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 6. Analysis highlights how theoretical perspectives differentially impact research methods and methodology | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 7. Narrative is articulate and readable. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 8. Narrative was well structured, argued, and conceptualized. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9. Narrative was well-referenced and supported by research articles | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 10. Student demonstrated mastery of APA style guidelines for in-text citations and reference list. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

OVERALL IMPRESSION: COMMENTS.

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT: COMMENTS.