

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

UNL Faculty Course Portfolios

Peer Review of Teaching Project

2021

Peer Review of Teaching Portfolio - SPED 990: Intervention Design III

Susan J. Loveall

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/prtunl>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#)

This Portfolio is brought to you for free and open access by the Peer Review of Teaching Project at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNL Faculty Course Portfolios by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Peer Review of Teaching Portfolio - SPED 990: Intervention Design III

Susan J. Loveall

Department of Special Education and Communication Disorders

University of Nebraska – Lincoln

Spring 2021

Sloveall-hague2@unl.edu

Abstract

This portfolio documents the development of SPED 990: Intervention Design III, a doctoral course being taught for the first time in the Spring of 2021 in the Department of Special Education and Communication Disorders. The primary goals motivating my creation of this benchmark portfolio included: 1) deciding what to teach and how to teach it for the course's first iteration, 2) understanding how this course fits into my department's broader curriculum and doctoral training program, 3) upon completion of the course, reflecting on what worked and what didn't to improve the course for future semesters, and 4) continuing my professional growth as an instructor. Since this was a very small doctoral level course, I qualitatively analyzed students' written feedback of the course to evaluate their learning. I also reviewed students' progress in their development of a research proposal from the beginning of the semester to the end. Both suggest that the course was effective but also identified areas for improvement. Lastly, I reflect on my experience in PRTP and how it has improved my teaching skills, particularly in the development of course assignments and in how I evaluate course effectiveness.

Keywords: intervention design, special education, doctoral courses, implementation science, research

Table of Contents

OBJECTIVES OF PEER REVIEW COURSE PORTFOLIO4

 Course Description.....4

 Rationale of Course Selection for PRTP5

TEACHING METHODS AND CLASS ACTIVITIES7

 In-Class Activities7

 Out-of-Class Activities & Assignments.....8

 Course Materials10

 Links to Broader Curriculum10

ANALYSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING12

 Student Reflections12

 Instructor Evaluation of Students’ Research Proposals17

INSTRUCTOR REFLECTIONS19

APPENDIX A: COURSE SYLLABUS21

APPENDIX B: RESEARCH PROPOSAL GRADING RUBRIC27

APPENDIX C: RESEARCH PRESENTATIONS GRADING RUBRIC29

Objectives of Peer Review Course Portfolio

Course Description

SPED 990: Intervention Design III - Field Based Implementation is a doctoral level course focused on providing students with the knowledge and skills necessary to conduct intervention research in school settings. Students gain a wide range of knowledge on considerations to be accounted for at the student, classroom, school, and district levels. In addition to practical considerations, students gain knowledge of laws, policies, and issues related to conducting research in schools, especially issues related to intervention delivery in rural school settings. The course topics include translating research to practice, school-university partnerships, district level considerations, school leadership, early childhood, elementary education, secondary education, sharing results with teachers, behavioral/health considerations, paraprofessionals, wide-scale considerations, professional development, and state-level considerations.

The students in this course are doctoral students in special education. Some of the students will be funded on a training grant focused on intervention research and rural education settings. They will have a wide variety of backgrounds but all will have worked in special education or with students with disabilities in some capacity. This course is the third in a series of doctoral level courses focused on special education interventions (known as the Intervention Design series). This course builds on other courses the students will have previously completed.

The course has four primary goals. Upon successful completion of this course, students will:

1. Demonstrate an understanding of the roles, responsibilities, and routine challenges for superintendents, principals, teachers, and other practitioners;

2. Demonstrate an understanding of state and local policies relevant to conducting research in schools;
3. Conduct an independent evaluation of an intervention program, including the degree to which it could be effectively implemented in everyday school settings;
4. Demonstrate an understanding of the steps in both district and school approval to conduct research.

As future researchers and administrators in special education, it is important that students understand intervention research and have the knowledge and skills to successfully conduct and collaborate on their own intervention studies. Accomplishing these four goals will prepare students to do so. Course goals will be reflected in the course structure, including readings, assignments, activities, group discussions, and student presentations.

Rationale of Course Selection for Peer Review of Teaching Portfolio (PRTP)

This was a new course for me and a new course for the department. As such, it was important to carefully plan the content. I hope to continue teaching this course for several more years; having an evaluation plan will also help me continue to revise and improve it moving forward. One of the challenges I anticipated included the uncertainty of structuring the course during and after Covid-19. This course is focused on implementing interventions in school settings. However, schools have undergone, and will continue undergoing, great changes due to Covid-19, and these changes also influence research conducted in school settings. Another consideration was that some of the content is outside my area of expertise, so I had to prepare for and supplement those sections carefully with extra resources (e.g., webinars, guest lectures). Lastly, this is the third course in a three-course series focused on intervention research in my

department. I had to review what was covered in the first two courses to ensure that my content expanded on the information that had already been covered and was still a useful class for my students.

There were four main goals motivating my creation of this portfolio. I foresaw using the portfolio as an opportunity to: 1) decide what to teach and how to teach it, 2) understand how this course fits into my department's broader curriculum and doctoral training, 3) refine the course to improve it moving forward, and 4) continue growing as an instructor. The first goal was focused on maximizing student learning. I wanted to make sure that my students learned and that what they learned was useful to them. The portfolio and PRTP process helped me think carefully about the course content and delivery, as well as measure outcomes. This information could then be used to make revisions for future semesters (goal 3 above). Similarly, my second goal was to ensure that this course contributes to my department by covering content that is not already being covered elsewhere and that helps my department graduate students with the knowledge and skills necessary to be successful post-graduation. I also hoped that this portfolio would help me reflect on and discuss with my coworkers how this course fits into the larger departmental curriculum. Lastly, this portfolio helped me improve upon and demonstrate my commitment to teaching excellence. I hope that this, in turn, will be beneficial towards my promotion and tenure.

Teaching Methods and Class Activities

SPED 990: Intervention Design III: Field Based Implementation is worth 3 credits. In the Spring 2021 semester, it met on Wednesdays from 9:30 to 12:00 via Zoom and only had three students registered. To meet the course goals and objectives, I incorporated both in-class learning activities and out-of-class assignments. See Appendix A for the course syllabus.

In-Class Activities

In-class activities included student-led group discussions and presentations. Prior to each class period, students were responsible for completing a set of readings and preparing thoughts and questions for discussion. These readings included assigned textbook chapters and other review papers selected by me, plus one peer-reviewed intervention study selected by that class's "lead".

Class Lead/ Mini Lectures

Each student had the opportunity to lead 2-3 class sessions. When they were the "lead", the student was responsible for providing a mini lecture over the assigned readings. The lead was also responsible for selecting a peer-reviewed research manuscript of an intervention study relevant to that week's course topic for the class to read. This was submitted one week before the group discussion. During class, and after their mini lecture, they lead a group discussion in which the class critically evaluated their selected intervention article's strengths and weaknesses. The purpose of the class lead/mini lectures was to give students practice with presentations and with critically evaluating intervention research.

Group Discussions

Because this course targets doctoral students, the primary method of teaching was group discussions and class participation. Students were expected to come to class prepared, having completed that day's required readings and with questions and ideas about those readings. The purpose of these discussions was to stimulate thought and to tie readings to practice, including their own research.

Research Proposal Presentations

All students were currently developing their dissertation ideas. Students gave two presentations of their dissertation ideas: one at the beginning of the semester and one at the end. The first presentation allowed me to see where each student was at in their design process. The second presentation incorporated what they had learned throughout the semester and included how their project might be implemented in a rural school setting. See below for more detail.

Out-of-Class Activities and Assignments

Students also had several assignments to work on outside of class throughout the semester. The purpose of these assignments was to help students learn to critically evaluate intervention research and apply the material to their own research.

Institutional Review Board Assignment

Students reported on the process for receiving IRB approval for their dissertation. This included where/how they will recruit participants (including rural schools) and the steps needed to receive IRB approval from relevant school districts and through UNL's Institutional Review Board.

Cost Analysis

Students conducted a cost analysis of their dissertation. This included three phases, aligning with IES's Cost Analysis Tool. The focus of Phase 1 was to identify the resources needed to conduct their dissertation study, including personnel, facilities, materials, equipment, etc. The focus of Phase 2 was to identify pricing for each of those resources, including how that price might vary over the time period of their dissertation. Finally, the focus of Phase 3 was to create the cost estimate, including calculating total cost of the dissertation, conducting a sensitivity analysis, and making adjustments as needed.

Research Proposal and Research Proposal Presentations

Students submitted a written research proposal for their dissertation. This included an introduction section that provided relevant background information and outlined the rationale for their dissertation. It also included their research questions and/or hypotheses. The proposal also included a methods section in which they outlined the methodology they will use to test their research questions and hypotheses.

As noted above, students also prepared a presentation of their dissertation/research proposal. They presented this two times throughout the semester, once at the beginning and once at the end. The second presentation was revised to include an overview of how their project might be implemented in rural settings.

Students were provided detailed instructions and grading rubrics for their proposals, both the written proposal and the final presentation. These instructions and grading rubrics included guidance on what information is expected in dissertation proposals, thereby helping the students begin drafting and/or refining their actual dissertation proposal document (See Appendices B and C for instructions and grading rubrics).

Instructor Meeting

Once during the semester students scheduled a 1:1 meeting with me to discuss their dissertation project and review course progress. This provided the opportunity to trouble-shoot and talk through challenges associated with the dissertation project and/or in the course.

Course Materials

There was one required textbook for the course. This was supplemented with additional readings and other materials (e.g., videos, tutorials).

Required Text

Rosenfield, S., & Berninger, V. W. (Eds.) (2009). *Implementing evidence-based academic interventions in school settings*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Link to Broader Curriculum

The students enrolled in this course were doctoral students studying special education. This course is the third in a series of doctoral-level courses focused on special education interventions. Students were simultaneously enrolled in a lab course (Intervention Design Studio) in which they worked to develop their dissertation studies. SPED 990: Intervention Design III (the current course) built on the other two intervention design courses the students had completed (Intervention Design I and II) and work in tandem with their lab course. While developing the course, I met with faculty who taught these other courses and asked for their syllabi. These conversations and materials helped me develop a course that built off students' previous coursework and was complementary to their concurrent lab course.

A large focus of SPED 990 was on how to implement research and interventions in different settings, particularly rural areas. I worked to directly connect course content to students' dissertation ideas so they could apply the knowledge to further develop their projects.

Analysis of Student Learning

Since this was a small, discussion-based course, I chose to qualitatively evaluate student learning via written student feedback. First, I wanted to evaluate if the course learning objectives were met. I also wanted to evaluate the format and assignments to see if they effectively supported student learning. I provided guided questions and asked students to evaluate the course via written feedback. From their feedback, I identified themes surrounding course objectives, assignments, and activities. I also evaluated learning by reflecting on students' development of a research proposal over the course of the semester.

Student Reflections

Course Description and Objectives

Students were asked to re-read the course description and learning objectives. They were then asked the extent to which the course promoted their learning regarding how to conduct intervention efficacy and effectiveness research in school settings, especially rural school settings (course description) and to reflect on their learning, including which objectives they felt were and were not met. Student responses indicated they felt they had expanded their knowledge and ability to think critically about intervention research and what this might look like in rural settings.

“I feel like this course had broaden my knowledge on how to conduct research in rural settings. In particular, our discussions on rural considerations (strengths, weakness, rural culture, etc.) have been both interesting and helpful in expanding my thinking about rural settings.”

“I think that the most important thing I've learned in this course is about how to go about the problem-solving process when implementing interventions in schools. We talked a lot about the challenges of implementing and sustaining quality interventions with fidelity over time, but we also discussed how we would do things differently if we were given the opportunity. I have a better

understanding of how to think critically in these situations as well as how I need to (and who I need to) collaborate with to facilitate successful research-practice relationships.”

“I think this course did a good job promoting our understanding of interventions in general and understanding special considerations for implementing interventions in rural settings. Although the textbook was a little vague at times with the explicit steps it takes to implement a successful intervention, I think it was beneficial to be exposed to the successes and failures presented in the books and read about what the researchers/implementers considered when implementing their interventions. I really like the different intervention articles we read each week as well. It helped expose me to different designs and statistical analyses as well as different research topics since we all have different research interests.”

Regarding the course objectives, students identified that objectives 1 (*Demonstrate an understanding of the roles, responsibilities, and routine challenges for superintendents, principals, teachers, and other practitioners*) and 3 (*Conduct an independent evaluation of an intervention program, including the degree to which it could be effectively implemented in everyday school settings*) were met but would have appreciated more explicit information and examples to assist with objectives 2 (*Demonstrate an understanding of state and local policies relevant to conducting research in schools*) and 4 (*Demonstrate an understanding of the steps in both district and school approval to conduct research*).

“I think all of these objectives have been met over the course of the semester. In our weekly modules, in addition to our class discussions and assignments like the IRB proposal and cost analysis, we got a good idea of what it takes to implement research in schools. We had in-depth conversations about the limitations of some of the projects we looked at but also brainstormed ways we could improve them if this was our own research.”

“Goals 1 & 3 were addressed at great length in this course, especially through the interventions we reviewed. I feel like they were easily met. I feel like goals 2 & 4 were touched on but could have been addressed more explicitly. Potentially, a 'how to' paper and more webinars would have been more helpful in this area. The book chapters outline this to some extent, but these examples are largely anecdotal with little promise in terms of sustainability.”

Activities and Assignments

The most salient theme I identified from student feedback on assignments was that they especially appreciated the interactive and discussion-based format. Students enjoyed leading discussions and presenting “mini-lectures”.

“The class discussion and leading mini lectures have been most helpful for me personally. I think we always have thought-provoking, but also light-hearted and fun conversations about what it's really like to try to bridge the research to practice gap. This semester I've learned a great deal from my instructor and my peers about the research to practice gap, and I think we all bring a different level of background knowledge and experience that makes our discussions engaging and interesting.”

“I prefer the weekly discussions of different intervention studies because this gave us the opportunity to look at a variety of approaches and designs. The fact that it was a discussion-based, informal evaluation also left it more open for us to share our opinions and learn from one another because we all have pretty different levels of background knowledge and experience with each of the topics we covered this semester.”

“I would have preferred to be in person, but overall, I think this is one of my favorite online classes I've taken this year. It helps that the class was structured in a way that promoted discussion so I wasn't just sitting and listening the whole time. It was also helpful that the class was small so everyone got multiple chances to lead the discussion and also participate a lot... the discussions were the most helpful for learning because it allowed me to hear others' thoughts as well as giving me the opportunity to think through my own opinions.”

In particular, students enjoyed having the opportunity “dissect” and analyze interventions via these weekly discussions on research articles. However, one student felt the class sometimes got “stuck” on minor points and would benefit from more structure on how to evaluate research, at least at the beginning of the semester.

“... the dissection of interventions has been extremely helpful.”

“I do like analyzing intervention research, as I believe that is a skill that I still need to hone. Looking at studies and analyzing them for strengths and weaknesses is an important activity. In previous courses, I have found studies that have blatant flaws, and looking at the nuances in research when flaws are less obvious

is a skill I needed to work on. Additionally, it has been helpful that peers have selected some of the research, as they may pick articles I am less familiar with, so it is good practice. I feel weekly reviews would be better than one larger evaluation as we get more repetition this way.”

“I enjoyed doing a weekly discussion and evaluation of different interventions. I think having a more structured evaluation technique in the beginning would be helpful to have a model or example of what is expected, but I think all of our conversations were good. I do think our discussions got stuck at some points - like we dwelled a little too long on an introduction or couldn't look past a small issue. I don't think that's a huge issue for the most part except it didn't leave a lot of time for discussing other things in as much depth.”

One assignment that was identified that could be improved was the IRB assignment.

Students felt like they did learn about the IRB process, but that learning was minimal. They wanted more direction and examples to help them put together their IRB application.

“The only thing that I think could be improved would be the IRB proposal assignment. I would have benefited from an example IRB proposal before writing my own so I knew what a finished product looked like... I still think I have more to learn in terms of what requires a full board versus a project that is exempt from needing IRB approval.”

“I have had some experience with IRB as I was required to submit it for my survey (one of my comps). However, the assignment requiring us to think through IRB and the feedback given was a practical and useful process.”

Student feedback on the cost-analysis assignment was mixed. Some students felt like this assignment was not applicable their research. However, other students enjoyed it, and all students seemed to think the assignment itself was fair.

“I feel the only [assignment] that has not been beneficial is the cost/benefit analysis, but I believe it is not helpful as I have such a low incidence population that I feel an IES grant is unrealistic. However, I think this is a good step for other students to learn, and it is likely impossible to tailor a course that will completely align with every doctoral student's interests.”

“I don't think I would feel confident doing a cost-analysis on my own, but I do have more knowledge of the process now.”

“I really appreciated reading and discussing the IES Toolkit. This helped make the cost analysis process fairly straightforward and concrete for me.”

“As I had no background knowledge of this process, this was my largest area of growth. I thought the assignment was broken into manageable parts, and the feedback was helpful. Additionally, the feedback allowed me to revise what I submitted and think through my intervention.”

Other Reflections

Across assignments, students appreciated detailed feedback and the required individual instructor meetings.

“My instructor is accessible and her feedback helps me improve my existing work because she makes observations that I did not consider in terms of what I could add or change.”

“For the most part, the assignments were beneficial, and a new set of eyes on my proposal and the steps leading up to it will help expand my thinking on the process.”

Students also felt welcome, respected, and comfortable to ask questions and to share their thoughts.

“I felt welcome and respected. I think everyone was able to voice their opinions if they wanted to and there was no one who was disrespectful. I also think you did a good job of asking someone's thoughts if it seemed like the conversation was being dominated which helped create a welcoming environment overall.”

“Dr. Loveall has set an atmosphere of respect over zoom where students are able to ask any questions. Even if only one student is confused, she will take the time to address the question and explain it.”

“I feel as though I am treated like a professional colleague more than a student, and that has helped me prepare for this continued kind of collaboration in the future.”

Lastly, while this did not come up frequently in the written student feedback, the class as a whole agreed that the textbook was outdated. There is not an updated version for future

semesters, so moving forward, I will either select a new textbook or pull together other resources to replace this outdated text.

Instructor Evaluation of Students' Research Proposals

A research proposal of each student's dissertation idea was the primary and culminating project in this course. I specifically designed assignments throughout the semester to help students develop and cultivate their idea over time and to encourage them to incorporate learning objectives into their dissertation projects.

Students began the semester with informal PowerPoint presentations of their dissertation ideas. These presentations were essentially graded pass/fail, and it was okay if their ideas were incomplete and not yet fully formed. The purpose was for me to learn about their research topic and understand where they were at in their planning process.

During the semester students were required to meet with me at least once one-on-one to discuss their dissertation projects. This provided students an opportunity to ask detailed and specific questions, me an opportunity to provide individualized feedback on their proposal ideas, and together an opportunity to brainstorm and troubleshoot potential areas of difficulty. Students commented that these meetings were very helpful and almost all students made adjustments to their projects and left the meeting with follow-up questions and ideas to discuss with their primary mentor. In future semesters, I would not wait until the end of the semester to have these meetings. Instead, I would build in 2-3 individual meetings throughout the semester.

At the end of the semester, students presented an updated, and more formal, dissertation research proposal. Students were expected to have more fully developed ideas and to incorporate learning objectives from the semester. This included IRB considerations and ideas for how their

dissertation could include rural school districts. These presentations also gave students practice giving professional presentations and talking about their research ideas. I appreciated these follow-up presentations as they allowed me to see progress in the students' ideas and dissertation plans. However, in the future I would also incorporate more training on how to give a research presentation, as many students seemed either overly anxious, got sidetracked and lost track of time, or came across overly casual. Students' ideas were well thought out and strong, but their execution of presenting those ideas could be improved. Although I provided a detailed grading rubric, in the future I will emphasize the need to follow the rubric more closely and to practice and time themselves prior to presenting to the class.

Lastly, students submitted a formal written research proposal. This was a more in-depth, written proposal of their dissertation idea and included introduction and methods sections. Students were again expected to incorporate course learning objectives (i.e., IRB and rural school setting considerations). Students expressed appreciation of the detailed grading rubric, as it clearly articulated what information is expected in a proposal. Similar to their final presentations, their research ideas were strong, but upon reflection I realize some students need more guidance in how to structure their proposals and in scientific writing practices. If the course remains small, in future semesters I will have students turn in an early draft and meet with me to receive feedback. They can then incorporate those edits for their final draft.

Overall, I feel the research proposal was a success, but there are several changes I can make in future semesters to further improve student learning.

Instructor Reflections

I feel that this course was successful in several ways, especially considering it was the first time it was taught. First, students appreciated the hands-on and interactive nature of the course, particularly class discussions and low-stakes practice evaluating different intervention studies. Second, the assignments effectively supported student learning, particularly the development of their dissertation research proposal. Students made significant progress in their ability to critically evaluate research, and this also carried over into their own proposals. Third, students appreciated feedback on their assignments and expressed appreciation for detailed instructions and grading rubrics as well as the one-on-one instructor meetings. Overall, the course seemed to be a nice extension of the previous two intervention design courses by providing more applied information.

Although the course went well overall, through the PRTP process I was able to identify several modifications I would like to make to improve the class moving forward. First, after reflecting back on the course's four learning objectives, I need to incorporate more information regarding state and local policies relevant to conducting research in schools (objective 2) and how to receive approval to conduct research in schools (objective 4). To better address these objectives, I will allot more class time to these topics, invite guest lecturers (i.e., from UNL's IRB and different school personnel) to present on their procedures and processes, and modify the IRB assignment to provide more guidance and detail. I also plan to develop content regarding how to give research presentations, how to structure research manuscripts/proposals, and tips and tricks for scientific writing. My hope is that this class will meet in-person in the future, which will also provide opportunities for in-person student presentations.

Participating in the PRTP process was very beneficial. Three things in particular stand out. First, PRTP reinforced the value of hands-on, experiential learning for students. I received very positive student feedback on the interactive and applied nature of the course. Second, I learned the importance of aligning course assignments and activities with learning objectives. It allowed me to clearly identify objectives I need to better address in future semesters. Third, I was exposed to and learned many different ways in which I can evaluate a course. Until PRTP I had almost exclusively used quantitative student evaluations for this purpose. Taking the time to ask students detailed questions about their experiences in the course allowed for a much deeper review of the course. If I teach this course in the future, I will continue to use the iterative process of evaluation and reflection to make adjustments and improvements.

Appendix A Course Syllabus



SPED 994: Intervention Design III, Field Based Implementation Spring 2021

Instructor: Susan Loveall, PhD

Office: 355 Barkley

Email: sloveall-hague2@unl.edu (preferred method of communication)

Office Hours: By appointment

Course Location: Due to Covid-19, we will meet synchronously via Zoom. If and when it becomes safe to do so, we can transition to in-person classes.

Course Meeting Times: Wednesdays 9:30-12:00

Zoom Link: <https://unl.zoom.us/j/98638982810>

Course Description

This course will provide students with knowledge and skills necessary to conduct intervention efficacy and effectiveness research in school settings, especially rural school settings. Students will gain a wide range of knowledge on considerations to be accounted for at the student, classroom, school, and district levels. Students will be exposed to the concerns of education professionals who will speak to specific considerations for interventions in rural schools, from preschool to secondary school. In addition to practical considerations, students will gain knowledge of the local, state, and national laws, policies, and issues related to conducting research in schools, especially issues related to intervention delivery in rural schools.

Course Goals and Objectives

Upon successful completion of this course, students will:

1. Demonstrate an understanding of the roles, responsibilities, and routine challenges for superintendents, principals, teachers, and other practitioners.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of state and local policies relevant to conducting research in schools.
3. Conduct independent evaluations of intervention programs, including the degree to which they can be effectively implemented in everyday school settings.
4. Demonstrate an understanding of the steps in both district and school approval to conduct research.

Methods of Learning

Class lectures and group discussions will be used during class periods to promote active learning and application of course material. This will be supplemented with assignments and presentations.

Course Website & Technology Requirements

We will use Canvas to share information (e.g., articles, PowerPoint slides) and Zoom for class meetings.

Students in this course are required to have the following technology to participate fully in this course.

Note: The instructor recognizes that not all students may have access to the technology listed below. Students should reach out to the instructor to discuss challenges and accommodations that may need to be made.

- Active email address in Canvas LMS (sign up for Huskers email if you have not already)
- Access to Canvas LMS (Learning Management System)
- Internet connection (preferably high-speed broadband wired or wireless)
- Speakers and a microphone (built in or USB plug-in or Bluetooth)
- Webcam (built-in or USB plug in)
- Supported operating systems to access Zoom ([requirements here](#))
- Supported Web browser (Google Chrome is strongly recommended)
- Word processor (such as Microsoft Word)
- Adobe Reader (to view PDF files)

Instructional Materials and Resources

Course Readings

Students will be assigned readings from the required course text. Additionally, students will read relevant research articles or supplemental materials, which will be posted to Canvas.

Required Text

Rosenfield, S., & Berninger, V. W. (Eds.) (2009). *Implementing evidence-based academic interventions in school settings*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press

Activities and Assignments

Class Participation (*Illustrate/Practice/Reflect*): There are 30 class participation points to be earned throughout the semester (2 points per class). Students receive one point per class period for being present and one point for participating. This includes completing readings and contributing to class discussions.

Class Lead/ Mini Lectures (*Illustrate/Practice/Reflect*): Each student will have the opportunity to lead 2-3 class periods for a total of 30 points. This includes the following:

- 1) Selecting a peer-reviewed research manuscript of an intervention relevant to the course topic and posting it to Canvas for the class to read (this must be submitted to the instructor one week before the group discussion),

- 2) Preparing and presenting a “mini-lecture” that reviews the readings for that class period and posting their PowerPoint slides to Canvas,
- 3) Leading a group discussion over the course readings and an evaluation of the selected intervention article.

Instructor Meeting (*Feedback/Guidance*): At least once during the semester students should schedule a 1:1 meeting with the professor to discuss their dissertation project and review course progress. This is worth 5 points.

IRB Assignment (*Illustrate/Practice*): Students will report on the process for receiving IRB approval for their dissertation, worth 20 points. This includes where/how they will recruit participants (including rural areas) and the steps needed to receive IRB approval from relevant school districts and UNL.

Cost Analysis Assignment (*Evaluate/Practice*): Students will conduct a cost analysis of conducting their dissertation in a rural setting, worth 25 points. This will include three phases, aligning with IES’s Cost Analysis Tool. The focus of Phase 1 (5 points) is to identify the resources needed to conduct their dissertation study, including personnel, facilities, materials, equipment, etc. The focus of Phase 2 (10 points) is to identify pricing for each of those resources, including how that price might vary over the time period of their dissertation. Finally, the focus of Phase 3 (10 points) is to create the cost estimate, including calculating total cost of the dissertation, conducting a sensitivity analysis, and making adjustments as needed. Students will also be asked to identify sources of funding for their dissertations.

Research Presentations (*Evaluate/Practice*): Students will give two presentations (20 points each, 40 points total) of their dissertation: one at the beginning of the semester and one at the end. The first presentation will allow me to see where they are in their dissertation process. The second presentation will incorporate what they have learned throughout the semester and include a review of how their project might be implemented in a rural school setting.

Research Proposal (*Mastery*): Students will submit a written research proposal for their dissertation worth 50 points. This will include an introduction section that provides relevant background information and outlines the rationale for their dissertation. It will also include their research questions and/or hypotheses. The proposal will also include a methods section in which they outline the methodology they will use to test their research questions and hypotheses. This will build on the cost:benefit analysis assignment and incorporate how the student could implement their intervention in rural settings.

Points Associated with Activities and Assignments

Graded Activities/Assignments	Point Breakdown	Total Points
Class Participation	2 points per class	30
Class Lead/Mini-Lectures (x2-3) (includes article selection, article discussion, & PowerPoint slides)	10 points each	30
Meeting with Instructor	5 points	5

IRB Assignment	20 points	20
Cost Analysis	25 points	25
Research Presentations (x2)	20 points each	40
Research Proposal	50 points	50
Total		200 points

Grading

In order to receive a course letter grade of A-C, all required assignments, projects and course materials must be completed. The instructor can consider an incomplete only if a substantial portion (50% or more) of the class assignments is completed with a satisfactory grade (A-B) at the time of request. In all other circumstances, students should contact Registration/Records to make arrangements to withdraw from the course.

Grade	%	Grade	%
A+	98.0 - 100	C+	78.0 – 80.0
A	92.0 – 97.9	C	75.0- 77.9
A-	90.0 - 91.9	C-	70.0 – 74.9
B+	88.0 – 89.9	D+	68.0 – 69.9
B	85.0- 87.9	D	65.0 – 67.9
B-	80.0 – 84.9	D-	60.0 – 64.9
		F	Below 60.0

Course Policies

Late Course Work Policy

To be eligible for full credit, assignments must be submitted via Canvas by the due date. Due dates will be posted on Canvas. For each day the assignment is late, it will be docked 10%. Request for late assignments must be cleared ahead of time and for good reason as judged by the instructor.

Submitting Assignments

Assignments are submitted electronically through the Canvas site. The file name should be saved as the student's last name followed by the assignment title (e.g., Loveall_articlereview) and include the student's name/date at the top of the page.

People First Language

All assignments must be completed using *People First Language*. Points will be deducted if these conventions are not followed. The following websites present additional resources on People First Language:

Snow, K. (2005). People first language. Retrieved on January 5, 2018, from [https://www.inclusionproject.org/nip_userfiles/file/People First In Depth.pdf](https://www.inclusionproject.org/nip_userfiles/file/People%20First%20In%20Depth.pdf)

Technical support

- If you have a general tech support question related to accessing information on Canvas, please contact the instructor of this course.
- If you are having difficulty with more detailed technical issues, please contact the UNL help

desk (helpdesk@unl.edu; 402-472-3970 / 1-866-472-3970).

Academic Honesty

Academic honesty is essential to the existence and integrity of an academic institution. The responsibility for maintaining that integrity is shared by all members of the academic community. The University's Student Code of Conduct addresses academic dishonesty. Students who commit acts of academic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary action and are granted due process and the right to appeal any decision.

Accommodations

The University strives to make all learning experiences as accessible as possible. If you anticipate or experience barriers based on your disability (including mental health, chronic or temporary medical conditions), please let me know immediately so that we can discuss options privately. To establish reasonable accommodations, I may request that you register with Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD). If you are eligible for services and register with their office, make arrangements with me as soon as possible to discuss your accommodations so they can be implemented in a timely manner. SSD contact information: 117 Louise Pound Hall; 402-472-3787.

Counseling and Psychological Services

UNL offers a variety of options to students to aid them in dealing with stress and adversity. Counseling and Psychological & Services (CAPS)Links to an external site.; is a multidisciplinary team of psychologists and counselors that works collaboratively with Nebraska students to help them explore their feelings and thoughts and learn helpful ways to improve their mental, psychological and emotional well-being when issues arise. CAPS can be reached by calling 402-472-7450. Big Red Resilience & Well-BeingLinks to an external site. (BRRWB) provides one-on-one well-being coaching to any student who wants to enhance their well-being. Trained well-being coaches help students create and be grateful for positive experiences, practice resilience and self-compassion, and find support as they need it. BRRWB can be reached by calling 402-472-8770.

Student Resources

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln and the College of Education and Human Sciences are committed to ensuring the health and well-being of our students. This responsibility is shared by all members of the academic community and includes providing resources for the intellectual, academic, financial, physical, social and mental well-being. To further this, the College of Education and Human Sciences has developed a comprehensive resource guide that has been developed to assist faculty and students in finding specific university and CEHS resources based on their needs. This can be found at go.unl.edu/studentresources.

Face Covering Policy

The university's face covering policy can be found at: <https://covid19.unl.edu/face-covering-policy>

Course Calendar*Note: This calendar is subject and likely to change.*

Week	Date	Topics	Readings	Assignments
1	1/27	Course Introduction		
2	2/3	Student Presentations		Research Proposal Presentation 1
3	2/10	Challenges & Opportunities in Translating Research to Practice	Rosenfield & Berninger, Chp 7 & 14 (skim 14) Henrik et al. (2017) Selected article	
4	2/17	School-University Partnerships	Rosenfield & Berninger, Chp 13 Selected article	
5	2/24	District & State Level Considerations	Rosenfield & Berninger, Chp 11 & 12 Selected article	IRB Assignment
6	3/3	Budgeting & Cost Analysis	IES report & webinar Selected article	
7	3/10	School Leadership	Canvas Readings Selected article	Cost Analysis Phase 1
8	3/17	Early Childhood	Rosenfield & Berninger, Chp 6 & 15 Selected article	
9	3/24	Elementary Education & Sharing Research with Teachers	Rosenfield & Berninger, Chp 16 IES webinar Selected article	Cost Analysis Phase 2
10	3/31	Secondary Education & Adolescent Education	Canvas Readings Selected article	
11	4/7	Behavioral/Health Considerations	Canvas Readings Rosenfield & Berninger, Chp 9 Selected article	Cost Analysis Phase 3
12	4/14	Guest Presentation		
13	4/21	Paraprofessionals	Canvas Readings Selected article	
14	4/28	Professional Development	Canvas Reading IES webinar Selected article	Research Proposal (due 4/30)
15	5/5	Final Exam Week		Research Proposal Presentation 2

Appendix B Research Proposal Instructions & Grading Rubric

Submission Guidelines

1. Due date: 4/30/2021 by 11:59 p.m.
2. Must be submitted online to Canvas
3. Note that I have turned on the “Turnitin” feature for plagiarism review
4. There is no length requirements but think of this as more a “journal style” than “dissertation style” write-up (so maybe 20ish pages)

Overview

Students will submit a written research proposal for their dissertation. This will include an introduction section that provides relevant background information and outlines the rationale for their dissertation. It will also include their research questions and/or hypotheses. The proposal will also include a methods section in which they outline the methodology they will use to test their research questions and hypotheses. This will build on the cost:benefit analysis assignment and incorporate how the student could implement their intervention in rural settings.

Rubric

This assignment is worth 50 points total. Each bullet below will be graded from 0-2 points

- 0 = not done, done very poorly
- 1 = done, adequate, still needs work
- 2 = done very well

Writing Proficiency

1. APA format (7th edition) _____ (0/1/2)
 - *Includes: cover page, running head, page numbers, headers, citations, references*
2. Clarity of writing _____ (0/1/2)
 - *Includes: correct grammar, punctuation, spelling*

Title Page

3. Title identifies population and key topics/variables _____ (0/1/2)

Abstract

4. Abstract of no more than 250 words _____ (0/1/2)
 - *Includes: key information on background, purpose, participants and method*

Introduction

5. Topic & population are easily identifiable _____ (0/1/2)
6. Strong & convincing rationale for the study, includes problem statement _____ (0/1/2)
7. Information presented in coherent, logical paragraphs that leads to research question(s) _____ (0/1/2)
8. Adequate evidence in support of all claims; literature review is current & accurate _____ (0/1/2)
9. All terms clearly defined _____ (0/1/2)
10. Research question(s)/ hypotheses clear & flow naturally from background _____ (0/1/2)

Method

- 11. Design section allows experimenter to adequately answer research question(s) _____ (0/1/2)
- 12. Independent and dependent variables appropriate and clear to the reader _____ (0/1/2)
- 13. Participant sample and selection clearly defined _____ (0/1/2)
 - *Includes: sample size, inclusion/exclusion criteria, recruitment considerations*
- 14. Measures well-defined _____ (0/1/2)
 - *Includes: references, reliability and validity considerations, variables will be used in data analysis*
- 15. Methods described clearly, succinctly, and detailed enough for replication _____ (0/1/2)
- 16. Intervention and control conditions described thoroughly _____ (0/1/2)
- 17. Testing environment adequately described _____ (0/1/2)
- 18. Testing time/length of study/dosage noted _____ (0/1/2)
- 19. Threats to validity controlled for/ addressed in limitations _____ (0/1/2)
- 20. Appropriate randomization/matching used _____ (0/1/2)
- 21. Consideration for how to incorporate rural settings _____ (0/1/2)

Participant Protection

- 22. Protection of participants is considered _____ (0/1/2)
 - *Includes: risks should not outweigh benefits, IRB approval, consent and assent, incentives*

Limitations

- 23. Key limitations (or anticipated difficulties) of the study are noted & discussed _____ (0/1/2)
 - *Note, add this as an extra section at the end.*

References

- 24. All citations appropriately referenced, includes primary sources _____ (0/1/2)

Appendices

- 25. Appendices included & correct (when needed) _____ (0/1/2)

Score out of 50: _____

Appendix C

Research Proposal Presentation Instructions & Grading Rubric

Grading Rubric – Presentation

This assignment is worth 20 points towards your course grade.

Now that you have designed a brilliant research project to examine one of the most important scientific questions of our time, you have the opportunity to share all your hard work with the class! Here are some details on your presentation:

- Prepare a presentation of ~20 minutes of your dissertation proposal
- The presentation should utilize PowerPoint
- Start with a brief introduction/background
 - Include relevant background that sets up the need for your study (aka build the rationale)
 - Ensure that you address why the research topic and your question are important
- Include a slide where you clearly state your research question and hypothesis
- Then the majority of your presentation should focus on your methods.
- Methods should include (and I recommend going in this order!):
 - Design of your study, key variables
 - Participants
 - Measures
 - Procedures
- Wrap-up with brief mention of limitations and a reference slide
- Part of your grade will come from asking questions from other groups' presentations
- You should dress professionally (i.e., business casual)
- Email me your slides by 9:00 a.m. the morning you are presenting, so I can have them downloaded onto the classroom computer.

A grading rubric is provided on the following page, so you can see what exactly I will be looking for and grading on.

	Content
0/.5/1	1. Includes title, presenter name(s) and affiliation
0/.5/1	2. Key background information/rationale presented sets up need for study
0/.5/1	3. Includes clearly written research question and hypothesis at end of introduction that is a logical extension of information presented in introduction
0/.5/1	4. Includes study design (e.g. experiment, survey, correlational design, etc.)
0/.5/1	5. Includes key variables (IVs, DVs, predictors, outcome, etc.)
0/.5/1	6. Key information on participants included
0/.5/1	7. Measures well defined
0/.5/1	8. Procedures well described, includes demonstration of intervention
0/.5/1	9. Limitations briefly mentioned at the end
0/.5/1	10. Includes primary/key references
0/.5/1	11. Incorporates rural settings in some way
	Design/Aesthetic
0/.5/1	12. Text not overwhelming; presentation includes more than just text
0/.5/1	13. Grammar, punctuation, spelling all correct
0/.5/1	14. Headings and subheadings included and help reader follow study
	Presentation
0/.5/1	15. Explains study clearly, succinctly, does not read directly from slides
0/.5/1	16. Intelligently answers and discusses class questions
0/.5/1	17. Looks and behaves professionally
0/.5/1	18. Completes presentation in allotted time frame (20 minutes)
	Class Participation
0/.5/1	19. Engages with other students' presentations by asking questions, giving comments
	PowerPoint
0/.5/1	20. PowerPoint of presentation uploaded to Canvas
	Total Points out of 20