

**EDCP Grading Guidelines
July 2008**

A level - Good to Excellent Work

- A+ (90-100%) A very high level of quality throughout every aspect of the work. It shows the individual (or group) has gone well beyond what has been provided and has extended the usual ways of thinking and/or performing. Outstanding comprehension of subject matter and use of existing literature and research. Consistently integrates critical and creative perspectives in relation to the subject material. The work shows a very high degree of engagement with the topic.
- A (85-89%) Generally a high quality throughout the work. No problems of any significance, and evidence of attention given to each and every detail. Very good comprehension of subject and use of existing literature and research. For the most part, integrates critical and creative perspectives in relation to the subject material. Shows a high degree of engagement with the topic.
- A- (80-84%) Generally a good quality throughout the work. A few problems of minor significance. Good comprehension of subject matter and use of existing literature and research. Work demonstrates an ability to integrate critical and creative perspectives on most occasions. The work demonstrates a reasonable degree of engagement with the topic.

B level - Adequate Work

- B+ (76-79%) Some aspects of good quality to the work. Some problems of minor significance. There are examples of integrating critical and creative perspectives in relation to the subject material. A degree of engagement with the topic.
- B (72-75%) Adequate quality. A number of problems of some significance. Difficulty evident in the comprehension of the subject material and use of existing literature and research. Only a few examples of integrating critical and creative perspectives in relation to the subject material. Some engagement with the topic.
- B- (68-71%) Barely adequate work at the graduate level.

NOTE: For UBC's Faculty of Graduate Studies (FOGS), a final mark below 68% for Doctoral students and below 60% for Masters students is the equivalent of a Failing mark.

C & D level - Seriously Flawed Work

- C (55-67%) Serious flaws in understanding of the subject *material*. Minimal integration of critical and creative perspectives in relation to the subject material. Inadequate engagement with the topic. Inadequate work at the graduate level.

D level

- D (50-54%)

F level - Failing Work

- F (0-49%)

EDCP 601 Course Schedule & Readings

The schedule primarily consists of a series of seminars, student symposia, and minicourses.

Date	Forum	Assignment	Readings & Topics
Week 1 6 Sept	Seminar	Readings & Assignments	Can the “Next Generation” Speak? Understanding Curriculum (and Instruction) Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery & Taubman, “A Postscript;” Weiss, “Our Rights”
Week 2 13 Sept	Seminar	Readings & Assignments	Historiography of Curriculum and Instruction and Curriculum Studies
Week 3 20 Sept	Seminar	Affiliated & SSHRC due 22 September	Historiography of Curriculum and Instruction and Curriculum Studies
Week 4 27 Sept	Seminar	Readings & Assignments	Conceptual Analysis and Conceptual History / Perceptual Analysis and Perceptual History
Week 5 4 Oct	Symposium	Readings & Assignments	Student Symposium: Curriculum and Pedagogy Works (in Progress) Your / EDCP PhD student work, TBA
Week 6 11 Oct	Symposium	Readings & Assignments	Student Symposium: Curriculum and Pedagogy Works (in Progress) Your / EDCP PhD student work, TBA
Week 7 18 Oct	Seminar	Analysis due 18 October	Sociology & Theory of Curriculum and Pedagogy
Week 8 25 Oct	Symposium	Readings & Assignments	Student Symposium: Curriculum and Pedagogy Works (in Progress) Your / EDCP PhD student work, TBA
Week 9 1 Nov	Seminar	Readings & Assignments	Sociology & Theory of Curriculum and Pedagogy
Week 10 8 Nov	Minicourse	History due 8 November	Minicourse: Are Children Human Beings or Human Becomings?
Week 11 15 Nov	Minicourse	Readings & Assignments	Minicourse: Histories and Stories of Indigenous Curriculum and Pedagogy
Week 12 22 Nov	Minicourse	Readings & Assignments	Minicourse: Our Environment & the Anthropocene
Week 13 29 Nov		Paper due 13 December	

Week 1

Can the “Next Generation” Speak? Understanding Curriculum

Close Reading

1. Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). Understanding curriculum: A postscript for the next generation. In *Understanding curriculum* (pp. 847-868). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
 - a. Peters, M. (1999). Review of *Understanding Curriculum*. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 31(2), 254-258.
2. Weiss, E. B. (1990). Our rights and obligations to future generations for the environment. *American Journal of International Law*, 84(1), 198-207.

Resources

1. Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
2. Pinar, W. F. (Ed.). (2003). *International handbook of curriculum research*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
3. Pinar, W. F. (Ed.). (2013). *International handbook of curriculum research* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
4. Connelly, F. M., Fang He, M., & Phillion, J. (2008). *Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
5. Malewski, E. (Ed.). (2012). *Curriculum studies handbook– The next moment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
6. Ng-A-Fook, N. & Rottmann, J. (Eds.). (2012). *Reconsidering Canadian curriculum studies: Provoking historical, present, and future perspectives*. New York, NY: Palgrave.

Week 2

Historiography of Curriculum ~~and Instruction~~ and Curriculum Studies

Close Reading

1. Petrina, S., Lee, Y.-L., & TBA. (2017). *The historiography of curriculum ~~and instruction~~* (Draft). Unpublished manuscript, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC.
2. Petrina, S., Lee, Y.-L. & Feng, F. (2016). *On the historiography of curriculum: The legend of Petrus Ramus*. Paper Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC, 7-10 April 2016.
3. Baker, B. (Ed.). (2009). Borders, belonging, beyond: New curriculum history. In *New curriculum history* (pp. ix-xxxv). Rotterdam, NL: Sense.

Semantics

1. Phelan, A. (2015). Introduction: Teacher education for the sake of the subject. In *Curriculum theorizing and teacher education* (pp. 1-9). New York, NY: Routledge.

Resources

1. Lee, Y.-L. & Petrina, S. (in press). Hacking minds: *Curriculum mentis*, noosphere, internet, matrix, web. In N. Ng-A-Fook, S. Pratt, B. Smith, & L. Radford (Eds.), *Hacking education in a digital age: Teacher education, curriculum, and literacies* (pp. 1-17). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Inc.
2. Baker, B. (Ed.). (2009). *New curriculum history*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
3. Hendry, P. M. (2011). *Engendering curriculum history*. New York, NY: Routledge.
4. Hamilton, D. (1989). *Towards a theory of schooling*. London, UK: Falmer.
5. Doll, W. E. (2002). Ghosts and the curriculum. In W. E. Doll & N. P. Gough (Eds.), *Curriculum visions* (pp. 23-72). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Week 3

Historiography of Curriculum and Instruction and Curriculum Studies

Close Reading

1. Hendry, P. M. (2011). Introduction and Chapter 1, Engendering curriculum history. In *Engendering curriculum history* (pp. 1-30). New York, NY: Routledge.
2. Hua, Z. & Gao, Z. (2003). Curriculum studies in China: Retrospect and prospect. In W. F. Pinar, (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 118-133). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
3. Hamilton, D. (1989). On the origins of the educational terms class and curriculum. In *Towards a theory of schooling* (pp. 35-55). New York, NY: Falmer.

Resources: Mythopoetic Pedagogies

1. Leonard, T. & Willis, P. (Eds.). (2008). *Pedagogies of the imagination: Mythopoetic curriculum in educational practice*. New York, NY: Springer.
2. Ricoeur, P. (1980). Narrative time. *Critical Inquiry*, 7(1), 169-190.

Week 4

Conceptual Analysis & Conceptual History / Perceptual Analysis & Perceptual History

Close Reading

1. Bal, M. (2009). Working with concepts. *European Journal of English Studies*, 13(1), 13-23.
2. Hunt, S. (2014). Ontologies of indigeneity: The politics of embodying a concept. *Cultural Geographies*, 21(1), 27-32.
3. Funteh, M. B. (2015). Dimensioning indigenous African educational system: A critical theory divide discourse. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 5(4), 139-150.

Example

1. Farr, J. (2004). Social capital: A conceptual history. *Political Theory*, 32(1), 6-33.

Resources

1. Petrina, S. (2017). Conceptual analysis. <http://blogs.ubc.ca/educ500/files/2014/06/Conceptual-Analysis.pdf>
2. Petrina, S. (2017). Conceptual history. <http://blogs.ubc.ca/educ500/files/2014/06/Conceptual-History.pdf>
3. Petrina, S. (2017). Perceptual analysis. <http://blogs.ubc.ca/educ500/files/2014/06/Perceptual-Analysis.pdf>
4. Petrina, S. (2017). Perceptual history. <http://blogs.ubc.ca/educ500/files/2014/06/Perceptual-History.pdf>
2. Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1991/1994). *What is philosophy?* (Trans. H. Tomlinson & G. Burchell). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
5. Neumann, B. & Nünning, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Travelling concepts for the study of culture*. Boston, MA: de Gruyter.

Week 5

Student Symposium: Curriculum and Pedagogy Works (in Progress)

Re-signifying Curriculum Studies from Indigeneity in the Mexican and Kenyan Contexts

Maria Jose Athie-Martinez & Philip Kimani Karangu

Close Reading

1. Furlan, A. (2011) "Curriculum studies in Mexico: Key scholars". In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum studies in Mexico: intellectual histories, present circumstances* (pp. 111-136). New York, NY, Palgrave.

- Dei, G. J. S. (2000). African development: The relevance and implications of 'Indigenouslyness'. In G. J. S. Dei, B. L. Hall & D. G. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Indigenous knowledge in global contexts: Multiple readings of our world* (pp. 70-86). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Week 6

Student Symposium: Curriculum and Pedagogy Works (in Progress)

Re-engaging the Method of Currere: Teachers' Perspectives

Emmanuel (Kofi) Amoah, Kiera Brant, & Scott Robertson

Close Reading

- Pinar, W. (2010). Currere. In C. Kridel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of curriculum studies* (pp. 177-178). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Secondary Reading

- Aoki, T. (2004). Legitimizing lived curriculum: Toward a curricular landscape of multiplicity. In W. F. Pinar & R. L. Irwin (Eds.), *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki* (pp. 199-215). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pinar, W. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Petrina, S. (2014). Currere: The method. Retrieved on October 2, 2017 from: <http://blogs.ubc.ca/educ500/files/2014/06/CurrereNotesPetrina2014.pdf>

Week 7

Sociology & Theory of Curriculum and Pedagogy

Close Reading

- Hunter, I. (2006). The history of theory. *Critical Inquiry*, 33(1), 78-112.
- Britzman, D. (1996). On becoming a "little sex researcher:" Some comments on a polymorphously perverse curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 12(2), 4-11.
- Pinar, W. (2012). Preface + chapter 1. In *What is curriculum theory?* (2nd ed.) (pp. xi-42). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Phelan, A. (2014). *Theorizing pedagogy* [Course outline]. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia.
- Guillory, J. (2002). The very idea of pedagogy. *Profession*, 164-171.

Resources

- Hamilton, D. (2009). Blurred in translation: Reflections on pedagogy in public education. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 17(1), 5-16.
- Aoki, T. T. (1981/2005). Toward understanding curriculum: Talk through reciprocity of perspectives. In W. F. Pinar & R. L. Irwin, (Eds.), *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki* (pp. 219-228). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Pinar, W. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Week 8

Student Symposium: Curriculum and Pedagogy Works (in Progress)

Creating Space to Conceptualize Different Families

Matthew Isherwood & Naoki Takemura

- Sedgwick, E. K. (1994). Chapter 1: Queer and now. In *Tendencies* (pp. 1-20). London, UK: Routledge.

- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). Chapter 7: Understanding curriculum as gender text. In *Understanding curriculum* (pp. 358-403). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Resource

- Ueno, C. (2009). *The modern family in Japan: Its rise and fall*. Melbourne, Vic: Trans Pacific Press.

Week 9

Sociology & Theory of Curriculum and Pedagogy

Close Reading

- Arnot, M. (2002). The complex gendering of invisible pedagogies: Social reproduction or empowerment?. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(4), 583-593.
- Stearns, J., Sandlin, J. A. & Burdock, J. (2011). Resistance on aisle three?: Exploring the big curriculum of consumption and the (im)possibility of resistance in John Updike's "A&P". *Curriculum Inquiry*, 41(3), 394-415.

Secondary Reading

- Whitty, G. (2010). Revisiting school knowledge: Some sociological perspectives on new school curricula. *European Journal of Education*, 45(1), 28-45.
- DeLeon, A. P. & Ross, E. W. (2010). On the edge of history: Towards a new vision of social studies education. In *Critical theories, radical pedagogies, and social education* (pp. ix-xvi). Rotterdam, NL: Sense

Signature Pedagogies

- Klebesadel, H. & Kornetsky, L. (2009). Critique as signature pedagogy in the arts. In R. A. R. Gurung, N. L. Chick, & A. Haynie, (Eds.), *Exploring signature pedagogies* (pp. 99-138). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Sociology of Curriculum

- Rosenkranz, K. & Brackett, A. C. (1874). Pedagogics as a system. *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 8(1), 49-73.
- Bernstein, B. (1981). Codes, modalities, and the process of cultural reproduction: A model. *Language in Society*, 10(3), 327-363.
- Goodson, I. (1988/1995). *The making of curriculum: Collected essays*. London, UK: Falmer.
- Tomlinson, S. (1982/2012). *A sociology of special education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M. (1981). Reproduction, contestation, and curriculum: An essay in self-criticism. *Interchange*, 12(2-3), 27-47.

Resources

- Bertrand, Y. & Houssaye, J. (1999). Pédagogie and didactique: An incestuous relationship. *Instructional Science*, 27(1/2), 33-51.
- Edwards, A. (2001). Researching pedagogy: A sociocultural agenda. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 9(2), 161-186.
- Aristarkhova, I. & Wilding, F. (2009). "My personal is not political?" A dialogue on art, feminism and pedagogy. *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies*, 5(2), 1-20.
- Pinar, W. F. (2005). The problem with curriculum and pedagogy. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 2(1), 67-82.
- Rocha, S. (2015). The blue soul of jazz: Lessons on waves of anguish. In T. E. Lewis & M.J. Laverty, (Eds.), *Art's teachings, teaching's art* (pp. 195-209). New York, NY: Springer.
- Petrina, S. (2004). The politics of curriculum and instructional design / theory / form: Critical problems, projects, units and modules. *Interchange*, 35(1), 81-126.
- Petrina, S. (2006). C&I high. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 3(2), 125-147.

- Hirst, P. H. (1969). The logic of the curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1(2), 142-158.

Critical Pedagogy

- Mathison, S. & Ross, E. W. (Eds.). (2008). *Battleground schools: An encyclopedia of conflict and controversy*, 2 Volumes. New York, NY: Greenwood.
- Ross, E. W. (2008). Critical pedagogy. In S. Mathison & E. W. Ross, (Eds.), *Battleground schools: An encyclopedia of conflict and controversy, Volume 1* (pp. 156-161). New York, NY: Greenwood.
- hayes, k., Steinberg, S. R., & Tobin, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Key works in critical pedagogy: Joe L. Kincheloe*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- Sandlin, J. A. & McLaren, P. (Eds.). (2010). *Critical pedagogies of consumption: Living and learning in the shadow of the "shopocalypse."* New York NY: Routledge.
- McLaren, P. (1995/2004). *Critical pedagogy and predatory culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Week 10

Minicourse: Are Children Human Beings or Human Becomings?

- Qvortrup, J. (2009). Are children human beings or human becomings? *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali*, 117(3/4), 631-653.

Week 11

Minicourse: Histories and Stories of Indigenous Curriculum and Pedagogy

Close Reading

- Palmater, P. (2014). Genocide, Indian policy, and legislated elimination of Indians in Canada. *aboriginal policy studies*, 3(3), 27-54.
- Marker, M. (2016). Borders and the borderless Coast Salish: Decolonising historiographies of Indigenous schooling. *History of Education*, 45, 1-23.

Secondary Reading

- Archibald, J.-a. (2007). *Indigenous storywork: Educating the heart, mind, body, and spirit*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Cole, P. & O'Riley, P. (2008). Coyote & Raven discuss mathematics, complexity theory and Aboriginality. *Complicity: An International Journal of Complexity and Education*, 5(1), 49-62.

Resources

- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Honouring the truth, reconciling for the future: Summary of the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Ottawa, CA: Author.
- Democracy Now! (2015, June 30). "Cultural genocide:" Landmark report decries Canada's forced schooling of indigenous children [Interview transcript]. [Democracy Now!](#)
- Fontaine v. Canada (Attorney General). (2014, January 14) Ontario Superior Court of Justice, 283.

Week 12

Minicourse: Our Environment & the Anthropocene

Close Reading

- Rose, E. C. (1991). The good mother: From Gaia to Gilead. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 12(1), 77-97.
- Crutzen, P. J. & Stoermer, E. F. (2000, May). The "anthropocene." *Global Change Newsletter*, 41, 17-18.

3. Latour, B. (2014). Agency at the time of the anthropocene. *New Literary History*, 45(1), 1-18.
4. TBA

Resources

1. Sagan, D. & Margulis, L. (1987). Gaia and the evolution of machines. *Whole Earth Review*, 55, 15-21.
2. Morton, T. (2014). How I learned to stop worrying and love the term anthropocene. *Cambridge Journal of Postcolonial Literary Inquiry*, 1(2), 257-264.
3. TBA

Participation

We refer to scholarly levels of participation as **academic conversation**, **academic dialogue**, or often **performance**, which entail a variety of things including articulation and presentation. Throughout, the challenge is to develop a facility for both **description** and **depiction**. Description and depiction are key practices across *all* the disciplines and interdisciplines. **Commentary and criticism** seem to presuppose a **close reading** of a text or work, immersion, and a transgressive reading, subversion, although this is neither always possible nor the case. If commentary presupposes **solemn reverence** for a discipline, text or work, then criticism presupposes **gentle mocking** or **subversive irreverence** for that same discipline, text and work. Indeed, interdisciplinarity (cross, meta, multi, trans, etc.) demands and presupposes immersion and subversion. All of this necessitates a certain **vulnerability**. Avoid **defensive readings**; read for **understanding**.

Participation is variant whereas modes have proliferated. Participation is interdependent with **preparation** for each class, which involves **reading** (highlighting, pagination margin notes, comments & questions, etc.), **writing** (note-taking, outlining, questioning, defining, mapping, framing, summarizing, journaling, blogging, tweeting podcasting, exposition, etc.), **organizing** (documenting, labeling, ordering, archiving, filing, sequencing events, chronicling, etc.), **reflecting** (rethinking, reincorporating, remapping, analyzing, synthesizing, etc.), and **speaking** (discussing, corresponding with peers, social media, etc.). While a variety of apps and media are readily available for organizing notes, consider [Evernote](#) for starters.

Assignments

1. **Curriculum and Pedagogy Works (in Progress) Symposium**— (Groups of 2-3) Choose a day on the schedule and coordinate a C&P Works (in Progress) Symposium (3 hours). These are student symposia in that they are: a) coordinated and organized by students; and b) based on EDCP PhD student research, work, or works in progress. The symposia are open to all students and faculty and ideally you will invite faculty members to co-present or provide responses to the work presented. Ideally, all readings for the symposia (i.e., your work + other panelists' or background readings) will be distributed at least two weeks prior. Coordinating and organizing involves: a) selecting and inviting the panelists, performers, presenters, chair, respondents, etc.; b) selecting the papers, works, etc. to be presented or performed along with the theme; c) designing the format and media for the symposium; and d) inviting guests and advertising or broadcasting the event. See [AERA](#) for typical symposium format:

A symposium provides an opportunity to examine specific research issues, problems, or topics from a variety of perspectives. Symposia may present alternative solutions, interpretations, or contrasting points of view on a specified subject or in relation to a common theme. Symposia may also use a panel discussion format targeted at a clearly delineated research issue or idea. Symposia may also be quite interactive where a large portion of the session is devoted to activities such as

discussion among the presenters and discussants, questions and discussion among all those present at the session, or small-group interaction.

2. **Affiliated or SSHRC Proposal**— Complete and submit a SSHRC / Affiliated application. The SSHRC process must be followed for all potential recipients of either a SSHRC or Affiliated award. Directions for this process can be found at SSHRC.crsh.gc.ca and at the Awards & Financial Aid menu on the G+PS website. Basically, there are three parts to the application: Personal Data (including vita), Program of Study (2 page description of proposed research), and Appraisals (referee/reference letters). We will give feedback to each other on the Program of Study.
3. **Conceptual Analysis (of Curriculum and Pedagogy) w/ Thesis + Response**— Provide a conceptual analysis of a concept that is inadequately conceptualized or theorized or demands reconceptualization. Conceptualizing is the necessary complement to historicizing. This challenges you to state a thesis and defend or topple it in 1,000 words. The second part challenges you to write a response to a peer’s paper in 300 words. Conceptual analysis is often used interchangeably with philosophical analysis or philosophical method. Conceptual analysis is complementary to data analysis and more specifically a technique of data analysis associated with practices such as grounded theory (GT). Conceptual analysis is *not* analytic philosophy, diagrammatic ontology, formal analysis, content analysis, cultural analysis, discourse analysis, linguistic analysis (e.g., structure of linguistic meaning), or text analysis, although it may draw from methodological practices within each of these. Conceptual analysis is a means of clarifying or explicating and giving definition, dimension, and meaning to ordinary and obscure expressions (i.e., cultural, natural, or spiritual things, image, text, sound, etc.). The verb “to explicate” means either to explain empirically or to provide an analysis of a concept (Meyers, 1966, p. 392). *Download [Notes on Conceptual Analysis](#). Essays should be no more than 1,000 words excluding references.
4. **Conceptual History (of Curriculum and Pedagogy)**— Historicize a theoretical concept that has yet to be given history (herstory, mystory, theirstory, etc.) or has been given a history inadequate to your research and contemporary standards. Ideally, this expands the concept analyzed in the first assignment. Historicizing is the necessary complement of theorizing. History can be defined as “the cultivation and maintenance of the collective memory,” emphasizing the active role historians play in “the past” and in “the present” (Joyce, 1984, p. 133). Options vary considerably in the ways that the collective memory or past is cultivated and maintained, and shaped from the present. Historiography is the cultivation and maintenance of the ways history is told or silenced and the way the past is made visible or hidden. This essay should be conceptual history (i.e., composite concept, phrase, conceptual statement, etc.) and reflect an effective balance of primary and secondary sources. The challenge is to write history *in contextus* and from the past forward as opposed to *in vacuo* and from the present backward. **Download [Notes on Conceptual History](#) and see examples in *Contributions to the History of Concepts*. Essays should be no more than 1,000 words excluding references.
5. **Scholarly Paper**— This is an invitation or opportunity to write in-depth on a research topic in your discipline or responsive to your interdisciplinary (meta, multi, trans, etc.) interests. Ideally, this will be a publishable paper but this is also an opportunity to begin new work or bring work in progress to a new stage. A scholarly paper necessitates a facility for handling a wide scope and large volume of sources. With that said, one option is to refine the conceptual analysis and history of the previous assignments. Another is to limit the paper to a review of literature.




















Paper Length: 4,500 words or about 13-14 pages double-spaced + references or endnotes.

Include a title page. Generally, keep in mind the following criteria as you develop and

write:

1. Clarity of communication / writing
 - a. Is the writing clear and concise?
 - b. Are the ideas focused and organized?
2. Development of argument / thesis
 - a. Is the argument coherent? Thoughtful? Analytical? Critical? Sophisticated? Poststructural? Queer? Postcolonial?
3. Exploration of content and theory
 - a. Is there evidence of critically and theoretically exploring the issues?
 - b. Are the ideas theorized, synthesized, extended or applied?
4. Examples
 - a. Are examples sufficient? Do examples ground the paper?
 - b. Are there narrative examples?
5. Grammar & Style
 - a. Organization, sentence structure, paragraphs, spelling
 - b. APA Style (format, references)

Curriculum and Pedagogy Files
(for the first and second year doctoral student)

-  SSHRC or Affiliated Application, or equivalent (My own + Example)
-  Comprehensive Exams Proposal + Papers (My own + Example)
-  Doctoral dissertation w/ Review of Literature on my Topic/s (+ various examples)
-  CV (My own)
-  Example CV (Assistant Professor)
-  Statement on Learning and Teaching (My own)
-  Statement on Research Program (My own)
-  Publication Submitted and Under Review (My own, single or co-authored)
-  AERA, CSSE or Other Major Conference Proposal (My own)
-  Membership in AERA, CACS, CSSE or Other Major Research Organization
-  Example Syllabus for Undergraduate or Teacher Education C&I or C&P Course (Quality Good to Excellent)
-  Example Syllabus for Graduate Curriculum Studies Course (Quality Good to Excellent)
-  Example Syllabus for Graduate Research Methods Course (Quality Good to Excellent)
-  Working Syllabus for Undergraduate C&I or C&P Course I Want to Teach
-  Working Syllabus for Graduate Curriculum Studies Course I Want to Teach
-  Example Syllabus for Graduate Research Methods Course I Want to Teach
-  *CAUT Bulletin* (Canadian Association of University Teachers)
-  *University Affairs* (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada)
-  *Chronicle of Higher Education* + Vitae
- 