

EDI 621 Restorative Discipline: Accountability & Restoration in Schools

**Master of Arts in Education Program
Eastern Mennonite University
Location: Lancaster, PA**

Instructor: Dr. Judy H. Mullet (mulletjh@emu.edu) 540-432-4427

Class Dates and Times: July 18 & 19 (1 SH); July 18-22, 2011 (3SH) , 8 AM – 5:00 PM
Total Hours: 1 credit = 14 hours, 3 credits = 42 hours

Course Description:

This school discipline course is designed for teachers, counselors, administrators, social workers and others who work with discipline issues in K-12 schools. Restorative discipline is based on restorative justice theory and fills the relationship gap in current school discipline practices. The model articulated in this course views misconduct first as a violation of relationships and secondarily as a violation of school rules and expectations. Breaking rules is seen as harming people and interpersonal relationships and the misbehaving student has the primary responsibility of repairing the harm done. The restorative discipline model addresses the needs of the person who was harmed as well as increasing accountability on the part of the one doing the harm. The harmer is given the opportunity to make amends and be accepted back into the school community.

Restorative discipline is one of the fastest growing discipline approaches in the country and is a useful tool for fostering empathy, self-discipline, and preventing reoccurrence of misconduct. A differentiated discipline approach to fostering positive behavior takes into account the uniqueness of each conflict situation and matches solutions with needs of all parties involved.

Students will apply restorative justice principles to individual student, classroom, school and community practices that support safe schools. Participants learn the art of moment-to-moment restorative practices, mini-chats, restorative conversations, and the facilitation of group conferences.

EMU Conceptual Framework: “Preparing Caring, Reflective Teachers for a Changing World”

The EMU Teacher Education Program has chosen the theme *Preparing Caring, Reflective Teachers for a Changing World* as the conceptual framework from which its beliefs and outcomes are based. The Teacher Education Program envisions preparing informed lifelong leaders and learners who value the dignity of all persons and are ready and willing to share a pilgrimage of openness and continuous growth as they invite others to join them. These caring, reflective educators will offer healing and hope in a diverse world. Six performance outcomes focus all course and candidate outcomes:

M.A. in Education Program Outcomes:

- 1. Scholarship:** to acquire advanced knowledge through core curriculum and specialty area courses and to organize and integrate that knowledge into professional practice.

2. **Inquiry:** to generate questions and to use critical thinking to self-assess, to view problems from multiple perspectives, to make informed decisions and to engage in action research for educational change.
3. **Professional Knowledge:** to acquire advanced pedagogical and specialty area knowledge in order to create cultures of change and manage environments conducive to learning, setting high expectations and implementing appropriate instructional and assessment practices.
4. **Communication:** to develop communication strategies (verbal, nonverbal, and technological) that support collaboration and resourcefulness to empower self and others.
5. **Caring:** to develop a nurturing spirit that advocates for students, encourages social and ethical responsibility, and promotes peacebuilding in diverse settings.
6. **Leadership:** to act as social change agents by working collaboratively to bring about fair and just systemic change within educational contexts.

Course Outcomes Aligned with Program Outcomes (in parentheses):

Upon completion of this course the student should have the ability to:

1. *successfully investigate a transformational framework for building safe schools which value restoring broken relationships, reducing violent action, differentiating discipline and including all affected parties in the problem solving process. [Knowledge & Dispositional Levels: Professional Knowledge, Inquiry, Caring]
2. *articulate a restorative justice lens that recognizes misbehavior as an offense against relationships rather than a violation of school rules. [Dispositional Level: Caring]
3. foster restorative measures when working with persons harmed, persons who have committed the harm, and home and community stakeholders. [Skill & Dispositional Levels: Inquiry, Communication, Caring]
4. identify ways to bring restorative discipline to their own education contexts. [Leadership]

*** Outcomes for ISH students**

Required Readings:

Claassen, R. & Claassen, R. (2008). *Discipline that restores*. CA: Booksurge Publishing

*Holtham, J. (2009). *Taking restorative justice to schools: A doorway to discipline*. Breinigsville, PA: Del Hayes Press.

*Stutzman-Amstutz, L. & Mullet, J. H. (2005). *The little book of restorative discipline*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.

*** Required reading for 1SH students**

Course Requirements:

Course Requirements: (3SH hour students will do 1-5. 1SH students will do 1-3 and 6)

1. Attendance & Participation:
*Since this course is taught in daylong sessions, it is necessary for 100% attendance. You will participate in role-playing activities to learn the processes of RD apply restorative justice principles processes to your own educational context. High engagement is expected and can affect the final grade.
 2. Report on Stutzman-Amstutz & Mullet *The Little Book of Restorative Discipline*
*As background for the course, each student will read *The Little Book* and participate in discussions and brainstorm on how restorative justice principles might work in today's schools. See rubric for specific guidelines (10 points).
 3. Demonstration of the Conferencing Process:
*Students will use the models presented in class & in Hotham's *Taking Restorative Justice to Schools* to demonstrate its applicability in a case study context. Students will be given the conflict and the perspectives of all parties involved. Each student will then facilitate a conference OR write a script outlining what could happen in a successful conference to put things as right as possible. See rubric for specific guidelines (40 points)
 4. Restorative Classroom Development: Compare/Contrast Paper (Claassen & Claassen DTR Model with A Student-Selected Model)
Students will compare and contrast a restorative discipline model with an evidence-based discipline model that is not self-reported to be based on restorative justice philosophy. Students select this model and, with instructor approval, compare it to the DTR model in a 10+ page paper. See rubric for guidelines. (25 points) DUE AUGUST 22.
 5. Design A Restorative Measures Plan:
Students are asked to examine their current school or classroom discipline plan and revise or rewrite to include the principles offered in this course. This plan should either outline a broad revision of the current system with at least one section including a detailed a portion of the system, e.g., strategies for reintegration after suspension, or outline a bottom up approach beginning with the actions and changes of a single teacher. See rubric for specific guidelines (10+ pages) (25 points) DUE AUGUST 22.
- *For 1SH students only:** Redesign One Element of A Current Discipline Plan:
6. Choose one restorative measure that you plan to add to (or replace) your current school or classroom discipline system (e.g., use of mini-chats). Write a 4-5-page paper describing what you plan to do, why it would be restorative, and how it would benefit students. (3+ professional references). (10 pts.) DUE AUGUST 19.

- **Required assignments for 1SH students**

Rubrics for Restorative Discipline Assignments

***Report on Amstutz & Mullet *Little Book of Restorative Discipline* (10 pts.)**

5 points possible	<u>Analysis:</u> Demonstrated understanding of restorative discipline through class discussion - responding to and offering questions, comments and accurate information.
5 points possible	<u>Application:</u> Identified at least 2 aspects of restorative discipline outlined in the Stutzman-Amstutz & Mullet text that are currently practiced in your setting, and 2 elements that could be adapted in your current setting.

***Demonstration of Conferencing Process (40 pts.)**

20 points possible	<u>Knowledge & Application:</u> Exemplary application of conferencing process in a case study simulation, evidencing deep understanding and use of class-demonstrated and Holtham's Boomerang models in planning, implementing and reporting on the conference. The facilitator did not provide suggestions but kept participants on track, used active listening where appropriate, and elicited specifics of the solutions.
10 points possible	<u>Facilitator Role:</u> Impartiality was maintained through the process. The process was not rushed but moved at a comfortable pace, and all aspects of the process were sensitively and thoroughly demonstrated.
10 points possible (for 3SH)	<u>Preparation:</u> Demonstrated complete and effective pre-conferencing as per classroom input and Holtham model.

Restorative Classroom Development: Compare/Contrast Paper (Claassen & Claassen DTR Model with A Student-Selected Model) (25 pts.)

10 points possible	<u>Description & Research:</u> Exemplary description and understanding of DTR and a student-selected model. Included a theory/research-based rationale for each model, with at least 5 academic sources.
10 points possible	<u>Compare & Contrast:</u> Appropriate and comprehensive comparison of the two models on critical features needed for classroom system development. Contrasts the two programs on critical elements as well. Concluding statement evaluates the usefulness of infusing restorative principles into the student-selected model.
5 points possible	<u>Standards:</u> Minimum of 7 sources (including the 3 required texts) and 10 pages. Exemplary use of APA and EMU standards of writing.

Design a Restorative Measures Plan (School or Classroom) (25 pts.)

10 points possible	Exemplary knowledge and application of restorative justice theory and research in developing a specific-to-context school or classroom program from either a bottom up or top down approach, and from an added-value or new program perspective.
10 points possible	<u>Synthesis:</u> The proposed application of the process to your context was appropriate and well developed with ample descriptions of the critical elements in the discipline system, including a more detailed section for one aspect of the program (e.g., strategies for reintegration). The program or classroom process should include proactive, preventative measures as well as responsive components.

	If a program is chosen.
5 points possible	<u>Standards:</u> Minimum of 7 sources (including the 3 required texts) and 10 pages. Exemplary use of APA and EMU standards of writing.

Tentative Content Outline

DAY 1: What is restorative discipline?

Changing paradigms: From getting even to getting well

ASSIGNMENT to be completed before Day 1:

In preparation for the first day, read both *The Little Book of Restorative Discipline* (overview of restorative theory and practices) and *Taking Restorative Justice to Schools* (description of restorative conferencing and circles practices and program development). Be prepared to share at least 2 aspects of restorative discipline outlined in the Stutzman-Amstutz & Mullet text that are currently practiced in your setting, and 2 elements that could be adapted in your current setting.

Introductions

Sharing our stories
Little Book discussion
 Syllabus review

Definition and Rationale

The what and why of RD
 From philosophy to practice
 A Discipline Continuum: From Coercion to Invitation
 A Case for Differentiated Discipline via RD
 Framing Restorative Discipline:
 - Socio-ecological & relational theories (the 4 quadrants)
 - Research base for restorative justice
 - RTI connections
 - General & specific principles of RD
 - Moving toward self-discipline

The Essential Questions

The promise of empathy-focused, need-sensitive questions
 Restorative justice through a child's eyes
 Video: Introduction to Conferencing
 Conferencing Workshop

Evaluation

DAY 2: What restorative strategies work? What doesn't work?

Responsive Approaches: Tend, befriend and mend

ASSIGNMENT to be completed before Day 2:

For 1SH students, review Holtham's *Taking RJ to Schools* and handouts in class and be prepared to demonstrate how to preconference and facilitate a restorative conference using a case study given to you on Monday.

For 3SH students, review the Holtham book and handouts and be prepared to participate in and critique simulated conferences.

The Shame vs. Pain Debate

Preconferencing & Conferencing Workshop cont.

Preconference checklist

Preconferencing process (pp. 23-31, Holtham)

Preconference practice

Video: challenging cases

Conferencing Simulations for 1 SH students

Literature Review

Find a study assessing RJ in schools:

What specific strategies were assessed and with whom?

How were they assessed?

What worked? What didn't work? Weaknesses of the study?

What "truth" can be gleaned from the study?

Evaluation

DAY 3: What models are working in schools and community justice programs?

From Responsive to Proactive: If you're not modeling it, you're teaching something else. (Belinda Hopkins)

ASSIGNMENT:

Be prepared to share with the class your NET Search findings from Day 2 (providing answers to the 4 series of questions above).

Evidence-based practice

Share research studies

Prevention through Relational Measures

Rights & responsibilities

Fraser Curriculum Review

Sample Restorative Models:

Creating respect, cooperation and responsibility in the classroom: The Claassen Model

Just School Model – Belinda Hopkins

The Gossen Restitution Model: punisher, monitor and manager

SaferSanerSchools Model: IIRP Program

Victim Offender Mediation

Video of victim offender reconciliation

Guest VO mediator & co-author: Lorraine Stutzman-Amstutz

Evaluation

Day 4: What can "living into a culture of restoration" look like?

Priming, time and paying it forward

ASSIGNMENT: Bring to class a copy of your school's mission statement.

Assessing Discipline Models/Programs

Using a restorative continuum yardstick, evaluate one of the following:

Fay & Cline's *Love & Logic*

Jones's *Tools for Teaching*

Nelson's *Positive Discipline*

Kohn's *Beyond Discipline*

Student suggestions:

Moment to moment restorative discipline

The case for peaceable schools

Mini-chats: Rewind, Unwind and Windup

Restorative conversations

Reframing

Long Range Planning for Relational and Restorative Schools

Reviewing discipline policies

Critiquing your current classroom and/or school policies

Evaluation

Day 5: Where to from here?

The promise of restoration

ASSIGNMENTS to be completed before Day 5:

Prepare to Demonstrate Conferencing:

Students will use the models presented in class & from Holtham to demonstrate its applicability in a case study context. Be prepared to demonstrate this on Friday. Students will create or choose a specific conflict with clear articulation of the perspectives of all parties involved. Optional, with instructor permission:

The student will write a script outlining what could happen in a successful conference to put things as right as possible. (40 points)

Conferencing demonstrations

The moral imagination: Designing a differentiated grass roots process for sustainable peace

Video: Peace Game

Community meetings

Mistakes, mischief and mayhem (Coloroso)

Redesigning mission statements

Forgiveness workshop

Grievance test

What forgive is and what it isn't

Processes of forgiveness

Languages of apology

Ending to begin

Evaluation

Course Evaluation: 1 SH Students:

<i>The Little Book</i> In-class Report	10 points
Conferencing Demonstration	30 points
Application Paper	10 points

Grading Scale:

48-50	A
46-47	A-
44-45	B+
42-43	B
40-41	B-
38-39	C+
36-37	C
35	C-
33-34	D+
31-32	D
Below 30	F

Course Evaluation: 3 SH Students:

<i>The Little Book</i> In-class Report	10 points
Conferencing Demonstration	40 points
Compare/Contrast Paper	25 points
Program/Classroom Design	25 points

Grading Scale:

94-100	A
91-93	A-
88-90	B+
83-87	B
80-82	B-
77-79	C+
72-76	C
69-71	C-
67-68	D+
62-66	D
Below 62	F

Attendance Expectations:

Students are required to attend class meetings of all courses for which they are enrolled except in unusual and emergency circumstances. In the case of absence, the student is responsible for the material presented in class. Students should not absent themselves from class without advanced notification if possible. Because classes are offered in nontraditional format, absence from one class session can result in a lower grade. Please review your graduate catalogue for further details.

Special Accommodations:

If a student needs course adaptations or accommodations because of a documented disability, or has emergency medical information to share, please inform the instructor of your needs.

Academic Integrity:

The responsibility to foster and guard academic integrity rests with all members of the academic community. A foundation of mutual trust is essential to the learning community. Any incidences of academic dishonesty may result in a failing grade for the work submitted and a "Record of Academic Dishonesty" filed in the graduate dean's office. Students will be asked to meet with the instructor (and other affected persons, where appropriate) to examine the effects of the dishonesty on others and to develop an accountability plan. Please review the academic integrity policy in your graduate catalogue for further details.

Use of Graduate Level Writing Standards and American Psychological Association (APA) Writing Style:

Students are expected to use the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association 6th Edition* for written assignments including annotated bibliographies and references.

Candidates citing references in Power Point references are also expected to use APA style.

Instructors may exclude short personal narratives, essays, lesson plans, or some project work if APA writing style is inappropriate.

Class Format:

The following learning strategies will be used throughout the class sessions:

- a. lecture-discussion
- b. role play & simulation
- c. brainstorming
- d. concept synectics (metaphor development)
- e. shared inquiry
- f. observational analysis
- g. analytical writing
- h. conflict dialogues

Schedule of Class Time**Morning:**

8-9:15 Block 1
9:15 - 9:25 BREAK
9:25 - 10:40 Block 2
10:40 - 10:50 BREAK
10:50 - 12:05 Block 3

Afternoon:

12:05 – 12:30 LUNCH
12:30 – 1:45 Block 4
1:45- 1:55 BREAK
1:55 – 3:25 Block 5
3:25 – 3:35 BREAK
3:35 - 5:00 Block 6

A SAMPLING OF KNOWLEDGE BASE RESOURCES:

Ashworth, J., Van Bockern, S. & Ailts, J. (2008). The restorative justice center: An alternative to school detention. *Reclaiming Children & Youth*, 17(3), 22-26.

- Banjoko, A.A. (2011). Restorative discipline as an alternative to retributive discipline within the juvenile courts system: An analysis of the metro county juvenile court community restorative board. *Dissertation Abstracts*, pp. 2358.
- Bodine, R. J. & Crawford, D. K. (1998). *The handbook of conflict resolution education - a guide to building quality programs in schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Bodine, R. J.; Crawford, D. K.; & Fred Schruppf. (1995). *Creating the peaceable school - a comprehensive program for teaching conflict resolution*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- Boulton, J. & Mirsky, L. (2006). Restorative practices as a tool for organizational change. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 15 (2), 89-91.
- Bullara, D. T. (1993). Classroom management strategies to reduce racially-biased treatment of students. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 4(4), 357-368.
- Charles, C.M. (2008). *Today's best classroom management strategies: Paths to positive discipline*. NY: Allyn & Bacon.
- Chmelynski, C. (2005, September). Restorative justice for discipline with respect. *The Education Digest*, 17-20.
- Claassen, R. and Claassen, R. (2008). *Discipline that restores: Strategies to create respect, cooperation, and responsibility in the classroom*. South Caroline: BookSurge Publishing.
- Claassen, R. & Claassen, R. (1996). *Making things right*. Fresno, CA: Center for Peacemaking and Conflict Studies.
- Coloroso, B. (2005). *Just because it's not wrong doesn't make it right: Teaching kids to think and act ethically*. London: Penguin.
- Costello, B., Wachtel, J. & Wachtel, T. (2009). *The restorative practices handbook for teachers, disciplinarians and administrators*. Bethlehem, PA: IIRP.
- Curwin, R.L. & Mendler, A. N. (1997). Beyond obedience: a discipline model for the long term. *Reaching Today's Youth*, 1(4), 21-23.
- Damon, W. (2010). The bridge to character. *Educational Leadership*, 67, 36-39.
- Darch, C. & Kame'enui, E. J. (2004). *Instructional classroom management: A proactive approach to behavior management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Drewery, W. and Winslade, J. (2003). Developing restorative practices in schools: Flavor of the month or savior of the system? Presented to AARE/NZARE Conference, December 2003. Auckland, New Zealand: Australian Association for Research in Education & New Zealand Association for Research in Education.

- Frey, N. & Fisher, D. (2008). The under-appreciated role of humiliation in middle school. *Middle School Journal*, 193(3), 4-12.
- Gossen, D. C. (2001). *Restitution: Restructuring school discipline*. Chapel Hill: New View Publications.
- Hendry, R. (2009). *Building and restoring respectful relationships in schools*. NY: Routledge.
- Holtham, J. (2009). *Taking restorative justice to schools: A doorway to discipline*. Breinigsville, PA: Del Hayes Press.
- Hopkins, B. (2004). *Just schools: A whole school approach to restorative justice*. NY: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Hopkins, B. (2006) What is restorative justice? Retrieved April 16, 2006 from <http://www.transformingconflict.com/aboutjustice.htm>
- Ierley, A. & Claassen-Wilson, D. (2003). Making things right: Restorative justice for school communities. In Jones & Compton (Ed.), *Kids Working It Out*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ickes, W. (1997). *Empathic accuracy*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kauffman, J. M., Mostert, M.P., Trent, S.C., & Pullen, P.L. (2006). *Managing classroom behavior: A reflective case-based approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kohn, A. (1996). *Beyond discipline: From compliance to community*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Kraybill, R. & Wright, E. (2006). *The little book of cool tools for hot topics*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.
- Krevans, J., & Gibbs, J. (1996). Parents' use of inductive discipline: Relations to children's empathy and prosocial behavior. *Child Development*, 67(6), 3263-3277.
- Mirsky, L. (2011, May 25). Restorative practices: Whole school change to build safer, saner school communities. Retrieved June 29, 2011 from <http://www.safersanerschools.org/featured-articles.html>
- Morrison, B. (2007). *Restoring safe school communities: A whole school response to bullying, violence and alienation*. Sydney: Federation Press.
- Morrison, B. (February, 2002). Bullying and victimisation in schools: A restorative justice approach, *Trends & Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 1-6.
- Mullet, J. H. (2008). *Restorative discipline: A bottom-up approach to restoration*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Nelson, J. (2006). *Positive discipline*. NY: Ballantine.

- Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- O'Connell, T., Wachtel, B., & Wachtel, T. (1999). *Conferencing handbook: The new Real Justice training manual*. Pipersville, PA: The Piper's Press.
- Palazzo, D., & Hosea, B. (2004). Restorative justice in schools: A review of history and current practices. *The Fourth R* (Winter). (www.acrnet.org/pdfs/fourthr-win04.pdf)
- Porter, A.J. (2007, April 27). *Restorative practices in schools: Research reveals power of restorative approach, part I*. Retrieved June 29, 2011 from <http://rjvictoria.org/?cat=8>
- Porter, A.J. (2007, April 27). *Restorative practices in schools: Research reveals power of restorative approach, part II. Restorative practices eForum*. Retrieved June 29, 2011 from <http://rjvictoria.org/?cat=8>
- Pranis, K. (2003). *Peacemaking circles: From crime to community*. St. Paul, MN: Living Justice Press.
- Redekop, P. (2008). *Changing paradigms: Punishment and restorative discipline*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.
- Reimer, K. (March 2011). An exploration of the implementation of restorative justice in an Ontario public school. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration & Policy*.
- Roberts, W., & Strayer, J. (1996). Empathy, emotional expressiveness, and prosocial behavior. *Child Development*, 67(2), 449-470.
- Savage, T. V. (1999). *Teaching self-control through management and discipline*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Schrock-Shenk, C. (Ed.) (2000). Beyond punishment - restorative discipline in schools, *Conciliation Quarterly*, 19(2), 1-16.
- Simpson, R., Kline, S.A., Barnhill, G., & Griswold, D. (2000). Focusing on mental health, not metal detectors: Three building blocks of safe and effective schools. *Reaching Today's Youth*, 4(2), 40-42.
- Stinchcomb, J., Bazemore, G., & Riestenberg, N. (2006). Beyond zero tolerance: Restoring justice in secondary schools. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 4(2), 123-147.
- Stutzman-Amstutz, L. & Mullet, J. H. (2005). *The little book of restorative discipline*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.
- Styles, D. (2001) *Class meetings: Building leadership, problem-solving and decision-making skills in the respectful classroom*. Ontario, Canada: Pembroke Publishers.

Sweedler, M. (Ed.). (2004, Winter). *The fourth R: The quarterly newsletter of the education section*. Washington, D.C.: Association for Conflict Resolution.

The Restorative Justice Consortium (2003). *Statement of restorative justice principles as applied in a school setting*. London: Merchant House. Retrieved June 29, 2011 from www.restorativejustice.org.uk

Vandering, D. D. (2010). Towards effective implementation and sustainability of restorative justice in Ontario public schools: A critical case study. *Dissertation Abstracts*, pp. 4566.

Wachtel, T. & Mirksy, L. (2008). *SaferSanerSchools: Restorative practices in education*. Bethlehem, PA: International Institute for Restorative Practices.

Walker, H.M., Colven, G. & Ramsey, E. (1995). *Antisocial behavior in school: Strategies and best practices*. Pacific Groves, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice*. Intercourse, PA: GoodBooks.

Selected sites:

Children Naturally Prone toward Empathy, Moral Reasoning:
http://news.uchicago.edu/news.php?asset_id=1403

Review of International Research Finds Links between Bullying and Suicide:
<http://opa.yale.edu/news/article.aspx?id=5913>
YouthTransformationCenter.org

Kidsareworthit.com

Cjibc.org

saferSanerSchools overview of two year process:
http://www.iirp.org/pdf/SaferSanerSchools-Program.pdf?utm_source=Restorative+Practices+eForum&utm_campaign=d81f064243-eForum_Whole_School_Change&utm_medium=email

IIRP 22 schools testimonials:

http://www.iirp.org/article_detail.php?article_id=Njks&utm_source=Restorative+Practices+eForum&utm_campaign=d81f064243-eForum_Whole_School_Change&utm_medium=email

Writing Standards –Graduate Level (Grid Version)

Criteria	A excellent	B minimal expectations	C below expectations	Comments
Content (quality of the information/ideas and sources/details used to support them)	- shows clarity of purpose - shows depth of content - applies insight and represents original thinking - demonstrates quality and breadth of resources	- shows clarity of purpose - shows substantial information and sufficient support - almost always represents original thinking - uses quality resources	- shows clarity of purpose - lacks depth of content and may depend on generalities or the commonplace - represents little original thinking - uses mostly quality resources	
Structure (logical order or sequence of the writing)	- is coherent and logically developed - uses very effective transitions	- is coherent and logically developed - uses smooth transitions	- is coherent and logically (but not fully) developed - uses some awkward transitions	
Style (appropriate attention to audience: effective word choice, sentence variety, voice; appropriate level of formality for academic writing vs. informal text messages and email)	- is concise, eloquent, and rhetorically effective - composes varied sentence structure	- displays concern for careful expression - composes some varied sentence structure	- displays some personality <u>but</u> lacks imagination and may be stilted - composes little varied sentence structure - frequently uses jargon and clichés	
Conventions (adherence to grammar rules: usage, mechanics)	- composes well-constructed sentences - makes virtually no errors in grammar and spelling - makes accurate word choices	- almost always composes well-constructed sentences - makes minimal errors in grammar and spelling - makes accurate word choices	- usually has well-constructed sentences - makes several errors - makes word choices that distract the reader	
Source Integrity (appropriate acknowledgment of sources used in research)	- cites sources for all quotations - composes credible paraphrases, cited correctly - includes reference page - makes virtually no errors in documentation style	- cites sources for all quotations - composes credible paraphrases, usually cited correctly - includes reference page - makes minimal errors in documentation style	- cites sources for all quotations - composes mostly credible paraphrases, sometimes cited correctly - includes reference page - makes several errors in documentation style	
The weighting of each of the five areas is dependent on the specific written assignment and the teacher's preference. Plagiarism occurs when a person presents as one's own "someone else's language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source" (adapted from Council of Writing Program Administrators).				Grade