



CEP 901

CEP 901 Proseminar in Educational Psychology /
Educational Technology

Preface to CEP 901 Syllabus

The following is provided to you as a sample syllabus for the course. Please note, instructors and dates are subject to change. Course contents, readings and assignments are likely to be updated and may vary. Please check with the current course catalogue <http://reg.msu.edu/> for details and contact the instructor of record should you have any questions. Additional information for this course can also be found at <http://mkoehler.educ.msu.edu/summer2012/>.

Spring 2012 Syllabus * CEP 901A

Proseminar in Educational Psychology & Educational Technology

Class Hours: Wednesdays, 12:40-3:30pm
Location: 218 Bessey Hall and Online

Instructor

Dr. Christine Greenhow
Assistant Professor
Department of Counseling, Educational Psychology and Special Education
College of Education, Michigan State University

Office Hours: By appointment, 513F Erickson Hall

E-mail: greenhow@msu.edu

Website: www.cgreenhow.org

Course website: <http://angel.msu.edu> Angel is MSU's primary course management system. Course materials and information will be there. Please check it frequently for updates.

Social media & emerging technologies: In addition to Angel, we will be using other technologies as needed to supplement or augment our face-to-face meetings or provide a backchannel for the course.

Course Overview

The Proseminar in Educational Psychology and Educational Technology is designed to introduce you to the scholarly disciplines of educational psychology and educational technology and support you in the process of becoming a researcher and scholar. Many doctoral programs have courses called proseminars that introduce students to academic and professional fields.

In the EPET doctoral program (and in most other doctoral programs in MSU's College of Education) the Proseminar serves as a required starting point for doctoral study. You will be exploring the relationship between educational psychology and technology, between learning and digital media, with an eye towards developing your knowledge of the field, including its historical context, interdisciplinary conversations, and current topics. Most importantly, you will be developing your own research interests and beginning to situate yourself in the field.

To this end, this proseminar is built around the following goals:

- Enriched, collaborative preparation. The proseminar offers doctoral students broad-based work with colleagues and peer support through the shared experiences of the seminar; support for the conceptualization of original research; and opportunities to present their work and ideas multiple times, both formally and informally.
- Introduction to the field. The proseminar introduces the central themes, concepts, and paradigms of research in educational psychology and educational technology, complementing and extending previous work.
- Development of scholarly literacy. The proseminar builds students' skills and abilities for participating in a community of scholars.
- Development of individual research interests. The focus of any doctoral program is to develop students' focus and abilities to conduct innovative research that makes a significant contribution to the field. This process begins in the fall proseminar and continues this semester.
- Creation of a professional network. Much of your learning will take place away from class in interactions with your fellow students and faculty members. Through active and ongoing participation in a community of active researchers, doctoral students prepare for and gain entry to careers that emphasize research in education.
- Connection to a broader research community. The proseminar will facilitate your participation in the community of education researchers and scholars at MSU and in the broader community.

REQUIRED TEXTS:

[American Psychological Association](#). (2009). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

You will need this publication and style manual throughout your research career. Buy your own copy! Because of APA's strict copyright rules, only some of the important information in it is available for free online.

READINGS:

We will be reading a variety of journal articles, books, and book chapters dealing with various aspects of research in educational psychology, learning, and technology. All readings will be available on the Angel website. You will be able to download copies to your own computer to read or print. Other readings may be assigned as appropriate during the term.

ASSIGNMENTS, PROJECTS & GRADING:

Your grade will be determined through your performance in: weekly class meetings, class interactions through the Angel course site, interactions with guest speakers, written responses to readings, article critique, your personal research portfolio, and the final literature review project. The breakdown for grading is as follows:

Participation	30%
• In-class	
• Online discussion	
• Leading 1 in-class discussion	
Written assignments	20%
• Written reading responses	
Personal Research Statement	20%
Final project: Literature review & Presentation	30%

Each component is expected to reflect high professional standards, and both substantive and technical quality will be considered in determining your grade. Thoroughness, accuracy, salience, and effective organization are required; correct English grammar, spelling, punctuation, and usage are expected.

Additional information and guidelines for each assignment will be posted on Angel and discussed in class.

SUBMISSION OF ASSIGNMENTS: All assignments should be submitted to the Drop Box on the Angel site by 12:40pm on the day they are due. No late assignments accepted.

PARTICIPATION: Participation in class discussions, both in-class and online, will be a significant part of your grade, approximately 30%.

Preparing for class

Students will be expected to read several conceptual or empirical journal articles or book chapters per class. Your participation grade for that week will be based on how well you are able to participate in evidence-based discussions and class activities. Preparation for class discussion includes such things as:

- reading for understanding
- being able to summarize the key points
- coming to class with questions, insights, related-experiences or resources to share
- being able to substantiate your assertions or disagreements with evidence from the readings, your experiences, or relevant resources,
- having the necessary materials with you or accessible to be an engaged participant.

In addition to these readings and participation in class discussion, you may be asked to respond to a discussion question on the Angel course site. These will be short (approximately 200-250 words) reaction papers about the readings.

These written responses should be thoughtful and show evidence that you have reflected upon the questions asked and the readings. Assertions should be supported with evidence and/or examples. Merely citing parts of the readings

without commentary, summarizing the reading, or inserting large sections of the text to fill space would not be good!

Leading class discussion

You will work with a partner to lead one class discussion over the course of the semester. Your task will be to draw out key themes from the day's readings and to develop discussion questions that engage the class in the central relationship between educational psychology and educational technology. This will involve two tasks:

Presenting how your own set of research questions are connected to, challenged by, informed by or contradictory to, the day's topic. This means that you will likely want to choose an interesting angle from which to lead the discussion that illustrates the lessons you take from the topic.

Working with the instructor to design the flow of the day's class, including discussion of the readings and activities.

Online classes

Classes conducted online will be conducted asynchronously, unless notified otherwise. We know that students learn differently with some being advantaged in a real-time, face-to-face, dynamic discussion environment. Other students are advantaged in online, asynchronous discussion environments where they can think before they write, visibly (rather than orally) engage with the readings and evolving ideas of their classmates, and pull in a multitude of information-rich, online resources to substantiate their perspectives.

- We will seek to engage in collaborative knowledge building online. To this end, we will practice and evolve the Online Discussion Guidelines available in the course Web site.
- In addition, please set up a Twitter account (<http://www.twitter.com>) and practice micro-blogging throughout the course. These "tweets" will serve as a back-channel for our course, which unlike the Angel course site, is not a formal, walled off community but a conduit to informal, spontaneous, abbreviated sharing, social network-building and operates within the larger social, multimedia universe in which we live.

Social Media and Technology Trends

You are invited to submit entries in this section of the course website and come to class with your trend to be featured and incorporated into our class as time permits. These are online resources that are interesting, relevant, provocative, etc. and can be projected in class (i.e., news stories, specialized Web sites, YouTube videos, online tools, new social media, etc.

Attendance at in-class sessions and participation online is required and part of the participation grade.
College of Education Mission Statement

The College of Education at Michigan State University is a top-ranked, award-winning graduate school of education that has a [mission](#) of Leadership, Scholarship and Service. We prepare professionals for leadership roles in education. We seek to understand, reform and improve education. We examine issues of education across the lifespan.

Course Schedule (subject to modifications)

Depending on how the course proceeds and building on your areas of interest, this schedule is subject to change. Please note that articles will be added as needed, and some may be dropped (so check with the instructor before reading too far ahead). Timing of topic coverage and reading assignments beyond the second week will depend on how each topic is proceeding and will be announced well in advance.

Week	Date	Event(s)/Topic(s)	Readings & Assignments
1	Jan 11	Introduction to the course Getting to know each other	Informational essays – in class
2	Jan 18	ONLINE Learning theories and technology	Week's readings Reading responses posted in online discussion due by Monday 1/16 Categorized response to peers due by Wednesday 1/18
3	Jan 25	Learning theories and technology Educational technology policy Survey: Internet & social media use Making the most of the Ph.D. Guest speaker : Ralph Putnam, introduction to the PhD program	Week's readings
4	Feb 1	The Internet and education	Week's readings Reading responses posted in online discussion due by Monday 1/30
5	Feb 8	ONLINE Introduction to purposes and structures of literature reviews Read and discuss example of existing literature reviews Practice critiquing an article	Week's readings Reading responses posted in online discussion due by Monday 2/6 Categorized response to peers due by Wednesday 2/8
6	Feb 15	Games, simulations and learning Discuss the research statement (Due 2/29) Read and critique articles relevant to your review Guest speaker: Kate Corby, Library Services	Week's readings Article Critique #1 Due
7	Feb 22	Assistive technologies & special education Read and critique articles relevant to your review Guest speakers: Sara Jones, Alumni Office & Laura Jimenez, advanced EPET doctoral student	Week's readings Post draft of research statement posted in online discussion due by Monday 2/20

8	Feb 29	<p>Technology in and out of schools Read and critique articles relevant to your review</p> <p>Literature Review Assignment</p> <p>Article Critique #2</p>	<p>Week's readings</p> <p>Research statement due by 2/29 at 12:40pm</p>
9	March 7	SPRING BREAK	<p>Work on Article Critique #2</p> <p>Work on Literature Review</p>
10	March 14	<p>Technology, literacy & New Literacies</p> <p>Read and critique articles relevant to your review</p> <p>Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) Training Requirements</p> <p>Guest speaker: Michelle Hagerman, Student Research Group and advanced doctoral student</p>	<p>Week's readings</p> <p>Article Critique #2 Due</p>
11	March 21	<p>Technology & subject matter learning</p> <p>Read and critique articles relevant to your review</p> <p>Guest speaker: Tonya Jamison, Office of Human Research Subjects and Institutional Review Board</p>	<p>Week's readings</p> <p>Record RCR Training</p>
12	March 28	<p>Online learning, distance education, virtual schools</p> <p>Read and critique articles relevant to your review</p> <p>Guest speaker: Matt Helm , Doctoral Advising & Career Services</p>	<p>Week's readings</p> <p>Outline and partial draft of literature review due by 3/28 at 12:40pm</p>
13	April 4	<p>Social media and learning</p> <p>Read and critique articles relevant to your review</p>	Week's readings
14	April 11	No class (AERA)	*Work on Final paper and presentation*

15	April 18	Hot topics, research challenges, and new methods for research	Week's readings Complete draft of literature review due by 4/18 at 12:40pm
16	April 25	FINAL paper submission and presentations	Final version of literature review due by 4/15 at 12:40pm Class presentation of your review findings and research directions

Reading List (all will available through course web site or via direct web link to MSU lib databases)
CEP901B: Weekly Reading List

Week 2: Learning theories and technology

Salomon, G., & Almog, T. (1998). Educational Psychology and Technology: A Matter of Reciprocal Relations. *Teachers College Record* Volume 100 Number 2, 1998, p. 222-241 <http://www.tcrecord.org> ID Number: 10310, Date Accessed: 1/4/2006 2:26:01 PM

Nickerson, R. S. (2005). Technology amplification. In R. J. Sternberg, & D. D. Preiss (Eds). *Intelligence and technology: The impact of tools on the nature and development of human abilities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. P. 3- 28.

Mishra, P., Spiro, R. J. & Feltovich, P. (1996). Technology, representation & cognition. In von Oostendorp, H. (Ed.) *Cognitive aspects of electronic text processing*. Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Salomon, G., & Perkins, D. (2005). Do technologies make us smarter? Intellectual amplification with, of and through technology. In R. J. Sternberg, & D. D. Preiss (Eds). *Intelligence and technology: The impact of tools on the nature and development of human abilities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. P. 71 – 86.

Optional

Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt (1996). Looking at technology in context: A framework for understanding technology and education research. In D.C Berliner & R.C. Calfee (Eds), *Handbook of Educational Psychology* (pp. 807-840). New York: Simon and Schuster Macmillan.

Greeno, J. G., Collins, A. M., & Resnick, L. (1996). Cognition and learning. In D. Berliner and R. Calfee (Eds.) *Handbook of Educational Psychology*, (pp. 15–46). New York: MacMillan.

Week 3: Learning theories and political context for technology in education

Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32-42.

National Research Council (2000). *How People Learn*. Washington DC: National Academy Press. (Selected excerpts).

Barron, B. (2006). Interest and self-sustained learning as catalysts of development: A learning ecologies perspective. *Human Development*, 49, 193-224.

Culp, K.M., Honey, M., & Mandinach, E. (2005). A retrospective on twenty years of educational technology policy. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 32(3), 279-307.

Optional

Brown, A. L. (1992). Design experiments: Theoretical and methodological challenges in creating complex interventions in classroom settings. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 2(2), 141-178

Carr-Chellman, A. & Hoadley, C. (Eds.) *Learning sciences and instructional systems: Beginning the dialogue* [Special issue]. (2004). *Educational Technology*, 44(3).

Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher*, 27(2), 4-13.

Stahl, G., Koschmann, T., Suthers, D. (2006). Computer-supported collaborative learning: An historical perspective. In K. Sawyer (ed.) *Handbook of the Learning Sciences* (pp. 79–96), Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

U.S. DOE (2010, March 5) *Transforming American Education: Learning Powered by Technology*. National Educational Technology Plan 2010.

<http://www.ed.gov/sites/default/files/NETP-2010-final-report.pdf>

Government web site: <http://www.ed.gov/technology/netp-2010>

Week 4: The Internet in education: From hypertext to new media and more

Shapiro, A., & Niederhauser, D. (2004). Learning from hypertext: Research issues and findings. Jonassen (Ed), Handbook of Research for Educational Communications and Technology. New York: Macmillan. 605-620.

Warschauer, M. & Matuchiank, T. (in press). New technology and digital worlds: Analyzing evidence of equity in access, use, and outcomes. Review of Research in Education.

Greenhow, C., Robelia, E., & Hughes, J. (2009). [Web 2.0 and classroom research: What path should we take now?](#) Educational Researcher, 38 (4), 246-259.

Kuiper, E., et al. (2005). The Web as an information resource in K-12 education: Strategies for supporting students in searching and processing information. Review of Educational Research, 75, 285-328.

Week 5: Introduction to literature reviews

Boote, D.N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. Educational Researcher, 34(6), 3015.

Freeman, M., deMarrais, K., Preissle, J., Roulston, K., & St. Pierre, E.A. (2007). Standards of evidence in qualitative research: An incitement to discourse. Educational Researcher, 36(25), 25-32.

Wallace, R. (2003). Online learning in higher education: A review of research on interactions among teachers and students. Education Communication and Information, 3, 241-280. doi: 10.1080/1463631032000092046

Article Critique #1: Wallace, R.M. (2004). A framework for understanding teaching with the internet. American Educational Research Journal, 41(2), 447-488.

Week 6: Games and simulations for learning

Mitchell, A., & Savill-Smith, C. (2004) The use of computer and video games for learning: A review of the literature. London: Learning and Skills Development Agency.

Optional:

Gee, J. P. (2007). What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy. New York: Macmillan.

Salen, K. (2007). The ecology of games and youth. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Squire, K.D. (2006). From content to context: Video games as designed experiences. Educational Researcher, 35(8), 19-29.

Week 7: Assistive technologies and universal design

Edyburn, D.L. (2006). Assistive technology and mild disabilities. Special Education Technology Practice, 8(4), 18-28.

Bottge, B. A., Heinrichs, M., Chan, S., Mehta, Z. D., & Watson, E. (2003). Effects of video-based and applied problems on the procedural math skills of average- and low-achieving adolescents. Journal of Special Education Technology, 18(2), 5-22

Universal Design for Learning: Principles, Research and Technology

<http://www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl>

<http://www.udlcenter.org/research/researchevidence>

Optional:

Rose, D., Hasselbring, T. S., Stahl, S., & Zabala, J. (2005). Assistive technology and universal design for learning: Two sides of the same coin. In D. Edyburn, K. Higgins, & R. Boone (Eds.), Handbook of special education technology research and practice (pp. 507-518).

Edyburn, D.L. (2005). Assistive technology and students with mild disabilities: From consideration to out-

come measurement. In D.L. Edyburn, K. Higgins, & R. Boone (Eds.). (2005). Handbook of special education technology research and practice (pp. 239-270). Whitefish Bay, WI: Knowledge by Design.

Week 8: Technology in and out of schools

Cilesiz, S. (2009). Educational computer use in leisure contexts: A Phenomenological study of adolescents' experiences at Internet Cafés. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46 (1), 232-274.

**Focus on pages 232-239

Ito, M., Horst, H., Bittanti, M., boyd, d., Herr-Stephenson, B., Lange, P. G., et al. (2008). Living and learning with new media: Summary of findings from the Digital Youth Project. White paper, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Reports on Digital Media and Learning.

<http://digitalyouth.ischool.berkeley.edu/files/report/digitalyouth-WhitePaper.pdf/>

Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A new framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1017-1054.

Yong, Z., & Frank, K.A. (2003). Factors affecting technology uses in schools: An ecological perspective. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40 (4), 807-840.

Week 10: Technology, literacy and New Literacies

Coiro, J., Knobel, M., Lankshear, C., & Leu, D. (2008). Central issues in new literacies and new literacies research. In J. Coiro, M. Knobel, C. Lankshear, & D. Leu (Eds.), *Handbook of research on new literacies* (pp. 1–21). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Handbook of Research on New Literacies [Table of Contents]

http://www.newliteracies.uconn.edu/pub_files/handbook_of_research_on_new_literacies.pdf

Mills, K. A. (2010). A review of the "digital turn" in the new literacy studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 80 (2), 246–271

Greenhow, C. & Robelia, E. (2009). [Old communication, new literacies: Social network sites as social learning resources](#). *Journal of Computer-mediated Communication*, 14(4). 1130-1161.

Article Critique #2: Lai, C.H., Yang, J.C., Chen, F.C., Ho, C.W., & Chan, T.W. (2007). Affordances of mobile technologies for experiential learning: The interplay of technology and pedagogical practices. *Journal of Computer-assisted Learning*, 23, 326-337.

Optional

Snow, C. E., & Moje, E. B. (2010). What is adolescent literacy? Why is everyone talking about it now? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91(6), 66-69.

Moje, E. B., & Luke, A. (2009). Literacy and identity: Examining the metaphors in history and contemporary research. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 44(4), 415-437.

Moje, E. B., Ciechanowski, K., Kramer, K., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(1), 38-71.

*Selections from the Handbook of Research on New Literacies

Week 11: Technology & subject matter learning

Adamy, P., Bell, L., Schrum, L., Milman, N.B., & Thompson, A.D. (2010). Framing research on technology and learning in the content areas

Review Introduction: Why research in this area is difficult to locate – [Table of Contents](#) –

Roschelle, J., Schechtman, N., Tatar, D., Hegedus, S., Hopkins, B., Empson, S., Knudsen, J., & Gallagher, L. (2010). Integration of Technology, Curriculum, and Professional Development for Advancing Middle School

Mathematics: Three Large-Scale Studies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47(4), 833-878.

Williams, M., Linn, M. C., Ammon, P., & Gearhart, M. (2004). Learning to teach inquiry science in a technology based environment: A case study. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 13(2), 189 – 206.

Zhao, Y. (2003). Recent developments in technology and language learning: A literature review and meta-analysis. *CALICO Journal*, 21(10), 7–27. Retrieved from https://www.calico.org/html/article_279.pdf

Optional

Tamin, R.M., Bernard, R.M., Borokhovski, E., Abrami, P.C., Schmidt, R. (2011). What forty years of research says about the impact of technology on learning: A second-order meta-analysis and validation study. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(1), 4-28.

Krajcik, J., Blumenfeld, P.C., Marx, R.W., Bass, K.M., Fredrick, J., & Soloway, E. (1998). Inquiry in project-based science classrooms: Initial attempts by middle school students. *Journal of Learning Sciences*, 7(3&4), 313-350.

Week 12: Online learning, distance education and virtual schools

Barbour, M.K., & Reeves, T.C. (2009) The reality of virtual schools: A review of the literature. *Computers and Education* 52(2), 402-416.

Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones., K. (2010) Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A meta-analysis and review of online learning studies. U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved February 27, 2012 from <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/evidence-based-practices/finalreport.pdf>

Tallent-Runnels, M.K., Thomas, J.A., Lan, W.Y., Cooper, S., Ahern, T.C., Shaw, S.M., & Liu, X. (2006). Teaching courses online: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*. 76(1), 93-135.

Optional

Zhao, Y., Lei, J., Yan, B., Lai, L., Tan, H. S. (2005). What makes the difference? A Practical analysis of research on the effectiveness of distance education. *Teachers College Record*, 107(8), 1836–1884.

Jonassen, D.H., & Kwon, H.I. (2001). Communication patterns in computer-mediated vs. face-to-face group problem solving. *Educational Technology Research & Development*, 49(1), 35-51.

Porter, E. (2004). A typology of virtual communities: A multi-disciplinary foundation for future Research. *Journal of Computer-mediated Communication*, 10(1). Retrieved February 26, 2012 from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol10/issue1/porter.html>

Cassell, J., and Tversky, D. (2005). The language of online intercultural community formation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 10(2). Retrieved February 26, 2012 from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol10/issue2/cassell.html>

Haythornthwaite, C., Kazmer, M. M., Robins, J., Shoemaker, S. (2000). Community development among distance learners: Temporal and technological dimensions. *Journal of Computer-mediated Communication*, 6(1). Retrieved February 26, 2012 from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol6/issue1/haythornthwaite.html>

Week 13: Social media and learning

boyd, d. m., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), article 11. <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol13/issue1/boyd.ellison.html>

Greenhow, C. (2011). Youth, learning and social media. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*,

45(2),139-146. [Defines social media and presents emerging areas of inquiry].

Greenhow, C. & Burton, L.(2011). Help from my “Friends:” Social capital in the social network sites of low-income high school students. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 45(2), 223-245.

Junco, R., Heiberger, G., & Loken, E. (2011). The effect of Twitter on college student engagement and grades. *Journal of Computer-assisted Learning*, 27, 19-132.

Optional:

Robelia, B., Greenhow, C. & Burton, L. (2011): Environmental learning in online social networks: adopting environmentally responsible behaviors, *Environmental Education Research*, 17(4), 553-575

Greenhow, C. & Li, J. (2012). Like, comment, share: Collaboration and civic engagement in social network sites. In Mouza, C. & Lavigne, N. (Eds.). *Emerging Technologies for the Classroom: A Learning Sciences Perspective*. Springer.

Greenhow, C. & Robelia, E. (2009). [Informal learning and identity formation in online social networks](#). *Learning, Media and Technology*, 34(2), 119-140.

Week 15: Hot topics, research challenges, and new methods

Barab, S., & Squire, K. (2004). Design-based research: Putting a stake in the ground. *Journal of Learning Sciences*, 13(1), 1-14

Academic Integrity and Plagiarism

The University's policy concerning academic integrity is covered in the Spartan Life booklet, General Student Regulations. According to the handbook, "...no student shall claim or submit the work of another as one's own. For more information about this and other scholarship issues, please consult the Spartan Life handbook: <http://www.vps.msu.edu/SpLife/>

The principles of truth and honesty are fundamental to the educational process and the academic integrity of the University; therefore, no student shall:

- 1.01 claim or submit the academic work of another as one's own.
- 1.02 procure, provide, accept or use any materials containing questions or answers to any examination or assignment without proper authorization.
- 1.03 complete or attempt to complete any assignment or examination for another individual without proper authorization.
- 1.04 allow any examination or assignment to be completed for oneself, in part or in total, by another without proper authorization.
- 1.05 alter, tamper with, appropriate, destroy or otherwise interfere with the research, resources, or other academic work of another person.
- 1.06 fabricate or falsify data or results.

Additional resources and information about what constitutes plagiarism may be found at <http://www.msu.edu/unit/ombud/plagiarism.html>

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

The University is legally obligated to provide appropriate accommodations for students with documented disabilities. Students with disabilities should contact the Resource Center for Persons with Disabilities to establish reasonable accommodations. For an appointment with a counselor, they should call 353-9642 (voice) or 355-1293 (TTY). Please notify the instructor at the beginning of the semester of any documented disabilities so reasonable accommodations can be made to assist learning and evaluation in the class.

Guidelines for Turning in Assignments

- (1) Save the file as a Word Document
 - (2) Combine all aspects of the assignment into a single file (Word doc) wherever possible.
 - (3) Label the file with yourlastname__assignmentname
 - (4) Single space the assignment
 - (5) Insert page #'s in the upper right corner
 - (6) Keep margins at 1 inch
 - (7) Make your writing easy to read. For instance, set off headings in bold or underlined as appropriate.
- Think of yourself as the reader/grader.