ABSTRACT

HOLDING-JORDAN, KAREN LOUISE. Perceptions of Effective Teaching Practices in Early College High Schools: A Juxtaposition of the Perceptions of Students and Their College Instructors. (Under the direction of Dr. Lisa Bass).

Early College High Schools (ECHS) are cooperative and innovative high schools in which students are concurrently enrolled in high school courses and college courses. ECHS students are simultaneously exposed to different levels and styles of teaching, including secondary education pedagogy and higher education teaching. This research examines ECHS students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of college instructors’ teaching practices, as well as college instructors’ perceptions of their students’ experiences of effective teaching practices. The researcher seeks to inform the discipline of teaching practices of college instructors whose students are also in high school, by determining differences, if any, between college instructors’ and ECHS students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices. This study has the potential to enhance the creation of optimal learning environments in college classes for ECHS students to achieve academic success in college-level courses.

This quantitative research study focused on three Early College High Schools in a southeastern state. The participants were students and college instructors: juniors and seniors in a college-level English, science, technology, engineering or mathematics course, as well as the instructors of these courses. Quantitative data were collected using two instruments, the Tripod Standard Survey of Effective Teaching Practices for Secondary Education Students and the Instructor Survey. The Tripod Survey provides the conceptual framework for this study, which classifies effective teaching practices according to seven categories or constructs (the “7 Cs”): care, control, challenge, confer, clarify, captivate, and consolidate. Data were analyzed in terms of descriptive statistics (means, modes, medians, rankings, and
standard deviations), as well as analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing, specifically f-tests, to determine differences in variances of ECHS students’ and college instructors’ distribution of scores of the seven constructs of effective teaching practices. Finally, t-tests were conducted to determine statistical differences in means scores for the populations under study. The results of the study reveal students’ and instructors’ perceptions of effective teaching practices differ in six categories: care, challenge, confer, clarify, captivate and consolidate. However, students’ and instructors’ perceptions of classroom control were viewed similarly, to the extent, their mean scores were statistically the same. The implications of the results suggest an overall incongruence in what instructors believe students are experiencing, and what students say they are experiencing in their classes. More importantly, and specific to teaching implications, the awareness of students’ needs, based on their perceptions, can assist instructors in adjusting their teaching approach, which may enhance students’ opportunities for academic success. And, more broadly, the implementation of instructor training or professional development to aid college instructors in how to meet the challenges of teaching secondary education students.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

America cannot lead in the 21st century unless we have the best-educated, most competitive workforce in the world.

—President Barack Obama, “Remarks on Higher Education” (2009)

As the world’s economies become more globally interdependent, and as workforces trend toward increasing competitiveness and technological orientation, the U.S. educational system faces the imperative of improving the productive capacity of our nation by increasing the number of well-prepared minority students (Ferguson, 2003; Labaree, 1997; Phillips, 1991). The national imperative to improve the educational experiences and outcomes of underrepresented students has placed a responsibility on K-12 public school systems to collaborate with community colleges and university systems. One type of collaborative initiative, at the state level, is the establishment of Early College High Schools (ECHSs) through Comprehensive Articulation Agreements (CAA). These collaborative agreements define policies and guidelines that inform how high school students can be admitted and integrated into college-level classes. Admitting high school students into ECHSs can help ensure that students who are economically and academically at-risk, or underrepresented have access to higher education. Specifically, ECHS programs enable students to attain, by the time the student would be graduating with a high school diploma, an associate’s degree or up to two years of college credits that are transferrable to a constituent four-year institution. The ECHS essentially accelerates the acquisition of a baccalaureate degree, which represents the “gateway to the professions” and increases the capacity of human capital and the potential for social mobility (Bender, 1991, p. 70; Murnane, 2005).
The origins of early college high schools can be traced to concurrent-enrollment programs launched in Texas in the 1990s. Though these programs were not official ECHSs, they had the same overarching goal as the ECHSs that would be established a decade later: to enable high school students to enroll in college courses concurrently. The following decade, in 2002, the Early College High School Initiative was launched by the Gates Foundation, to expedite the national emergence of cooperative and innovative high schools, this was a secondary school reform measure designed to enhance the higher educational opportunities and attainment of minority and underrepresented students, including disadvantaged, low-income, first-generation college attendees (nebhe.org). The initiative provided highly rigorous coursework, project-based learning experiences, a seamless alignment of college curriculum, and smaller classes (jff.org, 2016; earlycolleges.org, 2016). The ultimate goal of developing a “college-going culture” is encapsulated in the physical locality of ECHSs, which are located on or near the premises of community colleges, colleges or university campuses, reinforcing the “power of site” (Berger, Adelman & Cole, 2010). The Early College High School Initiative (ECHSI) that was established in the southeastern state where this research was conducted, known as the Learn and Earn Early College High School Initiative (LEECHS), was developed in 2003. The LEECHS program design principles are aligned with the national ECHSI, yet refined, to emphasize the shared beliefs in a common set of standards that promote “powerful teaching and learning” (ncnewschools.org).

The national ECHS Initiative in 2002 was a joint venture, with several primary funding sources, including the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Ford Foundation, and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (Brotherton, 2003).
According to Hendrie (2005), the Gates Foundation committed $806 million to the initiative in an effort to improve graduation rates and college attendance rates among poor, minority, and first-generation college students. The Gates Foundation and other financial partners ceased funding in 2009, as the initiative was never intended for perpetuity (Zehr, 2011). Rather, the expectation was that the ECHSs would evolve to become self-sustaining. Today, nearly a decade after the cessation of external funding to ECHSs, the United States has 280 ECHSs. Direct impacts of the program include increased college success and retention, increased graduation rates, and positive economic impact on participating states due to business and industry workforce partnerships (American Institute for Research & Stanford Research Institute, 2009; Berger, et al., 2010; Edmunds, et al., 2012). For the ECHS student, success in college coursework can translate to improved retention and completion rates, which in turn may result in the acquisition of higher education attainment and workforce readiness. Student success also ensures the sustained financial viability of early college high schools.

At the very core of the ECHS initiative, success is greatly determined by the way in which students transition from the high school curriculum and culture to the community college or college/university curriculum and culture (Berger et. al., 2010). Such a transition can pose unique challenges, to include students’ preparedness for the rigors of college level course work, instructional approach, levels of academic support, as well as the expectation of maturity and self-directedness. Amidst such challenges, teachers can play an important role in guiding and supporting students through the transition. For this reason, the dispositions and teaching practices of college instructors who teach early college high school students are
central to those students’ success. As Watson (1996) noted, “Educators in high schools and in higher education institutions face the challenges of creating optimal learning environments for students in Early College High Schools” (p. 53). Given the importance of instructors to ECHS students’ acclimation to the college classroom, it is noteworthy that the college-level instructors of ECHS courses often assume the charge of teaching these high school students without having received formal training or professional development to do so. College instructors are not required to have high school certification to teach concurrently enrolled students, nor are they subject to the rigorous teacher requirements that apply to K-12 teachers. In addition, college instructors are not held to the same standard of demonstrating content knowledge in each core content area in which they teach. Further, they do not have any waivers of full state certification requirements in the state in which they teach, as mandated by the federal legislation of the No Child Left Behind Act, now known as Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which governs Local Education Agencies (LEAs) for secondary education teachers (American Institute for Research & Stanford Research Institute, 2009; ed.gov, 2015).

While the ECHS design was intended to embody the seamless alignment of high school and college curricula, the teaching philosophies and practices of secondary teachers as compared to college instructors is not at all pedagogically seamless. In fact, the two sets of philosophy and practice differ significantly. To substantiate this point, the American Institute for Research and the Stanford Research Institute (2009) cited the following remark from a college dean:
We haven’t done any [professional development for college instructors] to teach high school. And I don’t want to do it. They don’t teach high school classes. They teach college classes with five high school kids in it with a bunch of college kids. So why would you teach the class differently? . . . Philosophically, it’s a bad idea because the whole goal is to have the kids be successful in college... What we do instead is we focus on teaching the high school kids to be college kids. (AIR & SRI, 2009, p. 67)

This quotation, which reflects the sentiments of some college instructors and administrators, attests to the lack of inter-institutional collaboration of professional staff development that is necessary to establishing shared effective teaching practices across institutions. Yet, research suggests that effective teaching practices influence student engagement, motivation, and academic success, thus precipitating the researcher’s desire to study ECHS students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices of college instructors.

The purpose of this study is two-fold: first, to investigate and identify factors associated with ECHS students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of college instructors’ teaching practices, and second, to investigate instructors’ perceptions of students’ experiences of their effective teaching practices. In the present dissertation study, the framework for effective teaching is provided by the dispositions identified in the Tripod Standard Survey for Effective Teaching. These tenets are delineated in the purpose statement below and discussed throughout the dissertation.

**Problem Statement**

The dispositions and teaching practices of college instructors are central to ECHS students’ academic success in college-level courses. However, research on how high school
and college instructors engage with students have found variations in these instructors’ “instructional approach and the levels of support they provided students” (American Institute of Research [AIR], 2013, p. 53; Alaie, 2011; AIR & SRI, 2009; Post, 2011; Kugel, 1993).

According to Duffy, Cassidy, Keating, and Berger (2009), the most salient difference between college instructors and high school teachers is that college instructors expect students to be self-directed and take responsibility for their own learning. However, there is no research to indicate whether this hands-off approach is the most appropriate or suitable for early-college high school students. The question matters, particularly for the most at-risk and underrepresented demographic of ECHS students, because the effectiveness of college instructors can have dramatic implications for higher educational attainment. This research study focuses on Early College High School students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of their college instructors’ teaching practices, as well as college instructors’ perceptions of ECHS students’ experiences of their effective teaching practices. The ultimate goal of the study is to determine what differences may exist between students’ and instructors’ perceptions of effective teaching practices.

Statement of Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to investigate and identify factors associated with Early College High School (ECHS) students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of college instructors’ teaching practices and to compare students’ and instructors’ perceptions of effective teaching practices. College instructors’ perceptions of students’ experiences of effective teaching practices are also examined and compared to ECHS students’ perceptions to provide insight as to whether teachers and students have similar views of effective
teaching practices. As a conceptual framework, this study draws on the conception of teaching effectiveness in the Tripod Survey of Effective Teaching Practices. In this survey, effective teaching practices are classified by seven constructs, referred to as the 7 Cs. These are as follows:

1) Care— instructors demonstrate interest in, and emotional support toward, students;
2) Control— instructors engage in effective classroom management, managing the classroom by establishing respect, cooperation, and concentration;
3) Clarify— instructors provide clear instructions and feedback to enhance students’ understanding of difficult concepts and their relevance to real life;
4) Captivate— instructors make students interested and motivated to learn;
5) Confer— instructors actively engage in discourse with students and respect their ideas and perspectives;
6) Challenge— instructors establish high academic expectations that press students’ effort, perseverance and rigor; and
7) Consolidate— instructors organize and summarize the information in their instruction, and integrate concepts by highlighting their interconnections (Tripod Education Partners, 2015).

Each of these seven constructs is discussed in greater detail in chapter two.

This quantitative study addresses a gap in the literature on teaching practices of college instructors who teach secondary education students despite receiving little or no training to do so. This study is timely, as it addresses this critical issue at a time when the trend toward early college high schools is part of a larger paradigm shift in U.S. K-12 public
education. More secondary education students are being concurrently enrolled in high school and college courses, a trend that has been motivated by the objective of preparing students for the workforce or continued postsecondary education. To address the purpose of this study, three research questions are investigated:

1) What are Early College High School (ECHS) students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices of college instructors?
2) What are college instructors’ perceptions of students’ experiences of effective teaching practices?
3) How do the perceptions of ECHS students and their college instructors compare?

Through the analysis of these three questions, this study addresses a gap in the literature on effective practices for teaching ECHS students. The findings are expected to assist college instructors in implementing the teaching practices that students have deemed to be of greatest benefit to them in supporting their academic achievement and higher education attainment.

**Significance of the Study**

An abundance of research has been completed on Early College High Schools; however, a gap in the literature exists regarding ECHS students’ perceptions of their college instructors’ effective teaching practices. The gap is especially pronounced in research that compares both students’ and their instructors’ perspectives of effective teaching. The significance of this study is that it will determine and uncover differences, if any, between students’ and instructors’ perceptions with respect to effective teaching practices. The study takes into account students’ perceptions because they, as the ones experiencing these
practices and being affected by them, are the most qualified to discuss their own perspectives on effective teaching. A further significance of this study is that college instructors in Early College High Schools are given little to no formal training or professional development to aid in their proficiency in teaching high school students. Therefore, this study has the potential to inform the discipline of effective teaching for Early College High School students. The researcher seeks to gain insight into what constitutes optimal learning environments for Early College High School students so that their academic success in college-level courses might be maximized (Green, 2005; Fine & Cienkus, 1997; Darling-Hammond & Young, 2002).

**Overview of Research Methodology**

The data collection method for this research centers on two surveys on perception: The Tripod Standard Student Perception Survey for Secondary Students and the Instructor Perception Survey. The former survey, used on students, was designed and validated by the Tripod Project for assessing effective teaching practices. The latter survey is a modified version of the former, adapted for use with instructors. For this study, the student survey was administered electronically to juniors and seniors at three Early College High Schools, enrolled in college-level courses in 5 curriculum areas: English, math, science, engineering and technology. The instructor survey was also administered electronically to college instructors whose students were participants in this study. In this way, the researcher could evaluate how instructors perceive students’ experiences of the effectiveness of their teaching practices. For the researcher to compare students’ and instructors’ perceptions of effective teaching practices, data analysis of question 3, began with f-tests to test differences in variances of students’ and instructors’ scores on the 7Cs. Then, two-sample t-testing was
performed on the 7Cs, the results of which, tested the following hypothesis: College instructors’ perceptions of students’ experiences of effective teaching practices will be statistically different from students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices. In addition to survey data, the researcher also examined extant data relevant to academic achievement, as well as course syllabi and student handbooks, to determine teaching practices and student expectations. The research methodology employed for this research relies on the postpositivist research paradigm, in that the intent is to represent the perspective of reality as it is known by the participants, and the “empirical data”, and not the researcher’s “impressions, drive the findings” (Hatch, 2002, p. 14).

Limitations and Delimitations

The limitations and delimitations of this study are related to sample selection, sample size, and study location. The researcher’s process for sample selection was based on convenience and accessibility, in recognition of the need to represent “the population of interest” (Harris, 1998, p. 258). The sample for the study consisted of 168 student participants and 10 college instructor participants. Due to the size of the sample and the fact that it was not randomly chosen from the entire population of interest, findings from the data analyses were not generalizable to the entire population, which encompasses 80,000 ECHS students across 31 states (jff.org, 2016). The sample also posed a geographical delimitation because study participants are all from the same southeastern state and school district. Finally, due to the strictly quantitative nature of this study, the researcher did not have the opportunity to probe more deeply into the meaning or understanding of participants’ responses to survey questions.
Definitions of Terms

_Early College High School (ECHS):_ A cooperative and innovative secondary school design, in collaboration with a community college or university, in which high school students earn college credit in addition to high school credit by being concurrently enrolled in both high school and college courses; the program culminates in a high school diploma and an Associate’s degree, or up to two years of college credit toward a Bachelor’s degree (earlycolleges.org, 2016).

_ECHS Design Principles:_ Six principles that underlie the work of early college high schools in order to ensure students are prepared for postsecondary education and careers: (1) belief in a common set of high standards and expectations that ensures every student graduates ready for college; schools maintain a common set of standards for all in order to eliminate the harmful consequences of tracking and sorting students; (2) upholding of common standards for high-quality, rigorous instruction that promotes powerful teaching and learning; (3) personalization, meaning educators must know students well to help them achieve academically; (4) redefined professionalism, creating a shared vision so that all school staff take responsibility for the success of every student; (5) purposeful design, so that the use of time, space and resources ensures that best practices become common practice; and (6) empowerment of shared leadership, embedded in a culture of high expectations and a collaborative work environment, to ensure the success of each student (jff.org, 2016; ncnewschools.org, April 27, 2014).

_Engagement:_ Student engagement in the classroom setting; viewed as a behavioral and educational outcome and defined as “active, goal-directed, flexible, constructive,
persistent, focused interactions with the social and physical environments” (Furrer, & Skinner, 2003, p. 149).

**Rigor:** Characteristic of an educational program when materials and instructional strategies challenge and encourage all students to produce work or respond at or above the grade level; in other words, “all students are required to demonstrate mastery at these levels” (Connell & Klem, 2006, p. 63).

**Academic press:** Defined as “the normative and behavioral environment of a school that emphasizes high academic expectations” and excellence for all students (Lee, 2012, p. 331; Phillippo & Stone, 2013).

**Overview of the Dissertation**

Chapter one pointed out the need for additional quantitative research on ECHS students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices of college instructors, and college instructors’ perceptions of their students’ experiences of their practices. The chapter introduced the research problem, purpose, research questions, potential significance, and conceptual framework for this study. The chapter also noted the study’s limitations and delimitations and defined key terms. Chapter two, the review of literature, presents a brief historical perspective on ECHSs and discusses in more detail the existing research on how Early College High Schools are designed and what teaching practices have been found to be effective in this context. Chapter three describes the methodological design of this study, including data collection and analysis procedures, as well as the researcher’s subjectivity statement. Chapter four presents the results of the study, and chapter five discusses the results and presents conclusions. This study is needed because it is important to reconcile potential
differences, if any, in how students’ and instructors’ perceptions compare. The findings of this study may ultimately influence academic achievement in college-level courses.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This study’s overarching goal is to examine how ECHS students perceive the effectiveness of their college instructors’ teaching practices, as well as to compare these perceptions to college instructors’ perceptions of what students consider effective teaching practices. Determining or attempting to determine what constitutes optimal learning environments in college classes for the ECHS student is paramount to the continued success and sustainability of ECHSs. This literature review surveys the empirical and theoretical research on effective teaching practices, particularly with regard to supportive teacher-student relationships, student engagement, student expectations, and course rigor. This chapter serves to first, give a historical and background account of the establishment of ECHSs; then, present a discussion of the literature of each of the seven effective teaching practices, as represented on the survey instrument used for this study; and finally, it draws on these seven practices and the literature to establish the conceptual framework for the study.

History and Background on Early College High Schools

The initial creation of the early college high school in the early 2000s was, according to Marcy (2006), intended “to engage students in rigorous college-level work at an age when they are open to liberal arts learning, moving students into upper-division college courses with a high degree of mastery” (p. 62). The prerequisite of entering college-level core academic courses typically includes the completion of two years of the high school curriculum, as well as a desire to be academically challenged. The immediate outcomes for ECHS students, as compared to traditional high school students, include the following: increased student attendance, increased frequency of higher-level courses, improved attitudes
toward self, improved behavior, increased aspirations toward college, and improved student achievement. The long-term outcomes include increased high school graduation rates, increased enrollment in college, increased workforce readiness, and increased college graduation rates (AIR, 2013).

The ECHS initiative has been unevenly implemented across various states. Table 2.1 shows the seven states with the greatest number of ECHSs, including the year in which the first ECHS was opened in each state.

**Table 2.1. States With Ten or More ECHSs and the Year the First One Opened**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Number of ECHSs</th>
<th>Year Opened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1997-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


ECHS curricula tend to follow a common course sequence. Table 2.2 below illustrates a typical course sequence for high school and college-level courses prescribed to ECHS students. The scope and sequence of college-integrated classes supports the ECHS design principle of gradually acclimating students to the academic rigor and expectations of college-level, credit-bearing courses.
Table 2.2. Typical Sequence of College Courses Integrated at an Early College High School Located on a College Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>College Courses’ Instructors and Students</th>
<th>College Courses and Credits Possible</th>
<th>Total credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>Students are in classes taught by high school staff serving as adjunct college instructors.</td>
<td>During academic year / During summer</td>
<td>up to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 courses (electives or college prep classes) / 0 courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>Students are taught by college instructors in classes that are only for Early College students.</td>
<td>2 courses /1 course (elective and core academic classes)</td>
<td>up to 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>Students are in classes with traditional college students. Often by the junior year, dual enrollment courses make up 75% of a student’s schedule.</td>
<td>4 courses /1 course (all core academic classes)</td>
<td>up to 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>Students are in classes with traditional college students. Often by the senior year, dual enrollment courses make up 100% of a student’s schedule.</td>
<td>4 courses /2 courses (all core academic classes)</td>
<td>up to 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.2 shows the gradual process by which ECHS students are immersed in and acclimated to college-level courses and college culture. Through this gradual process, students establish the foundation for increased academic and social competency that are required in college-level courses and college culture.

Illustrating the need for support of ECHS students during the transition into college curricula, Thompson and Ongaga (2011) presented a case study of Hudson Early College High School, located in Southeastern North Carolina. Their study revealed that beginning in
ninth grade, students needed a support system of high school and university personnel, as well as community partners, to create programs that indoctrinate students to campus life as college students. According to these authors, ECHS programs can support students’ learning by fostering “student and teacher interactions based on trust, respect, and open communications, clear and shared expectations and a safe and welcoming learning environment” (Thompson & Ongaga, 2011, p. 53). Such consistent, caring support of students is a necessary bridge for their academic and social transition to college, assuming that “the vision of early colleges is to blend high school and college in a rigorous yet supportive program for vulnerable students who might be at risk of dropping out of high school” (Thompson & Ongaga, 2011, p. 53).

Further substantiating a relationship between teacher support and student academic achievement, Klem and Connell (2004) cite conditions that need to exist in order to support student success. These conditions include high standards for academic learning and conduct, meaningful and engaging pedagogy and curriculum, professional learning communities among staff, and personalized learning environments. Extensive support from, and relationship-building with, advisors and college instructors are also imperative in order for the ECHS student to achieve academic success in college-level courses (Thompson & Ongaga, 2011; Klem & Connell, 2004; Muller, 2001; Reis, Colbert & Herbert, 2005; Cornelius-White, 2007). Research suggests that faculty who teach early college courses must manage the additional demands and responsibilities of providing personalized instruction and advising beyond that of their counterparts in traditional higher education institutions (Marcy, 2006). Overall, Klem and Connell (2004) emphasize how teachers’ support of, and
relationship-building with, ECHS students leads to the latter’s academic achievement. They suggested that when students know their teachers’ expectations, regarding standards of conduct and learning outcomes, they are better able to meet those expectations and foster more positive attitudes and values toward self and school.

In addition to supportive teacher-student relationships, another essential design principle of the ECHS, necessary for the success of ECHS students, is high academic standards and expectations. The philosophy and design principle of high-quality, meaningful, rigorous and engaging pedagogy includes the diversification of instructional delivery, through which instructors move students toward critical thinking and ultimately success in rigorous college-level coursework. Instructors of ECHS students who work in community colleges must possess equivalent credentials to their counterparts in traditional institutions of higher education. Moreover, they must possess “the ability to inquire across disciplines, armed with a desire to connect the scholarship of discovery to teaching and learning in the classroom” (Marcy, 2006, p. 64). Effective instructional practices must focus on student support, teacher clarity, student engagement, student expectations, curriculum alignment, and course rigor and relevance (Thompson & Ongaga, 2011; Connell & Klem, 2006).

Overall, research on the ECHS design substantiates the effectiveness of this model in a myriad of ways. The primary value of these programs is the ability for underrepresented students to be concurrently enrolled in high school courses and college-level, credit-bearing classes at no cost, thus eliminating the financial barrier that often prevents this demographic from acquiring higher education (Berger et al., 2009; Berger et al., 2013; Edmunds, 2012; Edmunds et al., 2012; Fischetti, McKain & Smith, 2011; Oliver, et al., 2010). The purposeful
design of the ECHS model applies primarily to the high school component, as high school teachers receive specific training about the ECHS design principles. However, the support and training for college instructors varies. In light of this variation in instructional training and effectiveness, the next section of the chapter considers literature on seven elements of instructional effectiveness as delineated by this study’s survey instrument: care, control, clarify, captivate, confer, challenge, and consolidate. Each of these will be discussed in turn, with reference to relevant literature.

The Seven Cs of Instructional Effectiveness

**Care.** The first construct in the model for effective teaching practices, *care*, is defined as an instructor’s demonstrated interest in, and emotional support toward, students. Noddings (1992) posited that caring teachers engage in three important behaviors: they emulate caring behavior to their students; engage students in dialogues that lead to mutual understanding and perspective-taking; and expect as well as encourage students to do their very best. The ethic of care, representative of supportive teacher-student relationships, is conducive to academic motivation, engagement, academic efficacy, and overall academic success of students (Lewis et al., 2012; Marchand & Skinner, 2007; Klem & Connell, 2004; Wentzel, 1997; Noddings, 1992). This section focuses on research into this topic, considering specific characteristics of supportive teacher-student relationships, as well as the understanding of how these relationships contribute to student academic success.

Research has shown that instructors demonstrate varying levels of care toward students, however, higher levels of care have positive effects on student outcomes. In Phillippo and Stone’s (2013) quantitative study on supportive teacher-student relationships,
they administered surveys to 531 students and 45 teachers to measure “role breadth,” defined as the degree to which teachers included social and emotional support for students as part of their professional responsibilities. The results revealed that “students assigned to teachers with a high degree of measured role breadth reported higher levels of teacher support and also tended to report higher levels of academic press” (Phillippo & Stone, 2013, p. 369).

Similarly, Lee (2012) conducted a quantitative data analysis using “U.S. data taken from an international cross-sectional data set, the Program for International Student Assessment 2000,” the study examined supportive teacher-student relationships and academic press (p.333). Data consisted of 3,700 students from 145 schools, in the U.S. The findings showed that “teacher-student relationships had significantly positive associations with student outcomes,” including an increase in behavioral and emotional engagement and academic press (Lee, 2012, p. 335). Positive, supportive teacher-student relationships enhance students’ self-esteem or self-efficacy and create an environment of connectedness in the classroom and the larger school community.

Supportive teacher-student relationships have also been construed as a form of social capital, in which student and teacher both invest in hopes of reaping a reward. In Muller’s (2001) research on teacher-student relationships, students and teachers viewed the teacher-student relationship as a form of “social capital,” in that the relationship facilitated reciprocal action: “Both teacher and student are likely to calculate an expected pay-off from investing in the relationship” (Muller, 2001, p. 242). This quantitative study utilized the National Education Longitudinal Study (NELS) of 1988-1992, which included a representative sample of 24,599 students. However, only 6,007 students and their English or social studies and
math or science teachers were included in this study, for an average of two teachers per student. The results suggested the need for teacher-student relationships that promote correlative action (i.e. social capital) was “especially high for at-risk students who feel their teachers are interested, expect them to succeed, listen to them, praise their effort, and care” (Muller, 2001, p. 248). In turn, these students expended more effort because they felt like the teacher had a vested interest in their success, to the extent that they were willing to act to help students learn and succeed. The caveat in Muller’s research findings was that students’ perceptions of caring teachers and teachers’ perceptions of students’ efforts were “weakly associated with mathematics achievement for most students” (Muller, 2001, p. 241). Nevertheless, the results did not undermine the influence of instructors’ care on students’ self-efficacy and academic press, which encourages academic success.

Research also shows that caring teachers can enhance student resilience. Reis, Colbert, and Hebert (2005) conducted a three-year study employing both a comparative case study and ethnographic method approach to examine and understand the resiliency of 35 at-risk (i.e. high poverty, minority), academically talented high school students in an urban high school. Their research incorporated “grand tour questions” with a follow-up, more specific question to provide insight into the phenomenon of resiliency. One of the grand tour questions was, “Tell me about the adults in this school who have worked closely with you” (Reis, Colbert & Herbert, 2005, p. 112). The research revealed that despite the factors that placed students at risk academically, their resiliency to succeed was developed and enhanced by protective factors that included supportive relationships of “caring teachers and counselors” (Reis, Colbert & Herbert, 2005, p. 118).
The abundance of research on supportive teacher-student relationships comes from a variety of perspectives. However, Cornelius-White’s (2007) meta-analysis of 119 articles published between the years of 1948 and 2004 provided clarity on the characteristics that defined supportive teacher-student relationships. The study focused on the topic of the learner-centered teacher-student relationship; this was defined as an educational approach that focuses on learner traits and learning processes, and that “emphasizes teacher empathy (understanding), unconditional positive regard (warmth), genuineness (self-awareness), non-directivity (student-initiated and student-regulated activities), and the encouragement of critical thinking (as opposed to traditional memory emphasis)” (Cornelius-White, 2007, p. 113). The results of the study showed above-average correlations with the aforementioned teacher variables and learner outcomes (Cornelius-White, 2007, p. 134). The plethora of literature on supportive teacher-student relationships undoubtedly substantiates the influence of these relationships on academic achievement. However, in the case of ECHS students, the extensive need for support and relationship building can “place unusual burdens on faculty members to engage in their students’ lives” (Marcy, 2006, p. 64). Such a burden can be particularly challenging for ECHS instructors in the absence of formal training on working with high school students.

**Control.** The second construct in the model for effective teaching practices, *control*, is exercised by instructors who engage in effective classroom management by establishing an environment of respect, cooperation, and concentration. A classroom environment that is welcoming, safe, and well-organized and structured represents the effective teaching practice of classroom control or management. Effective teachers maintain a classroom environment
that is orderly, mutually respectful, and facilitates optimal learning opportunities by skillfully managing class time, without being rigid or authoritative (Green, 2005; Wentzel, 1997; Evertson, 1985). Further, effective classroom management skills require teachers to establish, early in the school year, student behavior expectations, clear procedures, and shared routines (Evertson, 1985). Studies on classroom management have revealed that successful classroom management enhances students’ academic learning time by influencing student behaviors of attention, engagement, and motivation positively (Oliver, Wehby & Nelson, 2015; Wang, Haertel & Walberg, 1993).

Overall, research on classroom control supports its importance for instructional effectiveness. In Perry and Tunna’s (1988) mixed-method study of 159 college students’ perceptions of instructor control and quality instruction, they found a relationship between students’ beliefs about classroom control and how well students learned, and, further, the “loss of control can create deficits that interfere with effective teaching” (Perry & Tunna, 1988, p. 107). Similarly, Wang, et al. (1993) study consisted of data from 61 research experts, 91 meta-analysis and 179 handbook chapters, which concluded classroom management is related to student learning and achievement.

**Clarify.** The third construct in the model for effective teaching practices is *clarify.* Instructors who clarify provide clear instructions and feedback to enhance students’ understanding of difficult concepts and their relevance to real life. Research indicates that teachers’ ability to clarify and break down complex concepts promotes students’ understanding and learning. The construct of teacher clarity can be defined as an instructor’s ability to effectively stimulate the desired understanding and comprehension of course
content by students through the use of structured verbal messages and non-verbal cues (Frymier & Weser, 2001). In concrete terms, teachers’ efficacy in providing explanation to students’ incorrect answers and misunderstanding of concepts increases students’ acquisition of desired knowledge, as well as transfer of knowledge (Butler, Godbole, & Marsh, 2013). Butler et al.’s (2013) empirical research on instructor explanation feedback, conducted with sixty college students, found that “explanation feedback produced better performance than correct answer feedback” (p. 294). In other studies involving college students, Chesebro and McCroskey (2001) and Houser and Frymier (2009) revealed that teacher clarity correlated with student motivation and self-efficacy, meaning that when teachers communicate clearly, they enhance students’ opportunity for academic success.

Instructors who provide immediate, specific, and frequent feedback through the use of inquiry-based and rigorous questioning allow for students to be less apprehensive to engage in the learning process and encourage critical analysis of information and self-correction, which promotes and supports the internalization and transference of learning (Chesebro & McCroskey, 2001). Teacher clarity has consistently been shown to have a positive influence on student outcomes (Hines, Cruickshank & Kennedy, 1985; Chesebro & McCroskey, 2001; Frymier & Weser, 2001; Rodger, Murray & Cummings, 2007; Butler, et al., 2013).

Captivate and Confer. The fourth and fifth elements of teaching effectiveness both have to do with students’ engagement. Instructors who captivate make students interested and motivated to learn, while instructors who confer actively engage in discourse with students and respect their ideas and perspectives. Both practices involve engaging with
students in ways that are conducive to learning. Decades of research on student engagement suggest that engaging with students is a dynamic phenomenon, encompassing the interplay of both psychological and sociological concepts to include students’ self-perceptions (i.e. self-efficacy), voice, and goal orientations, as well as students’ relationships with parents, teachers and peers (Eccles, Wigfield, & Schiefele, 1998; Stipek, 2002). Instructors can captivate students—motivate them to engage in the learning process, independent of their preexisting personal interest—by making curricula interesting, relevant, and applicable to real-life, with opportunities for autonomous, active learning (Assor & Roth, 2002; Marcy, 2006). Instructors can confer with students by practicing “active, goal-directed, flexible, constructive, persistent, focused interactions with the social and physical environments” (Furrer, & Skinner, 2003, p. 149). This is a behavioral and educational outcome that occurs in the classroom setting.

Research strongly supports the link between student engagement and positive outcomes. For example, Finn and Voelkl’s (1993) study of 6,488 at-risk eighth graders from 758 public schools found that student engagement is a critical component to improving learning outcomes. They further found that engagement is increased in smaller classes, as well as in school environments that are orderly and disciplined, that are diverse in composition, and where students feel a sense of identification and belonging (Lee, 2012). To some extent, “students internalize the feeling that they are a conspicuous part of the school environment and that school is an important aspect of their own experience” (Finn, & Voelkl, 1993, p. 250). Relatedly, it has been determined that student engagement is a good predictor of students’ long-term academic achievement and their successful completion of school
Student engagement serves as a social cue, eliciting supportive correlative reactions between students and teachers, thus enhancing students’ authentic learning and schooling experiences to include increased participation, enhanced teacher-student communications, higher teacher expectations, and enhanced teacher-student relationships. In another study of student engagement, specifically academic resilience, Borman and Overman (2004) studied 925 poor minority students and found that behavioral engagement in academic activities had a positive effect on academic performance, and was more evident among academically resilient students. Resilient students were defined as having higher than predicted math scores, based on previous math scores and individual socioeconomic status. Based on the studies and the impact of student engagement on learning, resilience and academic performance, student engagement is a crucial effective teaching practice, for the targeted demographic in ECHSs, to achieve academic success in college level coursework and successful completion of the early college high school.

**Challenge.** The sixth construct in the model of effective teaching practices, *challenge*, refers to the practice of establishing high academic expectations that press students’ effort, perseverance and rigor (Tripod Education Partners, 2015). To date, nearly fifty years of prolific research on teachers’ expectations of students and the influence on learning outcomes has been conducted, primarily at the elementary grade level (Babad, 1998; Brophy, 1983; Cooper, 1985; Good & Weinstein, 1986; Rubie-Davies, 2006; Weinstein, 2002). The basis for much of this research has been the seminal work of sociologist Robert K. Merton (1948) and the introduction of the “the self-fulfilling prophecy,” which posits that prediction based upon beliefs, however false, will come true due to actions and behaviors that
directly or indirectly influence and reinforce held beliefs. Rosenthal and Jacobson’s (1968) research extended the “self-fulfilling prophecy” phenomenon to the educational realm. Their research suggested that teachers’ expectations of students are based upon their personally held beliefs about or perceptions of students based on race, gender, socioeconomic status and parents’ educational levels. These personally held beliefs guide and direct teachers’ instructional behaviors and practices, including those regarding course rigor, expectations of students, and communications with students. These behaviors and practices are, in turn, internalized by students, causing the teacher’s held beliefs to become actualized and true.

The phenomenon of low academic teacher expectations is more prevalent at schools that serve predominately at-risk students, who are primarily minority and high-poverty (low-SES). According to Muller (2001), “Little is more tragic in American education than a student with hopes taught by teachers who do not expect success and therefore do not teach curricula necessary for progress” (Muller, 2001, p. 241). The lack of a supportive and academically rigorous school environment promotes and perpetuates the institutionalization of the achievement gap that exists between minority and non-minority students (Borman & Overman, 2004). Given this achievement gap, and instructors’ key role in establishing student expectations, it is crucial that college instructors represent high academic expectations in their pedagogy, and undertake challenging and rigorous instruction with the opportunity for “real-world” collaborative project-based learning. According to Washor and Mojkowski (2007), “In such settings, students—like academician and clinicians who are rigorous about their work—encounter complex, messy problems for which tools and solutions may not be readily apparent or available” (p. 48). These types of rigorous learning
opportunities provide the impetus for critical thinking and problem-solving skills necessary for success in a 21st-century global, technological economy. For this reason, teachers’ willingness to challenge students is an essential component of instructional effectiveness.

**Consolidate.** Finally, the seventh construct in the model of effective teaching practices is *consolidate*. Instructors who *consolidate* organize and summarize the information in their instruction, and integrate concepts by highlighting the interconnections among them. In this effective teaching practice, instructors integrate and connect information across disciplines, between new learning and prior learning, and between course learning and real life (Green, 2005; Marcy, 2006; Washor & Mojkowski, 2007). In order for consolidation of knowledge and learning to occur, it is important for instructors to explain what they are teaching and why. They must provide adequate time for students to formulate answers, actively listen, and ask probing questions. These practices give students opportunities to understand the relevance and connectedness of skills and concepts being taught. The construct of consolidate also encompasses teachers’ evaluative feedback that is constructive, positive and permits students to gain an understanding of how to improve (Hines et al., 1985; Rodger et al., 2007). Together, the 7Cs of effective teaching practices: care, control, challenge, confer, clarify, captivate and consolidate, not only define the cognitive abilities of instructors, but also the affective qualities or attributes of instructors, that contribute to their ability to successfully facilitate students learning and subsequent academic success.

**Conceptual Framework: Effective Teaching Practices**

In order to guide ECHS students through the transition from high school curriculum and culture to college or university curriculum and culture, college instructors must create
optimal learning environments for these students. At the heart of this challenge—the task of creating optimal learning environments—is the issue of instructional effectiveness: Which teaching practices will encourage the academic success of secondary education students in college-level courses? Most practitioners would agree that teaching is both an art and a science, though the relative weight that any given teacher places on the art versus science of teaching may depend on the individual’s formal training and philosophical orientation to the profession, as well as the content and level of students they teach. In any case, the abundance of research on effective teaching practices support certain irrefutable truths regarding student learning outcomes: effective instructors possess characteristics and skills that extend well beyond content expertise or the cognitive domain. In this study, as a conceptual framework for defining effective instructional practices is derived from the Tripod Survey of Effective Teaching Practices, mentioned above and described in detail in chapter three. The majority of these practices, the 7Cs described above, fall into the affective domain. Therefore, after summarizing the 7Cs below, there is a brief discussion of literature supporting the importance of affective qualities for instructional effectiveness.

**The 7Cs of Instructional Effectiveness.** Extensive research on effective teaching practices substantiates the recommendation that instructors need to possess not only academic knowledge and expertise, but also affective or emotional attributes. In the Tripod Survey of Effective Teaching Practices, instructional effectiveness is defined in terms of seven key attributes, characteristics and skills:

1. **Care.** Effective instructors create and maintain a caring classroom environment that is encouraging, supportive, nurturing and safe for all
students to participate in the learning process. The instructor cares about student learning and success and takes personal responsibility for students’ learning outcomes (Green, 2005; Klem & Connell, 2004; Wentzel, 1997; Noddings, 1992).

2. **Control.** Effective instructors maintain an orderly, well-managed and respectful classroom environment that is not too rigid or authoritative. Students are aware of conduct expectations, and they participate in the class structure and routines, as well as reciprocate respect to the instructor and each other (Green, 2005; Wentzel, 1997).

3. **Clarify.** Effective instructors are very knowledgeable about the content they teach; they can teach or explain concepts in varied ways and break down complex concepts into component parts, to ensure students’ comprehension (Frymier & Weser, 2001; Butler, Godbole, & Marsh, 2013). They give understandable instructions and feedback to help students understand concepts and their interrelationships.

4. **Captivate.** Effective instructors can make learning interesting and relevant, thus motivating students to engage in learning (Assor & Roth, 2002; Marcy, 2006).

5. **Confer.** Effective instructors ask students to share their thoughts and explain their ideas in order to ensure optimum learning, particularly to ensure that critical thinking and understanding occur (Eccles, Wigfield, & Schiefele,
These instructors actively engage in classroom discourse while respecting students’ ideas and perspectives.

6. **Challenge.** Effective instructors hold all students accountable to high academic expectations, but also establish clear expectations for achieving academic success (Muller, 2001; Washor & Mojkowski, 2007; Borman & Overman, 2004). These instructors push students toward high levels of effort and perseverance.

7. **Consolidate.** Effective instructors can connect and integrate concepts from prior learning and across disciplines, thus making learning integrative, relevant and applicable to real-life scenarios (Green, 2005; Fine & Cienkus, 1997; Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Kugel, 1993).

**Importance of Instructors’ Affective Qualities.** As encapsulated in the 7Cs above, effective teaching practices of college instructors of ECHS students must reflect not only the cognitive, but also the affective domain. That is, in order to increase students’ experiences of effective teaching and enhance their opportunity for academic success, instructors must be competent in curricular content as well as possess and exhibit caring characteristics. Illustrating this point is a qualitative study by Walls, Nardi, von Minden and Hoffman (2002), which examined characteristics of effective and ineffective teachers. Their study involved the participation of 90 subjects, including 30 prospective teachers (beginning teacher-education students), 30 novice teachers (post-student teaching), and 30 experienced teachers (average years of teaching experience was 15.8 years). Participants taught various subject matters and grade levels, from elementary to high school. The participants were
asked to classify teaching behaviors as “effective” or “ineffective.” Their responses were classified into ten areas: “Emotional Environment-effective, Emotional Environment-ineffective, Teacher Skill-effective, Teacher Skill-ineffective, Teacher Motivation-effective, Teacher Motivation-ineffective, Student Participation-effective, Student Participation-ineffective, Rules and Grades-effective, Rules and Grades-ineffective)” (Wall et al., 2002, p. 43). The results of the study revealed that in the participants’ descriptions, for all three groups of teachers, “the affective domain figured prominently,” and moreover, “The overall emotional environment [of the classroom] was a dominant theme. Caring about students was particularly prevalent in the descriptions of effective teachers” (Wall et al., 2002, p. 45). These findings support the importance of affective qualities in elementary through high-school teachers.

The importance of affective qualities also holds true at the level of postsecondary education. College students’ perceptions of teaching effectiveness has been linked to their perception of psychological or emotional closeness or rapport with instructors (Walls et al., 2002). Ample research in higher education investigates student ratings or evaluations of college instructors, and these are “a necessary source of evidence” to assess teaching effectiveness (Berk, 2005, p. 50). The general consensus is the same as that of previously mentioned studies involving elementary and secondary education teachers. Specifically, effective teaching practices encompass the affective domain, not just the cognitive domain. Effective instructors are enthusiastic about teaching, are available to students, are friendly and respectful toward students, are open and receptive to students’ ideas and opinions, are motivational and evoke students’ interest in learning, are caring towards students, are fair and
objective in evaluating students, are organized and well-prepared, and can present information to students in a manner that is relatable and comprehensible (Alemu, 2014; Berk, 2005; Wall et al., 2002; Post, 2011; Kugel, 1993).

Despite the importance of affective qualities for instructional effectiveness, including at the post-secondary level, some evidence suggests that post-secondary instructors do not often explicitly cultivate these qualities. For example, Post’s (2011) phenomenological study of twelve university professors’ beliefs and attitudes about teaching and learning in higher education, revealed that in the rare pedagogical training or orientation sessions that are provided to new faculty hires, “sessions are more likely to focus on the requirements of the institution for such things as a course syllabus, which clearly outlines course objectives and expectations, introduction and training on new technological advances, and fair student evaluation practices” (Post, 2011, p. 28). Faculty that were interested in improving their pedagogical knowledge (specifically, their effective teaching practices) voluntarily attended workshops and seminars offered through the college’s or university’s office or committee for faculty professional development. Often, faculty in higher education institutions hone their pedagogical skills in a manner that is arduous, self-directed and reflective of the adult learning principles of andragogy, which “involves making sense of experience resulting in an increase or modification in knowledge, skills strategies and values” (Post, 2011, p. 26). Post’s research supports research conducted by American Institute of Research (2013), which revealed college instructors and secondary education teachers differed in their teaching orientations and approaches to the profession, resulting in ECHS students experiencing, simultaneously, different teaching practices, while being concurrently enrolled in high school.
and college courses. Research on the affective domain of effective teaching practices, as defined by the 7Cs, reveal the importance of instructors’ attributes that contribute to the facilitation of student learning outcomes.

**Summary**

In chapter two, literature from various methodological perspectives was reviewed. The chapter focused on establishing the history and background of ECHS and presenting research on seven constructs of effective teaching practices (the 7Cs: care, control, clarify, captivate, confer, challenge, consolidate). Then it constructed a conceptual framework for the study by relating the seven constructs of effective teaching practices to the literature on affective qualities of effective teachers. The effective teaching practices relevant to this study included supportive teacher-student relationships (care), classroom management (control) student engagement (confer) and motivation (captivate), student expectations and course rigor (challenge) and relevance (consolidate & clarify). Chapter three describes the methodology implemented in this study, including the research design, research sites, participants, data collection and analyses, and issues relevant to validity and reliability.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The goals of this research were to determine effective teaching practices of college instructors, as perceived by ECHS students, in order to enhance instructor-student relationships and communications, and to foster instructor expectations and behaviors that encourage student engagement, motivation and academic success. The overarching goal was to better understand what secondary education students need to succeed in a postsecondary education setting, specifically in ECHSs, from the perspective of college instructor-student interactions and classroom environment. Further, the researcher sought to determine whether ECHS students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices are similar to college instructors, which is crucial in providing insight on potential incongruence between instructors’ and students’ perceptions, and on how those differences could be directly impacting academic success. This information could prove useful to instructors in their understanding of their students’ needs and how making adjustments to their teaching approach could make the difference between academic success and failure.

This chapter describes the study’s quantitative research design. It reviews the research questions and hypothesis; then it describes the research sites and research participants. After that, the methods of data collection and analysis are detailed. Issues of validity, reliability, and generalizability are also discussed. Next, the chapter discusses the study’s significance, as well as limitations and delimitations. Finally, the chapter presents the researcher’s subjectivity statement.
Research Questions and Hypothesis

As shown in Table 3.1, this study proposed three research questions related to college instructors’ and ECHS students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices. The third research question was also accompanied by a hypothesis, also shown in the table.

Table 3.1. Alignment of Research Questions, Hypotheses, and Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Mode of Data Collection</th>
<th>Mode of Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ1</strong>: What are ECHS students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices of college instructors?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ2</strong>: What are college instructors’ perceptions of ECHS students’ experiences of effective teaching practices?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ3</strong>: How do the perceptions of ECHS students and their college instructors compare?</td>
<td>College instructors’ perceptions of students’ experiences of effective teaching practices will be statistically different from students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices</td>
<td>Analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing, consisting of f-tests for each sample group for each category to test differences in variances. Then, two-sample t-tests for each category (7Cs) will be conducted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 1. What are ECHS students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices of college instructors? Research question 1 addressed ECHS students’ experiences with college instructors, from the perspective of instructor-student relationship, instructor expectations, and pedagogical practices. Addressing the research question yielded insight into the perceptions, beliefs, and opinions ECHS students have about the attributes and behaviors of their college instructors. To the extent, student perceptions of their instructors’ effective teaching practices that directly relate to college instructors’ affective attributes and behaviors of establishing high expectations of learning and conduct expectancies were evaluated. Instructors’ personally held beliefs and perceptions about ECHS students, mediated through their instructional practices and communications with ECHS students reflect the conceptual framework of perceptual predetermination. Perceptual predetermination posits that educators’ perceptions, assumptions, and beliefs about students will affect how they themselves will act and these actions are manifestations of educators ‘socialization and the influence “on his or her practice in the classroom” (Muhammad, 2009, p. 21; Zimbardo, 1985). In order to gather the necessary quantitative data for Research Question 1, a validated Student Perception Survey for Secondary Students, developed by the Tripod Project, was administered electronically (Appendix A). Extant data were also examined, including course syllabi, ECHS mission statement, and student handbook.

Research Question 2: What are college instructors’ perceptions of ECHS students’ experiences of effective teaching practices? To address this question, the Tripod Instructor Survey of Effective Teaching Practices was electronically administered to college instructors whose students were research participants (Appendix B). This data provided valuable insight
as to what instructors believe their students are experiencing in their classrooms, from the perspective of effective teaching practices.

Research Question 3: How do the perceptions of ECHS students and their college instructors compare? To address this question, survey responses from students related to Research Question 1 were compared to survey responses from instructors related to Research Question 2. To make the comparison, first, f-tests were performed to determine differences in variances of students’ and instructors’ distribution of scores, to ensure the appropriate two-sample testing methods was used. The appropriate two-sample t-tests, determined the acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis put forth by this study: College instructors perceptions of students’ experiences of effective teaching practices will be statistically different from students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices.

Research Sites

The participating research sites were three Early College High Schools. One ECHS was located on a community college campus with a curriculum focus of health and sciences, with a school community composition made up of 305 students, of those, 28.5% low-socioeconomic, 2.3% limited English proficient, and 2.3% special education, with 14 classroom teachers. The second ECHS was located on a large university campus with a curriculum focus of science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM education), with a school community composition made up of 261 students, of those, 48.27% first-generation college students, with 22 teachers. The third ECHS was located within 8 miles of a community college campus with a curriculum focus of vocational education, also known as Career and Technical Education (CTE). For this ECHS, school community composition data
was not available. All participant sites were in the same large public school district in a medium-sized metropolitan city, thus increasing the diversity and number of research participants. The participant school district was chosen purposefully, to increase the sample size. The researcher received permission to conduct research at the three research participant sites by submitting to the school district an Application to Conduct Research, which was approved by the district’s Board (Appendix D). The district’s approval for permission to conduct research was contingent upon the use of the district’s liaison to communicate directly with school principals, students and college liaisons regarding the study’s purpose. In addition, the liaison was responsible for implementing the researcher’s protocol for the administration of the Tripod Standard Survey of Effective Teaching Practices for Secondary Education Students. The challenges of the contingency were (1) the researcher not being directly involved in the communication of the purpose of the study and to clarify any concerns or questions participants may have had and, (2) the researcher not being directly involved in the administration of the survey instrument to ensure the integrity of the process. These challenges were also limitations of the study and duly noted, in the limitations section of this chapter. However, these challenges were overcome by numerous meetings between the researcher and the liaison to ensure all possible issues and concerns were addressed and reconciled.

In making the determination of student participant criteria, the researcher’s strategy was to recruit students that were juniors and seniors, who were beyond taking introductory and elective college courses. In this manner, students that were taking up to 21 credit hours in core college courses were participants, and therefore were truly experiencing secondary
education pedagogy and higher education teaching simultaneously, and could more poignantly assess the effective teaching practices of college instructors.

**Participants**

The research participants were 168 (45.52%) juniors and seniors, of a possible 369 participants, at three Early College High Schools, one located on a community college campus, one located in close proximity of a community college (within 8 miles), and one located on a university campus. The students were juniors and seniors taking, at minimum, one core college level course to include English, math, science, engineering and technology. Of the 168 student participants, 160 (95.24%) chose to provide their gender identity, which reflected 64 males (40%), and 96 females (60%). Of the student participants, 157 (93.45%) specified their race/ethnicity identity, the breakdown of which is in Table 3.2. Cross-analysis of race/ethnicity and the number of adults that live in the household reflected 161 (95.83%) responses; of those, 157 (97.52) race/ethnic identified, and 4 unidentified race/ethnic student participants specified the number of adults that lived in the household. Table 3.3 presents the breakdown of race/ethnicity and the number of adults living in the households of student participants. This data reflects the clear majority of student participants, 129 (80%) of the 161 that provided this data lived in households with two or more adults.
Table 3.2. Race/Ethnicity of Student Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>35.03%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>27.38%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>13.37%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic/Middle-Eastern</td>
<td>8.28%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.64%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6.36%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian or East Indian</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indian</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>157</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 3.2 shows, the ECHS student participants in this study were representative of the target population of the national Early College High School design, in terms of race/ethnic minority status, to include 102 (64.96%) minority verses 55 (35.03%) non-minority.
Table 3.3. Race/Ethnicity and Number of Adults in Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>3+ Adults</th>
<th>2 Adults</th>
<th>1 Adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic/Middle Eastern</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian/East Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the majority of student participants, 107 (66.45%), the number of adults in the household was two, with White students’ representative of the race/ethnic majority of those students, 29 (27.10%), followed by Black students, 28 (26.16%). There was only one South Asian or East Indian student participant, and that individual also had two adults in the household. Of the 161 total responses, 32 (19.87%) students indicated only one adult in the household.

College instructors of student participants also participated in the study. The school district liaison communicated with college liaisons to ensure college instructors of student participants were made aware of the study and invited to participate. The sample size of college instructor participants was 10. Because the researcher was required to use liaisons, for both the school district and the partner colleges, determining the exact number of possible college instructors was not attainable. Moreover, because there was one college that was partnered with two of the ECHS participant sites, it is possible there was duplication of instructor participation. For example, a college English instructor may have taught the same
course with two different sets of students, from two participant ECHSs. Despite the issue of possible instructor duplication, the primary object for gaining their participation was to compare their results with their students’. Hence, the juxtaposition of instructors’ and students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices. The college instructors were diverse in terms of teaching experience, gender, and race/ethnicity. The years of teaching experience of the 10 college instructors was represented as follows: 3 (30%) with 1-4 years; 3 (30%) with 5-8 years; and, 4 (40%) with 9 or more years. The gender identity breakdown of instructors was 8 females (80%), and 2 males (20%). Of the 10 instructor participants, 9 chose to specify their race/ethnicity identity, the breakdown of which is in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4. Race/Ethnicity of College Instructor Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic/Middle-Eastern</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian or East Indian</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indian</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of instructor participants were White (5 out of 9, or 55%) and a minority were non-white (4 out of 9, or 44.44%).
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Participation in this study was on a voluntarily basis, and participants were assured and guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity. The purpose of the study was disclosed to participants, as well as constituent stakeholders. The principal or administrative designee at each ECHS assisted in scheduling and administering the electronic perception survey instruments, via a secured, reusable website link, to students and instructors simultaneously. The surveys were administered during participants’ scheduled college classes. In this manner, high school class instructional time was not hindered; rather, the survey administration during college classes maximized participation, to perhaps inform teaching practices of college instructors. The participants in the study were diverse, in terms of gender and race/ethnicity.

Data Collection

The primary data sources for this study were survey responses provided by students and instructors on validated surveys. The advantages of using surveys included affordable costs, access to a large sample size, and efficiency of collecting and analyzing data (Creswell, 2014). Further, the use of surveys supported efficient analyses of data sets, to the extent that inferences could be made regarding how ECHS students perceive effective teaching practices of college instructors, and college instructors’ perceptions of what their students are experiencing and if students’ and instructors’ perceptions are viewed similarly. The survey items addressed the seven constructs, or 7Cs of effective teaching practices, to answer Research Questions 1 and 2. Specifically, survey questions were grouped into seven categories, each representing one of the 7 C’s of effective teaching practices. The mean response for both instructors and students was calculated in each of these 7 categories. To
address the hypothesis presented by Research Question 3, analysis of variance (ANOVA) f-testing was conducted to test differences in variances of students’ and instructors’ responses, to determine homogeneity and the type of t-testing required. Then, for each category, two-sample, assuming unequal variances, t-tests were conducted to compare the mean scores of both sample groups. The results of the t-tests determined the acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis that college instructors’ perceptions of effective teaching practices will be statistically different from students’.

The data collection process for this study utilized the Tripod 41-item Student Perception Survey for Secondary Students, as well as the Tripod 41-item College Instructor Perception Survey. Specifically, the researcher utilized Qualtrics, a software program designed to allow researchers to build surveys, distribute surveys and analyze responses all within the product. Accessibility to and use of this software was through a license from North Carolina State University, and available through North Carolina State University Institutional Research and Planning Office. The researcher created a Qualtrics account, using their university issued identification and password, to create the electronic student and instructor surveys. Completed surveys were beta tested by the researcher and the district liaison to provide an understanding of the ease of utility and estimate time of completion, from the participants’ perspective. Next, the researcher in collaboration with the school district’s liaison, established the protocol for deploying the surveys. The protocol was as follows: (1) the researcher sent the surveys electronically, via secured reusable website links, to the school district’s liaison’s district issued email account, (2) the liaison sent, via email, the reusable survey links to the participant schools’ administrators’ district issued email
accounts, (3) the school administrators had instructors take their students to computer labs
where the survey links’ or URLs were prominently posted on classroom whiteboards and, (4)
verbal and written instructions were provided and maintained at the school level (see
Appendix E). These same written instructions were in the introduction of the electronic
surveys, thus providing consistency and reiteration of the script, for instructions, explanation
of the purpose, and assurances of students’ anonymity and confidentiality of responses.
Moreover, participants were verbally told that participation was on a voluntary basis, and
they could stop participating at any time during the survey. Student and college instructor
participants accessed the surveys via the website links. Because the surveys were
administered via reusable website links, no personal identifiable information (PII) relating to
participants or participant sites, to include IP addresses, was captured, this feature added to
confidentiality and anonymity of participants’ identity and responses. Participant surveys
were coded with a record identification. In this manner, it further added to the security
protocol, thus guaranteeing participant anonymity and confidentiality. Additionally, the
researcher provided the school district access to Qualtrics, via the creation of a shared data
account, given to the school district’s liaison, for the review of student survey data. In this
manner, it established for the school district confidence that compliance and adherence to
FERPA was maintained. Moreover, the expected level of confidentiality of students’
responses and anonymity, by the researcher’s data collection process and protocol was vetted
and assured.
The purpose of the student survey was to obtain the necessary data to answer Research Question 1: What are ECHS students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices of their college instructors?

The purpose of the instructor survey was to obtain the necessary data to answer Research Question 2: What are college instructors’ perceptions of students’ experiences of effective teaching practices?

Both student and instructor participants simultaneously completed the surveys during the last 10-15 minutes of their scheduled college courses. If student participants were not comfortable completing the survey in the presence of their instructor, they were provided the opportunity to access the survey away from the school setting, as the surveys remained accessible for nineteen calendar days, from October 24 through November 11, 2016.

Extant data from course syllabi, the ECHS student handbook, and aggregate performance measures for mathematics, English, English proficiency, and college/career readiness was also collected for analysis.

The researcher securely maintained all data collected on a flash drive in a secured location. Again, the methodology of using reusable website links to deploy the surveys and capture participants’ data ensured participants anonymity and confidentiality of responses.

Data Analysis

This quantitative research study was based on a postpositivist paradigm that assumes “reality exists but is never fully apprehended, only approximated” (Hatch, 2002, p. 13). The primary focus of inquiry was quantitative representations of ECHS students’ “perspectives or constructions of reality” regarding their perception of effective teaching practices of college
instructors (Hatch, 2002, p. 15). In keeping with the traditional postpositivist methodological approach, this study involved descriptive statistics, with the utilization of a low-level statistics method approach in the form of survey instruments, designed with a Likert Scale, with responses ranging from 1 to 5. The response ratings were given the following meanings: 1 = Totally Untrue, 2 = Mostly Untrue, 3 = Somewhat True, 4 = Mostly True, 5 = Totally True (survey items presented from a negative perspective, the response order is reversed). ECHS students rated the seven constructs, or 7 Cs, of effective teaching practices of college instructors as they the students experienced them. Additionally, the researcher compared student responses to how college instructors perceived the students were experiencing their teaching practices. Each construct of effective teaching practices was analyzed, and inferences were made regarding the approximation of reality as it had been experienced and known by ECHS students and college instructors. The approximation of reality was captured and determined by the Measure of Central Tendency (i.e. mode, median, mean), as well as the measures of variability (i.e. standard deviation and variance) of the sample groups, via f-testing, which determined whether there was homogeneity of variance in students’ and instructors’ responses (Harris, 1998). The results of the f-tests determined that the variance in students’ and instructors’ distribution of responses were unequal. Thus, two-tailed, assuming unequal variances t-tests were conducted to answer Research Question 3, as well as test the hypothesis put forth by this research study.

The theoretical and conceptual assumptions used as additional interpretive lenses for the undertaking of this study were cognitive theories of motivation and predetermination. To the extent possible, deeper insight to students’ and instructors’ responses to survey items
could be gleaned and analyzed. This will be highlighted and discussed in greater detailed analysis in chapter four.

The study also made use of extant data that provided more depth and scope to the analyses of obtained quantitative data. The extant data included Early College High Schools student handbooks, course syllabi, and aggregate performance measure data that support college/career readiness. These data enhanced the validity of analysis via triangulation, which is the verification process whereby multiple sources of data give a more in-depth understanding of the phenomenon under investigation. The multi-source or triangulation “process can be claimed as adding to the validity of the study” (Creswell, 2014, p. 201).

Validity and Reliability

To undertake this quantitative research, the Tripod Standard Secondary Student Perception Survey was electronically administered to participants. The Tripod survey was created in 2001 with the collaboration of more than 3000 teachers and has been revised and refined for more than a decade, and used for the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project, an initiative launched by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation in 2009. According to the group responsible for the survey, “Millions of students, tens of thousands of teachers, and thousands of schools and classrooms across the U.S. currently participate in Tripod surveys each year” (Tripod Education Partners, 2015, p. 2). The reliability of the student survey to consistently measure student perceptions of the 7Cs was analyzed using an approach developed at the University of Chicago (Jean, Kimmel, & Raudenbush). This approach is more conservative than Cronbach’s alpha, and all reliability measures were found to be in the range of 0.80 (Tripod Education Partners, 2015, p. 16).
In order to compare the students’ perceptions to what the instructors believed the students perceived, a comparable and nearly identical survey was created for instructors. Each question on the instructor survey mirrored a question on the student survey, making the surveys nearly identical. Both the student and instructor surveys used the Likert-Scale model, and included 34 items. This design allowed for direct comparison between instructors’ perceptions and the true students’ perceptions. Basic descriptive statistical analysis was introduced to see the means and standard deviations of the 7Cs, comparing students and faculty. Further, cross-analysis of data was performed by breaking down the 7Cs by demographic and other study variables. To determine which t-test to use, f-tests were conducted; in this way, the researcher determined whether the student and faculty populations might have the same variance or variability of scores of the 7Cs. Then, two-sample t-tests were performed to measure the differences among the mean score responses of students and college instructors in each of the 7 C’s, “to test the simple null hypothesis” (Harris, 1998, p. 335). Conducting two-sample, assuming unequal variance, t-tests, comparing the 7Cs of students’ and instructors’ mean scores, was necessary to answer Research Question 3, as well as to reject or not reject the study’s null hypothesis. Further, the extant data, as well as the survey results, were both analyzed to establish corroboration of results. The use of multiple sources of data collection enhanced the internal validity and reliability of the research.

**Significance of the Study**

The significance of the study is that it focuses on a crucial, but little understood, point of overlap between the secondary and postsecondary school systems. Azinger (2000) noted
that “partnerships between schools and local community colleges have a potential to constitute an important point of connection between the secondary and postsecondary systems” (p. 17). However, the “seamless working relationships between K-12 districts and community colleges, however desirable, are difficult to achieve” (Azinger, 2000, p. 17). The partnership between the two systems is difficult for two reasons: the differences in organizational culture and philosophical orientation, and the differences in formal training into the teaching profession at these two levels.

At the K-12 level, curriculum is centrally controlled at the district level because of the increasing emphasis on workforce development embedded in the state mandated curricula; an example of this is the Career Technical Education curriculum/pathway. The workforce emphasis is a product of the ever-changing technological and global economy, poor academic performance, and increased drop-out rates in public high schools. Moreover, the K-12 school system tends to focus on educating the youth to represent community cultural and political values as the designated embedded social curriculum (Azinger, 2000). By contrast, the culture of the community college has been molded by the four-year colleges and universities, resulting in fostering a philosophy of academic freedom, self-directed learning, and critical thinking, to the extent students become problem solvers and teachers themselves. The educational environment becomes the forum to discuss controversial issues that would be unacceptable in the K-12 system. Further, “the nurturing component of schooling that is vital to the K-12 mission is very different at the community college, university level” (Azinger, 2000, p. 19). In short, the secondary and post-secondary school systems have very different structures, orientations, and cultures, and these differences have implications for
ECHS instructors and students alike. This study explores one of those implications, the instructional effectiveness of ECHS college instructors.

The research conducted in this study lends itself to several implications for practice and policy development and implementation. First, the vast majority of research regarding the ECHS initiative is from the school district perspective, whereby emphasis is placed on the factors that influence high school reform. However, there is a lack of research which renders the perspectives of ECHS students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices of college instructors, and college instructors’ perceptions of ECHS students’ experiences of their effective teaching practices, which subsequently establishes learning and conduct expectation standards, which directly affects ECHS students’ academic success in college level course work and graduation rates.

The level of college administrators’ and college instructors’ stakeholdership in the program development and implementation, as well as collaboration in the alignment of curriculums and pedagogy, collaborative staff development, and personalized attention given to students should be of paramount consideration.

This study explored the above referenced factors in order to gain insight into what constitutes academic success on the college level for ECHS students, as well as higher education completion rates. Further, the research may provide insight to an incongruence of college instructors’ intended conveyed expectations of and beliefs about ECHS students and the messages ECHS students actually receive from or perceive of their instructors. Instructors’ perceptions of students may influence their expectations and established standards of learning for students’ academic achievement. The study may reveal that not all
college instructors teaching ECHS students should be instructing this demographic, the data may warrant a vetting process, or perhaps a third tier for teacher certification/licensure in higher education. The study may also reveal the need for more professional development, in the area of effective teaching practices to include relationship-building (Care), classroom management (Control), effectively communicating and facilitating instruction (Clarify & Consolidate), establishing high academic expectations representative of course rigor (Challenge) and relevant pedagogy (Captivate) that has embedded 21st century skill acquisition (Confer), in collaboration with high school teachers. According to Azinger (2000) community colleges will need to implement diverse methods to modify its delivery system, in order to accommodate the needs of high school students.

**Delimitations of Data Validity**

The research has delimitations that are geographical, as well as programmatic. Participants and participant sites were selected through a non-random, purposive process because of access and convenience. In the southeastern state where the study was conducted, the common features of the ECHSs may not entirely align with ECHSs across the nation. Nationally, ECHS are aligned with the Early College High School Initiative. Therefore, the findings regarding the experiences of students in this study can only be generalized to other students in the state where the study was conducted.

**Limitations of Data Validity**

This research on ECHS students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of college instructors’ teaching practices has inherent limitations:
• Students may not have participated with a seriousness of purpose, thus yielding meaningless results;
• Lack of integrity may have been introduced in the survey implementation and administration process;
• What actually occurs in the classroom may not have been represented reliably, with an adequate number of survey items and an adequate sample size;
• Generalizability of results to the entire population of ECHS may be limited, as the demographic served vary from county to county and state to state due to the variation of communities (i.e. socio-economic strata, employment, technology infrastructure, and business and industry partnerships) and admission standards (i.e., lottery-based or selection/vetting process)
• Quantitative results may be difficult to interpret precisely and accurately.

Subjectivity Statement

Subjectivity or researcher bias is a constant concern in research as it may influence the accuracy with which data are collected, reported, and analyzed. However, the objective of this study is to report what actually occurred as truthfully as possible (Bogden & Biklen, 2007). To the extent, the data itself will support the researcher’s analysis, explanation or interpretation of the reality being studied. The researcher’s attempt to maintain an unbiased perspective in reporting data were reflected in the data collection process. The established protocols for coding and a well thought out data collection and analysis plan, as previously mentioned, was implemented and utilized to support the purpose and integrity of the research. The collection of extant data was necessary in ascertaining information that was
not attainable through the quantitative process, and was not contrived or manipulated by the researcher. Yet, this data added value to the research and data analysis process by providing more in-depth information to support the obtained quantitative data results.

Summary

Chapter three presented the research method and statistical analysis used to explain this quantitative study of ECHS students’ and college instructors’ perceptions of effective teaching practices. The next chapter presents the results obtained with those methods.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As stated in chapter one, the study’s purpose is to examine ECHS students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of college instructors’ teaching practices, as well as college instructors’ perceptions of their students’ experiences of whether their teaching practices are effective. Chapter three explained the research methodology used to answer the research questions and test the hypothesis. Chapter four presents the results to address, in turn, each research question and the hypothesis. The findings were obtained from statistical analysis of the Tripod 41-item survey questionnaires. Additionally, the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of cognitive motivation and predetermination utilized in this study to more critically analyze survey responses, and provide more explanation and understanding to the study’s findings will be discussed. The analysis of extant data used to provide multi-source validity to the obtained quantitative data will be presented.

Results of Research Question 1

Research Question 1: What are ECHS students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices of college instructors?

Since the survey questions were classified by the seven categories (7Cs) of effective teaching practices, answering the research question entailed conducting basic descriptive statistics to summarize and describe students’ responses, which were converted to scores, and presented as means of the 7Cs. The Likert Scale design of the surveys represented responses ranging from 1 to 5, with the following meanings: 1 = Totally Untrue, 2 = Mostly Untrue, 3 = Somewhat True, 4 = Mostly True, 5 = Totally True. Table 4.1 presents the student survey results. The results revealed that ECHS students’ experiences of college instructors’ teaching
practices were, overall, favorable. Most notably, students viewed as particularly favorable instructors’ abilities to effectively control/manage the classroom environment, and confer or actively engage with them, as well as academically challenge them, with mean scores of 3.996 (control), and 3.728 (confer), and 3.709 (challenge), with mode scores of 5, 4 and 4 respectively.

More in-depth data analysis, via cross-analysis, by race/ethnicity, reflected how these groups viewed differently the three highest ranked effective teaching practices of control, confer and challenge. Table 4.2 presents the race/ethnic breakdown of mean scores for control, in highest rank order, was South Asian or East Indian with a mean score of 4.4, Arabic/Middle-Eastern and “Other” students’ mean score for control represented 4.2, and Black or African American and Hispanic/Latino students’ mean score was 4.0. Table 4.3 presents the race/ethnic breakdown of mean scores for the effective teaching practice of confer, which was the second highest-ranked category, with Arabic/Middle-Eastern, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander and Black or African American participants’ mean score of 3.8 and White and South Asian or East Indian with mean scores of 3.7. Table 4.4 presents the race/ethnic breakdown of the mean scores for the third highest ranked category, challenge, with a mean score of 3.7; specifically, student participants that chose “Other” as their race/ethnic identity had a mean score of 4.1, followed by Arabic/Middle-Eastern students’ mean score of 3.9, and Black or African American, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander and White with mean scores of 3.7.

Conversely, students scored lowest, or viewed least favorable, their college instructors’ ability to show care, and to captivate or motivate them, with mean scores of
3.197 (care) and 3.315 (captivate). Table 4.5 presents the race/ethnic breakdown of mean scores for care. Specifically, South Asian or East Indian students’ mean score for care was the lowest of all race/ethnic groups, reflective of 2.7, followed by Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander with a mean score of 2.8, all other race/ethnic groups mean scores were 3.0 or higher. Table 4.6 presents the race/ethnic breakdown of mean scores for captivate. Specifically, South Asian or East Indian students’ mean score for captivate was 2.3, followed by Asian students’ mean score of 2.8, all other race/ethnic groups’ mean scores were 3.0 or greater.

Table 4.7 presents the race/ethnic breakdown of mean scores for clarify, and Table 4.8 presents the race/ethnic breakdown of mean scores for consolidate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.996</td>
<td>1.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.728</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.709</td>
<td>0.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.598</td>
<td>1.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.588</td>
<td>1.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captivate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.315</td>
<td>1.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.197</td>
<td>1.188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students’ mean scores for the 7Cs ranged from 3.197 (care) to 3.996 (control). The mode and median scores were incorporated to gauge which score response had the highest frequency.
and which score resided in the middle of the distribution of scores, thus providing more insight to the variance of scores and students differing experiences of those practices.

With respect to the construct of *care*, the mean, median, and mode are around the same response rate of 3. On average, students responded to their experiences of this effective teaching practice as being “somewhat true” (in the middle of true and untrue). Further, the standard deviation (1.188) of *care* indicated approximately how far the responses in the distribution of scores deviated from the average, thus scores were +/- 1.188 from 3.197.

With respect to the construct of *control*, the mean and median were the same response rate of 4, and the mode was 5. While the most frequent student response rate was 5, on average, students responded to this effective teaching practice with a response rate of 4, so most students viewed their experiences of the effective teaching practice of *control* as being “mostly true”. The standard deviation (1.040) indicated approximately how far the responses in the distribution of scores deviated from the average, thus scores were +/- 1.040 from 3.996.

With respect to the construct of *challenge*, the mode and median were the same response rate of 4, while the mean, 3.709, was slightly lower. However, although some students responded lower than 4, 3.709 is closer to 4 than 3, so most students viewed their experiences of this effective teaching practice as being “mostly true”. The construct of *challenge* had the smallest standard deviation (0.979), which indicated approximately how far the responses in the distribution of scores deviated from the average, thus scores were +/- 0.979 from 3.709.
With respect to the construct of confer, the mode and median were the same response rate of 4, while the mean, 3.728, was slightly lower. However, although some students responded lower than 4, 3.728 is closer to 4 than 3, so most of the students viewed their experiences of this effective teaching practice as being “mostly true”. The standard deviation (1.014) indicated approximately how far the responses in the distribution of scores deviated from the average, thus scores were +/- 1.014 from 3.728.

With respect to the construct of clarify, the mode and median were the same response rate of 4, while the mean, 3.588, was slightly lower. However, although some students responded lower than 4, 3.588 is closer to 4 than 3, so most students viewed their experiences of this effective teaching practice as being “mostly true”. The standard deviation (1.074) indicated approximately how far the responses in the distribution of scores deviated from the average, thus scores were +/- 1.014 from 3.588.

With respect to the construct of captivate, the median and mode were the same response rate of 3, and the mean, 3.315, was slightly higher. Although some students responded higher than 3, 3.315 is closer to 3 than 4, so most students viewed their experiences of this effective teaching practice as being “somewhat true” (in the middle of true and untrue). The standard deviation (1.135) indicated approximately how far the responses in the distribution of scores deviated from the average, thus scores were +/- 1.135 from 3.315.

With respect to the construct of consolidate the median and mode were the same response rate of 4, and the mean, 3.598, was lower. Although some students responded lower than 4, 3.598 is still closer to 4 than 3, so most students viewed their experiences of
this effective teaching practice as being “mostly true”. The standard deviation (1.137) indicated approximately how far the responses in the distribution of scores deviated from the average, thus scores were +/- 1.137 from 3.598.

Table 4.2. The Race/Ethnic Breakdown of Mean Scores for Control (Classroom Management)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic/Middle Eastern</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian/East Indian</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total means Overall/Grand Mean; range of scores 1-5.

For control, the mean scores were between 3.6 and 4.2 across races. Most students responded with “mostly true” for this category. The lowest mean score of 3.6 for Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander students is still closer to 4, which is “mostly true”. South Asian/East Indian students scored the highest, 4.4, which is notable since they have scored the lowest with: challenge, care captivate, and clarify. On average, the overall races/ethnicities responded with “mostly true” for this construct.
Table 4.3. The Race/Ethnic Breakdown of Mean Scores for Confer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic/Middle Eastern</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian/East Indian</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total means Overall/Grand Mean; range of scores 1-5.

The mean scores of *confer* were between 3.3 and 4.4, most students responded with “mostly true” in this category. On average, the Asian population scored the lowest (3.3), which means that they responded more with “somewhat true”. The highest score was for students who did not provide a race/ethnic identity, represented as “blank” (4.4). Notably, the South Asian/East Indian score was second highest, and equivalent to White (3.7). The South Asian group has scored on the lower end for *challenge, care, captivate* and *clarify*. On average, the overall races/ethnicities responded with “mostly true” for this construct.
Table 4.4. The Race/Ethnic Breakdown of Mean Scores for Challenge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic/Middle Eastern</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian/East Indian</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total means Overall/Grand Mean; range of scores 1-5.

The mean scores of challenge were between 3 and 4.1. On average, Asian and South Asian or East Indian populations responded with “somewhat true” (3), while the other races, on average, responded with “mostly true”. The highest score was for students who identified as “Other,” and those who did not provide a race/ethnic identity, represented as “blank” (4.1). On average, the overall races/ethnicities responded with “mostly true” for this construct.
Table 4.5. The Race/Ethnic Breakdown of Mean Scores for Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic/Middle Eastern</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian/East Indian</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total means Overall/Grand Mean; range of scores 1-5.

The mean scores for care were between 2.7 and 4.0, but most races responded, on average, 3 or “somewhat true”. Except for the “blank” category (of which there were only 4 people who responded), the rest of the race/ethnic groups responded between 2 and 3. South Asian or East Indian and Asian and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander were lowest, with 2.7 and 2.8. On average, the overall races/ethnicities responded with “somewhat true” for this construct.
Table 4.6. The Race/Ethnic Breakdown of Mean Scores for Captivate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic/Middle Eastern</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian/East Indian</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total means Overall/Grand Mean; range of scores 1-5.

The mean scores of *captivate* were between 2.3 and 3.9. Again, the Asian, South Asian/East Indian and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander scored the lowest, 2.8, 2.3, and 3.0. The highest mean score of 3.9, or “mostly true”, was for students who did not provide their race/ethnic identity, represented by “blank”. On average, the overall races/ethnicities responded with “somewhat true” for this construct.
Table 4.7. The Race/Ethnic Breakdown of Mean Scores for Clarify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic/Middle Eastern</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian/East Indian</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total means Overall/Grand Mean; range of scores 1-5.

The mean scores of *clarify* were between 3 and 4.3. The lowest score was 3.0 for South Asian students. The highest mean score was for students who did not provide their race/ethnic identity, represented by “blank” (4.3). The second highest score of 3.6 was tied among Arabic, Black, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian and White. It is notable that Native Hawaiian scored among the highest, since they have scored among the lowest for other categories. On average, the races responded with “mostly true”, except for Asian and South Asian with responses representative of “somewhat true”. However, the overall races/ethnicities responded with “mostly true” for this construct.
Table 4.8. The Race/Ethnic Breakdown of Mean Scores for Consolidate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic/Middle Eastern</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian/East Indian</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total means Overall/Grand Mean; range of scores 1-5.

The mean scores of consolidate were between 3.0 and 4.4. The highest mean score was for students who did not provide their race/ethnic identity, represented by “blank” (4.4), and the lowest mean score (3.0) was for Asian students. Notably, South Asian/East Indian have the second highest score since they have scored among the lowest for other constructs. On average, the races/ethnicities responded with “mostly true” for this construct.

**Results of Research Question 2**

Research Question 2: *What are college instructors’ perceptions of ECHS students’ experiences of effective teaching practices?*

The identical process used to answer Research Question 1 was used to answer Research Question 2. The instructor survey questions were classified by the seven categories (7Cs) of effective teaching practices. Answering the research question entailed conducting basic descriptive statistic to summarize and describe instructors’ responses, which were converted to scores and presented as means of the 7Cs. Table 4.9 presents the instructor
survey results. The results revealed that in general, college instructors’ perceptions of their ECHS students’ experiences of their effective teaching practices were very favorable. In particular, the constructs of confer, control, and challenge were ranked as the top three effective teaching practices that instructors thought students experienced in their classes. Specifically, the mean scores for the top three ranked constructs were 4.200 (confer), 4.115 (control), and 4.100 (challenge), with mode scores of 4, 4, and 4, respectively.

Table 4.9. Descriptive Statistics of Instructor Survey of Effective Teaching Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.033</td>
<td>0.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.115</td>
<td>0.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>0.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.903</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captivate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.825</td>
<td>0.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>0.607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructors’ mean scores of effective teaching practices ranged from 3.825 to 4.200. The mean, median, and mode scores were around the same value of 4. Most of the instructors responded to these constructs with the response of “mostly true”.

Results of Research Question 3

Research Question 3: How do the perceptions of ECHS students and their college instructors compare?
The study results revealed there were differences between students’ and instructors’ perceptions of the 7Cs of effective teaching practices. Table 4.10 presents a comparison of the students’ and instructors’ descriptive statistics data of mean scores.

### Table 4.10. Mean Scores of Students and Instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7Cs Effective Teaching Practices</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Cohen’s D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>3.197</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>4.033</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.996</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>4.115</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>3.709</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confer</td>
<td>3.728</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify</td>
<td>3.588</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>3.903</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captivate</td>
<td>3.315</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>3.825</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidate</td>
<td>3.598</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students’ and instructors’ mean scores for the 7Cs were vastly different for the constructs of care, challenge, confer, clarify, captivate and consolidate. However, the students’ and instructors’ mean scores for control were not as different as the other scores.

**Research Hypothesis Results**

The research hypothesis tested in this study was, *College instructors’ perceptions of students’ experiences of effective teaching practices will be statistically different from students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices*. The results of the data analysis, via two-sample, assuming unequal variances, t-tests for the 7Cs, revealed statistical differences in six of the seven categories of effective teaching practices. Specifically, the constructs of
captivate, confer, consolidate, challenge, care and clarify represented statistical differences between the mean scores for students and instructors. The statistical findings are presented in Table 4.11 (Captivate), Table 4.12 (Confer), Table 4.13 (Consolidate), Table 4.14 (Challenge), Table 4.15 (Care), and Table 4.16 (Clarify).

**Table 4.11. T-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances for the Construct of Captivate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.315047</td>
<td>3.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1.289915</td>
<td>0.404487179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.003241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value (&lt;)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect size: Cohen’s D= .44  \( r=.21 \)

Ha: \( \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \)

Since the p-value is < 0.05, the researcher’s results were not due to chance, and the null hypothesis was correctly rejected. The actual p-value, 0.0000222118185093868, was highly significant. Thus, the mean scores of captivate for instructors (3.825) and students (3.315) were statistically and significantly different. This means students feel “somewhat” (in the middle of true and untrue), while faculty feel “mostly true”. Further, the difference in variance, 1.289915 for students and 0.404487179 for faculty, represents the samples’ distribution or spread of scores. Students’ scores were not as close to each other or the mean, as were instructors’ scores. This, perhaps, was attributable to the number of observations for
student (638), which is much larger than the number of observations for faculty (40). The more observations there are, the greater the opportunity for variability in the responses.

**Table 4.12. T-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances for the Construct of Confer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.728421</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1.029465</td>
<td>0.303448276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.016692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value (&lt;)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect size: Cohen’s $D = 0.67$  $r = 0.32$

Ha: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

Since the p-value is 0.000111, the results were highly significant and not due to chance, and the null hypothesis was rejected. The mean scores for *confer* for instructors (4.2) and students (3.728) were statistically and significantly different. The difference in variance, 1.029465 for students and 0.303448276 for faculty, represents the samples’ distribution or spread of scores. Students’ scores were not as close to each other or the mean, as were instructors’ scores. This, perhaps, was attributable to the number of observations for student (475), which is much larger than the number of observations for faculty (30). The more observations there are, the greater the opportunity for variability in the responses.
Table 4.13. T-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances for the Construct of Consolidate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.598739</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1.293388</td>
<td>0.368965517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.016692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value (&lt;)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect size: Cohen’s D=.42    r=.20
Ha: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

Since the p-value is 0.000185, the results were highly significant and were not due to chance, and the null hypothesis was rejected. Thus, the mean scores for consolidate for instructors (4.1) and students (3.598) were statistically and significantly different. Students’ variance (1.293388) in scores was much greater than instructors’ variance (0.368965517) in scores, indicating instructors’ scores were much closer to one another and the mean, than students’ scores. Again, due to the disparate number of observations of students (476) as compared to faculty (30), this may have attributed to the differences in variance for the samples. The more observations there are, the greater the opportunity for variability in responses.
Table 4.14. T-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances for the Construct of Challenge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.709434</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.959546</td>
<td>0.62244898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.000995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value (&lt;)</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect size: Cohen’s D=.57  r=.28
Ha: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

Since the p-value is 0.001447, the results were highly significant and were not due to chance, and the null hypothesis was rejected. The mean scores for challenge for instructors (4.1) and students (3.709) were statistically and significantly different. This means that the students and faculty feel differently about challenge, faculty feel “mostly true” (4.1), and students also feel “mostly true” (3.709), but there were some students that responded with “somewhat” (3, in the middle of true and untrue). The difference in the samples’ variances; student (0.959546) and faculty (0.62244898), reflects the distribution of students’ scores were not as close to one another and the mean, as compared to instructors’ scores. The number of observations, 795 for students and 50 for instructors may have attributed to the differences in variance. The more observations there are, the more opportunity for variability of responses. Notably, the differences in variance for the samples was not as pronounced as captivate, confer, consolidate, care, and clarify. This means students and instructors responses for the construct of challenge were closer to one another and, respective means, as compared to the other six constructs.
Table 4.15. T-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variance for the Construct of Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.197479</td>
<td>4.033333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1.413552</td>
<td>0.654022989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.026192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value (&lt;)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect size: Cohen’s D=.59  \( r=.28 \)
Ha: \( \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \)

Since the p-value is 0.000000538, the results were highly significant and were not due to chance, and the null hypothesis was rejected. The mean scores for care for instructors (4.033) and students (3.197) were statistically and significantly different. This means that students and instructors feel differently about care. Instructors feel “mostly true” while the students feel “somewhat true” (3.2, in the middle of true and untrue). This category might be worth exploring further, to determine why there is such a pronounced divide; students may be feeling more untrue while instructors may be feeling more true about care.

Table 4.16. T-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances for the Construct of Clarify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.588647512</td>
<td>3.911111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1.149744803</td>
<td>0.508864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>1.980626002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value (&lt;)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect size: Cohen’s D=.35  \( r=.17 \)
Ha: \( \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \)
Since the p-value is 0.000106962, the results were highly significant and were not due to chance, and the null hypothesis was rejected. The mean scores for clarify for instructors (3.911) and students (3.588) were statistically and significantly different. This means that students and instructors feel differently about clarify; instructors feel “mostly true” and students feel “mostly true”, but some students also feel “somewhat true” (in the middle of true and untrue).

The construct of Control (classroom management) was the only effective teaching practice that both students’ and instructors’ mean scores were statistically not different. Table 4.17 represents the statistical data of the results.

| Table 4.17. T-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances for the Construct of Control (Classroom Management) |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| **Student**                                     | **Faculty**                                     |
| Mean                                            | 3.99640611                                      | 4.115942029                                      |
| Variance                                        | 1.082720885                                     | 0.721653879                                      |
| Observations                                    | 1113                                            | 69                                              |
| df                                              | 81                                              |                                                 |
| t Critical two-tail                             | 1.989686323                                     |                                                 |
| p-value (=)                                     | 0.2668                                          |                                                 |

Effect size: Cohen’s D=.13  \(r=.06\)

Ho: \(\mu_1=\mu_2\)

Since the p-value is 0.2668674, the results were not due to chance, and the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, the mean score of control for instructors (4.115) and students (3.996) were statistically the same score. This means both students and instructors feel “mostly true” about control (classroom management).
Cognitive Theories of Motivation

Having presented the quantitative results of the survey in the previous section, this section interprets those results through the lens of two cognitive theories of motivation: self-efficacy and predetermination. As explained in chapter three, these theories supplemented the study’s empirical analysis, enabling the researcher to more critically analyze student and instructor survey responses. Specifically, these theories provided a perspective for examining, or perhaps explaining, how classroom experiences and teacher–student interactions mediate student motivation, engagement, academic press, learning, and academic success, all of which arise from pedagogically-embedded beliefs and perceptions about students’ success or failure (Tollefson, 2000). Both student self-efficacy and predetermination are developed and enhanced by their experiences of effective teaching practices. Thus, the study’s results illuminate distinct differences between instructors’ and students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices, and the need to reconcile these difference to enhance the creation of optimal learning environments of college classes for ECHS students, which in turn, translate to academic success and higher education attainment.

Students’ Self-Efficacy. Students’ self-efficacy is constructed from their beliefs about their abilities or competency. According, to Bandura (1977), self-efficacy is a social learning theory which states differential amounts of effort, or academic press, individuals expend on a task relates to (1) their beliefs about their abilities, established by past experiences of success and failure and, (2) goal setting which is based on the premise of those beliefs. Thus, self-efficacy determines resiliency and whether individuals will be motivated to persist at a difficult task (Bandura, 1977; Tollefson, 2000). In addressing ECHS
students’ self-efficacy, or their held beliefs about their ability (or competency) and necessary effort (or academic press required to achieve academic success in college-level course work), three research questions were posed that directly related to time spent on homework, completion of homework, and levels of self-confidence in successfully completing the ECHS program. The questions were as follows:

1) Outside of class, about how much time in a week do you usually spend doing homework for this class? Response choices included: No time, Half an hour, 1 hour, 2 hours, 3-4 hours, 5-7 hours, 8+ hours.

2) When homework is assigned for this class, how much of it do you usually complete? Response choices included: Never assigned, None of it, Some of it, Most of it, All, All plus some extra. And,

3) How confident are you that you will successfully complete the ECHS with an Associate’s Degree or transferrable credits into the University System? Response choices included: Very confident, Moderately confident, Not confident at all.

Figure 4.1 depicts the responses of 157 ECHS students, to the question of how much time in a week they usually spend doing homework for the surveyed college course. 72 ECHS students (45.86%) indicated they spent 3 or more hours, per week doing homework, with the largest number of students, per category, 45 or 28.66%, spent 3-4 hours per week on homework.
Figure 4.1. Outside of class, about how much time in a week do you usually spend doing homework for this class?

Figure 4.2 depicts ECHS students’ responses to how much homework they complete for the surveyed college course. Of the 157 student responses, 80 (50.96%) students indicated they completed all assigned homework, and it is worth noting that 18 (11%) students indicated they complete all assigned homework, plus some extra.
Figure 4.2. When homework is assigned for this class, how much of it do you usually complete?

Figure 4.3 depicts how confident ECHS students are about successfully completing ECHS with an associate degree or transferrable credits into the university system. The data revealed that of the 160 student responses, 104 (65.00%) students were Very Confident they would successfully complete the program. 52 (32.50%) students were Moderately Confident, and 4 (2.50%) students were Not Confident at all. Further cross-analysis of data, by gender and the levels of confidence, revealed female students were overall more confident they would successfully complete the ECHS. Figure 4.4 represents the gender breakdown of this data.
Figure 4.3. How confident are you that you will successfully complete the ECHS with an Associate’s Degree or transferrable credits into the University System?

Figure 4.4. The Gender Breakdown of Confidence Levels
Of the 160 responses, 156 (97.5%) students were confident they would successfully complete the ECHS program. And, of those, 93 (59.23%) were females and 63 (40.12%) were males. Further, 4 (2.5%) students, 3 females and 1 male, responded they were not confident at all they would successfully complete the program, and 8 student participants did not respond to this question.

Data obtained from the three student questions related to self-efficacy supported the cognitive motivation theoretical framework, in that 62% of students completed all assigned, plus some extra, homework, reflective of academic press. Further, 45.86% of students spent three or more hours per week on homework. And, arguably, the most prominent of data obtained to support students’ self-efficacy, and intrinsic predetermination—specifically their belief about their competency and future academic success—was the levels of self-confidence students reflected, with a resounding 97.50% of students indicating they were confident they would successfully complete the ECHS program. Further, attendance data obtained from one of the participant ECHS sites showed the average percentage of students who attended school daily was 98.34%, this data also supported students’ self-efficacy and the amount of effort or academic press required to obtain academic success (North Carolina School Report Cards, 2014-2015). Attendance data for the other two participant ECHSs was not available.

**Instructors’ Predetermination.** Predetermination explains how the “unique human experience individuals bring into the school” contributes to the schools’ culture and success” (Muhammad, 2009, p. 29). Specifically, instructors’ perceptual predeterminations of students, influenced by their lived and socialized experiences, permeate their educational
practices, thus impacting students’ educational experiences (Muhammad, 2009). Further, intrinsic predetermination was examined from the perspective of “students’ perceptions of his or her probability of achieving success in school. The messages students receive from their environment—the home, community, and school can either build their confidence or work to destroy it” (Muhammad, 2009, p. 23).

The conceptual framework of predetermination, with respect to college instructors’ experiences, or training in effective teaching practices or pedagogy for secondary education students, directly relates to their ability to facilitate learning, and establish expectations for ECHS students. Thus, college instructors establishing high conduct expectations and high academic and rigorous curricula standards and outcome expectancies are essential for the success of ECHS students (i.e., learning expectations and outcomes), represented explicitly in course syllabi and pedagogy, and implicitly in instructor–student relationships, interactions and communications. When students are aware of the expectations required for academic success, they can make the necessary adjustments to the amount of effort required of them for the desired outcome of academic success.

Figure 4.5 reflects college instructors’ professional development to aid in their proficiency of teaching ECHS students. From the conceptual framework of predetermination, this data reflects college instructors’ experiences or training in effective teaching practices of ECHS students. Of the 10 instructor responses, 8 (80%) had not received pedagogy training to aid in their teaching practices with ECHS students. This data supports the position that the researcher put forth in chapter two, that dispositions and teaching practices of college
instructors and secondary education teachers are not seamlessly aligned; thus, ECHS students are simultaneously experiencing differing teaching philosophies and practices.

**Figure 4.5. College Instructors Professional Development to aid in Teaching ECHS Students**

Instructors’ ability to challenge and engage students with highly rigorous academic course work, requiring articulation of critical thinking and project-based learning and problem solving, reflective of the constructs of *challenge* and *confer*, was used to analyze data, from the perspective of the conceptual framework of predetermination. Specifically, students’ mean scores for *confer* and *challenge*, which reflected the second and third highest student-ranked effective teaching practices, directly related to college instructors established behavioral and academic expectations, and perceptions, of ECHS students, mediated through
pedagogy. Table 4.18 reflects ECHS students’ mean scores for the effective teaching practices of confer and challenge, which suggests that students perceived their instructors as holding them to a high academic standard with high academic expectations and engagement as high 3s, or on average, “mostly true” scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Confer</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.728</td>
<td>3.709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18. ECHS Students’ Mean Scores for Challenge and Confer

Analysis of Extant Data

The extensive examination of the extant data was conducted to provide insight and understanding to the obtained quantitative data, as it relates to policies, practices and procedures, as well as the expectations and rigor associated with college level courses. The extant aggregate performance data provided validity of students’ preparedness and success in college level courses.

As previously mentioned, course syllabi explicitly represent the academic and behavioral expectations that college instructors establish and to which they hold ECHS students accountable, to achieve academic success. Accordingly, the constructs of challenge and control are reflected in course syllabi. Within the scope of this study, course syllabi in the curricular areas of precalculus, algebra, chemistry, biology, and English were examined to analyze the academic rigor, as well as student conduct expectations, to offer additional support and validation to the quantitative results of data obtained by the student survey.
Particularly, the course syllabus of English 112 (Writing and Research in the Disciplines), a 27-page course syllabus, reflected course rigor, extensive personal accountability, self-directed learning, and discipline to successfully complete the course. Students were responsible for maintaining regular attendance, notifying the instructor of excused absences, and submitting homework on time. A homework assignment was due for every class session, and students were expected to be prepared to actively participate in class activities and engage in class discussion. And, even in the event of inclement weather, which resulted in class cancellation, students were still expected to turn in homework assignments via the course’s web-assisted, learning management system, Blackboard. Further, there was no rounding up of grades, calculated to the one-hundredth decimal place, no curving of exam grades, and no dropping of the lowest exam/quiz grade. All grades were counted towards students’ final grade. Moreover, as it pertained to behavior and conduct expectations, regular attendance was mandatory for successful completion. Moreover, students were asked to “treat your education in a responsible, professional manner” by checking Blackboard for exam scores or graded assignments, as well as check daily their college assigned email for course updates. Additionally, the very comprehensive and succinct course syllabus provided insight and support to the student highest rated effective teaching practice of control; the only statistically identical mean score of the 7Cs, for both students and instructors. Course syllabi provided evidence of classroom management, to the extent that conduct expectations, time on task, and effective use of instructional time were explicitly expressed (Appendix F).

Of the three participant ECHS sites, two provided public access to extant student achievement data. Student achievement data for the ECHS located on the community college
campus represented 63% mathematics proficiency, 88% English proficiency, and a 100% graduation rate, for which the school received “National Rankings” and earned a bronze medal, from US News and World Report, in 2016 (http://www.usnews.com). Student achievement data for the ECHS located on the university campus reflected a college/career readiness score of 89.9%, which included proficiency scores of 92.5% in biology, 88.5% in English, and 88.9% in mathematics, for which the school received “National Rankings” and earned a bronze medal, from US News and World Report, in 2016 (http://www.usnews.com). Unfortunately, in higher education institutions, particularly in the state in which this research was conducted, aggregate ECHS student achievement data in college-level courses was not available.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

This research investigated ECHS students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of college instructors’ teaching practices, and college instructors’ perceptions of their students’ experiences of their effective teaching practices. The goal was to determine differences, if any, between students’ and college instructors’ perceptions of effective teaching practices. Three research questions were addressed: (1) What are ECHS students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices of college instructors? (2) What are college instructors’ perceptions of ECHS students’ experiences of effective teaching practices? (3) How do the perceptions of ECHS students and their college instructors compare? In other words, is what students say they are experiencing in college instructors’ classes also what college instructors believe their students are experiencing in their classes?

In this quantitative study, the researcher used low-level statistics, via surveys, to capture and approximate ECHS students’ experiences of effective teaching practices in college courses, as well as college instructors’ perceptions of what they think their students are experiencing in their classes and to compare those perceptions. As a conceptual framework, as explained in chapter two, the researcher drew on the Tripod Standard Survey of Effective Teaching Practices for Secondary Education Students, and the corresponding Instructor Survey. The Tripod Survey classifies effective teaching practices according to seven categories or constructs (the 7Cs): care, control, challenge, confer, clarify, captivate, and consolidate. To further analyze the quantitative survey data in greater depth, the researcher used cognitive theories of motivation (including self-efficacy and predetermination) as an interpretative lens.
Implications

In this chapter, the researcher will build on the results and analysis presented in chapter four, delving deeper into the data analysis with the intent of informing teaching practices and uncovering policy and research implications. The attempt to inform teaching practices through reference to the students’ perspectives of their experiences of effective teaching practices reflects a recognition that students are principal stakeholders in the education process, and their expressed needs must be incorporated into classroom practices. Who better than students to inform teaching practices, as they are the ones experiencing and being affected by them. From this perspective, information on student’s perspectives on teaching practices could prove useful to instructors by (1) illustrating there is incongruence, with respect to how students perceive their experiences in college classes, as compared to what college instructors believe their students are experiencing in their classes, (2) illustrating students’ academic needs, (3) illustrating the need for content-specific professional development, and (4) illustrating how adjustments to teaching practices could make the difference between academic success and failure. This research can inform teaching practices that can contribute to enhancing opportunities for academic success for ECHS students in college courses.

The data analysis of the mean scores of students’ and instructors’ 7Cs of effective teaching practices, via t-tests, revealed the constructs of captivate, confer, consolidate, challenge, care and clarify were highly significant and statistically different, thus supporting the researcher’s study hypothesis: College instructors’ perceptions of students’ experiences of effective teaching practices will be statistically different from students’ perceptions of
Instructors’ and students’ views of effective teaching practices were very different in those categories, as students’ mean scores for all constructs were significantly and statistically lower than instructors’ mean scores for all constructs. In other words, what students said they were experiencing in college classes wasn’t at all what their instructors believed they were experiencing. Perhaps the issue resides in the realm of pedagogical professional development for college instructors to aid them in their proficiency to teach ECHS students. The results of the research data showed 80% of the instructor participants indicated they had not received professional development to aid in their proficiency to teach ECHS students. By contrast, secondary education teachers of ECHS students have been taught how to teach via teacher certification and licensure programs.

Research from various methodological perspectives, used to establish the foundational and conceptual framework for this dissertation study purported, central to students’ academic success are the dispositions and teaching practices of teachers (Watson, 1996; Post, 2011; American Institute of Research [AIR], 2013; Alaie, 2011; Kugel, 1993; Duffy, et al., 2009). Also, the experiences teachers bring into the classroom contributes to the schools’ culture and success (Muhammad, 2009). Further, the research results of this study supported prior research conducted by the American Institute of Research (AIR), 2013, which reported high school and college instructors, of ECHS students, varied in their instructional approach and levels of support they provided students.

The constructs of care and captivate were the lowest student-ranked effective teaching practices of college instructors. The most pronounced results were the cross-analysis of data by the construct care and demographics, specifically, South Asian or East Indian,
Asian and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander students’ scores were below 3.0, which reflected their belief about college instructors’ care for them was “Mostly Untrue”. Whether these results are truly indicative of effective teaching practices, or influenced by factors that may not be relevant, or applicable to effective teaching practices such as citizenship status, limited English proficiency, course difficulty, course type, or teaching behaviors that were not evaluated by the survey instrument; the reality is, these students’ perceptions are their reality. The issue of instructor care should be further explored as the targeted demographic of ECHSs are those representative of multiculturalism. Further, the need to understand why students feel like they are not cared for or about is a crucial nexus for instructors’ understanding and, making necessary adjustments to their teaching practices, to enhance students’ opportunities to achieve academic success.

**Recommendations for Practice**

Secondary education pedagogical professional development for college instructors, in collaboration with ECHS secondary education teachers, is a warranted recommendation for practice from the findings, and may be the potential solution to reconciling these differing perspectives of effective teaching practices, for ECHS students and college instructors. Further, inter-institutional pedagogical professional development that establishes standards for prescribing best practices in effective teaching, may enhance the seamless alignment of instructional practices, from secondary education to higher education in ECHSs. In addition, the need for more instructor-student communication and feedback, or rapport building, is critical in mitigating these differences. To this end, instructors meeting regularly with students (i.e., once a week, once every two weeks, or once a month) to discuss how they are
progressing or what their learning needs, or concerns are may be a viable resolution to reconciling these differences. Further, rapport building with students through deliberate planning may also breakdown cultural and communication barriers by enhancing cultural understanding and sensitivities to differences, by both instructors and students. Cultural awareness and sensitivity training should also be in collaboration with secondary education teachers, after all, secondary education teachers and college instructors are teaching the same students. Therefore, providing the same professional development opportunities of cultural awareness and sensitivity training may enhance the levels of support and understanding provided these students across institutions. Moreover, providing these students with a sense of being cared for and about may enhance their opportunities for academic success.

The construct of captivate, or instructors’ ability to motivate and intrigue students’ interest in learning, was below 3.0, or “Mostly Untrue,” for South Asian or East Indian, and Asian students, which may be more reflective of a cultural difference in interpretation or understanding, than an effective teaching practice issue, as all other demographics rated this construct as 3.0 or higher.

The effective teaching practice of classroom control was the only 7Cs to be viewed, and measured statistically as the same mean score for students’ and college instructors’. In other words, what students said they were experiencing in class relevant to classroom control (classroom management), was also what instructors believed students were experiencing in their classrooms, thus establishing congruence or alignment of this teaching practice. The extant data of course syllabi provided insight as to why this may have been the case. Course syllabi was comprehensive, succinct, and all-inclusive as it pertained to what was expected
and required of ECHS students to achieve success in college courses. Course syllabi provided students with a printed overview of the behavioral and academic expectations and requirements of courses, to which students could begin to conceptualize the amount of effort, or academic press required, and adjust study habits, accordingly, to obtain academic success. Course assignments as presented on syllabi, reflected course rigor and, perhaps, the amount of time required of students to spend on homework and prepare for class. 45.86% of students spent 3 or more hours, per week on homework, and 50.96% of students completed all assigned homework, and 11% completed all plus some extra. This data supported previous studies that concluded, effective teachers manage/control classroom environments, to the extent, the classroom is well organized and structured and students are aware of the classroom routines and expectations of them. As a result, class time is skillfully managed, providing optimal learning opportunities, which was reflected in course syllabi (Oliver, et al, 2015; Green, 2005; Wentzel, 1997; Evertson, 1985).

With respect to the targeted demographic served in ECHSs (minority, high poverty, and first generation college attendees, essentially the most vulnerable of being at-risk for academic failure and drop-out), the implications of the research suggest effective teaching practices is paramount. Primarily because this demographic doesn’t represent the typical higher education student, and therefore, college instructors do not necessarily or fully understand the levels of support and or variation in teaching style that may be required to enhance these students’ opportunities to achieve academic success in higher education. ECHS students’ academic success translate to subsequent upward social mobility through workforce development readiness and continued higher education attainment.
Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made. First, providing awareness of ECHS students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices of college instructors are very different, from what college instructors believe their students are experiencing. Instructors’ perspectives, in general, were more favorable than students’, and therefore reflect a false confidence in what they believe students are experiencing in their classes. Therefore, providing capacity-building for instructors to learn about their students’ needs, and to reflect on their own practices is necessary. Further, making college instructors aware of their ECHS students’ perceptions of their teaching practices legitimizes the need of college instructors to participate in inter-institutional professional development in best practices in effective teaching for ECHS students. In this manner, the pedagogical practices of secondary education teachers and college instructors will be aligned, thus ensuring students’ experiences of instructional approach and levels of support, while matriculating through the ECHS, will not be differential. The results of this study provide invaluable information to the office or department of professional development at the constituent higher education institutions, to inform and guide professional development in pedagogy for college instructors who teach ECHS students.

Second, ECHS students may need better induction programs or preparedness, for the college culture and experiences of academic rigor, self-directed learning, and adulthood required to achieve academic success, as well as successful completion of ECHSs.

**Recommendation for Policy**

From a secondary education policy implications perspective, negotiating mandatory, inter-institutional professional development through the Comprehensive Articulation
Agreements (CAA) would assist in ensuring the seamless alignment of teaching practices, as well as easing the transition from high school to college for ECHS students. Moreover, constituent higher education institutions should require college instructors of ECHS students to meet with them regularly, outside of scheduled office hours. In order to do this without it being burdensome on instructors, decreasing their full-time teaching load, by one course, as well as allowing these instructor-student meetings to occur during some of the mandatory professional development days, would ensure students are receiving the needed time and feedback from their instructors, to maximize their opportunity for academic success. A broader policy implication for this study might be to consider the use of Tripod Standard Survey of Effective Teaching Practices for Secondary Education Students, or a similar instrument, to inform instructor evaluations, and guide continuous improvement in teaching and professional development.

**Limitations and Recommendations for Further Study**

The study had three main limitations: the quantitative research design, the sample size of racial/ethnic demographics of participants, and the survey instrument. First, regarding the quantitative research design, this limited the researcher’s ability to probe more deeply into why participants responded in the way they did. Without the opportunity to engage student participants as to why they felt the way they did, and what they thought could be done to improve teaching practices, and enhance their chances of academic success; the heart of students’ academic needs could not fully be uncovered and addressed by this study.

Second, regarding participant demographics, a surprising finding of the study was that South Asian/East Indian and Asian students’ scores for 6 of the 7Cs of effective teaching
practices to include clarify, captivate, confer, consolidate, challenge, and care were the lowest mean scores of all demographics. And, yet, this same demographic had the highest mean score for control. These groups made up 11 (6.99%) student participants. Thus, the small sample of this demographic limited the internal validity of these two demographics. On the basis of these results alone, it is difficult to determine whether effective teaching practices or cultural misunderstanding account for the disparate results compared to the other demographic groups. However, as previously mentioned, it does suggest college instructors should have cultural awareness and sensitivity training, to ensure they are effectively meeting the needs of the diverse students they teach, and or understanding how making adjustments to their communications and or teaching practices can mitigate cultural misunderstandings and contribute to students’ positive experiences in their classes.

Finally, a third limitation of the study is that the instrument that was used, the Tripod Standard Survey of Effective Teaching Practices for Secondary Education Students, consisted entirely of close-ended questions.

For future study. Replicating this study, with a revision of the survey instrument. To this end, having ECHS students complete a version of the survey in which an open-ended question had been incorporated would provide greater clarity as to ECHS students’ academic needs. For example, a possible open-ended question to include is, “What teaching practice(s) can your instructor improve, for you to be more successful in the class?” Along these lines, a mixed-methods study could prove invaluable; it could use the Tripod Standard Survey and incorporate focus groups of students to provide additional, in-depth, information that may not be captured by an additional open-ended survey question. In this manner, more content-
specific information can be gleaned from students, with respect to their academic needs. The collection of this information could also show a common theme of what students, in general, are experiencing, and thus provide more content-specific feedback on effective teaching practices to instructors, as well as pedagogy training. Also, replicating this study to include much larger sample sizes would enhance the validity and generalizability of results to the entire population of ECHS students and college instructors.

In light of the national paradigm shift toward high school students being concurrently enrolled in high and college courses, and more specifically in the state of North Carolina through the Career and College Promise initiative (CCP), perhaps conducting a comparative study on CCP students and ECHS students may prove particularly invaluable in understanding, on a much broader scale, issues surrounding secondary students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices in higher education that will either enhance or impede their opportunities to achieve academic success.

The researcher’s position that college instructors’ perceptions of ECHS students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices will be statistically different from students’ perceptions of effective teaching practices was supported for 6 of the 7Cs of effective teaching practices. The juxtaposition, or side-by-side comparison, of ECHS students’ and instructors’ perceptions of effective teaching practices reflected incongruence, with respect to challenge, care, consolidate, clarify, confer, and captivate. However, students and instructors viewed the effective teaching practice of control (classroom management) similarly. The framework used and analysis of data presented might serve to assist educators and administrators in higher education institutions to reflect on practices and policies that may
mitigate these incongruent perspectives of effective teaching practices and enhance learner outcomes.
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Appendix A: Student Survey

Student Perception Survey of Early College High Schools’ College Instructors

Dear Student,

Thank you for participating in this survey. While answering the questions, it is important that you think about your experiences in a specific college level course. The proctor of the survey will tell you the college instructor you should think about. If they have not done so already, please ask.

Your college instructor will not look at your answers. The survey will be electronically captured and maintained confidentially without any identifiable information about you. Later, someone outside of your school will tell your college instructor how the students at your school responded, but not how you or any one individual student answered. Please answer what you really think and feel. You do not have to answer any question that you do not want to answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Totally Untrue (1)</th>
<th>Mostly Untrue (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat True (3)</th>
<th>Mostly True (4)</th>
<th>Totally True (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I like the way we learn in this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student behavior in this class makes the teacher angry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My teacher wants us to share our thoughts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My teacher asks questions to be sure we are following along when s/he is teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My teacher asks students to explain more about answers they give.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My teacher in this class makes me feel that s/he really cares about me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Our class stays busy and doesn’t waste time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My teacher knows when the class understands and when we do not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If you don’t understand something, my teacher explains it another way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My teacher makes learning enjoyable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My teacher explains difficult things clearly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Students in this class treat the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with respect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>This class does not keep my attention – I get bored.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>My teacher makes us explain our answers—why we think what we think.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My teacher doesn’t let people give up when the work gets hard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>My teacher has several good ways to explain each topic that we cover in this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The comments I get on my work in this class help me understand how to improve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Student behavior in this class is a problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>When s/he is teaching us, my teacher thinks we understand even when we don’t.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Student behavior in this class is under control.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>My teacher really tries to understand how students feel about things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I hate the way students behave in this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>My teacher makes lessons interesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>My classmates behave the way my teacher wants them to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>My teacher takes the time to summarize what we learn each day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>In this class, we learn a lot almost every day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>My teacher seems to know if something is bothering me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>In this class, the teacher expects nothing less than our full effort.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>In this class, we learn to correct our mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>My teacher gives us time to explain our</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>31.</strong> My teacher wants us to use our critical thinking skills, not just memorize things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32.</strong> Students speak up and share their ideas about class work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33.</strong> My teacher checks to make sure we understand what s/he is teaching us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34.</strong> We get helpful comments to let us know what we did wrong on assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. When homework is assigned for this class, how much of it do you usually complete? (Select one choice).
   - Never assigned
   - None of it
   - Some of it
   - Most of it
   - All
   - All plus some extra

36. Outside of class, about how much time in a week do you usually spend doing homework for this class? (Select one choice).
   - No time
   - Half an hour
   - 1 hour
   - 2 hours
   - 3-4 hours
   - 5-7 hours
   - 8+ hours

37. During most weeks, how many days a week is there homework to do for this class? (Select one choice).
   - 1 day
   - 2 days
   - 3 days
   - 4 days
   - 5 days
   - Never assigned
38. How confident are you that you will successfully complete the ECHS with an Associate’s Degree or transferrable credits into the University System (Select one choice).
   Very confident
   Moderately confident
   Not confident

39. Are you female or male?
   Male
   Female

40. How many adults live with you?
   One
   Two
   More than two

41. What is your race/ethnicity? (Mark all that apply).
   White
   Black or African-American
   Hispanic/Latino
   Asian
   Pacific Islander
   Arabic/Middle Eastern
   West Indian
   Native American (Indian)
   South Asian or East Indian
   Other
Appendix B: College Instructor Survey

Instructor Perception Survey of Early College High School Students’ Experiences of Effective Teaching Practices

Dear Instructor,

Thank you for participating in this survey. While answering the questions, it is important that you think about your students experiences in your college level course.

**The purpose of this survey is to evaluate how you as the instructor think students are experiencing your teaching practices. This is not about how you perceive your own teaching practices, but instead how the students experience it.**

The survey will be electronically captured and maintained confidentially without any identifiable information about you. Later, someone outside of your school will tell you how instructors responded, but not how you or any one individual instructor answered. Please answer what you really think and feel. You do not have to answer any question that you do not want to answer. This is not an evaluation of your teaching practices, rather an evaluation of students’ perceptions of your teaching practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totally Untrue (1)</th>
<th>Mostly Untrue (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat True (3)</th>
<th>Mostly True (4)</th>
<th>Totally True (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I believe students like the way they learn in this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Students believe behavior in this class makes me angry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Students believe I want them to share their thoughts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Students believe that they are asked questions to be sure they are following along when I am teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Students believe they are asked to explain more about answers they give.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Students believe that I really care about them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Students believe our class stays busy and doesn’t waste time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Students believe that I know when the class understands and when they do not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Students believe if they don’t understand something, that I explain it another way.</td>
<td>Totally Untrue (1)</td>
<td>Mostly Untrue (2)</td>
<td>Somewhat True (3)</td>
<td>Mostly True (4)</td>
<td>Totally True (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Students believe I make learning enjoyable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Students believe I explain difficult things clearly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Students believe they treat me with respect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Students believe this class does not keep their attention – they get bored.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Students believe I make them explain their answers - - why they think what they think.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Students believe I don’t let them give up when the work gets hard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Students believe I have several good ways to explain each topic we cover in this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Students believe the comments I give on their work helps them understand how to improve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Students believe student behavior is a problem in this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Students believe that when I’m teaching them, I think they understand even when they don’t.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Students believe student behavior in this class is under control.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Students believe that I really try to understand how they feel about things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Students hate the behavior in this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Students believe I make lessons interesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Students believe that their classmates behave the way I want them to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Students believe I take the time to summarize what they learn each day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. In this class, students believe they learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Students believe that I seem to know if something is bothering them.

28. Students believe I expect nothing less than their full effort.

29. In this class, students believe they learn to correct their mistakes.

30. Students believe I give them time to explain their ideas.

31. Students believe I want them to use their critical thinking skills, not just memorize things.

32. Students believe I want them to speak up and share their ideas about class work.

33. Students believe I check to make sure they understand what I am teaching them.

34. Students believe I give them helpful comments to let them know what they did wrong on assignments.

35. When homework is assigned for this class, how much of it do your students usually complete? (Select one choice).
   - Never assigned
   - None of it
   - Some of it
   - Most of it
   - All
   - All plus some extra

36. Outside of class, about how much time in a week do you think students usually spend doing homework for this class? (Select one choice).
   - No time
   - Half an hour
   - 1 hour
   - 2 hours
   - 3-4 hours
5-7 hours
8+ hours

37. During most weeks, how many days a week is there homework to do for this class? (Select one choice).
   1 day
   2 days
   3 days
   4 days
   5 days
   Never assigned

38. Are you female or male?
   Male
   Female

39. How many years have you been teaching?
   1-4
   5-8
   9 or More

40. Have you received professional development to aid in your proficiency of teaching high school students?
   Yes
   No

41. What is your race/ethnicity? (Mark all that apply).
   White
   Black or African-American
   Hispanic/Latino
   Asian
   Pacific Islander
   Arabic/Middle Eastern
   West Indian
   Native American (Indian)
   South Asian or East Indian
   Other
## Appendix C: 7 Cs Classification of 34-Items Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>Count of Construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Captivate</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the ways we learn in this class.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher makes learning enjoyable.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher makes lessons interesting.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This class does not keep my attention -- I get bored.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Care</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher in this class makes me feel that s/he really cares about me.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher really tries to understand how students feel about things.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher seems to know if something is bothering me.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this class, my teacher accepts nothing less than our full effort.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher asks students to explain more about answers they give.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher doesn't let people give up when the work gets hard.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher makes us explain our answers - - why we think what we think.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher wants us to use our thinking skills, not just memorize things.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarify</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you don't understand something, my teacher explains it another way.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this class, we learn to correct our mistakes.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher checks to make sure we understand what s/he is teaching us.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher explains difficult things clearly.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher has several good ways to explain each topic that we cover in this class.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher knows when the class understands, and when we do not.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The comments that I get on my work in this class help me understand how to improve.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We get helpful comments to let us know what we did wrong on assignments.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When s/he is teaching us, my teacher thinks we understand even when we don't.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Management</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hate the way that students behave in this class.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My classmates behave the way my teacher wants them to.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our class stays busy and doesn't waste time.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student behavior in this class is a problem.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student behavior in this class is under control.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student behavior in this class makes the teacher angry.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student in this class treat the teacher with respect. 1

**Confer**

- My teacher gives us time to explain our ideas. 1
- My teacher wants us to share our thoughts. 1
- Students speak up and share their thoughts about class work. 1

**Consolidate**

- In this class, we learn a lot almost every day. 1
- My teacher asks questions to be sure we are following along when s/he is teaching. 1
- My teacher takes the time to summarize what we learn each day. 1

**Grand Total** 34
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Appendix E: ECHS Student Survey Written Instructions Given by ECHS Administrators

Effective Teaching Practices Survey

Dear ECHS Student,

Thank you for participating in this survey. While answering the questions, it is important that you think about your experiences in a specific college level course.

The proctor of the survey will tell you the college instructor you should think about. If they have not done so already, please ask. Your college instructor will not look at your answers. The survey will be electronically captured and maintained confidentially without any identifiable information about you.

The researcher will inform the principal of your school, and your college instructor about how the students at your school responded, but not how you or any one individual student answered.

Please answer what you really think and feel. You do not have to answer any question that you do not want to answer.

Mary Smith

English 111

John Doe

Please sign below to confirm that you completed the survey:
Appendix F: ECHS Sample Course Syllabus

Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences Division
Part 1 of 3, Division Syllabus

Part 1 AHSS Division Syllabus

will structure its operations, training and educational programs around the Core Values of accountability, respect, responsibility, critical thinking, communication, and collaboration.

1. Core Values
   - **Accountability**—Accountability is essential for an environment of learning. Those who are accountable stand by their words and actions, taking full responsibility for what they create and for what they contribute to the community.
   - **Respect**—Respect is a prerequisite for enhancing learning. Community members who respect themselves and others help create a safe, yet open, climate of learning.
   - **Responsibility**—Responsibility is the root of success. Students who assume personal responsibility for their education will reach their goals. Responsible students also make contributions to their communities.
   - **Critical Thinking**—Critical thinking is the fundamental purpose of higher education. The ability to solve problems through the application of the appropriate skills is critical to all disciplines.
   - **Communication**—Communication is increasingly the key competency for living and working in the information age. Communicating effectively in oral and written forms through traditional and new media is a powerful tool for personal and career success.
   - **Collaboration**—Collaboration, by bringing together individual knowledge and talents, creates teams that are greater than the sum of their parts. Such teamwork maximizes benefits to individuals and the community.

2. Policies
   The AHSS Division adheres to the information and policies set forth in the College Catalog, as well as additional requirements set by the instructor. Academic information and student-related college policies are described in the official located at <http://www.ahss.edu/student-services/catalog>. Students are held accountable for this information. By remaining in this course, students agree to abide by these college policies and the contents of this syllabus. The instructor may ask students to sign a document stating that they have read, understood, and agree to abide by the information and policies contained in the college catalog and in this syllabus.

2.1 Attendance Policy
   Absences from class are a serious deterrent to good scholarship. The College, therefore, stresses regular class attendance. The College recognizes that students should have an opportunity to develop personal responsibility and should have some discretion in attendance to meet the demands imposed by other responsibilities. Students anticipating absences should notify their instructor in advance. If prior notification is not possible, the student should contact the instructor immediately upon returning to the College to determine the next course of action.
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Students are expected to be in attendance at least 90 percent of all scheduled class meetings. An absence is defined as missing one-third or more of any regularly scheduled class meeting. In the event that a student's absences in a class exceed 10 percent and the absences are not justified to the satisfaction of the instructor, the instructor will submit an online withdrawal form to Registration and Student Records, documenting the student's last date of attendance. For information on grades associated with attendance policy violations, see [catalog] section entitled "Assignment of Grades for Attendance Policy Violations and Withdrawals" in "Add, Audit, & Withdrawal Policies" at <http://www.---------------.edu/student-services/catalog/academic-information>.

In online and hybrid courses, to remain enrolled in the course, each student is required to open and attempt the Course Entry Quiz in Blackboard by 11:59 PM on the semester 10% date. Students should complete this activity as soon as possible. Delay in completion may result in missing assignments. Students who do not attempt the Course Entry Quiz by the deadline will be dropped from the course with no tuition refund.

Tardiness and Early Departure
Students are also expected to arrive to class on time and to remain in class for the entire class period. Arriving late or leaving early disrupts the learning environment. Because even the most conscientious students occasionally experience extenuating circumstances, classroom doors will be opened for tardy students although doors may be locked for security or pedagogical reasons. Patterns of tardiness or early departures that cannot be justified to the satisfaction of the instructor will be considered violations of the attendance policy, as follows: two tardies or early departures will equate to one absence. For the most recent copy of the Attendance Policy, please go to <http://www.---------------.edu/student-services/catalog/academic-information>.

Absences because of religious holidays—Students may miss up to two classes of excused absences for religious observances under the following conditions:
- Students must notify instructors in writing during the first two weeks of the semester.
- Make-up or alternate assignments will be provided. Students must submit make-up or alternate assignments by assigned due date or they will not be accepted.

2.2 Inclement Weather Policy
For the most recent policy, please go to <http://www.---------------.edu/student-services/catalog/campus-policies-and-procedures> and read the information under Campus Policies and Procedures. Students should make personal decisions regarding their travel safety.

2.3 Official Communication with Students Policy
Every curriculum student is provided with an official email account through the student portal (my.---------------.edu):
- Students must first activate their my.---------------.edu account, wait 24 hours, and then activate the email account.
- This college-issued email account is to be used for all email correspondence with instructors and other college officials.

Official correspondence from the college (from instructors, information about registration
or financial aid, etc.) will be sent to students’ email address ONLY. Instructors and college officials may refuse to accept student emails sent from other addresses. For the Official Communication with Students Policy, go to at <http://www.\[\text{link}]/student-services/catalog/campus-policies-and-procedures>, in Campus Policies and Procedures.

Appropriate Communication—In AHSS division classes, students are expected to communicate in clear, correct, respectful Standard American English at all times. This includes all online or electronic communication, which should follow the standards of Internet etiquette (also known as “netiquette”). Students unfamiliar with these concepts and conventions should check with their instructors.

2.4 FERPA Statement
For the most recent copy of the FERPA policy, please go to at <http://www.\[\text{link}]/student-services/catalog/registration-student-records> and read the information under Registration and Student Records.

Security of Student Records (FERPA). Students can grant access to their educational and financial records to specified persons with FERPA consent Form 1167.

Due to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 1974, instructors may not discuss any information pertaining to a student’s grade or other matters related to academic performance via email or telephone unless the student signs a Form 1126 waiving his or her FERPA rights.

For online classes, students may send an e-mail waiver to their course instructor, using Form 1126. This form may also be used for seated classes.

On the first day of the semester in online classes, all students must read the Authorization to Release Instructor Grade Material via Email (Form 1126). Students’ supplied email addresses are automatically included in this authorization.

Students should send each instructor an email (with their full name, student id #, course name, and course section number) stating that they authorize to release graded material to them via email. The emailed authorization acceptance is consent to all information contained on Form 1126. Emailed acceptance of this form authorizes course instructors to correspond with students by email on grade and academic performance-related issues. If electing not to complete this form, the student acknowledges that he/she will not email the instructor or any college employee with regard to grades or academic performance-related issues.

2.5 Community College Student Code of Conduct
"Students are expected to conduct themselves in accordance with generally-accepted standards of scholarship and conduct." It is important that students carefully read the most recent copy of the Student Code of Conduct, including a listing of Prohibited Conduct and Disciplinary Penalties for Violations of the Student Code. Please go to at <http://www.\[\text{link}]/student-services/catalog> and read the information under Student Code of Conduct, Rights, and Responsibilities.

2.6 Community College Academic Integrity Policy
For the most recent information on academic integrity, please go to
A. Expectations

When college officials award course credits, degrees, diplomas, and certificates, they assume integrity on the part of the student who has completed the work. The college expects students to demonstrate the highest personal integrity in all academic work and behavior. Effective education depends on an atmosphere that is conducive to learning, based on a commitment to honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and individual responsibility. Creating such an atmosphere is the responsibility of students and instructors and requires integrity on the part of both. Students may be asked to sign a statement of academic integrity upon entering classes.

Cheating and plagiarism, as defined below, are forms of academic dishonesty that violate the integrity of the academic process.

B. Violations of the Academic Integrity Policy

1. Cheating, including:
   a. receiving, giving, or helping another student receive or give any information during a quiz, test, examination, or individual assignment;
   b. using unauthorized materials or equipment during a quiz, test, or examination, e.g., notes or books;
   c. communicating the subject matter or contents of a quiz, test, or examination to another student unless specifically authorized by the instructor to share it;
   d. taking a quiz, test, or examination for another student;
   e. obtaining quiz, test, or examination questions beforehand;
   f. tampering with the grading of a quiz, test, or examination; or
   g. working with others in completing take-home quizzes, tests, examinations, or individual assignments unless the instructor specifically authorizes collaborative work.

2. Plagiarism*

   Plagiarism is stealing, or passing off as one's own, the ideas or words of another person. When students present others' words or ideas in a written assignment, they must document the source(s), as described in the MLA Handbook or as directed by the instructor of the course. Plagiarism also includes:
   a. having another person write a paper and submitting it as one's own;
   b. copying all or part of a paper from another student or another source, such as the internet; or
   c. allowing another person to copy one's work.

3. Buying, selling, stealing, or soliciting any materials purported to be unreleased contents of a forthcoming examination, quiz, test, or project/assignment or the use of such material.

4. Substituting for another person in any of the above-mentioned situations or allowing another person to substitute for oneself.

*This section is applicable to the arts, humanities, and social sciences division.
5. Collusion with another person in the preparation or editing of assignments submitted for credit, unless such collaboration has been approved in advance by the instructor.
6. Knowingly furnishing false information to the college; forgery, alteration and or use of college documents or instruments of identification with the intent to defraud.

C. Academic Penalties
The following academic penalties may be imposed by an instructor, a department head, or a division dean for violation of the Academic Integrity Policy:

1. Loss of Grade: A zero for the assignment.
2. Loss of Credit: An "F" for the course and loss of rights to attend the remaining class sessions.

Written notice of any academic penalty must be submitted on an Academic Integrity Reporting form to a student conduct officer for appropriate recordkeeping.

"Please note that all work submitted must be new, original work. According to the 7th edition of the MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, "If you must complete a research paper to earn a grade in a course, handing in a paper you already earned credit for in another course is deceitful" (59). Similar rules exist for documentation systems used in all fields of study. Whether researched or not, just as recycling work created by someone else in an effort to earn credit is plagiarism, re-using one's own work, without permission of the instructor, is "self-plagiarism" and is unacceptable because the work is not new or original.

SafeAssign: This course may require students to submit essays and/or papers using a Blackboard Assignment submission function. By utilizing this Assignment essay submission function in this course, you acknowledge your understanding that this function checks essay/paper submissions for plagiarism using SafeAssign. Your papers may be submitted to institutional and Global Reference databases.

Success Centers: ofrece offers free individual and small group tutorial services. Among these services are the Individualized Learning Center (ILC), the REAL (Rhetoric, Exposition, Argument, and Literature) Center specifically for English course support, the Foreign Language Center (FLC), the SPEAK (Speech Preparation Essentials and Knowledge) Center (for oral communication), the SSRC (Social Sciences Resource Center), and the THINK Center (Critical Thinking skills cultivation, Humanities). Please ask your instructor or consult the college website for more information.

3. Disability Support Services (DSS)
Disability Support Services is available for students who require academic accommodations due to any physical, psychological, or learning disability. For more information, please visit <http://www.cc.usd.edu/student-services/disability-support-services>. To determine eligibility, contact the office in 138 Holding Hall, call 6670 or the Sorenson video phone for the Deaf at 3833, or Fax 3616.
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4. Course Description—English 112—Writing/Research in the Disciplines
This course, the second in a series of two, introduces research techniques, documentation styles, and writing strategies. Emphasis is placed on analyzing information and ideas and incorporating research findings into documented writing and research projects. Upon completion, students should be able to evaluate and synthesize information from primary and secondary sources using documentation appropriate to various disciplines. This course may be computer-assisted; for assistance, contact helpdesk@escc.edu.

5. Prerequisite
A minimum grade of C in ENG 111 or ENG 111/111A
Students who do not meet course prerequisites will not be allowed to remain in the class.
Students should note that receiving a grade of F in a prerequisite course does not fulfill the prerequisite.

6. Credit Hours: 3

7. Student Learning Outcomes
By semester’s end, students will be expected to be able to demonstrate the ability to:

1. Students will apply the basics of rational argument: distinguishing relevant from irrelevant information, drawing conclusions supported by facts, reasoning to valid conclusions, distinguishing implications and consequences.
2. Students will apply argument-appropriate organizational models.
3. Students will consider and respond to opposing points of view.
4. Students will use credible evidence in supporting a position.
5. Students will apply the principles of academic writing: recognition of audience, clarity of expression, coherence of ideas, and the conventions of standard written English.
6. Students will demonstrate an understanding of MLA documentation guidelines through the use of in-text citations and properly formatted Works Cited pages.

8. Course Requirements
1. Argumentative Essays—Students will write a minimum of 3000 words out of class (or online) to include:
a. A Major Essay—a formal argumentative essay of at least 1200 words that uses research. This essay will follow one of these organizational patterns:
   - Toulmin
   - Claim-with-reasons or advocacy
   - Cause-effect
   - Applied criteria or evaluation
   - Problem-solution
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- Rogerian  
  b. Additional Essays—out of class (or online) writing to include ONE of the options as chosen by the individual instructor. Instructors will specify the option in their Course Schedule.  
    - Option 1: A second research-based argumentative essay (of at least 1200 words)  
    - Option 2: Two mini-argumentative essays using research (at least 600 words each)  

Writing Projects and Exercises: These may include the following types of work: an annotated bibliography, evaluation of sources for an assigned essay, an interview for an assigned essay, a rhetorical analysis, workshops, discussion boards, peer review and works cited exercises, etc.  

2. Unit Tests/Quizzes: These assessments may include the assigned readings from the class text, documentation skills, or short writing exercises to measure the development of writing skills.  

3. Final Exam: The Final Exam (timed) argument essay will be assessed not only for content, but also for major errors in written composition (e.g. fragments, comma splices, agreement errors, and so forth). Individual instructors will have latitude in the particulars of the exam (such as argument pattern, method, and so forth). However, the following guidelines should be followed:  
   a. Students will have fewer than 120 minutes to complete the final.  
   b. The final document should be the equivalent of two and one half to four handwritten pages long (or for online classes—500 to 750 words—written in a text format in the class website).  
   c. The use of primary or secondary sources for the final is optional.  
   d. Students will be allowed to utilize tools such as dictionaries, grammar texts, and so forth in taking the final, but not allowed to utilize notes or outlines, and specifically should not be allowed beforehand to know the test prompt or prompts.  
   e. Avoiding serious errors in grammar, mechanics, and punctuation should count 20-40 percent of the final grade.  

9. English Department Policy Regarding Student Written Work (Essays/Papers)  
   - The English Department requires that all final drafts of out-of-class essays be typed (computer-generated). A rough draft of all out-of-class essays must also be turned in (or for online classes, submitted in file format, as well).  
   - Students must submit copies of all sources used in researched essays. The instructor may also require that out-of-class essays be submitted as electronic files. Essays may be checked electronically for plagiarism.  
   - All papers must be retained by the instructor for one semester.
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• All grades are based on the ten-point scale, according to department policy.

10. Evaluation*
Out-of-class Formal Essays ................................................................. 60%
Writing Projects and Miscellaneous ................................ ............... 25%
Final Exam ......................................................................................... 15%

* Students often have questions regarding evaluation of work. Instructors hold regular office hours, either on campus or online, to assist students with questions about the course or evaluation of submitted work. Students should always work first with course instructors to find answers to questions or solve issues with evaluation prior to contacting the department head or associate department head (if applicable). After every effort to resolve issues in this manner, students may contact the AHSS Dean.

11. Texts


12. Student Concerns
For a student complaint or grievance, AHSS Division instructors follow the guidelines in the Student Handbook.

• The first step for resolving the situation is generally for the student to communicate concerns or complaints with the instructor, outside of class time

• As a follow up step, the student may contact the Department Head (see below for contact information)

• If the matter remains unresolved, the student would contact the Dean of the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences Division. Students would need to be prepared to explain the particular area of disagreement with the decision of the Instructor and Department Head to the AHSS Dean.

Contact Information
Acting Administrative Department Head
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13. Course Information

Syllabus for ENG 112 – Writing and Research in the Disciplines (Fall 2016)

Instructor: XXXXX

Office Hours:  Northern Campus, Office
Mondays and Wednesdays from 10:00-10:50 am and 1:30-1:50 pm
Fridays from 10:00-10:30 am

REAL Center Hours: Tuesdays and Thursdays, 11:00 am – 12:15 pm

E-mail Hours:  While I respond to e-mails as quickly as possible, please do not expect
a response to an e-mail sent after 5 pm on business days until the
next business day. E-mails are not responded to on weekends.

Office Phone:  (918) 532-XXXX-- please only use this number in the case of an emergency.
E-mail is the best way to get in touch with me outside of office hours and class time.

E-Mail:

English 112.XXX: Building E, Room 440 on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, 11:00 am – 11:50 am
(8/17/2016-12/19/2016)

English 112.XXX: Building E, Room 450 on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, 12:00 pm – 12:50 pm
(8/17/2016-12/19/2016)

14. Instructor Policies

Final Course Grade Evaluation
Essay #1 30%
Literature Review 10%
Essay #2 30%
Oral Presentation 5%
Final Exam 15%
Quizzes 5%
Homework/in-class Work 5%

Grading Scale
90-100% A
80-89% B
70-79% C
60-69% D
59-0% F

*Please note that grades in this class will not be rounded up throughout or at the end of the semester

Course Policies

Tardy Arrivals Policy
Two tardies or early departures equal one absence. If you arrive late to class, you must notify me of your
lateness at the end of the class session to ensure you are marked present for the class.

I do not stop my lectures to open the door for a student who is late. Another student will need to open the door
for you if you are late to class.
Withdrawing for Excessive Absences: For this class, if you miss FIVE classes before the final withdrawal date, the instructor will withdraw you from the class. The final withdrawal date for this class is October 28, 2016. Absences are counted from the first class meeting of the semester. If you miss five classes after October 28, the instructor will withdraw you with a WF or a W (depending on your grade).

*If you miss 2 consecutive weeks of class, you will be withdrawn from this course.

Inclement Weather/Sudden Class Cancellation Plan
In the event of cancellation of classes, the class will remain on schedule as per the syllabus. Homework that was originally due as a hard copy will be submitted electronically.

Policy For Late Major Essays
I will accept late major essays and assignments (although I will not accept late homework, quizzes and in-class work and presentations cannot be made up).

This is very important to remember (and please do not forget it as failing to remember this policy will not be an excuse for turning in a major essay late):

Any extensions for an essay in this course must be requested via e-mail or in person at least 48 hours before the assignment due date/time. Extensions are not automatic. I will determine the length of the extension, if approved.

All major essays and assignments (Major Essay #1, Major Essay #2, and the Literature Review) must be turned in on time to receive full credit for them. All assignments are due at the beginning of class on the due date. After a major essay that I have allowed an extension for is a day late, 10 points will automatically be deducted from the final grade of the paper. 10 points per day will be deducted from the essay's final grade after that. For example, if an assignment is turned in 2 days late, 20 points will be deducted from it. This policy includes weekends and holidays. Computer and printer error or malfunction is not an excuse for lateness, so please do your best to avoid printing a major essay right before class. Give yourself enough time to figure out a Plan B if computer or printer issues occur. I will never allow an extension for a major writing assignment that is longer than 1 week.

It is key to remember that flash drives often and easily get lost, so I strongly advise not relying heavily on one to store all of your work. Losing a flash drive is not an excuse for failing to turn an essay in on time or for an extension. To be safe, always e-mail final essays to yourself and e-mail drafts of essays to yourself as you write and add to them. This way, they will always be in your sent box and inbox.

Quiz Policy
Expect occasional quizzes on Blackboard. Be sure to keep up with when quizzes are due on the course calendar since quizzes cannot be made up. I do not allow extensions on quizzes. For in-class quizzes, remember to bring whatever materials you may need (scannramps, ear plugs if you need them, reading glasses if you need them, etc.). Failure to have the materials you need will not be an excuse for an incomplete quiz. If you are five or more minutes late to class, you will not be able to begin an in-class quiz.

There should be no talking, checking your phone, referring to notes or textbooks, text messaging or any other forms of communication with others in or outside of the classroom during an in-class quiz. Furthermore, you are not allowed to take in-class quizzes at home or outside of the classroom. Failure to adhere to these rules results in an automatic 0 on an in-class quiz.

Prewriting Policy
There will be prewriting assignments for major writing assignments in this course. Prewritings must be turned in on time to count for credit. Not turning in a prewriting on time results in the loss of 5 points on the major writing assignment it accompanies and a 0 for a homework grade. There are no exceptions to this rule.

In-Class Work
Throughout the course of the semester, work will be completed during class time for in-class work grades. This work must be completed in class. No in-class work may be made up, and you must be in class when the work is completed for it to count for a grade.
Page Requirement Policy
You must meet the page requirement of all major writing assignments in this course to avoid losing 10 points on them. If you turn in an essay that does not meet page requirement, 10 points will automatically be deducted from your writing assignment. Do not make your font or periods larger than size 12, add extra space around your title, between paragraphs, etc. to make it look like you met the page requirement when in actually, you did not. Tricks like this also result in the loss of 10 points on major writing assignments.

Check Your E-mail and Blackboard Frequently
Please check your e-mail frequently. I often send e-mails out after class that highlight what is due for the next one. These messages also include any changes made to the calendar.

The same messages will be posted to the announcements section on Blackboard and also sort out via e-mail. Failure to check your e-mail and/or announcements regarding assignment changes on Blackboard will not be an excuse for incomplete assignments. If you do not have access to a computer, you should make plans to visit a computer lab each day.

Keep Up With Your Grade
I will record everyone's grades both in my tangible gradebook and on the gradebook found on Blackboard. Throughout the course of the semester, you will be able to keep up with all of your grades by clicking on Blackboard > My Grades. Midway through the semester, you will be able to see what numeric and letter grade you are making in the class by clicking on Blackboard > My Grades.

Do not e-mail me and ask me why you made the grade you did before getting assignments back and carefully reviewing my comments. E-mails like this will not be responded to. Grades are only discussed in person.

Self-Plagiarism Policy
Do not turn in major writing assignments you have written for courses in the past (English 112 if you are taking it over again or other courses) for credit. Evidence that you have turned in a major writing assignment used prior to this class results in an automatic 0 on the assignment.

Extra Credit Policy
Throughout the course of the semester, there will be a few extra credit opportunities that count as homework grades. These responses will normally be due 1-2 weeks before a major essay is due. Extra credit assignments must be turned into me by their due date via e-mail to be graded. No late extra credit assignments will be read or considered for extra credit points. No extra credit handed in as a hardcopy will be read or considered for extra credit points.

To practice rhetoric analyzing the spoken word, the class will have the chance to rhetoric analyze assigned TED Talks in 1-2 pages (definitely no less than this). Extra credit responses must adequately address the following points and be formatted in proper MLA to count for extra points:

- In a 1-2 page response, briefly summarize the speaker's argument (1-3 sentences).
- After you establish the argument, write whether or not you think the argument is being made effectively. As you answer this question, consider the following:  
  - What approaches does the speaker take to appeal to the audience? What is her tone like? (Comical, serious, etc.)
  - Who would you guess is the speaker’s intended audience for this TED Talk? Explain why.
- Which rhetorical appeals (ethos, pathos, and logos) are used in the TED Talk? Explain how.
- Do these rhetorical appeals strengthen the argument the speaker is making? Why or why not?

Peer Review Policy
Multiple drafts and peer reviews are an integral part of the writing process. On peer review days, you are required to bring a completed, typed first draft of major writing assignments to class. Your rough draft will count as a quiz grade, and this grade will be a 100 if the draft is complete. No matter what the excuse is, failure to
English Department  
Part 3 of 3, General Syllabus  
English 112—Writing/Research in the Disciplines

have hardcopies of a full draft of major writing assignments on draft days will result in a harmed quiz grade. No matter what the excuse is, having no draft at all and/or not showing up to class for draft days results in a 0 on a quiz grade and <10 on major writing assignments. I walk around the room to make sure that everyone has a full draft on draft days. Peer reviews will also be graded as quiz grades.

Paper Formatting Policy  
All essays assigned in this course should adhere to all MLA formatting guidelines, so keep in mind the following rules:
• All margins must be 1 inch
• The text of the essay must be double-spaced and Times New Roman 12.
• Your last name and page number must be included in the upper right hand corner of each page.
• Your essays should include a creative title. In other words, do not just title your essays something like "Essay #1" or "Rhetorical Analysis Essay."
• The heading must be double-spaced and should include your name, my name, our course, and the due date.

A screenshot of how your assignments for this course should look in MLA format can be found here: https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/747/01/

A screenshot of APA format can be found here: https://owl.english.purdue.edu/media/pdf/20090212013008_560.pdf  
*Note: Some versions of APA somewhat differ from OWL's example, but this sample is still useful.

Please note: If you choose class time as a chance to socialize during lectures or group work, I will regroup you. Socializing in class is distracting and disrespectful to other classmates and to me.

Everyone in this class should participate in discussion, and listen and respond respectfully to the observations of fellow students. There should be no talking while I am talking or a fellow student is talking. Throughout the course of the semester, I expect to see the following:
• Evidence that you have read and reviewed the required material for class
• Attentiveness in class
• Students coming to class well-prepared. This means bringing all important materials to each class meeting. You should bring the following to every class:
  ✓ They Say / I Say with Readings: The Moves That Matter in Academic Writing, 3rd edition
  ✓ The course calendar
  ✓ Scantrons
  ✓ Writing utensils and paper for taking notes
  ✓ Additional readings when assigned (if I assign any additional readings, the texts will be on Blackboard)

Contact Information
If you miss class, it is a good idea to contact your fellow classmates about any missed notes, assignments, etc. in the space below, write down the names and e-mail addresses of three people near you.

The course policies and schedule in this syllabus are subject to change at my discretion. You will be made aware of changes in a timely and clear manner.
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15. Important Information  

Important Semester Dates:  
Deadline to drop with a 100% refund: 8/16/2016  
Deadline to drop with a 75% refund (10% point of the semester): 6/26/2016  
Deadline to drop with a W (60% point of the semester – 0% refund): 10/28/16  
Fall Break: 10/17/2016-10/18/2016  
Other Breaks: 9/29/2016, 10/12-10/14/2016  
Finals Week: 12/13/2016-12/19/2016
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English 112 Readings and Assignments Calendar
Any changes to this plan will be announced on the ANNOUNCEMENTS page and in class.

8/17
Introduction to the course policies/Assignments/Blackboard/Peer Introductions

Due 8/18
Read
☐ “They Say / I Say”: The Moves That Matter in Academic Writing (TS/S) Chapter (Ch.) 1 “They Say”: Starting with What Others Are Saying” (19+). and Ch. 2 “Her Point Is”: The Art of Summarizing” (30+)
☐ LB Brief (LBB) Ch. 29 “Subject-Verb Agreement” (242+)
☐ PG Ch. 4 “Creating Your Works-Cited List” (16+) and 5 “Creating In-Text Citations” (30+)

Complete
☐ Print from Blackboard “Essay #1: A Point-By-Point Comparative Rhetorical Analysis” (Assignments) and begin brainstorming your topic. You should also print the “Course Readings and Assignments Calendar” (Blackboard>Syllabus and Course Calendar>print pages 14-22). You should always have this calendar in your notebook.
☐ Skim and familiarize yourself with the MLA template for Essay #1 (Assignments>Essay 1 link). You will use this template for Essay #1.
☐ In Blackboard complete the Subject-Verb Agreement Quiz (Go to the Tests & Quizzes section of Blackboard > Click on “Subject-Verb Agreement Quiz.” Complete and submit this assessment electronically. Do not print this out. This quiz must be completed by 8/18 at 11:59 PM to receive credit.) No matter what the excuse is for not completing a quiz, no late quizzes or extensions on quizzes will ever be allowed in this course.
☐ Begin searching for the two articles you plan to work with for for Essay #1. These articles must come from Artilmes Literary Sources (Gale), JSTOR, Opposing Viewpoints in Context, Ebrary, Science Direct, or one of the various ProQuest databases (with the exception of Newsstand). No other Internet sources or newspaper articles (online or printed) are allowed. You must engage with peer reviewed scholarship for this essay. These articles should have been published within the last 10 years.

8/19
Introduce Essay #1: A Point-By-Point Comparative Rhetorical Analysis; Time in class to begin thinking of a topic for essay #1 and to run topics by me

Due 8/22
Read
☐ Review PG “Creating Your Works-Cited List” (16+)

Complete
☐ In Blackboard complete the Subject-Verb Agreement Quiz (Go to the Tests & Quizzes section of Blackboard > Click on “Subject-Verb Agreement Quiz.” Complete and submit this assessment electronically. Do not print this out. This quiz must be completed by 8/21 at 11:59 PM to receive credit.) No matter what the excuse is for not completing a quiz, no late quizzes or extensions on quizzes will ever be allowed in this course.
☐ Search for the two articles you plan to work with for Essay #1. These articles must come from Artilmes Literary Sources (Gale), JSTOR, Opposing Viewpoints in Context, Ebrary, Science Direct, or one of the various ProQuest databases (with the exception of Newsstand). No other Internet sources or newspaper articles (online or printed) are allowed. You must engage with peer reviewed scholarship for this essay. These articles should have been published within the last 10 years.

8/22
Discuss In-class Work That Will Occur Next Class Period; Library Database Review

Due 8/24
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Read
☑ Skim in LBS ch. 57 "APA Documentation and Format."
☑ TSIS "Does Texting Affect Writing" by Michellea Cullington (351+) and annotate in preparation for in-class work next class.

Complete
☑ Pick the two articles you plan to work with for Essay #1. These articles must come from Artemis Literary Sources ( Gale), JSTOR, Opposing Viewpoints in Context, Ebrary, Science Direct or one of the various ProQuest databases (with the exception of Newsstand). No other internet sources or newspaper articles (online or printed) are allowed. You must engage with peer-reviewed scholarship for this essay. These articles should have been published within the last 10 years.
☑ Begin prewriting for Essay #1 due 9/26.

8/24 In-Class Work on "Does Texting Affect Writing?"

HW due 8/26
Read
☐ Blackboard "Essay 1 Guidelines" (Assignments>"Essay 1: A Comparative Rhetorical Analysis" – Read the instructions and print the instructions off (document titled Essay #1 Prompt for Printing). Do not attempt to complete the assignment.
☐ Complete Essay #1: Prewriting Activity worksheet (Assignments>Essay #1 link > Prewriting) – this assignment must be typed, printed off, and turned in class on time on 8/26. If this assignment is not turned in as a hardcopy when asked, 5 points will be deducted from Essay #1 and you will receive a 0 for a homework grade. No late prewritings will be accepted for credit.

8/26 Collect Prewriting; Time in Class to work on Essay #1

HW due 8/29
Read
☐ LBS Ch. 54 "Avoiding Plagiarism and Documenting Sources" (405+) – Read the full chapters, but do not complete any exercises at the end of the chapters. Be prepared for an in-class quiz on Ch. 54, "Avoiding Plagiarism and Documenting Sources" next class.

Complete
☐ Draft essay #1. The first draft is due 9/9. The final draft is due 9/12.

8/29 Avoiding Plagiarism Quiz; Discuss thoughts, concerns, ideas, questions, etc. about Essay #1

HW due 8/31
Read
☐ TSIS Ch. 8 "As a Result": Connecting the Parts (105+) and Ch. 14 "What's Motivating This Writer?: Reading for the Conversation" (173+). Review Chapter (Ch.) 1 "They Say" Starting With What Others Are Saying" (19+) again.

Complete
☐ Draft essay #1. Draft essay #1. The first draft is due 9/9. The final draft is due 9/12.

8/31 Topic sentences and subject-verb agreement; Discuss TSIS chapters 1 and 14

HW due 9/2
Read
☐ LBS Ch. 53 "Working with Sources" (377+), skim over Ch. 54 "Avoiding Plagiarism and Documenting Sources" (405+) again, read chs. 35 "Sentence Fragments" (p. 271+) and skim ch. 57 "APA Documentation and Format."

Complete
☐ Blackboard Fragments Exercise and APA Styles in Text Quiz —(Tests & Quizzes)— Multiple attempts for all electronic exercises are allowed. These exercises are due prior to 11:59 PM on 9/1. No matter
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☐ Review MLA Template again (Blackboard/Resources and Essay #1 assignment link) – Essay #1 must follow this format, so use this document as a guide when you complete your rough and final draft of essay #1.

☐ Draft essay #1. The first draft is due 9/9. The final draft is due 9/12.

9/2 Introduce extra credit opportunity #1

HW due 9/7
Read
☐ LB 36 “Comma Splices and Fused Sentences” (p. 276+) and review read chs. 36 "Sentence Fragments” (p. 271+) again.

Complete
☐ Optional extra credit opportunity #1 to receive an additional homework grade. Review prompt at Blackboard> Resources > Extra Credit Prompts. Extra credit responses must be typed, 1-2 pages, and formatted in proper MLA and e-mailed to me no later than assigned due dates to be considered for extra points. This extra credit opportunity is due no later than Friday, September 8 at 8:30 am (please note that this says am, not pm, I need these early in the day). No late extra credit assignments will be read and/or considered for extra points.

☐ Come up with thoughts, questions, and concerns about Essay #1. Write these down in class so that you can easily transfer them to the whiteboard for discussion.

☐ Draft essay #1. The first draft is due 9/9.

9/7 Fragments and Run-on Review; Address Essay #1 Questions; Time in class to work on first draft of Essay #1

HW due 9/9
Read
☐ First draft of Essay #1. Print two typed copies of your essay and two copies of the peer review worksheet (Assignments>Essay #1 link) prior to class. No matter what the excuse is, failure to have hardcopies of a full draft of essay #1 will result in a harmed quiz grade. Essay #1 should be between 3-5 full pages, definitely no less than this. No matter what the excuse is, having no draft at all and/or not showing up to class for draft day results in a 0 on a quiz grade. -10 on essay #1. There are no exceptions to these rules. I walk around and check to see that everyone has a full draft.

9/9 Essay #1 peer review; Time in class to make corrections and changes to Essay #1

HW due 9/12
Complete
☐ Revise and print final draft of Essay #1, gather supplemental materials, secure in a binder clip. You must meet the page requirement of all major writing assignments in this course to avoid losing 10 points on them. If you turn in an essay that does not meet page requirement, 10 points will automatically be deducted from your writing assignment. Essay #1 should be between 3-5 full pages (definitely no less than this). Do not make your font or periods larger than size 12, add extra space around your title, between paragraphs, etc. to make it look like you met the page requirement when in actuality, you did not. Tricks like this also result in the loss of 10 points on major writing assignments.

Essay #1 is due 9/12 - Submit in a binder clip with evaluation rubric, final draft, copies the first page of each article, rough draft(s), and peer review(s). Submit an electronic copy to SafeAssign.com on Blackboard before class time – I will not read essays that are not submitted to SafeAssign.com via Blackboard.

9/12 Collect Essay #1; Reflection on Essay #1 for an in-class work grade
English Department  
Part 3 of 3, General Syllabus  
English 112—Writing/Research in the Disciplines

HW due 9/14  
Read  
☐ Read and print "Literature Review" assignment prompt (Assignments -> Literature Review)  
☐ Read and print "Essay #2: Problem-Solution Essay" assignment prompt (Assignments -> Essay #2)  
☐ Review APA format in LBB Ch. 57 (477+)

9/14  
Introduce "Literature Review" Assignment and Essay #2: Problem-Solution Essay

HW due 9/16  
Read  
☐ "Literary Analysis" and "Figurative Language Handouts" for the discussion and group activity we will have next class on "Champion of the World" (Blackboard -> Resources -> Additional Readings).  
☐ "Champion of the World" by Maya Angelou (Blackboard -> Resources -> Additional Readings). Print, annotate, and bring this reading to class on 9/16. We will have a group activity on this reading next class that will count for an in-class work grade, so come to class prepared.

Complete  
☐ Choose and print off the 5 sources that you will use for the "Literature Review" assignment (use guidelines to determine what kind are acceptable – sources must be published within the last 10 years, you should have at least one academic journal article, and you should not use all of one source type). Use NC Live Databases and Professional websites (no Wikipedia articles or sources written by non-academic / non-professional authors). Remember, 3 of these sources must be used in your final Problem Solution Essay (Essay #2), so choose your sources carefully.
☐ Next, begin Literature Review: "Prewriting Activity" worksheet (Assignments -> Literature Review link -> Prewriting) – this assignment must be typed, printed off, and turned into class on time on 9/23. Put your 3 chosen sources into this chart. If this assignment is not turned in as a hard copy when asked, 5 points will be deducted from the Literature Review and you will receive a 0 for a homework grade. No late prewritings will be accepted for credit.
☐ Draft the Literature Review. The first draft is due 10/7. The final draft is due 10/10.

9/16  
Begin discussion and Group Activity on "Champion of the World" for an in-class work grade; Time in class to begin Prewriting Worksheet for the Literature Review and to run sources by me

---

HW due 9/19  
Read  
☐ "Literary Analysis" and "Figurative Language Handouts" for the discussion and group activity we will have next class on "Champion of the World" (Blackboard -> Resources -> Additional Readings).  
☐ "Champion of the World" by Maya Angelou (Blackboard -> Resources -> Additional Readings). Print, annotate, and bring this reading to class on 9/16. We will have a group activity on this reading next class that will count for an in-class work grade, so come to class prepared.

Complete  
☐ Continue to work on the Literature Review: "Prewriting Activity" worksheet (Assignments -> Literature Review link -> Prewriting) – this assignment must be typed, printed off, and turned into class on time on 9/23.  
☐ Draft the Literature Review. The first draft is due 10/7. The final draft is due 10/10.

9/19  
Begin Discussion and Group Activity on "Champion of the World" for an in-class work grade

HW due 9/21  
Read  
☐ LBB Ch. 26 "Verb Tenses" (p. 221+). Be prepared for a quiz next class on verb tenses.  
☐ TSI/S Ch. 11 "He Says, He Does": Using the Templates to Revise" (135+  
☐ LBB Ch. 7 "Paragraphs" (p. 42+  
☐ Blackboard "Everyday Use" by Alice Walker (Resources -> Additional Readings) for a group activity next class. Print, read, and annotate this text. This activity will count for an in-class work grade, so
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come to class prepared.

Complete
☐ Continue to work on the Literature Review: "Prewriting Activity" worksheet (Assignments>Literature Review link > Prewriting) – this assignment must be typed, printed off, and turned into class on time on 9/23.
☐ Draft the Literature Review. The first draft is due 10/7. The final draft is due 10/10.

---

9/21 In-Class Quiz on Verb Tenses; Finish Discussion and Group Activity on “Everyday Use”

HW due 9/23

Read
☐ Blackboard “Everyday Use” by Alice Walker (Resources>Additional Readings) for a group activity next class. Print, read, and annotate this text. This activity will count for an in-class work grade, so come to class prepared.

Complete
☐ Complete the Literature Review: “Prewriting Activity” worksheet (Assignments>Literature Review link > Prewriting) – this assignment must be typed, printed off, and turned into class on time on 9/23. Put your 3 chosen sources into this chart. If this assignment is not turned in as a handout when asked, 5 points will be deducted from the Literature Review and you will receive a 0 for a homework grade. No late prewritings will be accepted for credit.

---

9/23 Collect Prewriting; Discussion and Group Activity on “Everyday Use”

HW due 9/26

Read
☐ Review “Literal Analysis” and “Figurative Language Handouts” again for the discussion and group activity we will have next class on “The Red Convertible” (Blackboard/Resources>Additional Readings). This activity will count for an in-class work grade, so come to class prepared.
☐ “The Red Convertible” by Louise Erdrich (Resources>Additional Readings). Print, annotate, and bring this reading to class.

Complete
☐ Draft the Literature Review. The first draft is due 10/7. The final draft is due 10/10.

---

9/26 Discussion on Entering Conversations and Writing about Literature; Begin Discussion and Group Activity “The Red Convertible”

HW due 9/28

Read
☐ Review “Literal Analysis” and “Figurative Language Handouts” again for the discussion and group activity we will have next class on “The Red Convertible” (Blackboard/Resources>Additional Readings). This activity will count for an in-class work grade, so come to class prepared.
☐ “The Red Convertible” by Louise Erdrich (Resources>Additional Readings). Print, annotate, and bring this reading to class.

Complete
☐ Draft the Literature Review. The first draft is due 10/7. The final draft is due 10/10.

---

9/28 Discussion on Entering Conversations and Writing about Literature; Finish Discussion and Group Activity “The Red Convertible”

HW due 9/30

Complete
☐ Draft the Literature Review. The first draft is due 10/7. The final draft is due 10/10.
☐ Come up with thoughts, questions, and concerns about the Literature Review Assignment
☐ LBB Chs. 30-32 (pp. 240-250), 38 “Gonna” (290+)
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☐ Skim PG Ch. 4 "Creating Your Works-Cited List" (18+ and 5 "Creating In-Text Citations" (30+) again
☐ Blackboard Comma Exercise—(Tests & Quizzes)—Multiple attempts for all electronic exercises are allowed. This exercise is due prior to 11:59 PM on 10/2. No matter what the excuse is for not completing a quiz, no late quizzes or extensions on quizzes will ever be allowed in this course.

9/30 Literature Review Discussion: Come up with thoughts, questions, and concerns about the Literature Review Assignment; Time in class to work on Literature Review
HW due 10/3
Read
☐ "The Story of an Hour" by Kate Chopin (Resources—Additional Readings or widely available online). Print, annotate, and bring this reading to class on 2/22. We will have a group activity on this story next class that will count for an in-class work grade, so come to class prepared.
Complete
☐ Blackboard Comma Exercise—(Tests & Quizzes)—Multiple attempts for all electronic exercises are allowed. This exercise is due prior to 11:59 PM on 10/2. No matter what the excuse is for not completing a quiz, no late quizzes or extensions on quizzes will ever be allowed in this course.
☐ Draft the Literature Review. The first draft is due 10/7. The final draft is due 10/10.

10/3 Begin discussion and group activity on "The Story of an Hour" for an in-class work grade
HW due 10/5
Read
☐ "The Story of an Hour" by Kate Chopin (Resources—Additional Readings or widely available online). Print, annotate, and bring this reading to class on 2/24. We will have a group activity on this story next class that will count for an in-class work grade, so come to class prepared.
Complete
☐ Draft the Literature Review. The first draft is due 10/7. The final draft is due 10/10.

10/8 Finish discussion and group activity on "The Story of an Hour" for an in-class work grade
HW due 10/7
Complete
☐ First draft of the Literature Review. Print two typed copies of your essay and two copies of the peer review worksheet (Assignments—Literature Review link) prior to class. No matter what the excuse is, failure to have hardcopies of a full draft of the Literature Review will result in a harmed quiz grade. This Literature Review should be between 2-3 full pages, definitely no less than this. No matter what the excuse is, having no draft at all and/or not showing up to class for draft day results in a 0 on a quiz grade and -10 on the Literature Review. There are no exceptions to these rules. I walk around and check to see that everyone has a full draft. The final draft is due 2/29.

10/7 Literature Review Peer Review; Time in class to make corrections and changes to the Literature Review
HW due 10/10
Read
☐ Review "Essay #2: Problem-Solution Essay" assignment prompt again (You should have already printed this off, but it is also found under Assignments—Essay #2)
Complete
☐ Revise and print final draft of Literature Review, gather supplemental materials, secure in a binder clip (Evaluation Rubric, final draft, peer reviews and rubrics, and pages from the articles you are using, NO FULL sources) and submit to Blackboard via SafeAssign.com prior to class on 2/29. You must meet the page requirement of all major writing assignments in this course to avoid losing 10 points on them. If you turn in an essay that does not meet page requirement, 10 points will automatically be deducted from your
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writing assignment. The Literature Review should be between 2-3 full pages (definitely no less than this). Do not make your font or periods larger than size 12, add extra spaces around your title, between paragraphs, etc. to make it look like you met the page requirement when in actuality, you did not. Tricks like this also result in the loss of 10 points on major writing assignments.

**The Literature Review is due 10/10 - Submit in a binder clip with evaluation rubric, final draft, pages from sources that you used (NO FULL articles), rough draft(s), and peer review(s). Submit an electronic copy to SafeAssign.com on Blackboard prior to class time— I will not read essays that are not submitted to SafeAssign.com via Blackboard.

10/10 Collect Literature Review Assignment; Introduce Essay #2

HW due 10/12 *Note: We will not hold class 10/12 due to a PD Day, but you must complete the work sent out via Blackboard to be marked as present for the class period.

Complete
☐ Begin drafting essay #2

10/12 Review Extra Credit Opportunity #2 and (check Blackboard for details regarding what needs to be completed to be marked present 10/12)

HW due 10/19
Read
☐ TSIS Chs. 7 “So What? Who Cares?: Saying Why It Matters” (p. 92+). Ch. 9 (“'Ain't So Folks Not' Academic Writing Doesn't Mean Setting Aside Your Own Voice” (121+) and 10 “But Don't Get Me Wrong: The Art of Meta comentario” (126+)

Complete
☐ Optional extra credit opportunity #2 to receive an additional homework grade. Review prompt at Blackboard > Resources > Extra Credit Prompts. Extra credit responses must be typed, 1-2 pages, and formatted in proper MLA and e-mailed to me no later than assigned due dates to be considered for extra points. This extra credit opportunity is due no later than Friday, October 21 at 9:59 am (please note that this says am, not pm, I need these early in the day). No late extra credit assignments will be read and/or considered for extra points.

10/19 Commas review; Discuss TSIS chapters

HW due 10/21
Read
☐ LBB Ch. 43 “Semicolon” (305+), 41 “Colon” (309+), 30 “Pronoun Case” (240+), 31 “Pronoun-Antecedent Agreement” (245+), and 32 “Pronoun Reference” (250+)
☐ TSIS Ch. 16 “Analyze This: Writing in the Social Sciences” 184+)

Complete
☐ Blackboard Pronoun usage, and the Semicolon electronic exercises (Tests & Quizzes). Both exercises due on 10/20 by 11:59 PM. No matter what the excuse is for not completing a quiz, no late quizzes or extensions on quizzes will ever be allowed in this course.
☐ Begin the typed Essay #2 Prewriting worksheet (Assignments>Essay 2>Prewriting). This assignment must be typed, printed off, and turned into class on time on 10/22. If this assignment is not turned in as a hardcopy when asked, 5 points will be deducted from Essay #2 and you will receive a 0 for a homework grade. As always, no late writings will be accepted for credit.
☐ Draft essay #2. The first draft is due 11/2. The final draft is due 11/4.

10/21 Review Semicolons, colons, and pronouns; Discuss TSIS Ch. 16

HW due 10/24
Read
☐ Wordiness and Plagiarism Notes on Blackboard (Resources>Additional Readings>Wordiness and
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Plagiarism notes)

Complete
☐ Work on the typed Essay #2 Prewriting worksheet (Assignments>Essay 2>Prewriting). This assignment must be typed, printed off, and turned into class on time on 10/28.
☐ Draft essay #2. The first draft is due 11/2. The final draft is due 11/4.

10/24
Wordiness/plagiarism notes and summary verse analysis; Time in class to work on Prewriting sheet

HW due 10/26
Read
☐ Toulmin’s Model Notes (Blackboard>Resources)
Complete
☐ Work on the typed Essay #2 Prewriting worksheet (Assignments>Essay 2>Prewriting). This assignment must be typed, printed off, and turned into class on time on 10/28.
☐ Scan and familiarize yourself with the M.A template for Essay #2 found on Blackboard under Assignments>Essay 2. You should use this to format Essay #2.
☐ Draft essay #2. The first draft is due 11/2. The final draft is due 11/4.

10/26
Review Toulmin’s Model Notes; Time in class to work on Prewriting sheet

*Note: Friday, 10/28 is the final withdrawal date for this class.

HW due 10/28
Complete
☐ Finish the typed Essay #2 Prewriting worksheet (Assignments>Essay 2>Prewriting). This assignment must be typed, printed off, and turned into class on time on 10/28. If this assignment is not turned in as a hard copy when asked, 5 points will be deducted from Essay #2 and you will receive a 0 for a homework grade. As always, no late prewritings will be accepted for credit.
☐ Compose up with thoughts, questions, and concerns about Essay #3. Write these down so you can easily transfer them to the whiteboard for discussion.
☐ Draft essay #2. The first draft is due 11/2. The final draft is due 11/4.

10/28
Collect Prewriting: Come up with thoughts, questions, and concerns about Essay #2. Write these down in class so that you can easily transfer them to the whiteboard for discussion. Discuss thoughts, concerns, ideas, questions, etc. about Essay #2; Time in class to draft Essay #2

HW due 10/31
Complete
☐ Draft essay #2. The first draft is due 11/2. The final draft is due 11/4.

10/31
Introduce Extra Credit Opportunity #3

HW due 11/2
Read
☐ LBB Ch. 44 “Other Marks” (p. 320+) and Ch. 43 “Quotation Marks” (316+)
☐ TSI/S Ch. 6 “Skeptics May Object: Planting a Naysayer in Your Text” (p. 78+)

Complete
☐ Optional extra credit opportunity #3 to receive an additional homework grade. Review prompt at Blackboard > Resources > Extra Credit Opportunity #3. Extra credit responses must be typed, 1-2 pages, and formatted in proper M.A and e-mailed to me no later than assigned due dates to be considered for extra points. This extra credit opportunity is due no later than November 4 at 9:00 am (please note that this says am, not pm, I need these early in the day). No late extra credit assignments will be read and/or considered for extra points.
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☐ First draft of Essay #2. Print two typed copies of your essay and two copies of the peer review worksheet (Assignments=Essay #2 link) prior to class. No matter what the excuse is, failure to have hardcopies of a full draft of essay #2 will result in a harmed quiz grade. Essay #2 should be between 4-5 full pages, definitely no less than this. No matter what the excuse is, having no draft at all and/or not showing up to class for draft day results in a harmed quiz grade and -10 on essay #2. There are no exceptions to these rules. I walk around and check to see that everyone has a full draft.

☐ Blackboard Other Punctuation Marks and the Quotation Marks, electronic exercises (Texts & Quizzes). Both exercises due on 11/1 by 11:59 PM. No matter what the excuse is for not completing a quiz, no late quizzes or extensions on quizzes will ever be allowed in this course.

11/2 Essay #2 Peer Review; Lecture on TS/S Ch. 6
HW due 11/4
Read
☐ LB6 Fallacies section of ch. 11 (section 4) (pgs. 111-115).

Complete
☐ Revise and print final draft of Essay #2, gather supplemental materials, secure in a binder clip (Evaluation Rubric, final draft, peer reviews and rubrics, and pages from the texts you are using. NO FULL sources) and e-mail an electronic copy to yourself so you do not lose the document. You must meet the page requirement of all major writing assignments in this course to avoid losing 10 points on them. If you turn in an essay that does not meet page requirement, 10 points will automatically be deducted from your writing assignment. Essay #2 should be between 4-5 full pages (definitely no less than this). Do not make your font or periods larger than size 12, add extra space around your title, between paragraphs, etc. to make it look like you met the page requirement when in actuality you did not. Tricks like this also result in the loss of 10 points on major writing assignments.

* A copy of Essay #2 turned in without a properly formatted works cited page, at least three cited (in-text) and incorporated sources, or photocopies/printouts of pages used from sources will be given a ZERO.

**Essay #2 is due 11/4 - Submit in a binder clip with evaluation rubric, final draft, copies pages used in articles (NO FULL SOURCES), rough draft(s), and peer review(s). Submit an electronic copy of the essay to to SafeAssign on Blackboard – I will not read essays that are not submitted to SafeAssign.com via Blackboard **

11/4 Collect Essay #2; Complete Essay #2 Reflection; Lecture on Evaluating Arguments
HW due 11/7
Read
☐ Muller’s “The Futile Pursuit of the American Dream” (Blackboard>Resources>Additional Readings)

11/7 Begin Discussion and Group Work on Rhetorically Analyzing in “The Futile Pursuit of the American Dream”
HW due 11/9
Read
☐ Muller’s “The Futile Pursuit of the American Dream” (Blackboard>Resources>Additional Readings)

11/9 Finish Discussion and Group Work on Rhetorically Analyzing in “The Futile Pursuit of the American Dream”
HW due 11/14
Read
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☐ O’Connor “Everything that Rises Must Converge” (Blackboard>Resources>Additional Readings) (read in preparation for in-class work next class period) and Ch. and “As He Himself Puts It: The Art of Quoting”

11/14 Begin in-Class Group Activity on “Everything that Rises Must Converge”
HW due 11/16
Read
☐ O’Connor “Everything that Rises Must Converge” (Blackboard>Resources>Additional Readings) (read in preparation for in-class work next class period) and Ch. and “As He Himself Puts It: The Art of Quoting”

11/15 Finish In-Class Group Activity on “Everything that Rises Must Converge”
HW due 11/18
Read
☐ TSIS Chs. 7 ‘So What? Who Cares?: Saying Why It Matters’
☐ Review guidelines for oral presentation on Essay #2 (Blackboard > Assignments > Presentation on Problem-Solution Essay)

11/18 Introduce Final Oral Presentations
HW due 11/21
Read
☐ Please come up with 2-3 things you learned this semester and write them down. I want each of you to write what you have learned on the board as an overview of topics covered this semester. Your list can consist of nearly anything (something about the rhetorical appeals, academic language, rules to remember when writing an academic essay, etc.). Be sure to make clear what it is you learned about a topic. In other words, do not just write “rhetorical appeals” or “punctuation,” write what specifically you learned about the rhetorical appeals or about punctuation. Bring your list of things learned this semester to class on 11/21 so you can transfer it to the whiteboard.

11/21 Overview of Lessons Learned This Semester
HW due 11/28
Complete
☐ Next class, we will go around the room and everyone will (casually) discuss their topic and argument for the Literature Review, Essay #2, and the oral presentation with the class. I will give you time at the beginning of class to think about what you want to say about your topic prior to hearing from each of you, but go ahead and start thinking about why this topic interests you, what argument/claim you will make about your topic, and why you want to write about it. Be prepared to share your topic with the class. Again, I will give you time to silently jot down/come up with a few ideas in class, but will start thinking about this.
☐ Draft and Practice Final Oral Presentation. Presentations begin on 11/30.

11/28 Go around the room and share presentation topics and research; End of semester feedback for an in-class work grade
HW due 11/30
Complete
☐ Draft and Practice Final Oral Presentation. Presentations begin on 11/30.
☐ Please remember that presentations (which are worth 5% of the final grade) start 11/30. Please
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be on time to class. Reminders for the presentations:

Please go ahead and take out your rubric and write your name at the top of it. To get this rubric, go to Blackboard > Assignments > Presentation on Problem-Solution Essay > Presentation rubric and print it off. Be sure to bring a hardcopy of this rubric with you to class with your name written at the top of it.

If you plan to take a watch or a phone up to the front of the room with you to keep track of time, do not forget it. Also, please gather whatever materials you need to take up to the front of the room with you (notecards, notes, reading glasses, etc.) and bring them to class. Failure to remember these materials will not serve as an excuse to not present.

Everyone also needs to bring paper and a writing utensil to class. As people present please come up with questions to ask them about their topics. You may ask them about the research they came across that supports the proposed solution, what else they found out about this topic that was not mentioned in the presentation, or something more specific. You may also just write and mention that you also think their topic is interesting.

Because there is an informal discussion on the information everyone finds, but I would like everyone to participate to avoid a harmed in-class work grade. No matter what the excuse is, you must be present for your presentation day to avoid a harmed in-class work grade and a 0 on the presentation. There are no exceptions to this rule. No matter what the excuse is, you must be present for all 3 presentation days to avoid harmed in-class work grades.

11/30 Some of the Class Presents, Open Discussion on Everyone’s Topics (Note: Presentations may only be given and considered for credit during the allotted time period. No late presentations are allowed.)
HW due 12/2
Complete
☐ Practice presentation if you still have to present

12/2 Some of the Class Presents, Open Discussion on Everyone’s Topics (Note: Presentations may only be given and considered for credit during the allotted time period. No late presentations are allowed.)
HW due 12/5
Complete
☐ Practice presentation if you still have to present

12/5 Some of the Class Presents, Open Discussion on Everyone’s Topics (Note: Presentations may only be given and considered for credit during the allotted time period. No late presentations are allowed.)
HW due 12/7
Complete
☐ Practice presentation if you still have to present

12/7 Some of the Class Presents, Open Discussion on Everyone’s Topics (Note: Presentations may only be given and considered for credit during the allotted time period. No late presentations are allowed.)
HW due 12/9
Complete
☐ Study for final exam

12/9 Exam Review
English Department
Part 3 of 3, General Syllabus
English 112—Writing/Research in the Disciplines

HW due 12/12
Complete
☐ Study for final exam

12/12 Further Exam Review

12/13-12/19 – Final Exam Week: Exam Time TBA