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Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes  
March 7, 2011  
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Members Present: Dean Vivian Fueyo, Drs. Bonnie Braun, Alejandro Brice, Olivia Hodges, Cynthia Leung, Zafer Unal, and Ms. Rebecca Rhoden Ogletree

Welcome and Announcements
Dean Fueyo welcomed the assessment committee. The minutes from the previous meeting were accepted as presented. The agenda was approved as presented.

New Business
The order of business was adjusted to review the NCATE Annual Report, Part C. Dean Fueyo went through every standard to showcase the items reported. The dean asked if the college should post the report on our website. The committee agreed to post the NCATE Annual Report, Part C on the COE website to highlight the progress and improvement efforts the faculty is consistently making.

ACTION ITEM: Zafer Unal will post the NCATE Annual Report, Part C.

Old Business
- Suggestions for Conceptual Framework: What actions shall the committee take with suggestions from this and previous meetings?
  - Posters were revised to explicitly reflect the three strands of the CF. These posters will be distributed as candidates enter the Level 1 internship.
  - CF language will be added to all syllabi.
- Successful Interns Time to Completion; Average GPA (Undergraduate, MAT, Dual Track)
  - Dr. Unal presented his initial study of Time to Completion for the BEE program. The report is based on data from Info-Mart. It was suggested we compare USF-Tampa data to our own. Dr. Unal will bring that report to our next meeting.
  - The question arose about what we could do with this information. Response: we’ve wondered if the CDN has extended graduation time. Apparently, based on this report, it has not, but we will compare USFSP and USF-T data. Dr. Rose suggested looking at pre-CDN data (pre/post data) from Info-Mart since the data will include our candidates. Did the CDN make a difference in time to completion?
- Undergraduate Admissions Data Template
  - Dean Fueyo presented the draft template and asked for additions or changes. The committee offered recommendations for improving the template, and those changes were made/edits were completed during the meeting.

ACTION ITEMS: Dean Fueyo will ask faculty to add CF language to all syllabi; Dr. Unal will bring a comparison of USFSP and USF-T Time to Completion data to our next assessment committee meeting; Dean Fueyo and Ms. Ogletree will meet with Dr. Deanna Bullard to share the revised Undergraduate Admissions Data Template.
Annual Schedule for Reporting to the Assessment Committee

Dr. Hodges began the Ed Leadership report by stating the program’s concerns regarding the rubric and asking for input. The candidates often don’t begin the AR until the practicum, so the feeling is they don’t have enough data. Therefore, Drs. Hodges and Vanover are moving the cycle earlier to encourage implementation. Dr. Hodges reports the candidates struggle with understanding action research.

Discussion regarding Action Research:

- Do we really develop this skill in our students? We’ve taught the students to be consumers of research but not researchers. Candidates come from varied backgrounds, and we can’t assume they’ve had an adequate background in research.
- Would using the language of research, the cycle of inquiry, help prepare students? Dr. Braun said students have, theoretically, had two introductions to research. Perhaps, it was said, it’s like the CF; they know the concept but not the language. Dr. Rose recommended using the language of action research.
- Suggestions were made to improve the Ed. Leadership rubric. The raters come from USFSP and Pinellas County Schools. Raters are individually briefed in the use of the rubric prior to reviewing the action research poster presentation.
- Because the review of action research posters included public stakeholders, the dean asked if there is a screening process prior to the review. There’s been no screening, but Dr. Hodges said that could be done; she can review the research design prior to printing and final review. Dr. Hodges said she would meet with Dr. Vanover to discuss the program’s current process and possibilities for change. Dean Fueyo suggested creating standards for public presentations.

Dr. Leung presented on the Reading program’s action research process. Dr. Leung is working with 21 students. All reading students are expected to get an A on the project. If not, they must take the reading comps exam. Every reading course features research, so the program is building research experience from the first class. Additionally, Dr. Leung shares with candidates the research she’s undertaking: research questions, design, etc. Candidates must keep anecdotal records, conduct assessments of students (identify strengths and weaknesses), evaluate students, and prepare case study based on these reports. Dr. Leung sees reading candidates ready for action research, but she sees mathematics, science, and literacy candidates seem to struggle. Dr. Leung shared rubrics for poster session and AR report. She expressed concerns about the poster rubric. She feels it is weak and needs strengthening. Components of the research paper are submitted in stages throughout the cycle so faculty can comment and intervene to help candidates be successful.

Dr. Braun said the special education program considers action research as a component of the MAT candidate portfolio, but it’s not a true capstone project.

With these differences, it was decided the discussion on action research reports needs to continue.

The agenda was adjusted to allow continuation of presentations for the annual schedule of reports at the April meeting (ESOL Program Submissions and Faculty Training, TWS Work Sample Results from Previous Fall, Placement Demographic Data Report for Spring Final Interns, and Graduate Admissions Date for Fall, Previous).

**ACTION ITEMS:** Drs. Hodges and Vanover will meet to discuss the Ed Leadership program’s current process for AR and possibilities for change.

Dean Fueyo will schedule a discussion of action research college-wide for a faculty meeting.

Other Business

Dr. Rose asked for guidance regarding CDN submissions and how candidates can be encouraged to see the connection between experiences and responses. Dean Fueyo suggested the MAT have a
candidate orientation such as what the reading program does for the CDN. Dr. Unal suggested a meeting of CDN evaluators.

The dean asked the committee to change the April meeting time. The committee agreed.

**Confirmation of Next Meeting Date** – The assessment committee will meet April 15, 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
NCATE Annual Report, Part C: Section 6. Unit Standards

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes, and/or improvements related to Standard 1 that occurred in your unit during this year:

1. The state changed statutory requirements for licensure from prescribed courses to competencies. Based on stakeholder feedback from the professional community asking for more elementary and exceptional education teachers, the faculty developed a merged program with competencies meeting state standards in elementary education, exceptional student education, with state approved endorsements in reading and ESOL (i.e., the BS in Education, BXE). Faculty developed new merged content courses, changed the field experiences to include both elementary and ESE placements, and developed a co-teaching model of course delivery with elementary education and special education faculty working together. The program’s candidates, first admitted in Fall 2009, will graduate in Fall 2010 with the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions to teach students in elementary and exceptional student education, as well as reading and ELLs. Simultaneously, the BS in Elementary Education and the BS in Exceptional Student Education were suspended in 2009. Candidates in these programs unable to graduate by Spring 2010 were transitioned into the BXE. The capstone project for the BXE, the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), was designed to include evidence of candidates’ impact on student learning.

2. ED Leadership—The final capstone project, the school improvement project, was divided into two sections with each being covered in a separate course to increase the amount of time within which candidates could implement the project and determine its impact. In addition, faculty required all major written assignments in the program to include an annotation of how the assignments were meeting the applicable Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS). EDA 6061: Principles of Educational Administration was revised to include direct instruction on the use of data for decision-making and to show evidence of critical thinking and problem-solving techniques from theory to practice. In EDA 6050: Principles and Practices of Educational Supervision, faculty added direct instruction about community and business relationships coupled with field experiences as part of the practicum. All changes were in response to reviews of candidate performance on the CDN and from supervisor, stakeholder, and mentor feedback.

3. Reading—As a result of faculty and school principal evaluations of candidates’ demonstration lessons, RED 6116: Current Trends in Differentiated Reading Instruction was revised to require candidates’ use of assessment and diagnostic strategies to determine a child’s reading ability, diagnose strengths and weaknesses, and provide remediation. RED 6540: Assessment in Literacy was revised to include formal and informal assessments of ELLs and secondary students, continuing a change piloted in the previous year and determined effective by the program faculty in increasing the practice of emphasizing diverse groups of learners in candidates’ assessment batteries.

4. Reading program faculty developed and piloted a professional dispositions instrument.

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement.

1. A discussion of the conceptual framework (CF) has been added to the adjunct orientations, faculty meetings each semester, Teacher Education Advisory Board agendas, and the Educational Leadership Advisory Board meetings.

2. A discussion of the CF was also added to the first internship seminars.
3. In the advanced programs, faculty include the conceptual framework in their syllabi, review it and highlight its importance during the first class sessions, and make clear connections to the CF’s three strands throughout their courses and programs.

**Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes, and/or improvements related to Standard 2 that occurred in your unit during this year:

The assessment committee established and implemented a calendar of reporting to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve the unit’s operations and programs. As a result, the unit made the following changes:

1. Faculty reviewed candidate submissions to the CDN (the unit's electronic assessment system) and found repetition in candidates’ responses to prompts 3 (i.e., 3. Reflect on what you have learned about this Accomplished Practice.) and 4 (i.e., 4. Write a reflection about what this Accomplished Practice means to you now that you’ve selected evidence and have written an annotation about it.). The CDN was revised making prompt 4 optional for the candidates.
2. Faculty reviewed all key assignments in program courses and their alignment with state standards [Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs)]. The alignment of key assignments and FEAPs was revised. The result was clearer evidence in each course of how each of the key assignments met the state standards. New sample annotations providing examples of clearer evidence were added to the CDN.
3. The Assessment and Internship Committees added regular monitoring of candidate progress on the CDN to meeting agendas. Select recommendations included: regular meetings of CDN faculty evaluators, group meetings of candidates to respond to questions about the CDN, and increased frequency of review of CDN submissions.
4. The process for CDN evaluation by full time faculty was changed. As a result, faculty are released from teaching a course to review candidate submissions in the CDN and provided training to ensure fairness and consistency in their reviews.
5. The unit established an Internship Committee to review candidate progress at this key transition point for program completion and to monitor decisions about placements. A field for ESOL placements was added to the internship data base to ensure that candidates' field placement with ELLs was systematically recorded and monitored.
6. The policy regarding progress through the ESOL portfolio was changed, requiring candidates to reach bridging on three out of five ESOL standards to enter the final internship.
7. Based on evaluations of practicum supervisors and school district personnel and a review of candidate performance on the FPLS, Educational Leadership faculty added empowerment of teachers to program courses and enhanced the capstone action research project to include an equity audit. In addition, faculty evaluated CDN submissions and found some candidates struggling to meet expected criteria. As a result, each major written assignment was changed to include an annotation describing how it relates to the FPLS.
8. School demographic information for all placements was added to the internship database and to the reports reviewed by the unit’s assessment and internship committees.
Standard 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes, and/or improvements related to Standard 3 that occurred in your unit during this year:

1. In development of the BXE, the program was designed so candidates could complete any course-related assignments during their internships. Often, the required age or grade level of the course assignments did not correspond to the age or grade level of the students in the internships. Faculty observed that candidates were not benefitting from the co-requisites. In addition, the advisors reported that having three or four courses as co-requisites for the 6-12 Integrated Internship posed a hardship for candidates, particularly for the unit’s part-time students who comprised a majority of candidates in the BXE. As a result, faculty removed all co-requisites with field experiences.

2. Faculty evaluated the candidates’ Teacher Work Sample (TWS) projects, the capstone experience for all final internships, in Fall 2009. As a result, faculty recommended a greater emphasis on contextual factors for determining the sample goals, assessment plan, analysis of student work, and how the candidates’ teaching related to their target students’ learning as documented in the TWS.

3. In the Spring 2010 faculty review of TWS, they found candidates’ selection of target students for the TWS was based on contextual factors and comprised a range of students in the candidates’ classrooms. Faculty scored the candidates higher on the TWS rubric as a result.

4. In the BXE program, the unit began offering an integrated K-5 internship in Fall 2009 and an integrated 6-12 internship in Spring 2010. In the process of developing knowledge, skills, and dispositions to prepare individuals to become teaching professionals in both elementary and exceptional student education, there are various levels of participation and experience for students in the College of Education, including not only coursework but also exposure to diverse groups of students in K-12 classrooms. These internship experiences were designed to be developmental in nature. The K-5 Integrated Internship Experience takes place in the elementary education class; the 6-12 Integrated Internship Experience takes place in a secondary ESE classroom. The BXE program culminates with a final, full time internship with eight weeks spent in a general education classroom and another eight weeks spent in an ESE classroom at the elementary level.

Standard 4. Diversity

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes, and/or improvements related to Standard 4 that occurred in your unit during this year:

1. The unit developed an on-line, self-paced, 60-hour ESOL training module for faculty. The training was designed to facilitate compliance with the state’s requirement for training of all faculty teaching in ESOL-infused programs. All new, full time faculty in the unit are required to complete the training in their first year of employment. For adjuncts teaching ESOL-infused courses, the unit provides a stipend to complete the training. All full time faculty and adjuncts teaching ESOL-infused courses in the unit are ESOL-endorsed.

2. The first integrated K-5 and 6-12 internships, with placements in both elementary and exceptional student education classrooms, were offered to all undergraduate students based on the merged program requirements of the BXE. The result is that all undergraduate ITP candidates have required field experiences with ELLs, ESE students, secondary reading students, as well as elementary education students, in addition to placements with economically and racially diverse students.

3. In Reading Education, RED 6540: Assessment in Literacy was revised to include formal and informal assessments of ELLs and secondary students, continuing a change piloted in the previous year and
determined effective by the program faculty in increasing the practice of emphasizing diverse groups of learners in candidates' assessment batteries.

**Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development**

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes, and/or improvements related to Standard 5 that occurred in your unit during this year:

1. The unit developed an on-line, self-paced, 60-hour ESOL training module for faculty. The training was designed to facilitate compliance with the state's requirement for training of all faculty teaching in ESOL-infused programs. All new, full time faculty in the unit are required to complete the training in their first year of employment. For adjuncts teaching ESOL-infused courses, the unit provides a stipend to complete the training.
2. Two full time faculty in Mathematics Education retired at the end of December 2009 (Rasch and Reeves). The unit also hired three new tenure-track faculty and one full time instructor in August 2009 (Roy in Math Education; Blake in Childhood and Literacy Education; Vanover and Hodges in Educational Leadership).
3. Faculty scholarly work continues to be driven by the mission of the unit, with a significant increase in external grant funding over the previous year, from $1.25 to $1.8 million. All externally funded projects represent the faculty’s collaboration with the unit’s public school and community partners to engage in inquiry and provide educational services: SunBay Digital Mathematics, a collaboration among the USFSP COE, the Pinellas County Schools (PCS), and SRI International, analyzes the impact of algebraic teaching and learning in 7th and 8th grades using technologically enhanced curricula, technological pedagogical content knowledge, and teacher professional development; Project 10, a statewide transition support project increases access to higher education for individuals with disabilities; Florida Inclusion Network (FIN) provides learning opportunities, consultation, information and support to educators, families, and community members, resulting in the inclusion of all students; and Project StingRay, a statewide pilot project for intellectually challenged 18-21 years-olds with special diplomas, provides participation in a university experience, as well as instruction in independent living skills.
4. As a result of the success of the SunBay Digital math project, the faculty developed a five-course graduate sequence in Middle Grades Digitally Enhanced Mathematics to be launched in Summer 2010, with tuition for the 10 middle school teachers supported by a grant from the Progress Energy Foundation.
5. The unit inaugurated the Alpha Beta Zeta Chapter of Kappa Delta Pi, the International Honor Society in Education, and inducted 42 students and 5 faculty. Two senior, tenured faculty members serve as program advisors.

**Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources**

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes, and/or improvements related to Standard 6 that occurred in your unit during this year:

1. Funded proposals written by Dean Fueyo, in collaboration with the Pinellas County Schools and SRI International, to the Helios and Progress Energy Foundations provided equipment for the math/science teaching lab in the College of Education, Coquina Hall 208, in which are taught all undergraduate and graduate math and science teaching methods courses. The funds were used to purchase a SMART Board
and a 26 laptop mobile cart to allow faculty to model the use of technology and candidates to practice its use for instructional purposes.

2. As part of the university’s technology upgrade program, SMART boards were installed in all 7 classrooms in Coquina Hall used by the College of Education.

3. In fiscal year 2010, the budget allocation at the institution was reduced proportionally across all academic units by 13%, representing a 5% cut to the base budget. The remaining 8% cut was supplant by Federal stimulus dollars, which will run out in fiscal year 2012.
### Undergraduate Admissions Data to the College of Education
#### Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of South Florida St. Petersburg</th>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USFSP Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USFSP Campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Men:
- Nonresident alien (international)
- Black, non-Hispanic
- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Hispanic
- White, non-Hispanic
- Race/ethnicity unknown
- Men total:

#### Women:
- Nonresident alien (international)
- Black, non-Hispanic
- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Hispanic
- White, non-Hispanic
- Race/ethnicity unknown
- Women total:

#### All:
- Average High School GPA
- Average GPA for COE Admittance
- Average Credit Hours Completed
- Average SAT Score
  - Verbal, Quantitative and Writing
- Average ACT Score
## Graduate Admissions Data to the College of Education
### Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of South Florida St. Petersburg</th>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Full-Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Part-Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Current Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prior Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USFSP Campus</strong></td>
<td><strong>PHCC Campus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident alien (international)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident alien (international)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GPA for COE Admittance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GRE Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal, Quantitative and Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>Novice (1)</td>
<td>Intermediate Candidate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Content</strong></td>
<td>The project may not yet be fully developed to reflect understanding or address critical elements of Action Research.</td>
<td>The candidate has studied the topic, has done additional research, and has planned and organized the information and materials appropriately, in a project plan that is results driven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td>The novice is disposed toward incorporating technology into the project.</td>
<td>The candidate prepared the project that utilizes technology for teaching, learning, and/or communication responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Leadership</strong></td>
<td>The novice demonstrated an awareness of the need for strategic planning in this project</td>
<td>The candidate demonstrated knowledge of strategic planning processes and identified critical elements, challenges and opportunities in this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Leadership</strong></td>
<td>The novice addressed elements of school culture and effective learning environment in the project plans</td>
<td>The candidate demonstrated knowledge of strategies for developing positive school culture, an effective learning environment and the use of effective instructional practice in the project plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning</strong></td>
<td>The novice developed a plan reasonably calculated to have some positive impact</td>
<td>The candidate developed a plan reasonably calculated to have a positive impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>The novice demonstrated an awareness of appropriate models &amp; principles of organizational development &amp; management, including research &amp; data driven decision making.</td>
<td>The candidate demonstrated an awareness of appropriate models &amp; principles of organizational development &amp; management, including research &amp; data driven decision making with attention to indicators of equity, effectiveness &amp; efficiency that promoted student achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Basic elements of action research were presented. The candidate demonstrated limited understanding of Action Research.</td>
<td>The candidate is aware of the components of Action Research but the presentation lacked formative data and results to demonstrate a more comprehensive understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership Development Program
Action Research Presentation Results
Fall 2011

Program Content 5.6
Technology 4.9
Strategic Leadership 5.2
Instructional Leadership 5.2
Student Learning 5.3
Organizational Leadership 5.6
Project 5.2
Action Research Report  
Math/Science and Reading Education  
3-7-11  
Cynthia Leung

Spring 2010
13 candidates took EDG 6935 – Seminar in Curriculum Research
12 candidates completed the action research project
1 incomplete for a Reading Education candidate

She is redoing the project in Spring 2011 with Dr. Leung

11 candidates received the grade of A
1 reading education candidate received a B on the paper and is taking a comprehensive exam

Fall 2010
3 candidates took EDG 6935 – Seminar in Curriculum Research
3 candidates completed the action research project
3 candidates received a grade of A

See attached rubric
SEMINAR IN CURRICULUM RESEARCH 6935

At the end of the semester, you will present your research project, findings, and reflections to the general public in the form of a Poster Presentation.

RUBRIC FOR POSTER AND POSTER PRESENTATION

Poster clearly describes your research and outcomes.
1_________ 2_________ 3_________ 4_________ 5_________
Inadequate  Exceptional

Poster includes graphics and photos that provide visual information about the research project.
1_________ 2_________ 3_________ 4_________ 5_________
Inadequate  Exceptional

Poster is attractive and easy to understand.
1_________ 2_________ 3_________ 4_________ 5_________
Inadequate  Exceptional

Presenter is professionally dressed for research presentation to the community.
1_________ 2_________ 3_________ 4_________ 5_________
Inadequate  Exceptional

Presenter interacts professionally with poster session attendees and clearly describes project.
1_________ 2_________ 3_________ 4_________ 5_________
Inadequate  Exceptional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>MEETS</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>ACCEPTABLE</th>
<th>EXCEPTIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research topic</td>
<td>Relevance not clear.</td>
<td>Academic relevance is apparent</td>
<td>Academic relevance is unique and creative and study has implications for enhancing student learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question(s)</td>
<td>Incoherent or too broad; not feasible.</td>
<td>Clearly articulated and feasible/researchable.</td>
<td>Question(s) clearly articulated and thought-provoking; researchable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Reliance on secondary sources; not enough peer-reviewed research studies cited.</td>
<td>Research literature is integrated into a coherent and meaningful context that frames the research question.</td>
<td>Sources cited are rich and diverse, and builds strong rationale for your study. Well crafted with exceptional flow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Major lack of feasibility; not carefully &quot;thought out.&quot;</td>
<td>Design and procedures clearly laid out and study is replicable.</td>
<td>High level of critical thinking is evident; design is coherent and cogent, and replicable for the research community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly voice</td>
<td>Poorly written with sentences that are not clear.</td>
<td>Composed of well crafted sentences that use professional vocabulary and clearly communicates the writer’s intent.</td>
<td>Study reads like a published research study in a peer-reviewed journal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA style adherence</td>
<td>Includes misuses of APA style.</td>
<td>Adheres to APA style.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings/Discussion</td>
<td>Inadequate explanation of findings and/or weak discussion quality.</td>
<td>Clear articulation of findings; research outcomes.</td>
<td>Exceptional articulation of findings; discussion moves beyond current study to implications for instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>