

## **Institutional Effectiveness 2023-2024**

**Program:** Exceptional Learning PhD

**College and Department:** College of Education, Exceptional Learning Ph.D. (ELPhD) Program

**Contact:** Ashley B. Akenson

**Mission:**

The central focus of the Exceptional Learning Ph.D. (ELPhD) program is the study of diverse exceptional learner populations. Exceptional learners may be a member of one or more of the following groups: at-risk, vulnerable, underserved, underrepresented, and/or marginalized populations. Exceptional learners include, but are not limited to, those persons for whom social, economic, cultural, and physical characteristics may function as a barrier to learning. These exceptional populations may be neglected, oppressed, or disempowered by society; often excluded from equitable access to governmental, economic, educational, sociocultural, and community resources; and viewed as inherently different from the majority population. The ELPhD program offers an outstanding graduate education that prepares professionals for careers as leaders in their disciplines and to effect positive change in diverse populations through research, leadership, and service.

The ELPhD program has a primary mission of offering rigorous and robust academic preparation of professionals who serve their communities, public school systems, institutions of higher education, and nontraditional educational environments. Core courses prepare students to address issues related to exceptional learners in all disciplines, traditional and nontraditional learning environments, inclusion, equity, and diversity. The research course sequence provides students a thorough grounding in research methods. Core, research, and concentration courses deliver interdisciplinary perspectives, advanced methodological preparation, and fundamental theoretical knowledge—which work together to shape inspired, engaged, and innovative professionals. Specific programs of study are available in five concentrations: Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA), Literacy, Health Behaviors & Wellness Education (HBWE), Program Planning and Evaluation (PPE), and STEM Education. There are two tracks within ABA: Applied Behavior Analysis School Age and Adult Populations (ABAS) and Young Children and Families (YCF). Instruction and research are major components of the academic mission of the program. A committed faculty serves the students through instruction, scholarly activity, and service to provide quality academic experiences.

These goals and outcomes have been identified through faculty collaboration, and they are consistent with a central purpose of any Ph.D. program: to prepare individuals for scholarly and professional success in their chosen field. The objectives are broad enough to allow for the diversity of the concentrations, yet maintain the focus on exceptional learners. Faculty routinely monitor current practices in core, research, and concentration courses—through attending academic and professional conferences, examining theory, and reviewing evidence-based literature—and assess how they align with program goals and outcomes.

## **Attach Curriculum Map (Educational Programs Only):**

Attached Files: See Appendix 1

### **PG 1 - Course Instruction**

#### **Define Outcome:**

Provide course instruction that models evidence-based practices in the respective program areas.

#### **Strategic Plan Connections:**

Core Principles: *Academic Excellence, Meaningful Innovation, Student Success, Value Creation*

Strategic Goals: *SG1–PA A, B, D, E; SG2–PA B & C; SG4–PA B*

#### **Assessment Methods:**

#### **IDEA Evaluations**

Course evaluations for each faculty member are implemented and maintained through the IDEA evaluation system, and are used by faculty members to refine instructional practices and modify course content based on student feedback in support of program goals and student learning outcomes. The IDEA evaluation survey is nationally normed, standardized instrument. These evaluations allow for national comparisons against similar courses with student ratings of progress on relevant objectives and teacher and course effectiveness. IDEA evaluations are used at higher education institutions all over the US. The evaluations have the support of 45 years of research and include questions to account for variables such as class size, student motivation, and other student and course characteristics. Scores, on a five-point scale, are used to gauge curriculum and faculty efficacy with respect to program goals and SLOs. The IDEA evaluation reports incorporate resources to support instruction development and improvement. The Director of Graduate Programs tracks and reviews all ELPhD faculty IDEA scores each semester. Reported scores are aggregated for each semester and compared against program-set quality benchmarks. Trend data (5-year) is also tracked and reviewed to ensure quality.

Attached Files: See Appendix 1

#### **Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):**

##### **IDEA Evaluation Thresholds:**

Acceptability: 3.5 score

Expectation: 4.0 score

Exceptionality:  $\geq 4.0$  score

**ELPhD Academic Achievement Thresholds:**

Acceptability: 3.25 GPA (mainly Bs; 80–89 out of 100)

Expectation: 3.5 GPA (As & Bs; 85–100)

Exceptionality: ≥ 3.9 GPA (almost all As or all As; 90–100)

**Link to 'Tech Tomorrow' Strategic Plan:**

1.A Experiential Learning,1.B General Education Curriculum,1.D High Impact Practices,1.E Stackable Credentials,2.B Research, Scholar, Intellect, and Creativity,2.C Adult Learners,4.B Programs, Certificates, and Training

**Results and Analysis:**

**IDEA Results**

Scores (5-point scale) indicate faculty and curricula are successful in achieving learning outcomes and objectives. Summer 2023 average score was 4.7, fall 2023 average was 4.8, and spring 2024 average was 4.8. The academic year average was 4.8. This exceeds the Threshold of Acceptability (3.5); ELPhD students report that faculty performing at the Threshold of Exceptionality (≥4).

Current IDEA data indicate course instruction is high quality and uses evidence-based practices. Scores over time have been fairly stable, demonstrating quality is maintained over time (2022-2023: 4.7; 2021–2022: 4.6; 2020–2021: 4.6).

**Exceptional Learning Ph.D. Course IDEA Evaluations 2023–2024**

<i>Faculty</i>	<i>Overall Ratings</i>								<i>Summary Evaluation</i>	
	<i>B. Progress on Relevant Objectives</i>		<i>D. Excellent Teacher</i>		<i>E. Excellent Course</i>		<i>C. Average of D &amp; E</i>		<i>A. Average of B &amp; C</i>	
	<i>Raw</i>	<i>Adj</i>	<i>Raw</i>	<i>Adj</i>	<i>Raw</i>	<i>Adj</i>	<i>Raw</i>	<i>Adj</i>	<i>Raw</i>	<i>Adj</i>
<b>Summer 2023</b>	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7
<b>Fall 2023</b>	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8
<b>Spring 2024</b>	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8

## **ELPhD Academic Achievement Results**

ELPhD students are expected to demonstrate appropriate doctoral-level mastery of course content. Trend data indicate students are consistently performing at or above expectations in these foundational courses that cut across all concentrations. Students taking these courses in 2023–2024 score lower in the quantitative sequence (EDU 7420, EDU 7430, EDU 7300) than in previous years. This will be monitored to see if this shift is an anomaly or if this is an area for medications. The 5-year averages are: EDU 7010 – 3.9, EDU 7330 – 3.9, EDU 7340 – 3.7, EDU 7420 – 3.6, EDU 7430 – 3.5, EDU 7300 – 3.6, and EDU 7040 – 3.8. The slightly lower scores in EDU 7420, 7430, & EDU 7340 are typical. EDU 7420 begins the quantitative sequence and EDU 7430 applies theory and concepts to applied statistical analysis. EDU 7340 is the culminating qualitative sequence where students apply qualitative analysis methods to their data and write a publication-worthy manuscript; the complexity of this results in slightly lower scores for EDU 7340.

Attached Files: Appendix 2

### **Use of Results to Improve Outcomes:**

#### **IDEA Evaluations**

No current changes have been made based on the data at this time. The Director of Graduate Studies continues to monitor results and trend data to ensure quality and that learning objectives are attained.

#### **ELPhD Academic Achievement**

No current changes have been made based on the data at this time. The Director of Graduate Studies continues to monitor results and trend data to ensure quality and that learning objectives are attained.

## **PG 2 - Scholarly Research**

### **Define Outcome:**

Initiate and maintain scholarly research activities that enhance program development and contribute to the design and delivery of services and supports to exceptional populations through research dissemination in the field.

### **Strategic Plan Connections:**

Core Principles: *Academic Excellence, Community Engagement, Meaningful Innovation, Student Success, Supportive Environment, Value Creation*

Strategic Goals: *SG1–PA A, B, D, E; SG2–PA B & C; SG4–PA B*

## **Assessment Methods:**

### **ELPhD Scholarly Activity Report**

The ELPhD Scholarly Activity Report captures scholarly activity for both students and faculty. Opportunities for collaboration, support, and skill development (e.g., calls for proposals for articles/chapters/conferences, workshops, seminars) in these areas are disseminated to all ELPhD students and faculty. Each faculty member submits a Faculty Activity report to Director of Graduate Programs addressing her or his efforts for the previous academic year. The report will address the following indicators: grant proposals, publications, presentations, other research endeavors, external consultants to public schools and agencies (including in-service and professional development). ELPhD students are asked annually to provide a current record of their scholarly activity (e.g., publication and presentations of original research or theoretical work, grant proposals, professional development activities).

The Director of Graduate Programs collects and reviews this data, then aggregates into the annual activity report. Scholarly activity 5-year trend is also tracked and reviewed to ensure application of appropriate scholarly and professional skills occur for students and that faculty maintain a strong scholarly presence. Trend data allows identification of change in scholarly productivity that may then be further examined as needed. Results are disseminated through faculty meetings, the College of Education Data and Assessment Forums, and institutional reports.

### **ELPhD Academic Achievement**

Doctoral courses scores are based solely on exams, research projects, and application of disciplinary theory and skills, all of which require mastery of appropriate research content/theoretical knowledge and skills. Course grades solely reflect students' progress in research content knowledge and skill mastery. A grade of *B* (80–89 out of 100) or better demonstrates sufficient content mastery for each course, whether that content is methods, practical application of professional skills, theory, or any combination of the three. Failure is considered a *C* or below. Students are allowed one *C* (70–79 out of 100) during their time in the ELPhD program. A second *C* is grounds for academic dismissal from the program. Tables below demonstrate course alignment to SLOs & PGs; attainment of an acceptable grade or higher in these courses aligns with progress toward and attainment of SLOs & PGs. A particular programmatic focus is on the research sequences and the Program Planning & Proposal Development course (EDU 7040) as these incorporate multiple skills acquired and developed across program curriculum. The Director of Graduate Programs tracks and reviews all ELPhD student final course grades each semester. Scores are aggregated for each year and cohort and compared against program-set quality benchmarks (thresholds). Trend data (5-year) is also tracked and reviewed to ensure program quality and identify any emerging needs. This data is paired with other specific direct assessment data to provide a robust picture of student academic progress and growth.

Attached Files: See Appendix 1

### **Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):**

#### **ELPhD Scholarly Activity Report Thresholds:**

*Acceptability:* actively working on a presentation or publication manuscript; submitted at least one presentation proposal &/or publication; collaboration with ELPhD students and faculty.

*Expectation:* submitted two or more presentation proposals &/or publication manuscripts; acceptance continued work on conference proposals and manuscripts for submission; collaboration with ELPhD students, faculty, and staff.

*Exceptionality:* submitted multiple presentation proposals &/or publications; at least one acceptance; cross-disciplinary and/or interdepartmental collaboration with students and faculty.

#### **ELPhD Academic Achievement Thresholds:**

*Acceptability:* 3.25 GPA (mainly Bs; 80–89 out of 100)

*Expectation:* 3.5 GPA (As & Bs; 85–100)

*Exceptionality:*  $\geq$  3.9 GPA (almost all As or all As; 90–100)

#### **Link to 'Tech Tomorrow' Strategic Plan:**

1.A Experiential Learning, 1.B General Education Curriculum, 1.C Diversity, 1.D High Impact Practices, 1.E Stackable Credentials, 2.B Research, Scholar, Intellect, and Creativity, 2.C Adult Learners, 4.B Programs, Certificates, and Training

#### **Results and Analysis:**

##### **ELPhD Scholarly Activity Results**

Students enrolled in the ELPhD program during the 2023–2024 academic year submitted 13 manuscripts (article, book chapter, or other scholarly work), 9 of which have been published (see table below). Students consistently performed or above the Threshold of Expectation, with several attaining the Threshold of Exceptionality. The publication trend across the last five years has been steady.

ELPhD students belonged to 76 professional organizations and disseminated original work (either their own or part of an active research collaboration with faculty &/or peers) at 17 scholarly/professional conferences (4 regional presentations, 5 national presentations, 8 international presentations). Overall, students consistently performed or above the Threshold of Expectation, with several attaining the Threshold of Exceptionality.

*Note: publications and presentations in which multiple faculty or students took part are only counted once. For example, four students may have published a paper together; it is reported as one publication rather than four.*

### **ELPhD Academic Achievement Results**

ELPhD students are expected to demonstrate appropriate doctoral-level mastery of course content. Trend data indicate students are consistently performing at or above expectations in these foundational courses that cut across all concentrations. Students taking these courses in 2023–2024 score lower in the quantitative sequence (EDU 7420, EDU 7430, EDU 7300) than in previous years. This will be monitored to see if this shift is an anomaly or if this is an area for medications. The 5-year averages are: EDU 7010 – 3.9, EDU 7330 – 3.9, EDU 7340 – 3.7, EDU 7420 – 3.6, EDU 7430 – 3.5, EDU 7300 – 3.6, and EDU 7040 – 3.8. The slightly lower scores in EDU 7420, 7430, & EDU 7340 are typical. EDU 7420 begins the quantitative sequence and EDU 7430 applies theory and concepts to applied statistical analysis. EDU 7340 is the culminating qualitative sequence where students apply qualitative analysis methods to their data and write a publication-worthy manuscript; the complexity of this results in slightly lower scores for EDU 7340.

Attached Files: See Appendix 1, Appendix 2, and Appendix 3

### **Use of Results to Improve Outcomes:**

#### **ELPhD Scholarly Activity Use for Improvement**

Fewer students and faculty submitted their scholarly activity as part of the IE process this year, so numbers are slightly lower than typical. The Director of Graduate Programs will begin the data collection process earlier to give students and faculty additional time to submit their information. One point of difference in this year's activity is that no students reported being involved with a grant proposal outside of EDU 7040 and none took part in funded grant. The Director of Graduate Programs will encourage faculty to ask students to participate and/or share opportunities to do so. Students will also be encouraged to take part in grant opportunities. Data from next year will be compared to see if numbers move toward previous levels. If they do not, the Director of Graduate Programs will work with faculty and students to identify and implement a plan to increase scholarly activity.

#### **ELPhD Academic Achievement Use for Improvement**

No current changes have been made based on the data at this time. The Director of Graduate Studies continues to monitor results and trend data to ensure quality and that learning objectives are attained.

## PG 3 - Leadership Personnel

### **Define Outcome:**

Develop leadership personnel in the areas of teaching and research for service in the fields of public education and social services such as public schools, state agencies, and higher education.

### **Strategic Plan Connections:**

Core Principles: *Academic Excellence, Community Engagement, Meaningful Innovation, Student Success, Supportive Environment, Value Creation*

Strategic Goals: *SG1–PA D; SG4–PA A, B, C, D*

### **Assessment Methods:**

#### **ELPhD Scholarly Activity Report**

The ELPhD Scholarly Activity Report captures scholarly activity for both students and faculty. Opportunities for collaboration, support, and skill development (e.g., calls for proposals for articles/chapters/conferences, workshops, seminars) in these areas are disseminated to all ELPhD students and faculty. Each faculty member submits a Faculty Activity report to Director of Graduate Programs addressing her or his efforts for the previous academic year. The report will address the following indicators: grant proposals, publications, presentations, other research endeavors, external consultants to public schools and agencies (including in-service and professional development). ELPhD students are asked annually to provide a current record of their scholarly activity (e.g., publication and presentations of original research or theoretical work, grant proposals, professional development activities).

The Director of Graduate Programs collects and reviews this data, then aggregates into the annual activity report. Scholarly activity 5-year trend is also tracked and reviewed to ensure application of appropriate scholarly and professional skills occur for students and that faculty maintain a strong scholarly presence. Trend data allows identification of change in scholarly productivity and professional skill development that may then be further examined as needed. Results are disseminated through faculty meetings, the College of Education Data and Assessment Forums, and institutional reports.

### **Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):**

#### **ELPhD Scholarly Activity Report Thresholds:**

Acceptability: actively working on a presentation or publication manuscript; submitted at least one presentation proposal &/or publication; collaboration with ELPhD students and faculty.

Expectation: submitted two or more presentation proposals &/or publication manuscripts; acceptance continued work on conference proposals and manuscripts for submission; collaboration with ELPhD students, faculty, and staff.

*Exceptionality*: submitted multiple presentation proposals &/or publications; at least one acceptance; cross-disciplinary and/or interdepartmental collaboration with students and faculty.

**Link to 'Tech Tomorrow' Strategic Plan:**

1.A Experiential Learning,1.D High Impact Practices,2.B Research, Scholar, Intellect, and Creativity,4.A Sustainable Partnerships,4.B Programs, Certificates, and Training,4.C Network of Scholars,4.D Alumni/Friend Engagement

**Results and Analysis:**

**ELPhD Scholarly Activity Results**

Students enrolled in the ELPhD program during the 2023–2024 academic year submitted 13 manuscripts (article, book chapter, or other scholarly work), 9 of which have been published (see table below). Students consistently performed or above the Threshold of Expectation, with several attaining the Threshold of Exceptionality. The publication trend across the last five years has been steady.

ELPhD students belonged to 76 professional organizations and disseminated original work (either their own or part of an active research collaboration with faculty &/or peers) at 17 scholarly/professional conferences (4 regional presentations, 5 national presentations, 8 international presentations). Overall, students consistently performed or above the Threshold of Expectation, with several attaining the Threshold of Exceptionality.

*Note: publications and presentations in which multiple faculty or students took part are only counted once. For example, four students may have published a paper together; it is reported as one publication rather than four.*

---

Attached Files: See Appendix 1 and 2

**Use of Results to Improve Outcomes:**

**ELPhD Scholarly Activity Use for Improvement**

Fewer students and faculty submitted their scholarly activity as part of the IE process this year, so numbers are slightly lower than typical. The Director of Graduate Programs will begin the data collection process earlier to give students and faculty additional time to submit their information. One point of difference in this year's activity is that no students reported being involved with a grant proposal outside of EDU 7040 and none took part in funded grant. The Director of Graduate Programs will encourage faculty to ask students to participate and/or share opportunities to do so. Students will also be encouraged to take part in grant opportunities. Data from next year will be compared to see if numbers move toward previous levels. If they do not, the Director of Graduate Programs will work with faculty and students to identify and implement a plan to increase scholarly activity.

## SLO 1 - Content Mastery

### **Define Outcome:**

Exceptional Learning Ph.D. (ELPhD) program students demonstrate progressively more complete and sophisticated content mastery appropriate for a doctoral student, building on and connecting theories, concepts, skills, and other subject matter through courses on their Program of Study. Performance on final portfolio from *At-Risk Populations: Research Service & Delivery* (EDU 7020), program planning and evaluation (PPE) model from *Program Planning & Proposal Development* (EDU 7040), culminating proposal in *Theoretical Foundations of Research* (EDU 7010), and comprehensive exams provide a picture of doctoral student growth.

### **Strategic Plan Connections:**

Core Principles: *Academic Excellence, Community Engagement, Meaningful Innovation, Student Success, Supportive Environment, Value Creation*

Strategic Goals: *SG1–PA A, B, C, D, E; SG2–PA B & C; SG4–PA B & C*

### **Assessment Methods:**

#### **EDU 7020 final exam**

*At–Risk Populations: Research, Service, & Delivery* (EDU 7020) directly addresses vulnerable, underrepresented, and underserved populations that are served in education. It is a broad overview of the topic of at-risk populations, including historical and current significance, definitions, service delivery systems, policies and programs, research, and recommended practices. In addition to exploring the number of groups that fall under at-risk classification, students learn the environmental, biological, and physical causative factors associated with at-risk populations; analyze the research and empirical bases for programs and services for various at-risk populations; and examine the fundamental elements of recommended practices. At the end of the course, students complete a final exam that allows them to synthesize and discuss all the knowledge they have learned and gathered throughout the course. Students are asked to pull information and supporting knowledge from their course work which includes article reviews, class notes, reading notes, lecture documents for a focused presentation, and an analysis of a service delivery program. These cumulative responses on the final exam represent the breadth and depth of the student’s understanding of and engagement with the course content.

#### **EDU 7040 PPE model**

*Program Planning & Proposal Development* (EDU 7040) is a core ELPhD course. Goals include 1) identify, study, understand, evaluate, and synthesize the most frequently applied program planning and evaluation (PPE) models in education and human services; 2) to understand

theoretical perspectives and the professional literature related to PPE in education; 3) to gain an understanding of and appreciation of PPE's place as an important part of the repertoire of a professional holding a Ph.D. in education; 4) to apply knowledge of best and effective PPE practices to proposal development; and 5) to develop a PPE model and apply the model to engage in program development.

The creation of a novel PPE model requires students to interpret and analyze relevant disciplinary information, create and refine model elements, and evaluate the model's individual parts and as a functioning whole. These skills are a regular part of professional expectations across disciplines, including but limited to curriculum development, course design, grant development and implementation, outreach initiatives, industry projects, and institutional processes and reporting.

### **EDU 7040 PPE Model Assessments –rubric categories (5–point scale; 30 points total)**

- C1. Use of class discussion and class participants
- C2. Use of variety of sources (minimum 6) and existing models
- C3. Selection (development) of defensible model
- C4. Articulation between/among components
- C5. Complete/thorough model and paper
- C6. Quality — level of effort/thought

### **EDU 7010 Research Proposal**

The research course sequence is an integral part of the ELPhD program. *Theoretical Foundations of Research* (EDU 7010) addresses foundational theoretical concepts, qualitative research methodology, and development of a qualitative research proposal. Students read extensively, including scholarly writings related to epistemologies and theories that influence and inform social science research and exemplary studies. Students' work undergoes faculty and peer review in preparation of an original research proposal.

The proposal guides data collection (EDU 7330) and analysis, interpretation, and presentation (EDU 7340). This succession allows students to develop the necessary research skills and emerge from the courses with original work that addresses gaps in the literature, investigates theory, uses sound and appropriate methodologies, and contributes knowledge to the discipline.

The research proposal is comprised of the chapters. Chapter 1 provides appropriate background and context to situate the study, research statement, study problem, and study significance. Chapter 2 a comprehensive review of relevant literature. Chapter 3 outlines the methods. This includes the proposed study's theoretical/conceptual framework (epistemology and existing theories that inform the study), theoretical perspective, approach, setting, participants, data sources, data collection procedures, data analysis, and trustworthiness. Students receive feedback on each chapter, which must be synthesized in the final research proposal. Successful completion

of the research proposal demonstrates appropriate doctoral-level content mastery for research fundamentals and conceptual understanding.

EDU 7010 assessments for the research proposal include rubrics for each chapter and a checklist for the final revised proposal. In addition to each rubric, students receive extensive written feedback from the professor, using track changes and comments in Microsoft Word, so that areas for improvement are clearly noted and explained. The aim of such extensive feedback is to ensure student understanding of the methodology and methods while also preparing students to become publishers of research in scholarly journals. All rubrics have a 3–point scale. The Chapter 2 rubric is divided into six criteria. The Chapter 1 rubric has eight criteria. The Chapter 3 rubric has seven criteria. After the first three chapters, with feedback, are evaluated, students revise and resubmit the chapters as a final proposal, which is evaluated using a checklist of 9 criteria.

### **Comprehensive Exam**

Comprehensive examinations are administered near the end of each semester as needed, typically in conjunction with Research Seminar in Education (EDU 7920), after all other coursework has been completed. Rigorous comprehensive examinations provide an opportunity for ELPhD students to provide evidence of proficiency in and mastery of expected learning outcomes. Students illustrate mastery of theory, research proficiency, professional skills, and concentration-specific content through their comprehensive exam responses. Students must pass their comprehensive exams to move to Ph.D. candidacy and continue in the program.

At the beginning of Research Seminar in Education (EDU 7920), the student and their Chair will select a series of four days (or more if there are more than 4 committee members) in a two-week period during which the comprehensive examination will take place. They may be spaced out according to student and committee needs. Each committee member submits an exam question or set of questions to the Chair. The student typically has 24 hours in which to craft a response to each member's question/set of questions, though individual members may elect to set a shorter or longer response time limit. Committee members may elect to allow the use of resources or to prohibit them. Responses are written to one committee member's question at a time. A student should not work on multiple responses at once. The questions must be answered with appropriate detail, clarity, and insight, and display strong comprehension and integration of fundamental concepts.

Once complete, the student submits the response to the Chair. If the question being answer was the Chair's, the Chair will then grade the response. If the question was submitted by a committee member, the Chair shares the response with the appropriate member. Responses on the qualifying exam are scored by their program chair and members of their graduate committee.

Scores (pass, low pass, fail) are based on pre-determined performance criteria devised by their committee and informed by evidence-based practices, discipline content knowledge, and

professional skills introduced and reinforced in previous coursework taken by the student. Upon passing the comprehensive exam, students move into Ph.D. candidacy.

If an answer lacks the desired mastery, committee members have two options. If the response is reasonably close to the expected level of proficiency and fluency, the committee member may choose to ask for more detail and offer a student an opportunity to elaborate if necessary. Alternatively, the committee member may fail the student. Students who fail the comprehensive exam must wait a semester before retaking their exam. Students may only retake their comprehensive exam one time. A failure of any part of a student's retake examination warrants academic dismissal from the program.

Student pass rates are monitored every semester. Any signs of declining competence and response quality are reviewed as a means of maintaining and/or improving curricular efficacy as well as ensuring student success. Trend data (5-year) is also tracked and reviewed to ensure program quality and identify any emerging needs. This data is paired with other SLO 1 assessment data to provide a robust picture of student academic progress and growth. Comp exam passing information is captured in the *ELPhD Academic Achievement table*.

Attached Files: See Appendix 1 and Appendix 4

### **Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):**

#### **EDU 7020 Final Exam Thresholds**

i. **Acceptability**: 70–79% overall score

ii. **Expectation**: 80–89% overall score

iii. **Exceptionality**: 90–100% overall score

#### **EDU 7040 PPE Model Thresholds**

i. **Acceptability**: 22.5 points

ii. **Expectation**: 24 to 26.9 points

iii. **Exceptionality**:  $\geq 27$  points

#### **EDU 7010 Research Proposal Thresholds**

i. **Acceptability**: minimum of 2 points per section (80%) across all chapters, 20% or fewer sections earn 0s or 1s.

ii. **Expectation**: 50% of sections earn 3 points across all chapters; no sections earn 0s.

iii. **Exceptionality**: 85% of sections earn 3 points across all chapters; no sections earn 0s or 1s.

## Comp Exam Thresholds

i.**Acceptability**: students pass the comprehensive exam in no more than two attempts.

ii.**Expectation**: students pass the comprehensive exam on the first attempt with no more than one *Low Pass* score.

iii.**Exceptionality**: students pass the comprehensive exam on the first attempt and receive *Pass* for all sections.

### Link to 'Tech Tomorrow' Strategic Plan:

1.A Experiential Learning,1.B General Education Curriculum,1.C Diversity,1.D High Impact Practices,1.E Stackable Credentials,2.B Research, Scholar, Intellect, and Creativity,2.C Adult Learners,4.B Programs, Certificates, and Training,4.C Network of Scholars

## Results and Analysis:

### EDU 7020 Final Exam Results and Use for Improvement

The final exam is scored on a 10–point scale with a rubric. The rubric contains 5 categories (*Course Connections, Accuracy, Quality, Opinion & Reflection, and Grammar & Mechanics*) worth up to 2 points each. For the 2023–2024 academic year, 4 students were enrolled in EDU 7020. Of those students, full points were earned in the categories of *Course Connections, Accuracy, and Opinion & Reflection*. The average number of points earned in the rubric categories of *Quality* and *Grammar & Mechanics* were 1.88 and 1.75 respectively. These results express that students have a strong understanding of the course content and how to apply to their chosen career fields. Every student scored a 90 or above, which puts them in the exceptional threshold based on the identified criteria for success.

### EDU 7040 PPE Model Results and Use for Improvement

Trend data indicate that students typically perform at the Threshold of Exceptionality. After observing the data and the qualitative comments shared by the instructor with students to justify point deductions (based on rubric criteria), it is evident that the weakest area is C4: *Articulation Between/Among Components*. Since many students take this course within the first or second year in the doctoral program, they are still honing their writing skills and developing their skills at synthesizing information in coherent ways. The most typical written comment provided on C4 is related to some component of their PPE Model lacking clear connections to other related components (perhaps visually linked in the model representation, but not connected (or insufficiently connected) within the accompanying narrative).

### EDU 7010 Research Proposal Results

For Chapter 2, students' overall scores were Acceptable. Students scored 2 (acceptable) or above on all but two criteria and 3 (exemplary) on one criterium. This is the first chapter submitted, and some students are new to the process, especially to applying what they have learned about correct APA usage and style. Students may benefit from more examples and a demonstration on how to explain a study's methodology and methods (*Literature Methodologies & Methods; Summary & Argument*). Students also may benefit from a review of APA style expectations.

For Chapter 1, students overall scores were Excellent (3). Students scored adequate or above ( $\geq 2$ ) on all criteria, with all students scoring exceptional on two criteria. More students had room for improvement with the *Research Statement* and with *Mechanics & Conventions*. The research statement is a single sentence, and students may initially find it difficult to concisely present the necessary research methodology and methods. While a video walks students through construction of the research statement, students may benefit from additional examples. It also may be important to be certain students are viewing the video. As students begin to revise chapters, their scores on *Mechanics & Conventions* tend to improve.

For Chapter 3, students' scores were Exemplary, with 100% scoring 3 in four categories, only two scoring less than 3 in three categories, and no students scoring below 2. Students may benefit from a review of methodology since the material for *Worldview, Theoretical Perspective, & Approach* is covered early in the semester, and course materials on the elements of *Trustworthiness* (design elements, ethical considerations, and subjectivities) will be reviewed to determine where instruction can be strengthened. Students who continue to struggle with *Mechanics & Conventions* may be waiting until all chapters are submitted to begin applying feedback. Additional tips for mastering clear, concise writing and APA style are provided.

For the revised final proposal, students' scores were Exemplary. Three students earned 3s in every category. For two criteria, 100% scored exceptional. Most students scored 3 (exemplary) in every category, no more than two students scored below 3 in any category, and no student scored below 2 in any category. Results indicated two students had room for improvement with *Grammar & Mechanics*, including one student who scored 2 for each chapter as well as for the revised paper. This student may benefit from additional tips for clear, concise writing and APA style as well as one-on-one discussion of specific errors that are being repeated.

### **Comp Exam Results**

Students are well prepared for their comprehensive examinations. All students in the last academic year passed their comprehensive examination on the first attempt and entered Ph.D. candidacy successfully. None received a low pass. Students are performing at or above the *Threshold of Expectation*. Historical comprehensive examination data show successful responses on the first attempt for students taking exams in the past 5 years, while only 3 have required a retake since 2009.

Attached Files: See Appendix 1,

[EDU 7040 average scores.pdf](#)

[EDU 7010 assessments.pdf](#)

[EDU 7010 results .pdf](#)

[EDU 7020 Final Exam Rubric \(fall 2023\) 7-16-24.pdf](#)

**Use of Results to Improve Outcomes:**

**EDU 7020 Final Exam Use for Improvement**

Moving forward, the goal will be to continue to work with students on the best and most effective ways to convey their knowledge and understanding in writing according to the set standards of the field of education to improve student scores in response *Quality* and *Grammar & Mechanics*. This will entail continued exemplary feedback throughout the course on weekly assignments to ensure students understand the appropriate expectations of scholarly work thorough explanatory detail to express all ideas fully. Ideally, students will continue to score in the exceptional threshold with continued improvement in the average scores of the *Quality* and *Grammar & Mechanics* categories of the final exam rubric.

### **EDU 7040 PPE Model Use for Improvement**

The data indicate providing exemplars of PPE Model papers from previous cohorts might be helpful. Exemplars of visual model representations have always been shared (show-and-tell, but not provided to students as artifacts), but narratives have not. The instructor will create opportunities to discuss the expectations for successful articulation within the model by showcasing narrative selections from previous papers (with student permission) that exemplify excellent (level 5) articulation between/among the model components.

### **EDU 7010 Research Proposal Use for Improvement**

The instructor noted APA as a point for growth. Additional resources may be provided, included a training module. The instructor will monitor APA progress and implement additional resources as needed. Some students may not be engaging with the asynchronous content that forms the foundation of the course; the instructor will monitor to see if this behavior continues and will work with CITL and use online learning resources for increasing student engagement with content if needed.

### **Comp Exam Use for Improvement**

In response to feedback about the comp exam experience, during the last year, comp content has transitioned to questions that relate course content to the proposed dissertation work. Students have expressed that this change is very helpful as they refine their dissertation prospectus. The Director of Graduate Programs will continue to monitor this initiative, seeking feedback from faculty and students and reviewing comp exam pass rates.

## **SLO 2 - Research Proficiencies**

### **Define Outcome:**

ELPhD program graduates develop, integrate, and apply foundational quantitative and qualitative research skills through successful 1) completion of course sequence cumulative final

projects, 2) creation of an approved dissertation prospectus, and 3) generation of original research culminating in a dissertation.

**Strategic Plan Connections**

**Core Principles:** *Academic Excellence, Community Engagement, Meaningful Innovation, Student Success, Supportive Environment, Value Creation*

**Strategic Goals:** SG1–PA A, B, C, D, E; SG2–PA B & C; SG4–PA A, B, C, D

**Assessment Methods:**

**EDU 7300 Final Exam**

The EDU 7300 final exam is the culminating assessment for the 3-course quantitative research sequence. Students must have appropriate comprehension and proficiency at the doctoral level to pass the exam. The exam has a total of 85 questions pertaining to the nature of research ( $n = 17$ ), measurement and instrumentation ( $n = 2$ ), sampling ( $n = 5$ ), reliability and validity ( $n = 19$ ), the literature review ( $n = 5$ ), proposal writing ( $n = 2$ ), design characteristics ( $n = 12$ ), choosing an appropriate design and methodology ( $n = 15$ ), statistical choice ( $n = 5$ ), and results interpretation ( $n = 5$ ).

<b>Week(s) covered</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Multiple choice</b>	<b>Matching</b>	<b>Yes/no</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
1	Nature of research	5	11	1	17
6	Measurement/instrumentation	2	–	–	2
4	Sampling	1	4	–	5
4, 5, and 6	Validity/reliability	1	16	–	17
3	Literature review	5	–	–	5
1, 3, 5, & 6	Proposal writing	2	–	–	2
2-5	Design characteristics	9	3	–	12
2-5, 8	Choose design	5	10	–	15
8	Statistical choice	5	–	–	5
8 & 9	Results interpretation	2	3	–	5
<i>Total</i>		37	47	1	85
<b>85 QUESTIONS TOTAL</b>					

## **EDU 7340 Culminating Paper**

*Data Analysis & Representation in Qualitative Inquiry* (EDU 7340) is the culminating qualitative research course. This addresses both theoretical and practical dimensions of conducting qualitative research. Data analysis concerns are embedded within the larger processes of qualitative research methods and must be considered in holistic ways. For example, data analysis decisions are inherently tied to particular epistemological and ontological stances of the researcher as well as the research focus. This course also functions as an advanced seminar to develop data analysis and representation skills using hands-on application of data analysis and representation methods. We will also enter into the on-going discourse among qualitative researchers concerning how to analyze and represent qualitative data. The transformation of “data” into “writing” makes a difference theoretically, practically, and ethically. As such issues around how we inscribe lives in our texts, how we contribute to hegemonies by maintaining marginality/dominance in our texts, and how our academic practices affect how and what we write are examined. Assignments are designed to facilitate the interaction between students’ epistemologies, theoretical perspectives, data, analysis, write-up/representation, and the literature.

As professionals in their disciplines, students will be expected to produce manuscripts that are publication-ready. The final project in EDU 7340 is a manuscript for submission to a reputable peer-reviewed journal. Students reimagine their chapters 1–3 from EDU 7010, transforming that into the first portion of the draft: introduction, context, theory, and research design and methods. After practicing multiple methods of data analysis, students select the most appropriate method and analyze their study data. Then, the data analysis methods, findings, and implications are written as the final piece of the completed manuscript. This manuscript must meet expectations for publication in a peer-reviewed journal including, but not limited to, clarity, relevant context, relation to literature, methodological detail, rich description, substantiated findings, and well-founded discussion and implications.

## **Dissertation Prospectus**

The dissertation prospectus is presented each semester as needed, in conjunction with or immediately following Research Seminar in Education, EDU 7920 (successful written and oral prospectus defense to graduate advisory committee). Note: Ph.D. candidate is

used in place of student as the individual will typically have passed comprehensive exams before presenting the prospectus.

Ph.D. candidates prepare their dissertation prospectus in Research Seminar in Education (EDU 7920). In this course, the Ph.D. candidate crafts the research design and write the prospectus for the proposed study. After receiving iterative feedback on the first three chapters of their research proposal from the course instructor and making revisions, the Ph.D. candidate presents a practice prospectus defense. The course instructor and candidate's Chair attend, though all committee members are welcome. Input from the course instructor and Chair is given at the end of the practice defense. The Ph.D. candidate then incorporates the feedback into the prospectus presentation and the dissertation prospectus.

After the practice prospectus defense, the Ph.D. candidate is directed to either schedule a formal prospectus defense with his/her dissertation advisory committee (after successful defense) or is directed to continue working on the prospectus and presentation with guidance from the Chair and committee members.

Once a formal prospectus presentation and defense date has been selected, the Ph.D. candidate is required to submit the dissertation prospectus to committee members at least two weeks prior to the scheduled prospectus date, though earlier is encouraged when possible.

At formal prospectus defense, the Ph.D. candidate presents the prospectus using PowerPoint, Prezi, or Keynote (other mediums may be acceptable) and provides handouts for the committee. The presentation is 25–35 minutes long. The Ph.D. candidate covers study background and context, problem description, study purpose, significance, theoretical lens, connections to relevant literature, and a detailed description of the proposed research methodology. Other pertinent information may also be included. After the presentation has concluded, committee members pose questions that the candidate must answer. The Ph.D. candidate is then dismissed from the room, while the committee members deliberate on whether or not the candidate should pursue the proposed research. Once a decision has been reached, the Ph.D. candidate is brought back and the decision is shared. The committee also provides additional feedback on the prospectus. If the prospectus defense was not successful, the committee will ask the Ph.D. candidate to revise the proposal and convene at a later date to present the revised prospectus. Ph.D. candidates who successfully defend the dissertation prospectus are given permission to proceed with their dissertation work.

Dissertation prospectus defense pass rates are monitored each semester. Data are looked at in semester, annual, and cohort levels, as well as 5-year trend data. This data is also reviewed in conjunction with other assessment data (e.g., research sequence, comprehensive exam, academic achievement, scholarly activity) to provide a comprehensive understanding of the student progress and program quality.

### **Dissertation Defense**

The dissertation defense occurs each semester as needed. Graduates must successfully complete a written and oral dissertation defense, scored by their dissertation advisory committee (minimum four qualified members).

Building upon the prospectus work, the Ph.D. candidate works closely with committee members throughout the dissertation process in preparation for the dissertation defense. A Ph.D. candidate regularly submits dissertation chapters to each committee member for feedback (schedule determined by Ph.D. candidate and committee Chair). The Ph.D. candidate incorporates feedback from all members and continually seeks additional guidance on revisions and refinement. The full dissertation must be submitted to the dissertation advisory committee and Director of Graduate Programs at least two weeks prior to the scheduled defense date, though earlier is encouraged when possible.

During the dissertation defense, the Ph.D. candidate has 20–40 minutes to review the information covered in the prospectus proposal (e.g., context, problem addressed, significance, methodology) and present the original dissertation research findings, conclusions, and implications (defense time is determined by the Chair). The defense includes written materials and a formal presentation. After the presentation has concluded, the committee and any others present may pose questions to the Ph.D. candidate. Committee questions may focus on research methods, findings, connections to the literature, implications, and areas that have been the subject of substantial revision during the dissertation process. Once all questions have been answered satisfactorily, the Ph.D. candidate and any guests are dismissed from the room. The dissertation advisory committee then deliberates about whether the Ph.D. candidate's defense was successful. Once a decision has been reached, the Ph.D. candidate is brought back and the decision is shared.

If the dissertation defense was successful, the committee signs the Dissertation Defense form and submits it to the Director of Graduate Programs and Graduate Studies. If the defense was not successful, the committee also provides additional feedback and outlines revisions that need to be made before scheduling a second defense.

The dissertation defense serves as the final assessment of a Ph.D. candidate's content mastery, course competency, and professional skill development as well as their development as scholars and leaders. Students must have mastered and integrated the content and skills acquired throughout the ELPhD program in order to pass the dissertation defense.

Data are looked at semester, annual, and cohort levels, as well as 5-year trend and "whole program history" trend data. Historical data show that students are well-prepared and generally pass on the first attempt. This data is also reviewed in conjunction with other assessment data (e.g., research sequence, comprehensive exam, academic achievement, scholarly activity) to provide a comprehensive understanding of the student progress and program quality.

Attached Files: See Appendix 1 and  
[EDU 7340 Final Manuscript Rubric.pdf](#)

### **Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):**

#### **EDU 7300 Final Exam thresholds**

- i. Acceptability: 65/85 points earned
- ii. Expectation: 70/85 points earned
- iii. Exceptionality: 75/85 points earned

#### **EDU 7340 Culminating Paper thresholds**

- i. Acceptability: 22.5 points
- ii. Expectation: 24 to 26.9 points
- iii. Exceptionality:  $\geq 27$  points

#### **Dissertation Prospectus thresholds**

- i. Acceptability: students pass the comprehensive exam in no more than two attempts.

ii. Expectation: students pass the comprehensive exam on the first attempt with no more than one *Low Pass* score.

iii. Exceptionality: students pass the comprehensive exam on the first attempt and receive *Pass* for all sections.

### **Dissertation Defense thresholds**

i. Acceptability: Ph.D. candidate passes the dissertation defense in no more than two attempts; candidate answers to defense questions, but answers may lack some of the desired complexity/depth; dissertation and defense presentation address all the required elements (study context, problem description, study purpose, significance, theoretical lens, connections to relevant literature, research methodology, findings, conclusions, and implications), but may need additional information; major revisions may be required before submitting to Graduate Studies and ProQuest.

ii. Expectation: Ph.D. candidate passes the dissertation defense on the first attempt; Ph.D. candidate adequately answers defense questions; dissertation is thorough and well-crafted, addressing all required elements in sufficient detail; minor revisions required before submitting to Graduate Studies and ProQuest.

iii. Exceptionality: Ph.D. candidate passes the dissertation defense on the first attempt; candidate's answers to defense questions are exceptional and demonstrate deep understanding of and connection to the work; defense presentation is engaging, informative, and shows Ph.D. candidate's expertise as a scholar and appropriate professional skills; dissertation displays thoughtful organization, relevant study purpose, clear significance, excellent methodology, clear findings, and insightful, nuanced conclusions and implications; minimal, if any, revisions are required before submitting to Graduate Studies and ProQuest.

### **Link to 'Tech Tomorrow' Strategic Plan:**

1.A Experiential Learning, 1.B General Education Curriculum, 1.C Diversity, 1.D High Impact Practices, 1.E Stackable Credentials, 2.B Research, Scholar, Intellect, and Creativity, 2.C Adult Learners, 4.A Sustainable Partnerships, 4.B Programs, Certificates, and Training, 4.C Network of Scholars, 4.D Alumni/Friend Engagement

### **Results and Analysis:**

#### **EDU 7300 Final Exam Results**

The average ( $n = 8$ ) percentage of correct items was 86.66% (SD = 8.43%), or approximately 74/85 questions correct, representing an adjusted score of 94. [Note: No data were collected in 2023 as only 1 student completed the course.] Results indicate that students successfully mastered content knowledge in the course, as indicated by foundational questions. Students succeeded in applying content knowledge to hypothetical prompts, as indicated by questions pertaining to choosing an appropriate design and methodology. Students answered fewer questions correctly in Sections 7 and 8.

## **EDU 7340 Culminating Paper Results and Use for Improvement**

After observing the data and the qualitative comments shared by the instructor with students to justify point deductions (based on rubric criteria), it is evident that the weakest areas are C4 (*Research Design & Methods Statement*), C5 (*Findings*), and C6 (*Discussion and Conclusions*).

It is not surprising that these three areas are students' weakest. As novice researchers and writers, these are the most difficult sections to articulate. Many candidates write and rewrite the "parallel" chapters in their dissertations multiple times because this work is complex and challenging. I allow a (generous) 10,000-word limit for this culminating paper, but most students have ~15,000 words in chapters 1–3 that they bring from EDU 7330 before editing those chapters into a journal article format while adding the new sections (data analysis methods, findings, and implications). As such, they often covet previously written content and keep too much of their (well-crafted) literature review (thereby using a disproportionate amount of their word count) and then write underdeveloped findings/discussion/conclusions.

## **Dissertation Prospectus Results**

All Ph.D. candidates in the last academic year passed their dissertation prospectus defense on the first attempt. All students in 2023–2024 performed at or above the Threshold of Expectation. Dissertation prospectus data show successful completion of presentations on the first attempt for all ELPhD students.

## **Dissertation Defense Results**

All Ph.D. candidates in the 2023–2024 academic year successfully passed their dissertation defense on the first attempt, performing at or above the *Threshold of Expectation*. Historical dissertation defense data show successful completion of defense on the first attempt for all ELPhD candidates, indicating candidates are well prepared and have appropriate mastery of disciplinary content and research proficiencies.

Attached Files: See Appendix 1 and  
[EDU 7340 Final Manuscript Rubric.pdf](#)  
[EDU 7300 results.pdf](#)

**Use of Results to Improve Outcomes:**

## **EDU 7300 Final Exam Use for Improvement**

For future offerings, the instructor plans to give short quizzes weekly to assess student mastery in each section to target instruction towards weaker areas. This would also allow for more practice in successfully choosing an appropriate design and/or analysis method based on a given prompt.

This exam was created and reviewed by content experts and was modified in 2024 to mitigate any instrument decay, as well as to transform some questions which did not pertain specifically to course content. While reliability and validity were assessed on this exam and deemed acceptable and high, reliability assessments, including alternate forms (online vs. in-person) and overall reliability, in addition to assessing content validity through correlating on exam scores with proposal scores, will be rerun in fall 2024.

Trend data will be collected going forward and regularly reviewed.

#### **EDU 7340 Culminating Paper Use for Improvement**

Sharing this data (length of publishable manuscripts) more clearly with students should make them more conscientious about space and content allocations in their papers. Further revision after the course is often needed since most journals set a 4,000-word limit for manuscripts. Another idea is to suggest students work in peer writing teams and that they receive feedback from their peer prior to submission to the instructor. This interim feedback component should result in better culminating papers. The instructor may pilot this approach in the next academic year and will collect data for comparison.

#### **Dissertation Prospectus Use for Improvement**

Dissertation prospectus data show successful completion of presentations on the first attempt for all ELPhD students. No changes to this assessment or data collection has been proposed.

#### **Dissertation Defense Use for Improvement**

No changes to this assessment or data collection has been proposed at this time; creating a rubric for the dissertation defense has been discussed. ELPhD faculty and the Director of Graduate Programs will continue discussions; if the decision to use a formalized rubric is reached, they will move forward with rubric creation/adoption.

### **SLO 3 - Professional Preparedness**

#### **Define Outcome:**

ELPhD students masterfully apply program content and skills commensurate with professional expectations of Ph.D. graduates. ELPhD students contribute to scholarly knowledge through peer-reviewed presentations, publications, and other appropriate means of dissemination research. They also are trained in grant preparation through a comprehensive grant proposal project in *Program Planning & Proposal Development* (EDU 7040).

### **Strategic Plan Connections**

**Core Principles:** *Academic Excellence, Community Engagement, Meaningful Innovation, Student Success, Supportive Environment, Value Creation*

**Strategic Goals:** SG1–PA A, B, C, D, E; SG2–PA B & C; SG4–PA A, B, C, D

### **Assessment Methods:**

#### **ELPhD Student Scholarly Activity**

The ELPhD Scholarly Activity Report captures scholarly activity for both students and faculty. Opportunities for collaboration, support, and skill development (e.g., calls for proposals for articles/chapters/conferences, workshops, seminars) in these areas are disseminated to all ELPhD students and faculty. Each faculty member submits a Faculty Activity report to Director of Graduate Programs addressing her or his efforts for the previous academic year. The report will address the following indicators: grant proposals, publications, presentations, other research endeavors, external consultants to public schools and agencies (including in-service and professional development). ELPhD students are asked annually to provide a current record of their scholarly activity (e.g., publication and presentations of original research or theoretical work, grant proposals, professional development activities).

The Director of Graduate Programs collects and reviews this data, then aggregates into the annual activity report. Scholarly activity 5-year trend is also tracked and reviewed to ensure application of appropriate scholarly and professional skills occur for students and that faculty maintain a strong scholarly presence. Trend data allows identification of change in scholarly productivity and professional skill development that may then be further examined as needed. Results are disseminated through faculty meetings, the College of Education Data and Assessment Forums, and institutional reports.

#### **Grant Proposals**

Grant proposals are crafted each summer semester in *Program Planning and Proposal Development* (EDU 7040). EDU 7040 incorporates theoretical program planning perspectives; in-depth discussion of various program planning models; and effective program development, planning, and evaluation practices for a variety of educational settings. This class includes a focus on adult learners as exceptional learners, in and out of traditional educational environments, and their particular needs. These theories, skills, and practices are not typically addressed in undergraduate or graduate programs and are especially important in preparing professionals who can lead sustainable change for exceptional learners. This course requires students to prepare products that may have real-world impact.

One of two main project students undertaken in EDU 7040 is creation of a grant proposal for a state- or federally-funded program. After completing the proposal, students must defend their proposal in mock “board meeting” discussions, which prepares them for gaining stakeholder buy-in, identifying unintended outcomes, and assessing needs in professional environments. This also provides students a chance to further improve their proposal via incorporation of the feedback given. The course instructor, who has authored or co-authored multiple successful grants over the last decade, evaluates the grant proposals and provides further input. Students who choose to submit proposals to the funding agency are encouraged to do so and directed to the Office of Research for instruction in grant submission policy and procedures.

Completion of culminating grant project that demonstrates analytic skill and proficient synthesis of required research, evaluation, and writing skills required to craft high-quality proposals. Number of proposals crafted and funded will continue to be used alongside the EDU 7040 proposal project to provide a clear picture of students’ growth.

Number of grants produced and funded is tracked year-by-year, with a 5-year trend as well (*ELPhD Scholarly Activity Table*). Informal feedback about the grant proposal process and collaboration (development of professional skills) is also collected.

Going forward, rubric data will be collected for this assessment.

Attached Files: See Appendix 1

**Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):**  
**ELPhD Student Scholarly Activity thresholds**

- i. Acceptability: actively working on a presentation or publication manuscript; submitted at least one presentation proposal &/or publication; collaboration with ELPhD students and faculty.
- ii. Expectation: submitted two or more presentation proposals &/or publication manuscripts; acceptance continued work on conference proposals and manuscripts for submission; collaboration with ELPhD students, faculty, and staff.
- iii. Exceptionality: submitted multiple presentation proposals &/or publications; at least one acceptance; cross-disciplinary and/or interdepartmental collaboration with students and faculty.

### **Grant Proposal thresholds**

- i. Acceptability: successful completion of a grant proposal as part of *Program Planning and Proposal Development* (EDU 7040) with a score of  $\geq 80\%$  or better.
- ii. Expectation: successful completion of a grant proposal as part of *Program Planning and Proposal Development* (EDU 7040) with a score of  $\geq 85\%$  or better.
- iii. Exceptionality: successful completion of a grant proposal as part of *Program Planning and Proposal Development* (EDU 7040) with a score of  $\geq 85\%$  or better; grant proposal submission; collaboration with other Tech faculty and students on additional grant proposals.

### **Link to 'Tech Tomorrow' Strategic Plan:**

1.A Experiential Learning, 1.D High Impact Practices, 2.B Research, Scholar, Intellect, and Creativity, 4.B Programs, Certificates, and Training

### **Results and Analysis:**

#### **ELPhD Student Scholarly Activity Results and Use for Improvement**

Students enrolled in the ELPhD program during the 2023–2024 academic year submitted 13 manuscripts (article, book chapter, or other scholarly work), 9 of which have been published (see table below). Students consistently performed or above the *Threshold of Expectation*, with several attaining the *Threshold of Exceptionality*. The publication trend across the last five years has been steady.

ELPhD students belonged to 76 professional organizations and disseminated original work (either their own or part of an active research collaboration with faculty &/or peers) at 17 scholarly/professional conferences (4 regional presentations, 5 national presentations, 8 international presentations). Overall, students consistently performed or above the *Threshold of Expectation*, with several attaining the *Threshold of Exceptionality*.

## **Grant Proposals Results**

Grant proposals for an externally funding source are a required component of EDU 7040. Students are also encouraged to take part in grants with faculty and community members. In 2023–2024, 4 grant proposals (including collaborative grants written outside of EDU 7040) were crafted. Students consistently performed at the *Threshold of Expectation*.

Attached Files: See Appendix 1 and [ELPhD Scholarly Activity tables.pdf](#)

### **Use of Results to Improve Outcomes: ELPhD Student Scholarly Activity Use for Improvement**

Fewer students and faculty submitted their scholarly activity as part of the IE process this year, so numbers are slightly lower than typical. The Director of Graduate Programs will begin the data collection process earlier to give students and faculty additional time to submit their information. One point of difference in this year's activity is that no students reported being involved with a grant proposal outside of EDU 7040 and none took part in funded grant. The Director of Graduate Programs will encourage faculty to ask students to participate and/or share opportunities to do so. Students will also be encouraged to take part in grant opportunities. Data from next year will be compared to see if numbers move toward previous levels. If they do not, the Director of Graduate Programs will work with faculty and students to identify and implement a plan to increase scholarly activity.

### **Grant Proposals Results and Use for Improvement**

No changes to the assessment are proposed. Rubric data will be gathered going forward to increase the robustness of the data

### **Summative Evaluation:**

Overall, students perform at or above the Threshold of Expectation, indicating appropriate growth and development across PGs and SLOs throughout the ELPhD program.

Changes to be monitored are listed in the Assessment Plan Changes below.

### **Assessment Plan Changes:**

ELPhD Scholarly Activity: Fewer students and faculty submitted their scholarly activity as part of the IE process this year, so numbers are slightly lower than typical. The Director of Graduate Programs will begin the data collection process earlier to give students and faculty additional time to submit their information. One point of difference in this year's activity is that no students reported being involved with a grant proposal outside of EDU 7040 and none took part in funded grant. The Director of Graduate Programs will encourage faculty to ask students to participate and/or share opportunities to do so. Students will also be encouraged to take part in grant opportunities.

## EDU 7020 Final Exam

Results express that students have a strong understanding of the course content and how to apply to their chosen career fields. Every student scored a 90 or above, which puts them in the exceptional threshold based on the identified criteria for success. Moving forward, the goal will be to continue to work with students on the best and most effective ways to convey their knowledge and understanding in writing according to the set standards of the field of education to improve student scores in response Quality and Grammar & Mechanics. This will entail continued exemplary feedback throughout the course on weekly assignments to ensure students understand the appropriate expectations of scholarly work thorough explanatory detail to express all ideas fully. Ideally, students will continue to score in the exceptional threshold with continued improvement in the average scores of the Quality and Grammar & Mechanics categories of the final exam rubric.

## EDU 7040 PPE Model

Trend data indicate that students typically perform at the Threshold of Exceptionality. It is evident that the weakest area of performance is C4: Articulation Between/Among Components. The instructor will create opportunities to discuss the expectations for successful articulation within the model by showcasing narrative selections from previous papers (with student permission) that exemplify excellent (level 5) articulation between/among the model components. The assessment itself will not change.

## EDU 7010 Research Proposal

Trend data indicate that students typically perform at the Threshold of Exceptionality for the final product. APA is an area where students struggled, particularly those new to the program. Additional APA writing tips were included this data cycle. No major revisions are planned at this time.

## EDU 7300 Final Exam

Results indicate that students successfully mastered content knowledge in the course, as indicated by foundational questions. While reliability and validity were assessed on this exam and deemed acceptable and high, reliability assessments, including alternate forms (online vs. in-person) and overall reliability, in addition to assessing content validity through correlating on exam scores with proposal scores, will be rerun in fall 2024. Trend data will be collected going forward and regularly reviewed.

## EDU 7340 Culminating Paper

Trend data indicate that students typically perform at the Threshold of Expectation for the final research paper. It is evident that the weakest areas are C4 (Research Design & Methods Statement), C5 (Findings), and C6 (Discussion and Conclusions). As novice researchers and

writers, these are the most difficult sections to articulate. They also keep too much of their (well-crafted) literature review (thereby using a disproportionate amount of their word count) and then write underdeveloped findings/discussion/conclusions. Sharing this data with students should make them more conscientious about space and content allocations in their papers. This will be monitored going forward with trend data.

#### EDU 7040 Grant Proposal

Completion of culminating grant project that demonstrates analytic skill and proficient synthesis of required research, evaluation, and writing skills required to craft high-quality proposals. Going forward, rubric data will be collected for this assessment to be paired with number of grants produced/collaborated on and funded is tracked year-by-year, with a 5-year trend as well (ELPhD Scholarly Activity Table).

#### **List of Appendices:**

Appendix 1: Exceptional Learning PhD Curriculum Map

Appendix 2: PG1 Results

Appendix 3: PG2 Results

Appendix 4: SLO1 Assessment Methods

Appendix 5:

Appendix 1: Exceptional Learning PhD Curriculum Map

**ELPhD Core & Research Curriculum Map**

I = introduced      R = reinforced      M = mastery      A = assessment

<b>Core Course Alignment with Program Goals and Student Learning Outcomes</b>					
<i>Course</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Content Mastery (SLO 1)</i>	<i>Scholarly Research Activities (PG 2, SLO 2)</i>	<i>Professional Skill Development (PG 2 &amp; 3, SLO 1-3)</i>	<i>Evidence- based Practices (PG1 &amp; 2, SLO 1-3)</i>
EDU 7000	Trans-Concentration Seminar	I	I	I	I
EDU 7010	Theoretical Foundations of Research	I	I, A	I	R
EDU 7020	At-Risk Populations: Research, Service, & Delivery	R, A	R	R, A	R, A
EDU 7040	Program Planning and Proposal Development	I, R	I, R, A	R, M, A	R
CUED 7430	Specialized Applications of Technology to Education	I	I	R, A	R

Appendix 2: PG1 Results  
ELPhD Academic Achievement Table

Exceptional Learning Ph.D. Academic Achievement (5-year)										
	<i>EDU</i> 7010	<i>EDU</i> 7330	<i>EDU</i> 7340	<i>EDU</i> 7420	<i>EDU</i> 7430	<i>EDU</i> 7300	<i>EDU</i> 7040	<i>Comps</i>	<i>Prospectus</i>	<i>Defense</i>
2019– 2020	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.7	4/4 passed on 1 <sup>st</sup> attempt	4/4 passed on 1 <sup>st</sup> attempt	3/3 passed on 1 <sup>st</sup> attempt
2020– 2021	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.0	5/6 passed on 1 <sup>st</sup> attempt	6/6 passed on 1 <sup>st</sup> attempt	6/6 passed on 1 <sup>st</sup> attempt
2021– 2022	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	2/2 passed on 1 <sup>st</sup> attempt	-	-
2022– 2023	4.0	-	-	3.8	3.5	3.8	4.0	-	-	-
2023– 2024	3.7	-	-	3.4	3.2	3.0	3.8	-	-	-

Appendix 3: PG2 Results  
ELPhD Scholarly Activity Tables

5-Year Exceptional Learning Ph.D. Faculty Activity							
	In-Service Workshops	Grant Proposals Funded	National Presentations	International Presentations	Books	Book Chapters	Peer-Reviewed Publications
2019–2020	21	16	28	15	2	6	57
2020–2021	11	21	20	18	3	16	30
2021–2022	0	11	7	5	0	1	10
2022 – 2023	14	21	8	10	1	13	17
2023 – 2024	16	13	17	10	1	5	10

5-year Exceptional Learning Ph.D. Student Scholarly Activity								
	In-Service Workshops	Grant Proposals Crafted	Regional Presentations	National Presentations	International Presentations	Book Chapters	Peer-Reviewed Publications	Pending Peer-Reviewed Publications
2018–2019	0	5 <i>(1 funded)</i>	24	12	16	0	3	4
2019–2020	1	14 <i>(7 funded)</i>	18	11	10	2	7	5
2020–2021	1	17 <i>(7 funded)</i>	15	5	10	0	7	7
2021–2022	2	12 <i>(4 funded)</i>	10	6	6	1	11	9
2022–2023	0	17 <i>(7 funded)</i>	22	0	12	1	9	9
2023–2024	0	4	4	5	8	2	7	4

*Note: publications and presentations in which multiple students took part are only counted once. For example, four students may have published a paper together; it is reported as one publication rather than four.*

Appendix 4: SLO1 Assessment Methods  
 EDU 7020 Final Exam Results (Fall 2023)

**At-Risk Populations Final Exam Rubric**

	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Course Connections</b> (Full reference list not required)	Each response is supported by the textbook, journal articles, class presentations, and/or in-class discussions.  Page numbers and an APA in-text citation are used to support all quotes.	Most responses are supported by the textbook, journal articles, class presentations, and/or in-class discussions.  Page numbers and an APA in-text citation are used to support most quotes.	Some responses are supported by the textbook, journal articles, class presentations, and/or in-class discussions.  Page numbers and an APA in-text citation are used to support some quotes.	Few responses are supported by the textbook, journal articles, class presentations, and/or in-class discussions.  Page numbers and an APA in-text citation are used to support few quotes.	Responses are not supported by the textbook, journal articles, class presentations, and/or in-class discussions.  No page numbers or in-text citations included for reference.
<b>Accuracy</b>	All discussions provided are clear and accurately reflect course content.	All discussions provided accurately reflect course content.	Some of the discussions provided accurately reflect course content.	Few discussions provided accurately reflect course content.	The discussions did not accurately reflect course content or were incomplete.
<b>Quality</b>	The discussions address each question fully with detail demonstrating a strong understanding of at-risk populations.	The discussions address each question fully with some detail demonstrating a general understanding of at-risk populations.	The discussions address each question briefly with little detail demonstrating a loose understanding of at-risk populations.	The discussions minimally address the questions and do not demonstrate an understanding of at-risk populations.	The discussions do not address the questions and/or demonstrate an understanding of at-risk populations.
<b>Opinion &amp; Reflection</b>	Each discussion includes student opinions and deep reflection.	Each discussion includes student opinions and some reflection.	Some discussions include student opinions and reflection.	Few discussions include student opinions on the content and reflection.	Discussions do not include student opinions or reflections.
<b>Grammar &amp; Mechanics</b>	Discussions include correct grammar & mechanics	Discussions include some errors in grammar & mechanics.	Discussions include several errors in grammar & mechanics.	Discussions included incorrect grammar & mechanics overall.	Discussions were missing or incomplete.
<b>Total</b>					/10

## EDU 7010 Assessments

### Chapter 1 Rubric for EDU 7010

Criteria	Exceptional (3 pts)	Adequate (2 pts)	Limited (1 pt)	Unacceptable (0 pts)
<b>Introductory Paragraph</b>	Introduces focus/topic of research proposal in engaging way; makes clear paper purpose (to propose a research study)	Briefly introduces the focus/topic of the research proposal but more effort needed on engagement or missing an element of the introduction	Attempts to introduce the topic but needs better focus or missing key elements of the introduction	Multiple elements or entire introduction missing or poorly constructed
<b>Background &amp; Context for Study</b>	Provides essential background -big picture- that helps reader understand problem (consider historical, cultural, political, social, temporal, & spatial background & context as it relates to topic); justifies research; uses multiple sources (both scholarly & other) as evidence of problem	Provides background with some evidence but needs additional context & evidence to be convincing	Limited evidence or background provided; or evidence does not fit the context of the study	No attempt to provide evidence or background for the study
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Clearly identifies & explains local, specific problem; includes evidence to convince reader that problem should be studied	Adequately identifies the problem with some explanation & some support from the literature	Identifies problem with limited or ambiguous explanation or limited supporting evidence	Identifies problem but no explanation or support; or no clear problem identified
<b>Purpose of Study (your goals)</b>	Clearly describes goals of study, including what prompted study, what researcher hopes to learn, & what researcher hopes to achieve & do with knowledge learned; addresses personal, practical, & intellectual goals	Adequately describes the goals of the study with some elaboration on how those goals developed; some discussion of 3 types of goals	Goals identified but with limited discussion of how they developed; missing types of goals	Goals are not described or poorly explained
<b>Research Statement</b>	Clearly & succinctly (1 sentence) describes intended inquiry,	Adequately describes intended inquiry with all	Attempts to describe intended inquiry, but some elements	Multiple elements or entire statement missing

	including theoretical lens, methodology, participants, setting, data sources, & object of knowledge	elements included; some restructuring or tightening may be needed	missing or lacking succinct focus in one or two sentences	or poorly constructed
<b>Research Questions</b>	Three to five clear, focused questions that together represent a complementary set; uses language of qualitative researcher; clearly aligns with specific research problem and purpose; includes an introductory paragraph to explain questions	Adequate research statement; questions represent a focused set with mostly appropriate language; aligned with research problem; includes introductory paragraph	Attempts questions but additional work needed to align with research problem/purpose; some problems with language or focus; missing introductory statement	Questions poorly constructed or do not align with research problem & purpose
<b>Significance Statement</b>	Clearly & thoughtfully addresses how research addresses a practical problem, a theory or assumption, & literature or knowledge base	Adequately explains how your research will address each of the three areas of significance	One area of significance is poorly described or missing	Little or no attempt to address the three areas of significance
<b>Mechanics and Conventions</b>	Creative, extraordinary writing, clear & succinct communication; few if any errors in APA style or writing conventions; all instructions followed	Well communicated; some errors in APA style, mechanics, or conventions, editing required, but errors don't get in the way of communication	Multiple errors with mechanics, conventions, style show inadequate proofreading, prevents communication	Difficult to decipher meaning

Chapter 2 Rubric for EDU 7010				
Criteria	Exceptional (3 pts)	Adequate (2 pts)	Limited (1 pt)	Unacceptable (0 pts)
<b>Introduction</b>	Engagingly introduces the topic; restates what you want to know and the research questions; gives the reader a roadmap of the chapter	Adequately introduces the chapter; reintroduces the research topic and questions	Introduction is included but missing some components	No attempt to introduce the chapter
<b>Audit Trail</b>	Provides detailed explanation of the methods to search existing literature; explains how the review was conducted, including libraries, databases, keywords, time frame, & justification for what was included or excluded	Adequately explains how literature review was conducted but could use more detail or missing one or two key elements	Limited or inadequate explanation of how literature review was conducted or missing multiple elements	No attempt to provide audit trail
<b>Organization and Structure</b>	Introduces & clearly explains the dimensions of each category, providing the reader with an overview of what can be expected in reading the category; provides transitions when moving between studies and between paragraphs within a category	Mostly adequate explanation of categories but could be strengthened with additional details about researcher decisions; some transitions	Limited explanation of categories that leaves the reader guessing about what is to come; transitions needed between studies &/or paragraphs	No attempt to explain categories
<b>Literature Findings &amp; Synthesis</b>	Provides a thoughtful synthesis of 15 relevant studies that situates them in the broader scholarly literature, critiques their scholarly significance, encompasses the language of the field, and links the discussion to the proposed study	Adequate discussion of relevant studies with some critique & links to the proposed study & some incorporation of language of the field	Mostly a summary or bibliography of studies with limited synthesis or critique &/or limited connections to the proposed study; relevance of some studies may be unclear; limited use of language of the field	No synthesis or relevance to proposed study demonstrated
<b>Literature Methodologies &amp; Methods; Summary and Argument</b>	Provides clear, detailed explanations of methodologies & methods of each study, including knowledge sought, findings,	Mostly adequate explanation of methodologies & methods but may be missing key details	Limited or poor explanation of methodologies & methods; summary does not address	Missing or inadequate detail on methodologies & methods

	participants, setting, & methods; includes a true summary of all findings and an argument for the proposed	needed by the reader; adequate summary and argument for proposed study	findings or no summary attempted; limited or no argument for proposed study	
<b>Mechanics &amp; Conventions</b>	Creative, extraordinary writing, clear & succinct communication; few if any errors in APA style, formatting, or writing conventions; references & citations are accurate & complete; assignment instructions followed, including 5 review guides	Adequately communicated; a few errors in APA style, mechanics, or conventions communication achieved; references & citations included but with a few errors	Multiple errors with mechanics, conventions, style shows inadequate proofreading, prevents communication multiple missing or inaccurate references or citations	Difficult if not impossible to decipher meaning; references & citations do not follow APA style

**Chapter 3 Rubric for EDU 7010**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exceptional (3 pts)</b>	<b>Adequate (2 pts)</b>	<b>Limited (1 pt)</b>	<b>Unacceptable (0 pts)</b>
<b>Introduction &amp; Conclusion</b>	Intro clearly explains purpose of the chapter; restates research topic & questions; provides roadmap for the reader. Conclusion provides brief narrative of timeline for data collection, analysis, & presentation	Includes both intro & conclusion but missing one or two essential elements	Limited intro &/or conclusion with many missing elements or inadequate scholarly sources for support	Inadequate or no effort to provide intro & concluding timeline
<b>Worldview, Theoretical Perspective, &amp; Approach</b>	Clear explanation & justification of researcher's choices for worldview, theoretical perspective, and approach. Demonstrates clear understanding of these concepts and what they enable the researcher to do; scholarly sources used to justify choices	Includes adequate discussion of epistemology, theoretical perspective, & approach; additional depth or scholarly sources needed to justify choices & strengthen proposal	Limited discussion or understanding of epistemology, theoretical perspective, & approach, or inadequate scholarly sources for support	Inadequate or no effort to explain these design choices
<b>Setting &amp; Participants</b>	Explains the importance and significance of setting for qualitative research and describes the chosen setting for the study; describes participants and justifies their selection, including sampling decisions, for the study; scholarly sources used to support choices	Includes adequate discussion of setting & participants, but additional depth or scholarly sources needed to strengthen proposal	Limited discussion or understanding of setting & participants, or inadequate scholarly sources for support	Inadequate or no effort to explain setting & participants

<b>Data Sources</b>	Clearly defines, explains, and justifies each data source, using scholarly sources, demonstrating an understanding of each data source's significance to the study	Includes adequate discussion of all data sources, but additional depth or scholarly sources needed to strengthen proposal	Limited discussion or understanding of data collection procedures, missing data sources, or inadequate scholarly sources for support	Inadequate or no effort to explain data sources
<b>Data Collection Procedures</b>	Details the plan for entering the field and collecting each source of data and managing data once collected	Adequate plan but discussion missing one or two elements of data collection	Limited discussion or understanding of data collection procedures	Inadequate or no effort to explain data collection plans
<b>Trustworthiness</b>	Explains the importance of trustworthiness in qualitative research & provides details on design elements, ethical considerations, & subjectivities as they are used to build a strong quality study; scholarly sources are used to justify choices	Includes adequate discussion of all trustworthiness elements, but additional depth or scholarly sources needed to strengthen proposal	Limited discussion or understanding of trustworthiness elements, or inadequate scholarly sources for support	Inadequate or no effort to explain trustworthiness
<b>Mechanics and Conventions</b>	Creative, extraordinary writing, clear and succinct communication; few if any errors in APA style or writing conventions; all instructions followed	Well communicated; some errors in APA style, mechanics, or conventions, editing required, but errors don't get in the way of communication	Multiple errors with mechanics or conventions get in the way of communication; multiple style errors indicate little effort to comply with APA style	Difficult or impossible to decipher meaning

**Revised Final Proposal Checklist for EDU 7010**

Criteria	Total Pts	Assignment Requirements
<b>Introduction, Background &amp; context</b>	/3	<p>Introduces the research proposal in an interesting way to hook the reader;</p> <p>Makes clear the purpose of the paper;</p> <p>Provides essential background &amp; context that describes the big picture;</p> <p>Clear evidence that study is timely;</p> <p>Supported by multiple sources, including scholarly sources.</p>
<b>Problem, Purpose</b>	/3	<p>Introduces the goals section;</p> <p>Explains the local, specific problem;</p> <p>Provides evidence, including scholarly, that there is a problem to study;</p> <p>Describes study's purpose, including personal, intellectual, &amp; practical goals.</p>
<b>Research Statement, Research Questions, Significance Statement</b>	/3	<p>One-sentence description of proposed inquiry includes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>theoretical lens,</li> <li>methodology,</li> <li>participants,</li> <li>setting,</li> <li>data sources, and</li> <li>object of knowledge;</li> </ul> <p>3 to 5 focused research questions that together represent a logical set;</p> <p>Uses language of qualitative studies;</p> <p>Aligns with problem &amp; purpose;</p> <p>Includes intro paragraph to explain research questions;</p> <p>Explains how the proposed study addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a practical problem,</li> <li>a theory or assumption, and</li> <li>the literature or knowledge base</li> </ul>

<b>Lit Review Audit Trail, Summary, and Concluding Argument</b>	/3	<p>Introduces the conceptual framework section of the study;</p> <p>Restates research topic &amp; questions;</p> <p>Explains your worldview about how knowledge is acquired;</p> <p>Introduces any theories being used in the study to aid understanding;</p> <p>Sources used to explain and support stance/theories;</p> <p>Provides an audit trail of the literature review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Libraries and databases used;</li> <li>Keywords searched;</li> <li>Choices for inclusion/exclusion of literature;</li> <li>Names categories.</li> </ul> <p>Concludes with true summary of findings.</p>
<b>Literature Review Synthesis</b>	/3	<p>Organizes studies into logical categories;</p> <p>Each category introduced and explained; Discussion is a synthesis of study findings;</p> <p>Provides adequate discussion of each study's methodology and methods;</p> <p>Explains how each study is related to proposed research;</p> <p>Includes transitions between studies;</p> <p>Includes a minimum of 15 primary source studies;</p>
<b>Methodology &amp; Methods</b>	/3	<p>Introduces, explains, and justifies design and its many parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>theoretical perspective,</li> <li>approach,</li> <li>setting,</li> <li>participants,</li> <li>data sources,</li> <li>data collection procedures,</li> <li>data analysis;</li> </ul> <p>Sources used to explain and support each element of design.</p>
<b>Trustworthiness</b>	/3	<p>Introduces, defines, and explains trustworthiness and its many parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>design elements to establish trustworthiness</li> <li>ethical considerations, and</li> </ul>

		<p>subjectivities;</p> <p>Sources used to explain and support each element of trustworthiness.</p>
<b>Revisions</b>	/3	Suggested revisions from feedback on prior assignments are addressed.
<b>Mechanics and Conventions</b>	/3	<p>Concepts, explanations, and ideas are clearly and succinctly communicated;</p> <p>Few if any errors in grammar &amp; mechanics;</p> <p>Past tense used to discuss research;</p> <p>Includes title page, abstract (115 wds), appropriate level headings Few if any errors in in-text citations and references;</p> <p>All required appendices included;</p> <p>Includes timeline; and</p> <p>All assignment submission instructions followed.</p>