2014-2015 LONG SIGNATURE SHEET

Proposal Number: <u>EDLD 04-07-2015</u>

UNC CHARLOTTE

Proposal Title: <u>Establishment of a PhD in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation</u>

Originating Department: <u>Educational Leadership (EDLD)</u>

TYPE OF PROPOSAL: UNDERGRADUATE_____   GRADUATE <u>X</u>   UNDERGRADUATE & GRADUATE____
(Separate proposals sent to UCCC and Grad. Council)

DATE RECEIVED	DATE CONSIDERED	DATE FORWARDED	ACTION	SIGNATURES
3-16-15	3-16-15	3-16-15	Approved	**DEPARTMENT CHAIR** *James J Bird* Jim Bird
3-16-15	3-16-15	3-17-15	Approved	**COLLEGE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE CHAIR** *Kelly Anderson* Kelly Anderson
3/17/2015	3/17/2015	3/17/15	Approved	**COLLEGE FACULTY CHAIR (if applicable)** Lyndon Abrams
3/17/15	3/17/15	3/17/15	Approved	**COLLEGE DEAN** *Dawson R. Hancock* Ellen McIntyre
			Approved	**GENERAL EDUCATION** (if applicable; for General Education courses) N/A
			Approved	**HONORS COLLEGE** (if applicable; for Honors courses & programs) N/A
			Approved	**UNDERGRADUATE COURSE & CURRICULUM COMMITTEE CHAIR** (for undergraduate content)
3-23-15	4-7-15	4-17-15	Approved	**GRADUATE COUNCIL CHAIR** (for graduate content) *Alan R. Freitag* Alan Freitag
				FACULTY GOVERNANCE ASSISTANT (Faculty Council approval on Consent Calendar)
				FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (if decision is appealed)

UNC CHARLOTTE

LONG FORM
COURSE AND CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

*To: Graduate Council Chair

From: College of Education Graduate Council

Date: April 7, 2015

Re: Establishment of a PhD in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation (ERME)

The Long Form is used for major curriculum changes. Examples of major changes can include:

Undergraduate: Major changes include new undergraduate degrees, minors, concentrations, certificates, and changes to more than 50% of an existing program (Note: changing the name of an academic department does not automatically change the name(s) of the degree(s). The requests must be underlined approved separately by the Board of Governors.)

Graduate: Major changes include new graduate courses, major changes to an existing graduate course or major changes to an existing graduate program

Submission of this Long Form indicates review and assessment of the proposed curriculum changes at the department and collegiate level either separately or as part of ongoing assessment efforts.

*Proposals for undergraduate courses and programs should be sent to the Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Committee Chair. Proposals related to both undergraduate and graduate courses, (e.g., courses co-listed at both levels) must be sent to both the Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council.

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

New Graduate Program Proposal for PH.D. in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation

Course and Curriculum Proposal from: Department of Educational Leadership in the College of Education

Title: Establishment of a Ph.D. in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation (ERME)

II. CONTENT OF PROPOSALS

A. PROPOSAL SUMMARY.
1. SUMMARY.

The Educational Leadership Department (EDLD) in the College of Education proposes a new Ph.D. program in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation (ERME). The ERME program will prepare professionals who seek advanced research, statistical, and evaluation skills for positions in a wide variety of educational institutions including higher education, K-12 school systems, for-profit companies, nonprofit agencies, community colleges, think tanks, government organizations, and other institutions concerned with solving problems in education. The new program will require minimal changes in the current doctoral curriculum that is being offered in the College of Education, and no new faculty members are needed to implement the new program.

B. JUSTIFICATION.
1. Identify the need addressed by the proposal and explain how the proposed action meets the need.

The UNC Charlotte's Ph.D. in ERME will be a state-of-the-art program based on the recent scholarship on doctoral education. The work of educating doctoral students took a turn a decade ago when the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching published two books that set about changes in many institutions of higher education, *Envisioning the Future of Doctoral Education: Preparing Stewards of the Discipline* (Golde & Walker, 2006) and *The Formation of Scholars: Rethinking Doctoral Education in the Twenty-First Century* (Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2008). These were followed by numerous articles, critiques, and other books, including the many works by Susan K. Gardner, such as *On Becoming a Scholar: Socialization and Development in Doctoral Education* (2010). This scholarship came about in response to criticism of Ph.D. programs in all disciplines.

The need for more education researchers prepared in programs like this one is known nationally. The deans of colleges and schools of education from peer institutions have written in support of our program and were asked to specifically address whether the proposal: (a) is well-conceived and provides a solid curricular foundation to future

education researchers, (b) provides the opportunity for intellectual and programmatic collaboration across the Charlotte region, and (c) addresses a compelling need within the field.

In December 2013, UNC Charlotte commissioned Hanover Research to conduct an assessment of the market for the proposed Ph.D. program in ERME. Hanover Research reviewed the student demand and distinctiveness of the proposed program by comparing it to similar programs in the state and region. Hanover Research was able to estimate the potential student demand for Ph.D. programs in ERME based on growth in current programs. Hanover found a trend of modest growth overall of students completing ERME-like programs in the state of North Carolina. When examining the labor market, it also found that "data indicate that employment in ERME-related occupations will grow across the region" (p. 10) and "ERME-related occupations will grow in the state of North Carolina" (p. 18). Growth in the labor market combined with modest growth in graduates of similar programs indicate a need for a new program in a region of the state with a large growing city that still has no program of its kind.

2. Discuss prerequisites/co-requisites for course(s) including class-standing, admission to the major, GPA, or other factors that would affect a student's ability to register.

Applicants must meet the following criteria for admission: (a) a master's degree in education or related field, such as statistics, with a cumulative GPA of 3.5 or higher (on a 4.0 scale); (b) a satisfactory score on the GRE or MAT that indicates strong analytical and writing skills; (c) a high level of professionalism and potential for success in the program as indicated in letters of reference; (d) strong writing skills as shown in a writing sample; (e) clear objectives related to obtaining a Ph.D. as evidenced in an interview; (f) appropriate interpersonal skills as determined in an interview with program faculty; (g) experience in an educational setting, which may include government or non-profit agencies with education missions; and (h) a minimum TOEFL score of 220 (computer-based), 557 (paper-based), or 83 (internet based) or a minimum IELTS band score of 6.5 is required for any applicant whose native language is not English.

3. Demonstrate that course numbering is consistent with the level of academic advancement of students for whom it is intended.

Only 8000-level courses will be included in the course requirements for the Ph.D. in ERME. The following four new courses have been proposed:

RSCH 8410 Internship in Educational Research: Students conduct research in a field setting and receive individual supervision of their work. [Syllabus included]

RSCH 8411 Internship in Teaching Educational Research: Students will co-teach a research course with a research faculty member. [Syllabus included]

RSCH 8699 Dissertation Proposal Design: Identification and definition of a research area and development of a proposal draft for an original research study appropriate for the dissertation requirement. [Syllabus included]

RSCH 8999 Doctoral Dissertation Research: Each student will initiate and conduct an individual investigation culminating in the preparation and presentation of a doctoral dissertation. [No syllabus created for this course]

4. In general, how will this proposal improve the scope, quality and/or efficiency of programs and/or instruction?

The proposed Ph.D. program will draw from the literature on doctoral education, with specific attention to the education of researchers, in that it will be designed and implemented as a high-quality, state-of-the-art model program. For instance, the faculty who teach in the Ph.D. in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation will:
- Communicate the purpose of the program to students from Day 1 of enrollment;
- Design a signature pedagogy that distinguishes the program from others in the region and state;
- Communicate to students in a consistent and clear manner from recruitment through orientation and progression through the program;
- Cultivate a scholarly culture among faculty and students;
- Provide mentoring strategies and activities that meet the needs of all students (e.g., full- and part-time students, students struggling to finish, ethnic and racially diverse students, or those excelling in all areas);
- Develop assessment standards and measures collectively; from the beginning, students will participate in designing student learning outcomes and assessments of their student progress;
- Design interdisciplinary experiences through coursework and field-based apprenticeship;
- Ensure all students have meaningful experiences that result in the connection of theory and practice in advancing the field; and
- Create culminating exams and dissertations to examine important questions in the education field.

The students in the program will:
- Take responsibility for their learning in coursework, internships, and dissertation research;
- Work on research studies that answer important questions in the field;
- Regularly meet with multiple mentors;
- Collaborate with faculty, other students, and agency/community partners on research and projects; and
- Become engaged with the academic community through professional publications and presentations.

The College of Education at UNC Charlotte is positioned to offer an exceptional program that includes these features. The College is listed by *US News and World Report* as one of America's best graduate schools in education and has moved in their rankings from 103 in 2013, 86 in 2014, and 76 in 2015. The College has also been selected by the American Educational Research Association for its inclusion in a national study of research doctorates in education and by the Carnegie Project for the Education Doctorate for its inclusion in the redesign of the Ed.D. The new ERME program will nurture and reinforce a scientific culture for promoting better research. The faculty in UNC Charlotte's College of Education have the credentials and expertise to implement this new program.

5. If course(s) has been offered previously under special topics numbers, give details of experience including number of times taught and enrollment figures.
N/A

C. IMPACT.
Changes to courses and curricula often have impacts both within the proposing department as well as campus-wide. What effect will this proposal have on existing courses and curricula, students, and other departments/units? Submit an Impact Statement that fully addresses how you have assessed potential impacts and what the impacts of this proposal might be. Consider the following:

1. What group(s) of students will be served by this proposal? (Undergraduate and/or graduate; majors and/or non-majors, others? Explain). Describe how you determine which students will be served.

Graduate students, both full- and part-time, who are seeking knowledge and skills in educational research, measurement, and evaluation will be served by this proposal. We will accommodate working graduate students by offering the opportunity for students to take up to 50% of courses online. The decision to provide access through online tools is intended to provide the flexibility prospective students may need while reaching a population not easily served by our sister institutions. Importantly, though, even the online classes will be "hybrid" in that each course will have some on-campus, face-to-face time. This will ensure that students are regionally-based and that relationships among students and faculty flourish.

2. What effect will this proposal have on existing courses and curricula?
   a. When and how often will added course(s) be taught?

   Most of the courses are currently being taught, and it is anticipated that the enrollment within courses will increase. The addition of the internship requirement (RSCH 8410 and RSCH 8411) and doctoral dissertation research (RSCH 8699 and RSCH 8999) will require additional courses.

   b. How will the content and/or frequency of offering of other courses be affected?

We do not anticipate a change in content or frequency of current courses.

c. What is the anticipated enrollment in course(s) added (for credit and auditors)?

We anticipate admitting 8-10 students annually to the program. The number of students enrolled in the content area courses will increase, and the current course offerings will support the increase. The research faculty typically serve as methodologist on dissertation committees, and the new program will offer additional desired opportunities for faculty to chair dissertation committees in their area of expertise.

d. How will enrollment in other courses be affected? How did you determine this?

The number of students enrolled in courses will increase due to students enrolled in the new Ph.D. program. The cap for doctoral level courses is presently 25 students. A review of the current enrollment indicates that all courses, even the secondary area concentration, can accommodate up to 10 additional students.

e. Identify other areas of catalog copy that would be affected, including within other departments and colleges (e.g., curriculum outlines, requirements for the degree, prerequisites, articulation agreements, etc.)

A new catalog copy will need to be developed. The proposed catalog copy is presented in Appendix C.

III. RESOURCES REQUIRED TO SUPPORT PROPOSAL.

When added resources are not required, indicate "none". For items which require "none" explain how this determination was made.

A. **PERSONNEL**. Specify requirements for new faculty, part-time teaching, student assistants and/or increased load on present faculty. List by name qualified faculty members interested in teaching the course(s).

The current faculty at the University has the expertise needed to teach the courses and supervise internships and research activities. No new faculty will be hired. Below is a list of qualified full-time faculty members who will teach research courses in the program.

Name	Academic Degree and Coursework	Other Qualifications
Lynn Ahlgrim-Delzell	PhD (Educational Research, Measurement, & Evaluation) University of North Carolina at Greensboro	20+ years of experience in educational research and evaluation Author or co-author of 24 peer-reviewed journal articles Served on 9 dissertation committees (chaired 1)
Bob Algozzine	PhD (Special Education Research) Pennsylvania State University	40+ years of experience in educational research and evaluation Author or co-author of over 300 peer-reviewed journal articles Served on over 100 dissertation committees
Sandra Dika	PhD (Educational Research & Evaluation) Virginia Tech	15+ years of experience in educational research and evaluation Author or co-author of 16 peer-reviewed journal articles Served on 9 dissertation committees (chaired 1)
Claudia Flowers	PhD (Research, Measurement, & Evaluation) Georgia State University	25+ years of educational research experience Author or co-author of 95 peer-reviewed journal articles Served on 87 dissertation committees (chaired 12)

Name	Academic Degree and Coursework	Other Qualifications
Dawson Hancock	PhD (Language and Literacy Education – Research Cognate) Fordham University	21 years of educational research and evaluation experience Author or co-author of 58 peer-reviewed journal articles Served on 28 dissertation committees (chaired 10)
Do-Hong Kim	PhD (Educational Psychology & Research) University of South Carolina	10+ years of experience in educational research and evaluation Author or co-author of 26 peer-reviewed journal articles Served on 11 dissertation committees (chaired 1)
Rich Lambert	PhD (Research, Measurement, & Evaluation) Georgia State University	27 years of educational research experience Author or co-author of 2 books and 71 peer-reviewed journal articles Served on 55 dissertation committees (chaired 7)
Jae Hoon Lim	PhD (Elementary Education w/ Qualitative Research Certificate) University of Georgia	13 years of qualitative research/evaluation experience Author or co-author of 17 peer-reviewed journal articles Served on 44 (chaired 1) dissertation committees Qualitative evaluator for Federal grants (NSF, ONR)

Name	Academic Degree and Coursework	Other Qualifications
Chuang Wang	PhD (Educational Research), The Ohio State University	25+ years of educational teaching and research experience Author or co-author of 62 peer-reviewed journal articles. Served on 55 dissertation committees (chaired 8).

B. PHYSICAL FACILITY. Is adequate space available for this course?

The existing facilities, classrooms, and computer labs in the College of Education will be adequate to support the new program. The new program will not negatively affect existing program space.

C. EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES: Has funding been allocated for any special equipment or supplies needed?

No special equipment or supplies are needed.

D. COMPUTER. Specify any computer usage (beyond Moodle) required by students and/or faculty, and include an assessment of the adequacy of software/computing resources by available for the course(s).

We anticipate that existing offices, data analyses software, and computer resources are adequate for student and faculty needed.

E. AUDIO-VISUAL. If there are requirements for audio-visual facilities beyond the standard classroom podiums, please list those here.

No new audio-visual resources will be required.

F. OTHER RESOURCES. Specify and estimate cost of other new/added resources required, e.g., travel, communication, printing and binding.

A research faculty member will be appointed as the program director, which will require a summer stipend. We will need minimal funds for recruiting students and advertising the new program, as most of this will be done electronically and through direct contact with potential candidates in school systems and at research conferences.

G. SOURCE OF FUNDING. Indicate source(s) of funding for new/additional resources required to support this proposal.

The Dean of College of Education will provide the funds needed to pay the program director stipend. The College of Education has committed one research assistant to the program for the first two years.

IV. CONSULTATION WITH THE LIBRARY AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS OR UNITS

A. **LIBRARY CONSULTATION**. Indicate written consultation with the Library Reference Staff at the departmental level to ensure that library holdings are adequate to support the proposal prior to its leaving the department. (Attach copy of ***Consultation on Library Holdings***).

A copy of the ERME program proposal was shared with Abigail Moore and Judy Walker, Education Librarians, for consultation. The report is included in Appendix A.

B. **CONSULTATION WITH OTHER DEPARTMENTS OR UNITS**. List departments/units consulted in writing regarding all elements outlined in IIC: Impact Statement, including dates consulted. Summarize results of consultation and attach correspondence. Provide information on voting and dissenting opinions (if applicable).

The proposed ERME program will operate out of the College of Education in the Educational Leadership Department (EDLD). All departments in the College of Education were consulted. Their letters of support are included in Appendix A.

C. **HONORS COUNCIL CONSULTATION**. In the case of Honors courses or Honors programs indicate written consultation with the Honors Council (if applicable).
NA

V. INITIATION, ATTACHMENTS AND CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSAL
A. **ORIGINATING UNIT**. Briefly summarize action on the proposal in the originating unit including information on voting and dissenting opinions.

The proposal was unanimously approved by the Department of Educational Leadership on March 17, 2015.

B. **CREDIT HOUR**. **(Mandatory if new and/or revised course in proposal)**
Review statement and check box once completed:
☒   The appropriate faculty committee has reviewed the course outline/syllabus and has determined that the assignments are sufficient to meet the University definition of a credit hour.

C. **ATTACHMENTS**.
1.CONSULTATION: Attach relevant documentation of consultations with other units.

Consultation with the Atkins Library and College of Education Department Chairs are in Appendix A.

2. COURSE OUTLINE/SYLLABUS: For undergraduate courses attach course outline(s) including basic topics to be covered and suggested textbooks and reference materials with dates of publication. For Graduate Courses attach a course syllabus. Please see Boiler Plate for Syllabi for New/Revised Graduate Courses.

The new syllabi for RSCH 8699, RSCH 8410, and RSCH 8411 are attached in Appendix B. There is not a course outline for RSCH 8999 (Doctoral Dissertation Research).

3. PROPOSED CATALOG COPY: Copy should be provided for all courses in the proposal. Include current subject prefixes and course numbers, full titles, credit hours, prerequisites and/or corequisites, concise descriptions, and an indication of when the courses are to be offered as to semesters and day/evening/weekend. Copy and paste the current catalog copy and use the Microsoft Word "track changes" feature (or use red text with "~~strikethrough~~" formatting for text to be deleted, and adding blue text with "underline" formatting for text to be added).

        a. For a new course or revisions to an existing course, check all the statements that apply:

      ____ This course will be cross listed with another course.

      ____ There are prerequisites for this course.

      ____ There are corequisites for this course.

      ✓ This course is repeatable for credit.

      ____ This course will increase/decrease the number of credits hours currently offered by its program.

      ____This proposal results in the deletion of an existing course(s) from the degree program and/or catalog.

For all items checked above, applicable statements and content must be reflected in the proposed catalog copy.

        b. If overall proposal is for a new degree program that requires approval from General Administration, please contact the facultygovernance@uncc.edu for consultation on catalog copy.

4. ACADEMIC PLAN OF STUDY (**UNDERGRADUATE ONLY**): Does the proposed change impact an existing Academic Plan of Study?

    ☐ Yes. If yes, please provide updated Academic Plan of Study in template format.

    ☒ No.

5. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (UNDERGRADUATE & GRADUATE):
Does this course or curricular change require a change in Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) or assessment for the degree program?
☒ Yes. If yes, please provide updated SLOs in template format. – Appendix D
☐ No.

6. TEXTBOOK COSTS: It is the policy of the Board of Governors to reduce textbook costs for students whenever possible. Have electronic textbooks, textbook rentals, or the buyback program been considered and adopted?
☒ Yes. Briefly explain below.
☐ No. Briefly explain below.

Most of the courses are already developed and methods of reducing cost to students have been developed. For example, many electronic library articles and online resources, which are free to students, are used in courses instead of requiring multiple textbooks.

IMPORTANT NOTE: A Microsoft Word version of the final course and curriculum proposal should be sent to facultygovernance@uncc.edu upon approval by the Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Committee and/or Graduate Council chair.

Appendix A

Consultation Letters

Library Consultation
Department of Reading and Elementary Education Letter of Support
Department of Counseling Letter of Support
Department of Middle, Secondary, & K-12 Letter of Support
Department of Special Education and Child Development Letter of Support

To: Claudia Flowers
Evaluation of Education and Library Resources, Atkins Library
Prepared by: Abby Moore & Judy Walker
March 10, 2015

In order to analyze the Atkins Library's holdings to determine if our collection and our services support a Doctoral program in Educational Evaluation and Research, I looked at variety of resources in our collection. Below is a narrative of my analysis.

The College of Education already has four Doctoral programs and the library has worked diligently to acquire materials to support these programs. Additionally, almost all of the course requirements for the Educational Evaluation and Research program area already offered by the College of Education, therefore, the library has taken strides to add materials to its collection that support these specific classes.

Print Resources:
With the help of our AUL of Technical Services, Michael Winecoff, I searched for titles in the LB1028 classification, defined by the Library of Congress as General Works in Educational Research. Our total holdings in LB1028 are 1100 titles, 376 titles were published in the last ten years. In order to take a closer look at titles that will support the program, I chose several search terms, including "educational research" and "educational assessment" (see table 1) and found total holdings that correspond with the searches terms. Each search yielded hundreds of titles that have been assigned subject terms related to the topic. The only concern I have about the Educational Research collection is its age. Adding the newest and best titles about educational research and assessment will be a priority for Atkins Library.

Because education is grounded in the social sciences, I thought it best to do a general analysis of print resources in the social science research classification. The excel spreadsheet attached shows the size and currency of our H60s collection in which Social Science Research is cataloged. According to the spreadsheet we have 1448 titles in the H60s. Of the 1448, over 250 are under 10 years old. Using our online catalog I did a keyword search for "social science research," limited it the last ten years. The results listed 2582 titles including 1930 ebooks.

Journals:
While print resources are important, PhD students will need access to a wide range of current information that can only be found in journals. To get a sense of our journal holdings, I again used our online catalog and limited the search to journals of "educational research" and found that UNC Charlotte students have access to full text articles from 275 educational research journals. Additionally, UNC Charlotte offers full text access to many (see Table 2) of the top journals in the field (based on Impact Factor).

Databases:
Knowing that the library has sufficient resources is one thing, having the most effective tools to access those resources is another. The Library's on-line catalog is the main research tool for

identifying what the library provides access to electronically or in print format including journals.

Not only do we have several multi-subject databases, we provide access to the most reliable education database, ERIC to all of our students. The ERIC database is available through EbscoHost. In addition to ERIC, the library subscribes to several education specific databases as well as social science databases. A list Education databases can be found here: http://guides.library.uncc.edu/database_education. A complete list of all our databases can be found here: http://guides.library.uncc.edu/az.php.

Library Services:
In addition to our print and online resources, I must mention several of the library services we offer that will support the students in the Education Evaluation and Research Program. The services listed below are available to all UNCC students.

Interlibrary Loan/Document Delivery Program:
UNC Charlotte students can obtain books and articles whenever they are unavailable on campus via the interlibrary loan program.

Digital Scholarship Lab:
Partners with faculty and graduate students in the use of digital and networked research tools to create, disseminate, and store new knowledge. The DSL can support the research process and projects through advising, digital tools, and services that include: copyright, data support, digitization, publication, and usability.

Subject Librarians:
Subject librarians provide research support to students and faculty to help them achieve their educational and academic goals. Subject specialists assist students at all levels with curriculum and research assignments. They are available in person, online and by phone for consultation on how to find and use the best information for research projects and academic assignments. Students and faculty can arrange to meet with a subject specialist to assist with research. Atkins Library employs 2 education librarians: Judy Walker (jwalker@uncc.edu) and Abby Moore (amoor164@uncc.edu).

Digital Initiatives:
The Atkins Library assists faculty and graduate students with locating and accessing numeric, geospatial, and statistical data, and with managing and preparing those data for analysis. We also provide data management support, including curation and archiving research data. Reese Manceaux (ramancea@uncc.edu) is our Data Services Librarian.

Collection Development Plan:
The library has an extensive collection development plan found here: http://library.uncc.edu/collectiondevelopment. Below are the main points of our collection development plan as it applies to the development of this PhD program:
- *Collection development is the provision of access to information in all formats through acquisition, borrowing, electronic connections, document delivery, and consortial arrangements. Collection*

development planning/policy is the identification of institutional needs, obligations, and limitations for collection development and the establishment of priorities and practices relative to these factors.

- *The Library encourages faculty participation in collection development. At present, each academic department assigns a member of its faculty to serve as library representative. This individual authorizes and maintains records of departmental library materials requests, encourages faculty review and participation in selection of approval titles, and coordinates the distribution of information to and from the Library.*

The Education Librarian will work diligently with the professors in the new PhD program in Education Evaluation and Research to assure doctoral students have access to new, innovative and seminal works in the topics of educational research and assessment. Since many of the classes required for the doctorate, the library already has an excellent core collection to support the program.

Summary:
The library resources at Atkins Library will absolutely support the new program in Education Evaluation and Research.

	TABLE 1	
Subject	**Print Titles**	**Last 5 Years**
Education Research	1891	274
Educational problems	505	51
Education policy	1183	402
Education evaluation	1920	1253
Educational assessment	581	93
Educational measurement	1380	167

Table 2			
Journal Title	**Rank**	**Impact Factor**	**UNCC Access**
Review of Educational Research	1	5.000	Yes
Educational Psychologist	2	4.844	Yes
Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness	3	3.154	Yes
Educational Research Review	4	3.107	Yes
Learning and Instruction	5	3.079	Yes

Journal of Research in Science Teaching	6	3.020	Yes
Educational Researcher	7	2.705	Yes
Science Education	8	2.921	Yes
Journal of the Learning Sciences	9	2.862	Yes
Journal of Engineering Education	10	2.717	Yes

UNC CHARLOTTE
College of Education

Department of Reading and Elementary Education
9201 University City Boulevard, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
t/ 704-687-8889 f/ 704-687-3749

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Dawson R. Hancock
            Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies, College of Education

FROM: Dr. Michael Putman
            Interim Chair, Department of Reading and Elementary Education

DATE: February 24, 2015

RE: Letter of Support for Establishment of Ph.D. in Educational Research,
            Measurement, and Evaluation

I offer my support for the establishment of a Ph.D. in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation.

The need for a Ph.D. in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation is well documented, locally and nationally. This is especially notable in the greater Charlotte region as there is no program that is specific to preparing future educational researchers.

Led by an experienced faculty of educational researchers, the program will be linked to and supported by other Ph.D. programs in the College of Education and across the university. As a result, graduates will develop the foundational knowledge and skills necessary to engage pursuing opportunities in a wide range of educational institutions as well as those in the private sector.

In conclusion, the Ph.D. in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation will fulfill a distinct need and will offer unique benefits to the UNC Charlotte campus and beyond. Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this letter of support.

UNC CHARLOTTE
College of Education
Department of Counseling
9201 University City Blvd., Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
t/ 704.687.8960 f/ 704.687.1033

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dawson R. Hancock, Ph.D.
           Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies
           College of Education

FROM: Henry L. Harris, Ph.D., LPC   *Henry L. Harris*
           Chair, Department of Counseling

DATE: March 3, 2015

RE: Ph.D. program in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation (ERME)

I offer this letter in support of the Educational Leadership Department (EDLD) in the College of Education to establish a new Ph.D. program in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation (ERME). Given the current and future educational climate, creating a program to prepare highly qualified professionals with in cutting-edge statistical skills in research, measurement, and evaluation is timely and warranted.

We have a number of active doctoral programs in the College of Education, and I believe the ERME program will promote a standard of excellence that will be embraced by these programs. Within the Department of Counseling, one of our immediate goals in the doctoral program is to establish comprehensive research based teams led by doctoral students and ERME is the ideal program to provide some of the needed support. When doctoral students, regardless of program area, have the opportunity to receive the level of training offered by ERME, they may likely increase their employment opportunities in public schools, institutions of higher education, and in other professional settings.

In summary, the proposed program has my full support and if you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at your earliest convenience.

UNC CHARLOTTE

College of Education

Department of Middle, Secondary and K-12 Education

9201 University City Blvd, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
t/ 704 602 6875 f/ 704 607 6606 www.uncc.edu

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Dawson R. Hancock
          Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies, College of Education

FROM: Dr. Scott Kissau
          Interim Chair, Department of Middle, Secondary, & K-12 Education

DATE: February 20, 2015

RE: Letter of Support for Establishment of a PhD in Educational Research,
          Measurement, and Evaluation (ERME)

The Ph.D. in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation in The Educational
Leadership Department (EDLD) in the College of Education at UNC Charlotte will serve to
prepare professionals who seek advanced research, statistical, and evaluation skills for positions
in a wide variety of educational institutions including higher education, K-12 school districts,
for-profit companies, nonprofit agencies, community colleges, think tanks, government
organizations, and other institutions concerned with solving problems in education.

On behalf of the Department of Middle, Secondary, & K-12 Education, I fully support the
proposal. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Scott Kissau

Middle Grades Education • Secondary Education • Teaching English as a Second Language
Foreign Languages Education • Arts Education • PhD in Curriculum and Instruction

The UNIVERSITY of NORTH CAROLINA at CHARLOTTE

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

UNC CHARLOTTE

College of Education

Special Education and Child Development

9201 University City Blvd, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
t/ 704.687.8828 f/ 704.687.1625 http://education.uncc.edu/spcd

March 10, 2015

Dawson Hancock, Associate Dean
Claudia Flowers, Professor
UNC at Charlotte
College of Education
Charlotte, NC 28262

Dear Drs. Hancock and Flowers

This letter is written to support a Ph.D. in Educational Research, Measurement, and
Evaluation in the College of Education at UNC at Charlotte. This is an area of study that
should be of benefit to future faculty researchers in education, as well as in other
disciplines. In addition, the courses would be suitable electives for graduate students
pursuing other areas of study. With today's focus on implementing evidence-based
practices in educational settings, it is important to have personnel with the expertise to
evaluate large bodies of data to make decisions and to add to the research-based strategies
to the professional literature. Rather than detract from the doctoral program in our
department, I see this degree as a series of courses that could enhance our program.
Therefore, I give my full support. In addition, students in the new program may elect to
add coursework taught in our department as electives (e.g., single subject research
design). If I can provide more information, please feel free to contact me
(Belva.Collins@uncc.edu).

Sincerely,

Belva C. Collins, Ed.D.
Professor and Chair

NCATE
An NCATE Accredited
Institution

The UNIVERSITY *of* NORTH CAROLINA *at* CHARLOTTE

Appendix B

New Syllabi

RSCH 8699
Dissertation Proposal Design

COURSE OUTLINE

1. COURSE NUMBER AND TITLE: RSCH 8699 Dissertation Proposal Design

2. CATALOG DESCRIPTION

Identification and definition of a research area and development of a proposal draft for an original research study appropriate for the dissertation requirement. (Fall, Spring)

CREDIT HOURS: 3

3. COURSE PREREQUISITES 18 Hours of Research Coursework, Successful Completion of Benchmark #1 and #2 Activities

COURSE COREQUISITES Admission to Candidacy

[It is strongly recommended that you have all coursework completed before you take this course. If you are taking an additional class that is needed to complete your coursework at the same time as RSCH 8699, it is assumed that (1) it is absolutely necessary and appropriate for your program *and* (2) you have the permission of your advisor.]

4. COURSE OBJECTIVES

A dissertation proposal is used to justify and gain approval for research to be completed as a final requirement in the doctoral program. The proposal typically does four things: (1) establishes the context for the study; (2) demonstrates a need for it; (3) illustrates that the study will address the need using appropriate research methods; and (4) provides assurances that the study will not harm participants.

The dissertation proposal typically contains three sections and appendices. The first section presents the research problem and purpose of the study, identifies the variables under investigation, provides a brief overview of the need and background for the study and how it will contribute to the advancement of knowledge, defines the research hypotheses, objectives, and/or questions, and describes limitations and delimitations of the research. The second section restates the research problem and need for the study and provides literature to justify systematic investigation. The final section presents a clear description of the method being proposed to address the research problem. Human subjects' assurances, data collection instruments, and other ancillary materials are included in appendices.

The dissertation proposal workshop involves independent research and writing by students coupled with corrective and supportive feedback and guidance from the instructor. Preparing a dissertation proposal is difficult for many students because they do not think about their culminating project until they have completed all coursework and passed their comprehensive examinations. At that time, motivation for completing a complex, formidable writing task is sometimes less than optimal. This workshop provides necessary guidance and support at a critical time for an important requirement of the doctoral program.

This course is related to the *College of Education's Conceptual Framework* in that it is designed to develop highly professional educators with the potential to impact student performance by fostering the effectiveness of aspiring educational researchers who will be knowledgeable, effective, and committed.

Professional Educators Transforming Lives, the Conceptual Framework for Professional Education Programs at UNC Charlotte, identifies the proficiencies that our graduates will demonstrate. During coursework, internship, and co-teaching experiences candidates have multiple opportunities to develop the **knowledge, effectiveness,** and **commitment** necessary to transform the lives of the learners with whom they work.

Core Proficiency: Knowledge. Candidates will demonstrate the **Knowledge** that provides the foundation for transforming the lives of the children, youth, and families with whom they work. This knowledge includes elements such as:

K1: Knowledge relevant to life in the 21st century
K2: Specialty area knowledge
K3: Pedagogical knowledge
K4: Knowledge of learners and their contexts
K5: Self-awareness
K6: Knowledge of policies, laws, standards, and issues

Core Proficiency: Effectiveness. Candidates will demonstrate **Effectiveness** in their work with children, youth, and families by applying knowledge and developing effective skills in areas such as:

E1: 21st century skills
E2: Planning, implementation, and evaluation
E3: Research-based practice
E4: Research skills
E5: Culturally competent practice
E6: Response to diverse learners
E7: Reflective practice

Core Proficiency: Commitment. Candidates will demonstrate their **Commitment** to transforming the lives of others through their actions in areas such as:

C1: Positive impact on learners
C2: Ethics
C3: Leadership
C4: Collaboration
C5: Advocacy
C6: Professional identity and continuous growth

The core proficiencies of **knowledge, effectiveness,** and **commitment** are fully aligned with the North Carolina standards for teachers, school executives, and counselors.

North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards (2007): 1) Demonstrate leadership, 2) Establish a respectful environment for a diverse population of students, 3) Know the content they teach, 4) Facilitate learning for their students, 5) Reflect on their practice.

North Carolina Standards for School Executives (2013): 1) Strategic leadership, 2) Instructional leadership, 3) Cultural leadership, 4) Human resource leadership, 5) Managerial leadership, 6)

External development leadership, 7) Micro-political leadership, and 8) Academic Achievement Leadership.

Course Objectives

1. To describe key aspects of dissertation process.

2. To identify research topics of interest to broad groups of individuals.

3. To develop introductory material suitable for inclusion in a dissertation proposal.

4. To develop a comprehensive review of literature supporting research topic.

5. To develop a comprehensive method for dissertation research.

6. To prepare a dissertation proposal suitable for submission to doctoral committee.

7. To present a dissertation proposal for peer review and feedback.

Illustrative Course Activities

Illustrative course activities include:

1. Review and evaluate at least 3 dissertation research proposals.

2. Prepare list of 5 potential research topics for dissertation research.

3. Prepare literature review summaries for at least 15 articles.

4. Prepare 10-15 page introduction for dissertation research proposal.

5. Prepare 10-15 page literature review for dissertation research proposal.

6. Prepare 10-15 page method for dissertation research proposal.

7. Prepare and deliver oral presentation of proposal for small group of peers.

5. INSTRUCTIONAL METHOD

This course will use a blended method, where students meet face-to-face to discuss components and criteria of the proposal and meet one-on-one to develop their proposal for defense.

TOPICAL OUTLINE OF COURSE CONTENT

1. Overview of Dissertation Research
   1.1. Purpose and Structure of the Course
   1.2. Purpose and Structure of the Proposal
   1.3. Ethical and Legal Considerations in Research
       1.3.1. Concern for ethical behavior
       1.3.2. Basic concepts for applied research conducted in learning environments
       1.3.3. Courteous research behavior
       1.3.4. Ethical and legal considerations for the classroom teacher
2. Overview of Professional Writing
   2.1. Making General Points

6. EVALUATING STUDENT PERFORMANCE

The following is an example of methods to evaluate student performance:

(20%)   1.   Preliminary research topic evaluated using rubric approved by department

(60%)   2.   Written proposal evaluated using rubric approved by department

(20%)   3.   Oral presentation of proposal evaluated using rubric approved by department

Weighted Average of Products

90-100% A

80-89%   B

70-79%   C

Less than 70% U

7. SPECIFIC POLICIES THAT APPLY TO THIS COURSE

Specify policies that apply to this course:

a. University Integrity

Code of Student Academic Integrity
All students are required to read and abide by the Code of Student Academic Integrity. Violations of the Code of Student Academic Integrity, including plagiarism, will result in disciplinary action as provided in the Code. Definitions and examples of plagiarism are set forth in the Code. The Code is available from the Dean of Students Office or online at: http://www.legal.uncc.edu/policies/ps-105.html.

Faculty may ask students to produce identification at examinations and may require students to demonstrate that graded assignments completed outside of class are their own work.

b.   Attendance

Students are expected to attend and be punctual to all seminar and co-teaching sessions. Absences from class *may* be excused by the instructor for such reasons as personal illness, religious holidays, or participating as an authorized University representative in an out-of-

town event or program-related activity such as attending a professional
conference. Whenever possible, students are expected to seek the permission of the instructor
prior to absences. If an assignment is due on the day of the absence, a new due date must be
approved by the course instructor.

> c.   Grading policy (A, B, C, Unsatisfactory and what are the requirements for
>   these as number grades) See #6 for grade criteria.

Grade of "I"
The grade of I is assigned at the discretion of the instructor when a student who is otherwise
passing has not, due to circumstances beyond his/her control, completed all the work in the
course. The missing work must be completed by the deadline specified by the instructor, and
no later than 12 months. If the I is not removed during the specified time, a grade of U is
automatically assigned. The grade of I cannot be removed by enrolling again in the same
course, and students should not re-enroll in a course in which they have been assigned the
grade of I. *For this course a written contract for an Incomplete must be developed with the
instructor prior to the deadline for final grades and will only be awarded in strict
compliance with University policy.*

> d.   Additional requirements such as CPR, liability insurance, no phones or beepers
>   in class (whatever are the requirements for that course).

The College of Education Commitment to Diversity
The vision for the College of Education at UNC Charlotte is to be a leader in educational
equality through excellence and engagement. The College of Education is committed to
social justice and respect for all individuals, and it seeks to create a culture of inclusion that
actively supports all who live, work, and serve in a diverse nation and world. Attaining
justice and respect involves all members of our community in recognizing that multi-
dimensional diversity contributes to the College's learning environments, thereby enriching
the community and improving opportunities for human understanding. While the term
"diversity" is often used to refer to differences, the College's intention is for inclusiveness,
an inclusiveness of individuals who are diverse in ability/disability, age, economic status,
ethnicity, gender, language, national origin, race, religion, and sexual orientation. Therefore,
the College aspires to become a more diverse community in order to extend its enriching
benefits to all participants. An essential feature of our community is an environment that
supports exploration, learning, and work free from bias and harassment, thereby improving
the growth and development of each member of the community.

College of Education Technology Statement
Professional education programs at UNC Charlotte are committed to preparing candidates for
success in the 21st century through an emphasis on knowledge, effectiveness and
commitment to technology integration and application. Preparation in the integration and
application of technology to enhance student learning is essential for all
candidates. Programs across the professional education unit, including the College of Arts +
Architecture, College of Education, and College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, reflect this

commitment in coursework, early field experiences, and clinical practice which includes student teaching and/or the capstone/internship phase of the respective programs.

Religious Accommodations
UNC Charlotte provides reasonable accommodations, including a minimum of two excused absences each academic year, for religious observances required by a student's religious practice or belief. Such reasonable accommodations must be requested in accordance with the procedures in this Policy, and include the opportunity for the student to make up any tests or other work missed due to an excused absence for a religious observance. Students wishing to request a religious accommodation may refer to the information found at http://legal.uncc.edu/policies/ps-134.html. It is the obligation of students to provide faculty with reasonable notice of the dates of religious observances on which they will be absent by submitting a Request for Religious Accommodation Form to their instructor prior to the census date for enrollment for a given semester (typically the 10th day of enrollment).

Disability Accommodations
If you have a disability that qualifies you for academic accommodations, contact the Office of Disability Services in Fretwell 230 or call 704-687-4355 at the beginning of the semester. Some requests for accommodations cannot be honored without supporting documentation from the Office of Disability Services. All information shared with the instructor concerning a disability will remain strictly confidential unless otherwise specified by the instructor.

Online Student Course Evaluation Process and Confidentiality
Courses in the College of Education will are evaluated through an online evaluation survey process. Student course evaluations provide an important source of feedback for faculty regarding course design and instructional effectiveness. The online course evaluations will be administered at the end of the term, during the final two week (prior to final exams). You will receive an email announcement alerting you when the survey period opens. Periodic reminders will be sent during the time the survey is open. Please be advised that this process will be secure and confidential. The technology used will ensure anonymity of participants as well as confidentiality. The College of Education is committed to excellent instruction and student support. Please help in continuing this commitment by participating in the course evaluation process.

Credit Hour Statement
This 3-credit course requires 3 hours of classroom or direct faculty co-teaching instruction and six hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately 15 weeks. Out-of-class work may include but is not limited to: syllabi development, course/presentation development, web-based course development, grading, or course evaluation.

Professional Dispositions for Professional Education Programs
Dispositions include the values, commitments, and ethics expected of professional educators and will be evaluated throughout your academic and professional preparation. (These may be found online at https://education.uncc.edu/resources/professional-dispositions-plan-and-information). Education is a demanding profession that requires candidates to act in a professional manner at all times, be collegial with peers and supervisors, and conscientiously attend to job-related details. Showing proper initiative and following through on tasks in a

timely manner are also critical. Establishing habits supportive of these dispositions is an important part of each candidate's career preparation and as such will be emphasized throughout this course and the program.

Inclement Weather Policy
The University is rarely closed because of bad weather. When such a closing occurs, it will be announced on the University website and over local television and radio stations. Since this class is online and travel is not required, attendance is not affected unless there is a widespread power outage. If such an outage occurs, reasonable accommodations depending upon the circumstances to the course schedule will be made. This policy does not cover individual student computer issues. Students are expected to have dependable internet access in order to attend this course.

8. PROBABLE TEXTBOOKS/RESOURCES

American Psychological Association (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Berliner, D. C. (2002). Educational research: The hardest science of all. *Educational Researcher*, *31*(8), 18-20.

Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. *Educational Researcher*, *34*(6), 3-15.

Cone, J. D., & Foster, S. L. (2006). *Dissertations and theses from start to finish: Psychology and related fields* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Eisenhart, M., & Towne, L. (2003). Contestation and change in national policy on "scientifically-based" education research. *Educational Researcher*, *32*(7), 31-38.

Feuer, M. J., & Guiterrez, K. (2002). Culture, rigor, and science in educational research. *Educational Researcher*, *31*(8), 21-24.

Feuer, M. J., Towne, L., & Shavelson, R. J. (2002). Scientific culture and educational research. *Educational Researcher*, *31*(8), 4-14.

Galvan, J. L. (2004). *Writing literature reviews: A guide for students of the social and behavioral sciences*. Los Angeles: Pyrczak.

Joyner, R. L., Rouse, W. A., & Glatthorn, A. A. (2013). *Writing the winning thesis or dissertation* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Miech, E. J., Nave, B., &Mosteller, F., (2005). The 20,000 article problem: How a structure abstract can help practitioners sort out educational research. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *86*, 396-400.

Paltridge, B. (2002). Thesis and dissertation writing: An examination of published advice and actual practice. *English for Specific Purposes*, *21*, 125-143.

Pan, M. L. (2003). *Preparing literature reviews: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Los Angeles: Pyrczak.

Spooner, F., Algozzine, B., Karvonen, M., & Lo, Y. (2011). *How to prepare a research article in APA style*. Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Turnbull, H. R. III (Ed.). (1977). *Consent handbook*. Washington, DC: American Association on Mental Retardation.

FACULTY RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPING THIS COURSE OUTLINE   **(List the names of the faculty members who have developed this basic course outline.)**   **Bob Algozzine**
APPROVAL BY THE APPROPRIATE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION CURRICULUM COMMITTEE:
Approved by the College of Education *Undergraduate* Curriculum Committee   **Chair:**   **Date:**
Approved by the College of Education *Graduate* Curriculum Committee   **Chair:**   **Date:**

RSCH 8410
Internship in Educational Research

COURSE OUTLINE

COURSE NUMBER: RSCH 8410
COURSE TITLE: Internship in Educational Research

1.   Course Number and Title: RSCH 8410 Internship in Educational Research

2.   Course Description (Catalog Description) to include graduate credit and how often course
        is to be offered.

      CREDIT HOURS: 3 (Can be repeated for credit up to 6 hrs.)

      Issues and concepts in statistical consulting, educational research design, and educational
      measurement are applied to practical problems in the field. This course supports the
      professional development of doctoral students as they gain experience applying
      educational research methods to research projects for school systems and related agencies.
      (Fall, Spring)

3.   Pre- or Co-requisites

      COURSE PREREQUISITE: RSCH 8140 Multivariate Statistics

      COURSE COREQUISITES: None

4.   Objectives of the course:

      Effective consultation skills are critical components of a successful career for persons in
      educational research and evaluation. These skills require up-to-date knowledge of the
      disciplines of educational research, measurement, evaluation, and statistics. In addition,
      they require the ability to communicate effectively with stakeholders and consumers of
      educational research findings. Students will learn to effectively understand the needs of
      consultation clients in school systems and related agencies. They will learn to diagnose the
      relevant contextual features and unique design challenges of real world applications of
      educational research methods. This course is related to the *College of Education's
      Conceptual Framework* in that it is designed to develop highly professional educators with
      the potential to impact student performance by fostering the effectiveness of aspiring
      educational researchers who will be knowledgeable, effective, and committed.

      Professional Educators Transforming Lives, the Conceptual Framework for Professional
      Education Programs at UNC Charlotte, identifies the proficiencies that our graduates will
      demonstrate. During coursework, internship, and co-teaching experiences candidates have
      multiple opportunities to develop the **knowledge, effectiveness,** and **commitment**
      necessary to transform the lives of the learners with whom they work. This course seeks to
      develop the proficiencies that are in <u>bold/underlined</u> below.

Core Proficiency: Knowledge. Candidates will demonstrate the **Knowledge** that provides the foundation for transforming the lives of the children, youth, and families with whom they work. This knowledge includes elements such as:

K1: Knowledge relevant to life in the 21st century

K2: Specialty area knowledge

K4: Knowledge of learners and their contexts

K5: Self-awareness

K6: Knowledge of policies, laws, standards, and issues

Core Proficiency: Effectiveness. Candidates will demonstrate **Effectiveness** in their work with children, youth, and families by applying knowledge and developing effective skills in areas such as:

E1: 21st century skills

E2: Planning, implementation, and evaluation

E3: Research-based practice

E4: Research skills

E7: Reflective practice

Core Proficiency: Commitment. Candidates will demonstrate their **Commitment** to transforming the lives of others through their actions in areas such as:

C6: Professional identity and continuous growth

The core proficiencies of **knowledge, effectiveness,** and **commitment** are fully aligned with the North Carolina standards for teachers, school executives, and counselors.

North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards (2007): 1) Demonstrate leadership, 2) Establish a respectful environment for a diverse population of students, 3) Know the content they teach, 4) Facilitate learning for their students, 5) Reflect on their practice.

North Carolina Standards for School Executives (2006): 1) Strategic leadership, 2) Instructional leadership, 3) Cultural leadership, 4) Human resource leadership, 5) Managerial leadership, 6) External development leadership, 7) Micro-political leadership.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

Upon completion this course, the successful student will be able to:

- Communicate effectively with consulting clients in order to understand their needs
- Plan and implement successful educational evaluation studies
- Plan and implement successful educational measurement projects
- Plan and implement successful educational research studies
- Create comprehensive reports at the conclusion of a successful educational research, measurement, of evaluation project

5.   Instructional Method:

This is an internship course in which the student will be placed in a field setting such as a school system, school building, related agency setting, or a research center within UNC Charlotte that serves external agencies (e.g., Center for Educational Measurement and Evaluation and Institution for Social Capital). Students will receive supervision from both sponsoring personnel at the field placement site and from the instructor of the course at UNC Charlotte. Students will attend seminar sessions as a group and will work on site for their sponsoring agency.

COURSE CONTENT OF THE SEMINAR SESSIONS

- Design and implement a research study that
    - poses significant questions;
    - aligns research to relevant theory;
    - uses research methodologies that answer these questions;
    - provides a coherent and explicit chain of reasoning;
    - replicates and generalize across studies; and
    - discloses finding to encourage professional scrutiny and critique.
- Present findings to agency
    - Verbal and written communication of results
    - Plan for dissemination of findings

Course activities include:

- Attend seminars with instructor and peers to share experiences and develop skills
- Design an educational research project that will benefit their host agency
- Develop a final report from one educational research field-based project

6. Means of student evaluation:

A grade for the course will be assigned using the following criteria:

- Professional conduct and participation as outlined in the *Professional Dispositions for Professional Education Programs* (20%)
- Report of research design for the educational research project (40%)
- Development of the final report for the educational research project (40%)

Weighted Average of Products

90-100% A

80-89% B

70-79% C

Less than 70% U

7. Specify policies that apply to this course:
    a. University Integrity

Code of Student Academic Integrity
All students are required to read and abide by the Code of Student Academic Integrity. Violations of the Code of Student Academic Integrity, including plagiarism, will result in disciplinary action as provided in the Code. Definitions and examples of plagiarism are set forth in the Code. The Code is available from the Dean of Students Office or online at: http://www.legal.uncc.edu/policies/ps-105.html.

Faculty may ask students to produce identification at examinations and may require students to demonstrate that graded assignments completed outside of class are their own work.

    b. Attendance

Students are expected to attend and be punctual to all seminar sessions. Absences from class *may* be excused by the instructor for such reasons as personal illness, religious holidays, or participating as an authorized University representative in an out-of-town event or program-related activity such as attending a professional conference. Whenever possible, students are expected to seek the permission of the instructor prior to absences. If an assignment is due on the day of the absence, a new due date must be approved by the course instructor.

    c. Grading policy (A, B, C, Unsatisfactory and what are the requirements for these as number grades) (see item 6 for grading criteria)

Grade of "I"
The grade of I is assigned at the discretion of the instructor when a student who is otherwise passing has not, due to circumstances beyond his/her control, completed all the work in the course. The missing work must be completed by the deadline specified by the instructor, and no later than 12 months. If the I is not removed during the specified time, a grade of U is automatically assigned. The grade of I cannot be removed by enrolling again in the same course, and students should not re-enroll in a course in which they have been assigned the grade of I. *For this course a written contract for an Incomplete must be developed with the instructor prior to the deadline for final grades and will only be awarded in strict compliance with University policy.*

    d. Additional requirements such as CPR, liability insurance, no phones or beepers in class (whatever are the requirements for that course).

The College of Education Commitment to Diversity
The College of Education at UNC Charlotte is committed to social justice and respect for all individuals, and it seeks to create a culture of inclusion that actively supports all who live, work, and serve in a diverse nation and world. Attaining justice and respect involves all members of our community in recognizing that multi-dimensional diversity contributes to the College's learning environments, thereby enriching the community and improving opportunities for human understanding. While the term "diversity" is often used to refer to

differences, the College's intention is for inclusiveness, an inclusiveness of individuals who are diverse in ability/disability, age, economic status, ethnicity, gender, language, national origin, race, religion, and sexual orientation. Therefore, the College aspires to become a more diverse community in order to extend its enriching benefits to all participants. An essential feature of our community is an environment that supports exploration, learning, and work free from bias and harassment, thereby improving the growth and development of each member of the community.

College of Education Technology Statement
Professional education programs at UNC Charlotte are committed to preparing candidates for success in the 21st century through an emphasis on knowledge, effectiveness and commitment to technology integration and application. Preparation in the integration and application of technology to enhance student learning is essential for all candidates. Programs across the professional education unit, including the College of Arts + Architecture, College of Education, and College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, reflect this commitment in coursework, early field experiences, and clinical practice which includes student teaching and/or the capstone/internship phase of the respective programs.

Religious Accommodations
UNC Charlotte provides reasonable accommodations, including a minimum of two excused absences each academic year, for religious observances required by a student's religious practice or belief. Such reasonable accommodations must be requested in accordance with the procedures in this Policy, and include the opportunity for the student to make up any tests or other work missed due to an excused absence for a religious observance. Students wishing to request a religious accommodation may refer to the information found at http://legal.uncc.edu/policies/ps-134.html. It is the obligation of students to provide faculty with reasonable notice of the dates of religious observances on which they will be absent by submitting a Request for Religious Accommodation Form to their instructor prior to the census date for enrollment for a given semester (typically the 10th day of enrollment).

Disability Accommodations
If you have a disability that qualifies you for academic accommodations, contact the Office of Disability Services in Fretwell 230 or call 704-687-4355 at the beginning of the semester. Some requests for accommodations cannot be honored without supporting documentation from the Office of Disability Services. All information shared with the instructor concerning a disability will remain strictly confidential unless otherwise specified by the instructor.

Online Student Course Evaluation Process and Confidentiality
Courses in the College of Education will are evaluated through an online evaluation survey process. Student course evaluations provide an important source of feedback for faculty regarding course design and instructional effectiveness. The online course evaluations will be administered at the end of the term, during the final two week (prior to final exams). You will receive an email announcement alerting you when the survey period opens. Periodic reminders will be sent during the time the survey is open. Please be advised that this process will be secure and confidential. The technology used will ensure anonymity of participants as well as confidentiality. The College of Education is committed to excellent instruction and

student support. Please help in continuing this commitment by participating in the course evaluation process.

Credit Hour Statement
This 3 credit course requires 3 hours of classroom or direct faculty instruction and six hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately 15 weeks. Out-of-class work may include but is not limited to: syllabi development, course/presentation development, web-based course development, grading, or course evaluation.

Professional Dispositions for Professional Education Programs
Dispositions include the values, commitments, and ethics expected of professional educators and will be evaluated throughout your academic and professional preparation. (These may be found online at https://education.uncc.edu/resources/professional-dispositions-plan-and-information). Education is a demanding profession that requires candidates to act in a professional manner at all times, be collegial with peers and supervisors, and conscientiously attend to job-related details. Showing proper initiative and following through on tasks in a timely manner are also critical. Establishing habits supportive of these dispositions is an important part of each candidate's career preparation and as such will be emphasized throughout this course and the program.

Inclement Weather Policy
The University is rarely closed because of bad weather. When such a closing occurs, it will be announced on the University website and over local television and radio stations. Since this class is online and travel is not required, attendance is not affected unless there is a widespread power outage. If such an outage occurs, reasonable accommodations depending upon the circumstances to the course schedule will be made. This policy does not cover individual student computer issues. Students are expected to have dependable internet access in order to attend this course.

8.   Probable textbooks or resources

Shadish, W., Cook, T., & Campbell, D. (2001). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference.* Independence, KY: Cengage Learning.

Cabrera, J, & McDougall, A. (2010). *Statistical Consulting.* New York: Springer.

9.   Topical outline of course content

It is expected that the internship students attend monthly seminar sessions and prepare for these sessions by reading all related assigned materials. They will also complete a contract with their sponsoring agency that outlines the educational research project they will be designing and completing during the placement, the deliverables for that project, and the hours they are expected to spend at the site. Below is a schedule of monthly seminar session topics.

Month	Topic
August/January	Introduction to statistical consulting
September/February	Design of educational research projects
October/March	Design of educational evaluation projects
November/April	Design of educational measurement projects
December/May	Writing the final report

FACULTY RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPING THIS COURSE OUTLINE
(List the names of the faculty members who have developed this basic course outline.)

Rich Lambert

APPROVAL BY THE APPROPRIATE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION CURRICULUM COMMITTEE:

Approved by the College of Education *Undergraduate* Curriculum Committee

Chair: **Date:**

Approved by the College of Education *Graduate* Curriculum Committee

Chair: **Date:**

RSCH 8411
Internship in Teaching Educational Research

Course Outline
RSCH 8411 College Teaching in Educational Research

1.   Course Number and Title: RSCH 8411 Internship in Teaching Educational Research

2.   Course Description (Catalog Description) to include graduate credit and how often course
      is to be offered.

      CREDIT HOURS: 3 (Limited to 3 credit hrs. and cannot be repeated)

      Issues and concepts in teaching adults and preparing educational researchers are applied in
      the college teaching experience. This course supports doctoral students as they experience
      a graduated co-teaching process ultimately resulting in assumption of full college teaching
      responsibilities for university courses in educational research topics. *(Fall, Spring,
      Summer)*

3.   Pre- or Co-requisites

      COURSE PREREQUISITES: ADMN 8695 Advanced Seminar in Teaching and Learning
      and RSCH 8210 Applied Research Methods

      COURSE COREQUISITES: None

4.   Objectives of the course:

      Effective university teaching is a critical component of a successful career for persons in
      higher education. It is also requires up-to-date knowledge of the discipline including both
      depth and breadth of knowledge of current research issues and instructional strategies. The
      College Teaching in Educational Research course is designed to (a) support students in
      their initial college co-teaching experience, (b) provide students with an opportunity to
      update their knowledge in a specific content area by teaching courses in the area of
      specialty, and (c) facilitate advanced training in higher education classroom instructional,
      management, and assessment practices. The first time that this course is taken, the student
      must co-teach with a faculty member. After that, the student and their advisor can decide
      whether to co-teach or teach independently. Thus, College Teaching in Educational
      Research supports both co-teaching and independent teaching experience where the
      doctoral student has responsibility for the course. Conducting the course in this manner
      allows for collaboration and mentoring between doctoral students who are in their first
      university teaching experience and those who have some experience in college teaching. In
      addition, students will use this course to apply the knowledge gained in their seminar in
      teaching (**ADMN 8695**). Course topics will address college teaching practices supported in
      the literature including planning, development of presentation, professionalism, and
      evaluation. This course is related to the *College of Education's Conceptual Framework* in
      that it is designed to develop highly professional educators with the potential to impact
      student performance by fostering the effectiveness of aspiring educational researchers who
      will be knowledgeable, effective, and committed.

Professional Educators Transforming Lives, the Conceptual Framework for Professional Education Programs at UNC Charlotte, identifies the proficiencies that our graduates will demonstrate. During coursework, internship, and co-teaching experiences candidates have multiple opportunities to develop the **knowledge, effectiveness,** and **commitment** necessary to transform the lives of the learners with whom they work. This course seeks to develop the proficiencies that are in <u>bold/underlined</u> below.

Core Proficiency: Knowledge. Candidates will demonstrate the **Knowledge** that provides the foundation for transforming the lives of the children, youth, and families with whom they work. This knowledge includes elements such as:

> K1: Knowledge relevant to life in the 21st century
> **K2: Specialty area knowledge**
> **K3: Pedagogical knowledge**
> **K4: Knowledge of learners and their contexts**
> **K5: Self-awareness**
> K6: Knowledge of policies, laws, standards, and issues

Core Proficiency: Effectiveness. Candidates will demonstrate **Effectiveness** in their work with children, youth, and families by applying knowledge and developing effective skills in areas such as:

> E1: 21st century skills
> **E2: Planning, implementation, and evaluation**
> **E3: Research-based practice**
> **E4: Research skills**
> **E5: Culturally competent practice**
> **E6: Response to diverse learners**
> **E7: Reflective practice**

Core Proficiency: Commitment. Candidates will demonstrate their **Commitment** to transforming the lives of others through their actions in areas such as:

> **C1: Positive impact on learners**
> C2: Ethics
> C3: Leadership
> C4: Collaboration
> C5: Advocacy
> **C6: Professional identity and continuous growth**

The core proficiencies of **knowledge, effectiveness,** and **commitment** are fully aligned with the North Carolina standards for teachers, school executives, and counselors. This course seeks to develop the North Carolina standards that are in <u>bold/underlined</u> below.

North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards (2007): 1) Demonstrate leadership, 2) Establish a respectful environment for a diverse population of students, 3) Know the content they teach, 4) Facilitate learning for their students, 5) Reflect on their practice.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

Upon completion of this course, the successful student will be able to:

- Develop effective course planning skills
- Plan and implement a college/university level course
- Develop and evaluate a course syllabus
- Collaborate with peers in course development
- Examine issues in college teaching
- Develop appropriate course evaluation measures
- Apply published teacher education research

5.   Instructional Method:

This is an internship course in which the student co-teaches an existing course with a faculty member using whatever method of instruction applies to the co-taught course (e.g., on line, lecture, discussion).

COURSE CONTENT OF THE SEMINAR

- Introduction to the course planning process
  - Syllabus development
  - Selection of course objectives
  - Selection of text and resources
  - Development of student evaluation
  - Development of content
- Presentation development
  - Selection of goals
  - Selection of content
  - Selection of activities
  - Time management
  - Planning purposeful interactions
  - Development of evaluation measures
- Web-based Course Development
  - Asynchronous course content and design
  - Synchronous delivery
  - Instructional design in online courses
- Issues of professionalism
  - Development of timelines
  - Development of policies
  - Student behavior
  - Unusual circumstances
- Course evaluation
  - Self-reflection
  - Peer evaluations
  - Student evaluations

        o   Using evaluation to improve teaching practices

REQUIRED COURSE ACTIVITIES IN THE CONTEXT OF THE COURSE BEING CO-TAUGHT

Course activities include:

- Co-teach and/or take primary teaching responsibility for a course
- Attend seminars with instructor and peers to share experiences and develop skills
- Develop and/or revise the course syllabus to be used
- Be observed using *College of Education's Peer Observation* process

6.   Means of student evaluation:

A co-teaching contract will be signed by the co-teaching student and course instructor each semester. See Attachment A in item 10 of this document. A grade for the course will be assigned using the following criteria:

- Professional conduct and participation as outlined in the *Professional Dispositions for Professional Education Programs* (20%)
- Development of course syllabi, content, activities   (40%)
- Evaluation and feedback from supervising faculty   (40%)

In addition, an evaluation of the co-teaching student's strengths and areas for improvement is completed by the course instructor and submitted to the student's advisor. See Attachment B in item 10 of this document.

7.   Specify policies that apply to this course:
     a.   University
     integrity

Code of Student Academic Integrity
All students are required to read and abide by the Code of Student Academic Integrity. Violations of the Code of Student Academic Integrity, including plagiarism, will result in disciplinary action as provided in the Code. Definitions and examples of plagiarism are set forth in the Code. The Code is available from the Dean of Students Office or online at: http://www.legal.uncc.edu/policies/ps-105.html.

Faculty may ask students to produce identification at examinations and may require students to demonstrate that graded assignments completed outside of class are their own work.

     b.   Attendance

Students are expected to attend and be punctual to all seminar and co-teaching sessions. Absences from class *may* be excused by the instructor for such reasons as personal illness, religious holidays, or participating as an authorized University representative in an out-of-town event or program-related activity such as attending a professional conference. Whenever possible, students are expected to seek the permission of the instructor prior to absences. If an assignment is due on the day of the absence, a new due date must be approved by the course instructor.

      c.   Grading policy (A, B, C, Unsatisfactory and what are the requirements for these   as number grades)

Weighted Average of Products

90-100% A

80-89%   B

70-79%   C

Less than 70% U

Grade of "I"
The grade of I is assigned at the discretion of the instructor when a student who is otherwise passing has not, due to circumstances beyond his/her control, completed all the work in the course. The missing work must be completed by the deadline specified by the instructor, and no later than 12 months. If the I is not removed during the specified time, a grade of U is automatically assigned. The grade of I cannot be removed by enrolling again in the same course, and students should not re-enroll in a course in which they have been assigned the grade of I. *For this course a written contract for an Incomplete must be developed with the instructor prior to the deadline for final grades and will only be awarded in strict compliance with University policy.*

      d.   Additional requirements such as CPR, liability insurance, no phones or beepers in class (whatever are the requirements for that course).

The College of Education Commitment to Diversity
The College of Education at UNC Charlotte is committed to social justice and respect for all individuals, and it seeks to create a culture of inclusion that actively supports all who live, work, and serve in a diverse nation and world. Attaining justice and respect involves all members of our community in recognizing that multi-dimensional diversity contributes to the College's learning environments, thereby enriching the community and improving opportunities for human understanding. While the term "diversity" is often used to refer to differences, the College's intention is for inclusiveness, an inclusiveness of individuals who are diverse in ability/disability, age, economic status, ethnicity, gender, language, national origin, race, religion, and sexual orientation. Therefore, the College aspires to become a more diverse community in order to extend its enriching benefits to all participants. An essential feature of our community is an environment that supports exploration, learning, and

work free from bias and harassment, thereby improving the growth and development of each member of the community.

College of Education Technology Statement
Professional education programs at UNC Charlotte are committed to preparing candidates for success in the 21st century through an emphasis on knowledge, effectiveness and commitment to technology integration and application. Preparation in the integration and application of technology to enhance student learning is essential for all candidates. Programs across the professional education unit, including the College of Arts + Architecture, College of Education, and College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, reflect this commitment in coursework, early field experiences, and clinical practice which includes student teaching and/or the capstone/internship phase of the respective programs.

Religious Accommodations
UNC Charlotte provides reasonable accommodations, including a minimum of two excused absences each academic year, for religious observances required by a student's religious practice or belief. Such reasonable accommodations must be requested in accordance with the procedures in this Policy, and include the opportunity for the student to make up any tests or other work missed due to an excused absence for a religious observance. Students wishing to request a religious accommodation may refer to the information found at http://legal.uncc.edu/policies/ps-134.html. It is the obligation of students to provide faculty with reasonable notice of the dates of religious observances on which they will be absent by submitting a Request for Religious Accommodation Form to their instructor prior to the census date for enrollment for a given semester (typically the 10th day of enrollment).

Disability Accommodations
If you have a disability that qualifies you for academic accommodations, contact the Office of Disability Services in Fretwell 230 or call 704-687-4355 at the beginning of the semester. Some requests for accommodations cannot be honored without supporting documentation from the Office of Disability Services. All information shared with the instructor concerning a disability will remain strictly confidential unless otherwise specified by the instructor.

Online Student Course Evaluation Process and Confidentiality
Courses in the College of Education will are evaluated through an online evaluation survey process. Student course evaluations provide an important source of feedback for faculty regarding course design and instructional effectiveness. The online course evaluations will be administered at the end of the term, during the final two week (prior to final exams). You will receive an email announcement alerting you when the survey period opens. Periodic reminders will be sent during the time the survey is open. Please be advised that this process will be secure and confidential. The technology used will ensure anonymity of participants as well as confidentiality. The College of Education is committed to excellent instruction and student support. Please help in continuing this commitment by participating in the course evaluation process.

Credit Hour Statement
This 3 credit course requires 3 hours of classroom or direct faculty co-teaching instruction and six hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately 15 weeks. Out-of-

class work may include but is not limited to: syllabi development, course/presentation development, web-based course development, grading, or course evaluation.

<u>Professional Dispositions for Professional Education Programs</u>
Dispositions include the values, commitments, and ethics expected of professional educators and will be evaluated throughout your academic and professional preparation. (These may be found online at https://education.uncc.edu/resources/professional-dispositions-plan-and-information). Education is a demanding profession that requires candidates to act in a professional manner at all times, be collegial with peers and supervisors, and conscientiously attend to job-related details. Showing proper initiative and following through on tasks in a timely manner are also critical. Establishing habits supportive of these dispositions is an important part of each candidate's career preparation and as such will be emphasized throughout this course and the program.

<u>Inclement Weather Policy</u>
The University is rarely closed because of bad weather. When such a closing occurs, it will be announced on the University website and over local television and radio stations. Since this class is online and travel is not required, attendance is not affected unless there is a widespread power outage. If such an outage occurs, reasonable accommodations depending upon the circumstances to the course schedule will be made. This policy does not cover individual student computer issues. Students are expected to have dependable internet access in order to attend this course.

8.   Probable textbooks or resources

Badger, R. L. (2007). *Ideas that work in college teaching*. New York: SUNY Press.

Barkley, E. (2009). *Student engagement techniques: A handbook for college faculty*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Case, K. (2013. Teaching strengths, attitudes, and behaviors of professors that contribute to the learning of African-American and Latino/a college students. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 24, 129-154.

Faculty Focus. *Higher ed teaching strategies*. Available from http://www.facultyfocus.com/.

Feden, P. (2012). Teaching without telling: Contemporary theory put into practice. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 23, 5-23.

Lieberg, C. (2008). *Teaching your first college class: A practical guide for new faculty and graduate student instructors*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Nilson, L. (2010). *Teaching at its best: A research-based resource for college instructors*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

9.   Topical outline of course content

It is expected that the co-teaching students will read materials related to the course that they are co-teaching in addition to the materials for the seminar outlined below. The co-teaching seminar will meet once per month to address topics of interest to all co-teaching student regardless of content area being co-taught.

Month	Topic
August/January	Introduction to the course planning process
September/February	Presentation development
October/March	Web-based Course Development
November/April	Issues of professionalism
December/May	Course evaluation

10.   Attachments - Attach course materials following the format presented above (items 1-9). If both graduate and undergraduate versions of this course are to be offered, evidence of the differences required for graduate students and undergraduate students must be submitted to both the Undergraduate Course & Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council.

FACULTY RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPING THIS COURSE OUTLINE
(List the names of the faculty members who have developed this basic course outline.)

Lynn Ahlgrim-Delzell

APPROVAL BY THE APPROPRIATE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION CURRICULUM COMMITTEE:

Approved by the College of Education *Undergraduate* Curriculum Committee

Chair: **Date:**

Approved by the College of Education *Graduate* Curriculum Committee

Chair: **Date:**

RSCH 8411
Attachment A

COTEACHING BY DOCTORAL STUDENTS IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
Contract with Supervising Faculty

Purposes of co-teaching are:

1. To gain additional knowledge to build an area of specialty as a doctoral student.
2. To gain expertise and experience in college teaching.

Course:＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿   Semester:＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

Faculty Member:＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿   Student:＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

Activity	Specifics for Course	Due Date	Date Completed	Points Possible/ Earned
Attend every class and meet/communicate with INSTRUCTOR prior to the start of classes and during exam week.	Dates missed:			Possible: 160 pts (10 per week)
Attend monthly co-teaching seminar	Dates missed:			Possible: 50 pts (10 per month)
Attend 2 CTL workshops during the semester as agreed upon with the course instructor.	List workshops attended: 1. ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿ 2. ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿	1. ＿＿＿ 2. ＿＿＿	1. ＿＿＿＿ 2. ＿＿＿＿	Possible: 20 pts (10 per workshop)
Support instruction with the following tasks: 1. Lead activity planned by instructor 2. Develop online content or activity (e.g., Moodle content, grade book, etc.) 3. Teach 1 hr. using instructor's notes 4. Teach 1 hr. using original	Specify topic or session for each: 1. ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿ 2. ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿ 3. ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿ 4. ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿	 1. ＿＿＿ 2. ＿＿＿ 3. ＿＿＿ 4. ＿＿＿	 1. ＿＿＿ 2. ＿＿＿ 3. ＿＿＿ 4. ＿＿＿	Total Possible: 200 1. ＿＿＿ (10 pts.) 2. ＿＿＿ (10 pts) 3. ＿＿＿ (20 pts) 4. ＿＿＿ (30 pts)

notes	5. _____	5. _____	5. _____	5. _____ (40 pts)
5. Lead an original activity	6. _____	6. _____	6. _____	6. _____ (40 pts)
6. Teach full class with instructor's notes	7. _____	7. _____	7. _____	7. _____ (50 pts)
7. Teach full class with original notes				
Grade 2 sets of papers, projects, or exams. Faculty co-grades at least one-third to check for agreement in use of grading code.	Items to be graded: 1. _____ 2. _____	1. _____ 2. _____	1. _____ 2. _____	Possible: 50 pts (25 per set) 1. _____ 2. _____
				Total Points:

We agree to the above expectations for co-teaching in this course.

_____   _____
Faculty   Student

Attachment B:

Course Instructor Evaluation of Co-Teacher

I.   Mastery of course content

II.   Strengths in course instruction and grading

III.   Areas for further improvement

Date _____   Faculty Signature _____

Student's signature indicates that you have read this evaluation.

Date _____   Student Signature _____

Appendix C

Catalog Copy

Catalog Description

The doctoral program at UNC Charlotte prepares professionals who seek advanced research, statistical, and evaluation skills for positions in a wide variety of educational institutions including higher education, K-12 school districts, for-profit companies, nonprofit agencies, community colleges, think tanks, government organizations, and other institutions concerned with solving problems in education.

The program builds on the Master of Education or a comparable program. The 60-credit Ph.D. program includes 9 credits in foundations, 21 credits in research methodology and data analyses, 6 credits in internship, 6 credits of an individually designed specialty, and 9 credits in dissertation design and study. Additional coursework may be required for students who do not have a foundation in research.

The program will accept up to two courses as transfer from a regionally accredited doctoral granting institution, providing the Education Research Doctoral Committee determines that the course or courses to be transferred are equivalent to similar courses required in the UNC Charlotte Ph.D. program or fit the specialty area. The grade in these transfer courses must be an A or B. All of the dissertation work must be completed at UNC Charlotte.

Timelines

Students are admitted for either full-time study or intensive part-time study and begin in the fall or spring semester. Students must complete their degree, including the dissertation, within 8 years. The minimum time for completion for a full-time student is 3 years.

Additional Admission Requirements

Applications for admission will be accepted twice a year to begin doctoral studies in the fall or spring semester.

The following documents/activities must be submitted in support of the application:

1. Official transcript(s) of all academic work attempted since high school indicating a GPA of 3.5 (on a scale of 4.0) in a graduate degree program*
2. Official report of score on the GRE or MAT that is no more than 5 years old*
3. At least three references* of someone who knows the applicant's current work and/or academic achievements in previous degree work
4. A two page essay describing prior educational and research experiences and objectives for pursuing doctoral studies*
5. A current resume or vita
6. A professional writing sample (e.g., published article, manuscript submitted for publication, term paper submitted in prior coursework, abstract of thesis, teaching manual)

7. International students must submit official and acceptable English language proficiency test scores on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), the Michigan English Language Assessment Battery (MELAB), or the International English Language Testing System (IELTS). All tests must have been taken within the past two years**

These items are required of applicants to any of UNC Charlotte' s doctoral programs.

**See the Graduate School's website for minimum acceptable scores.

Core Courses (9 credits)

- EDCI 8180 (Critical Issues and Perspectives in Urban Education)
- ADMN 8695 (Advanced Seminar in Teaching and Learning)
- RSCH 8210 (Applied Research Methods)

Research Methods and Advanced Content (21 credits)

- RSCH 8110 (Descriptive and Inferential Statistics)
- RSCH 8120 (Advanced Statistics)
- RSCH 8140 (Multivariate Statistics)
- RSCH 8111 (Qualitative Research Methods)
- RSCH 8121 (Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis)
- RSCH 8196 (Program Evaluation Methods)
- RSCH 8220 (Advanced Measurement)

Research Specialization (select 9 credits)

- RSCH 8112 (Survey Research Methods)
- RSCH 8130 (Presentation and Computer Analysis of Data)
- RSCH 8113 (Single-Case Research)
- RSCH 8150 (Structural Equation Modeling Methods)
- RSCH 8230 (Classical and Modern Test Theory)
- RSCH 8890 (Hierarchical Linear Modeling)
- *8000 level research courses from other doctoral program across the university may be considered*

Secondary Area of Concentration (6 credit hours)

- Students will be required to complete a secondary concentration of their choice, with the approval of their doctoral advisor/committee. Areas may include elective courses from: (a) educational leadership; (b) curriculum and instruction; (c) statistics; (d) counseling; (e) early childhood; (f) special education; (g) instructional systems technology; and (h) higher education.

Internship (6 credit hours)

- RSCH 8410 (Internship in Educational Research)
- RSCH 8411 (Internship in Teaching Educational Research)

Proposal Design (3 credit hours)

- RSCH 8699 (Dissertation Proposal Design)

Dissertation (a minimum of 6 credit hours)

- RSCH 8999 (Doctoral Dissertation Research)

Additional Degree Requirements

In addition to coursework and the dissertation, students must complete a portfolio of achievements related to the three focus areas of research, collaboration, and teaching. This portfolio must receive satisfactory ratings from the Portfolio Review Committee at two critical junctures known as Benchmark One and Benchmark Two. The first benchmark serves as a Qualifying Examination and includes demonstration of writing, collaboration, and research skills. The second benchmark is comparable to the comprehensive exams required by some Ph.D. programs. Students receive opportunities to build this portfolio through the Research and Practice coursework. The following are some examples of possible products in the portfolio: research based paper, journal article review, conference presentation, evaluation project, team study, and research report.

Admission to Candidacy

Once the student has an approved dissertation proposal, an *Application for Candidacy* should be submitted first to the advisor, then the doctoral director. The application for candidacy must be submitted at least 4 weeks before the semester in which the student graduates. It is recommended that this application be made as soon as the proposal has been approved.

Dissertation Requirements

The purpose of the dissertation is for doctoral students to demonstrate their ability to synthesize the professional literature and generate new knowledge for the profession through using well-established research tools. For the Ph.D. in Education Research, Measurement, and Evaluation Education, the dissertation may be quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods. Whatever type of design, it must adhere to current standards for quality as reflected in professional writing on the chosen method of research design and reflected in the current literature. Students must be continuously enrolled for dissertation research credits through and including the semester of graduation. Defense of the dissertation is conducted in a final oral examination that is open to the University community.

Application for Degree

Students must submit an Application for Degree during the semester in which they successfully defend their dissertation proposal. Adherence to Graduate School deadlines is expected. Degree requirements are completed when students successfully defend their dissertation and file the final copy of the dissertation in the Graduate School.

Appendix D

Student Learning Outcomes Plan

UNC CHARLOTTE
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

College: College of Education

Department: Department of Educational Leadership

Degree Program: PhD in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation (ERME)

Student Learning Outcome 1 (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed)
ERME PhD candidates will demonstrate strong knowledge and skills in (a) statistics (regression, general linear models, multivariate statistics, and statistical computer programs) and (b) research design (e.g., correlational, experimental, quasi-experimental design, and qualitative design).

Effectiveness Measure: Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and all scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be attached to the plan.
After completing 9 credit hours (Phase One), all candidates submit a Research Proposal on a topic selected in consultation with the advisor. The paper is scored on a rubric that has six criteria: (1) the introduction establishes purpose of the paper; (2) the literature review is comprehensive and provides a strong and synthesized rationale for the study; (3) the research questions are important and will advance the selected field; (4) the methodology section indicates advanced knowledge of educational research design, program evaluation, measurement and statistical issues needed to conduct the study and to address the research questions; (5) the style follows APA guidelines; and (6) the writing is clear and professional. Each item is scored as Inadequate (0), Minimally Adequate (1), Meets Expectation (2), or Exceeds Expectation (3) for a total score possible of 0-18. Candidates are required to demonstrate not only advanced writing skills, but also the skill of synthesizing research literature. Please see Appendix A: Grading Rubric for ERME PhD Research Proposal. In Phase Two of the PhD program (after 18 credit hours), all candidates submit an Advanced Statistical Analysis Paper on a topic selected in consultation with the advisor. The paper is scored on a four-point rubric (see Appendix B): Inadequate (0), Minimally Adequate (1); Meets Expectations (2); and Exceeds Expectations (3). Please see Appendix B: Grading Rubric for Advanced Statistical Analysis Paper.

Method: Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data.

Student learning outcomes for the ERME PhD program are assessed using portfolios submitted at two time points – after the completion of 9 credit hours (Phase One/Portfolio One) and after the completion of 18 credit hours (Phase Two/Portfolio Two). Portfolios are prepared independently of the candidate's coursework although the candidate learns how to complete each portfolio in courses preceding its submission.

SLO 1 is assessed with the Research Proposal submitted with Portfolio One, and the Advanced Statistical Analysis Paper submitted with Portfolio Two.

The administration and evaluation process is consistent across products:

- Submission timing: Portfolios and portfolio resubmissions can be submitted annually on April 1st (full-time students) or November 1st (part-time students). Resubmissions of portfolios that do not meet expectations at first submission will be due at the next portfolio submission date (April or November).

- Submission mode: Products for Portfolios One and Two are submitted through a Moodle Project site that is secured by the College of Education's Instructional Technology staff.

- Evaluation procedures: Each candidate has a doctoral committee of three faculty members who review products as part of the portfolios. The committee members review and score the products independently and then meet to discuss their scores. Using the consensus scoring method typical of federal grant panels, committee members can change their scores subsequent to this discussion. The scores are then averaged. For both the Research Proposal and Advanced Statistical Analysis Paper, the products must have no "inadequate" items and all "meet" or "exceed" expectations with an average score of at least 12 points to pass. The doctoral Program Director meets with the advisor (who is assigned at the beginning of the program) of each candidate to review all scoring for fairness, accuracy, and consistency with program guidelines

Unless a candidate has committed plagiarism or received a total score of 0 on the product, the candidate has the opportunity to resubmit the product at the second review date (to be determined by the advisor). In the timeframe between first and second submission, the candidate works with the advisor to remediate deficiencies noted by the committee (e.g., by searching the literature; remediating writing errors.) If the candidate fails the second submission, the doctoral Program Director recommends discontinuation from doctoral studies to the Dean of the Graduate School who has the authority to make the final decision on this recommendation.

The doctoral Program Director meets with the candidate and advisor mid-May (after April submission) or mid-December (after November submission) to convey the outcome and any recommendations for improvement. The number of candidates who pass each phase is summarized and housed in a secure website accessible to all faculty in the College of Education.

This pass rate is also described during a program faculty meeting once a year. No names are used in these summary statistics. Any individual failures are discussed in confidence with the doctoral committee to consider whether any program changes are needed.

Performance Outcome: Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of "acceptable" or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric*

Phase One: At least 80% of candidates "meets expectation" on the Research Proposal (minimum score of 12).

Phase Two: At least 80% of candidates "meets expectation" on the Advanced Statistical Analysis Paper (minimum score of 12).

Student Learning Outcome 2
(knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed)

Students should be able to write research-based papers and disseminate their findings to the field via conference presentations or publications.

Effectiveness Measure: Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. <u>A copy of the data collection instrument and all scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be attached to the plan.</u>

Students complete research internships that result in the completion of research-based paper under the supervision of a faculty member during Phase Two of the program. The research-based paper must be presented at a national/regional conference or published in a peer-reviewed journal or an edited book.

All candidates submit: (a) a research-based paper for the research internship on a topic selected in consultation with the advisor. The paper is scored on a rubric that has six criteria: (1) establishes purpose of the paper, (2) uses advanced statistics, (3) backs up all interpretation with valid results, (4) draws conclusions and makes recommendations and summarizes, (5) writes in APA style, and (6) writes clearly and professionally. Each item is scored as Inadequate (0), Minimally Adequate (1), Meets Expectations (2), and Exceeds Expectations (3). Candidates are required to convey not only advanced writing skills, but also the skill of synthesizing research literature. These papers are focused on educational research, advanced statistics, program evaluation, or measurement. Please see Appendix C for Grading Rubric for Research-Based Paper and Appendix D for Grading Rubric for Research Internship.

Method: Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data.

Student learning outcomes for the ERME PhD program are assessed using portfolios submitted at two time points – after the completion of 9 credit hours (Phase One/Portfolio One) and after the completion of 18 credit hours (Phase Two/Portfolio Two). Portfolios are prepared independently of the candidate's coursework although the candidate learns how to complete each portfolio in courses preceding its submission.

SLO 2 is assessed with the evaluation of the research intern by his/her onsite cooperating mentor, and with the research-based paper, both submitted after the completion of the research internship with Portfolio Two.

The administration and evaluation process is as follows:

- Submission timing: Portfolios and portfolio resubmissions can be submitted annually on April 1st (full-time students) or November 1st (part-time students). Resubmissions of portfolios that do not meet expectations at first submission will be due at the next portfolio submission date (April or November).

- Submission mode: Products for Portfolio Two are submitted through a Moodle Project site that is secured by the College of Education's Instructional Technology staff.

- Evaluation procedures: Each candidate has a Graduate School appointed doctoral committee of three faculty members who review the portfolio. The evaluation by the onsite cooperating mentor must have no "inadequate" items and all "meet" or "exceed" expectations with a score of at least 15 to pass this product. The committee members review and score the research-based papers independently and then meet to discuss their scores. Using the consensus scoring method typical of federal grant panels, committee members can change their scores subsequent to this discussion. The scores are then averaged. The research-based paper must have no "inadequate" items and all "meet" or "exceed" expectations with an average score of at least 12 points to pass. The doctoral Program Director meets with the advisor (who is assigned at the beginning of the program) of each candidate to review all scoring for fairness, accuracy, and consistency with program guidelines

Unless a candidate has committed plagiarism or received a score of less than 15 (evaluation by onsite cooperating mentor) or total score of 0 (research-based paper), the candidate has the opportunity to resubmit the product at the second review date (to be determined by the advisor). In the timeframe between first and second submission, the candidate works with the advisor to remediate deficiencies noted by the committee (e.g., by searching the literature; remediating writing errors.) If the candidate fails the second submission, the doctoral Program Director recommends discontinuation from doctoral studies to the Dean of the Graduate School who has the authority to make the final decision on this recommendation.

The doctoral Program Director meets with the candidate and advisor mid-May (after April submission) or mid-December (after November submission) to convey the outcome and any recommendations for improvement. The number of candidates who pass each phase is summarized and housed in a secure website accessible to all faculty in the College of Education. This pass rate is also described during a program faculty meeting once a year. No names are used in these summary statistics. Any individual failures are discussed in confidence with the doctoral committee to consider whether any program changes are needed.

Performance Outcome: Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of "acceptable" or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric.*

Research-Based Paper: At least 80% of candidates "meets expectation" on the Research-Based Paper (minimum score of 12).

Research Internship: At least 80% of candidates "meets expectation" on the Research Internship (minimum score of 16).

Student Learning Outcome 3
(knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed)

ERME PhD candidates will demonstrate professional behaviors consistent with fairness and the belief that all students can learn, including creating caring, supportive learning environments, encouraging candidate-directed learning, and making adjustments to their own professional dispositions when necessary.

Effectiveness Measure: Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and all scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be attached to the plan.

In Phase One of the PhD program, all candidates submit a sample teaching session. All of our candidates learn teaching through co-teaching our Master's level course (RSCH6101). With Portfolio One, the candidate submits evidence of effective preparation of a teaching session including their lecture notes, handouts, electronic presentation, and the faculty member's written observation. This written observation uses the College of Education Observation Instrument: Direct Instruction (See Appendix E). Candidates must receive a total score of 80% or better for the checklist items "included in the lesson."

In Phase Two of the PhD program, all candidates submit a synthesis of co-teaching of all of the courses they have co-taught with a sample college teaching session. The products submitted include a description of all classes taught, a sample session, and all faculty observations (using the College of Education Observation Instrument: Direct Instruction) for the sample session submitted. Candidates must receive a total score of 80% or better for the checklist items "included in the lesson.

Method: Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data.

Student learning outcomes for the ERME PhD program are assessed using portfolios submitted at two time points – after the completion of 9 credit hours (Phase One/Portfolio One) and after the completion of 18 credit hours (Phase Two/Portfolio Two). Portfolios are prepared independently of the candidate's coursework although the candidate learns how to complete each portfolio in courses preceding its submission.

SLO 3 is assessed with the sample teaching lesson in Portfolio One, and with the synthesis of all co-teaching completed (description of all classes taught, a sample session, and all faculty observations) in Portfolio Two.

The administration and evaluation process is consistent across both portfolios:

- Submission timing: Portfolios and portfolio resubmissions can be submitted annually on April 1st (full-time students) or November 1st (part-time students); that is, portfolio must be submitted on the closest date after which the candidate completes the required credit hours (9 hours for Phase One; 18 hours for Phase Two). Resubmissions of portfolios that do not meet expectations at first submission will also be due on these dates, as applicable.

- Submission mode: Products for Portfolios One and Two are submitted through a Moodle Project site that is secured by the College of Education's Instructional Technology staff.

- Evaluation procedures: Each candidate has a Graduate School appointed doctoral committee of three faculty members who review both portfolios. In Phase One, the evaluation for the sample teaching session must have 80% or greater items included in lesson from the College of Education Observation Instrument: Direct Instruction to pass. In Phase Two, the committee members review and score the synthesis of co-teaching independently and then meet to discuss their scores. Using the consensus scoring method typical of federal grant panels, committee members can change their scores subsequent to this discussion. The scores are then averaged. The candidate must have no "inadequate" items and all "meet" or "exceed" expectations with an average score of at least # points to pass. The doctoral Program Director meets with the advisor (who is assigned at the beginning of the program) of each candidate to review all scoring for fairness, accuracy, and consistency with program guidelines

  Unless a candidate has committed plagiarism or received a total score of 0 on the product, the candidate has the opportunity to resubmit the product at the second review date (to be determined by the advisor). In the timeframe between first and second submission, the candidate works with the advisor to remediate deficiencies noted by the committee (e.g., by searching the literature; remediating writing errors.) If the candidate fails the second submission, the doctoral Program Director recommends discontinuation from doctoral studies to the Dean of the Graduate School who has the authority to make

the final decision on this recommendation.

The doctoral Program Director meets with the candidate and advisor mid-May (after April submission) or mid-December (after November submission) to convey the outcome and any recommendations for improvement. The number of candidates who pass each phase is summarized and housed in a secure website accessible to all faculty in the College of Education. This pass rate is also described during a program faculty meeting once a year. No names are used in these summary statistics. Any individual failures are discussed in confidence with the doctoral committee to consider whether any program changes are needed.

Performance Outcome: Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of "acceptable" or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric*

At least 80% of candidates "meets expectation" on the Research-Based Paper (minimum score of 12).

Appendix A: Grading Rubric for ERME PH.D Research Proposal

Student's Name: _____ Evaluator: _____ Date: _____

CRITERIA	Level Zero Inadequate	Level One Minimally Adequate	Level Two Meets Expectations	Level Three Exceeds Expectations	Level Met
1. **Purpose of the Proposal**	• Little or no discussion of research focus/purpose of research • Significance of the research is not identified (how it adds to previous research)	• Minimal discussion of research focus/purpose of research • Significance of the research is not clearly identified (how it adds to previous research)	• Research focus/purpose of research are described but not as well articulated • Significance of the research is defined (how it adds to previous research) but more could have been done	• Research focus/purpose of research is clearly identified and discussed • Significance of the research is clearly identified (how it adds to previous research)	
2. **Literature Review**	• Research focus not grounded in previous research/theoretically relevant literature	• Research focus is not well-grounded in previous research/theoretically relevant literature	• Research focus is less well-grounded in previous research/theoretically relevant literature	• Research focus is clearly grounded in previous research/theoretically relevant literature	
3. **Research Questions**	• The research questions are not important and the study may not advance the field • Hypotheses are poorly articulated or are absent altogether	• The research questions may not be important and the study may not advance the field • Hypotheses are not well articulated	• The research questions are important and the study will advance the field. • Hypotheses are described but not as well articulated	• The research questions are very important and the study will advance the field • Hypotheses are clearly articulated	
4. **Method**	• The method section indicates lack of knowledge of educational research design, program evaluation, measurement and statistical issues	• The method section indicates some knowledge of educational research design, program evaluation, measurement and statistical issues needed	• The method section indicates sufficient knowledge educational research design, program evaluation, measurement and statistical issues	• The method section indicates advanced knowledge of educational research design, program evaluation, measurement and statistical issues needed	

CRITERIA	Level Zero Inadequate	Level One Minimally Adequate	Level Two Meets Expectations	Level Three Exceeds Expectations	Level Met
	needed to conduct the study • Variables are not operationally defined	to conduct the study, but there are errors and/or omissions • Variables are not well operationally defined	needed to conduct the study and address the research questions • Variables are described but not as well operationally defined	to conduct the study and to address the research questions • Variables are well operationally defined	
5. APA Style	Numerous errors or used outdated APA style	Has some APA errors	Few typos, proofed; follows conventions of current APA style with minimal error	Flawless- no APA errors found; no typos.	
6. Writing	Unclear, rambles, grammatical errors, unprofessional, lacks depth, skims surface, light weight	Overall paper lacks coherence, organization, and clarity of writing	Clear, fluent, grammar correct, professional, tone, intelligent writing	Superbly written overall	
Explanation: Each member of the portfolio committee scores each of the above criteria after reading the completed paper by circling the applicable descriptor for each criterion. Students are expected to score at least "2" on each of the above. The committee members then total the points and average their results to determine the Final Score.					**Total:**

FINAL SCORE

❑ **Rubric score range from 0-4** **(0)** **Missing Large Sections or Containing Inappropriate Information**	❑ **Rubric score range from 5-9** **(1)** **Does Not Meet Expectations**	❑ **Rubric score ranges from 10-14** **(2)** **Meets Expectations**	❑ **Rubric score ranges from 15-18** **(3)** **Exceeds Expectations**

Appendix B: Grading Rubric for Advanced Statistical Analysis Paper

Student's Name: _____   Evaluator:_____   Date: _____

CRITERIA	Level Zero Inadequate	Level One Minimally Adequate	Level Two Meets Expectations	Level Three Exceeds Expectations	Level Met
1. **Establishes purpose of the paper**	• Little or no discussion of research focus/purpose of research • Research focus not grounded in previous research/theoretically relevant literature • Significance of the research is not identified (how it adds to previous research) • Hypotheses are poorly articulated or are absent altogether • Variables are not defined	• Minimal discussion of research focus/purpose of research • Research focus is not well-grounded in previous research /theoretically relevant literature • Significance of the research is not clearly identified (how it adds to previous research) • Hypotheses are not well articulated • Variables are not well defined	• Research focus/purpose of research are described but not as well articulated • Research focus is less well-grounded in previous research/theoretically relevant literature • Significance of the research is defined (how it adds to previous research) but more could have been done • Hypotheses are described but not as well articulated • Variables are described but not as well defined	• Research focus/purpose of research is clearly identified and discussed • Research focus is clearly grounded in previous research/theoretically relevant literature • Significance of the research is clearly identified (how it adds to previous research) • Hypotheses are clearly articulated. • Variables are well defined	
2. **Uses advanced statistics (e.g., one-way and n-way analysis of variance and covariance, advanced ANOVA designs, regression)**	• Description of how the data were collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, plan of analysis or measurement instrument, research context is very confusing/not articulated sufficiently • Units of measurements	• Description of how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, plan of analysis or measurement instrument, research context is somewhat confusing/not clearly articulated • Some units of	• Description of how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, plan of analysis or measurement instrument, research context is adequate but limited • All units of measurements are	• Provides accurate, thorough description of how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, plan of analysis or measurement instrument, research context • All units of	

CRITERIA	Level Zero Inadequate	Level One Minimally Adequate	Level Two Meets Expectations	Level Three Exceeds Expectations	Level Met
	are invalid or inappropriate for the purpose of the data analysis • No advanced statistical analysis or use of inappropriate statistical tools • Demonstrate very poor understanding of statistical foundation	measurements are valid and appropriate for the purpose of the experiment but do not sufficiently address a broad range of situations • Attempts made to perform such analyses as one-way and n-way analysis of variance and covariance, advanced ANOVA designs and/or regression but additional analysis could have been done related to the research questions • There are a few serious flaws in the choice of the statistical procedures to analyze the problem • Demonstrate only modest understanding of advanced statistical foundation	valid and appropriate for the purpose of the experiment but are presented in an incomplete or inaccurate manner • Attempts made to perform such analyses as one-way and n-way analysis of variance and covariance, advanced ANOVA designs and/or regression but analyses are still incomplete. • Data are statistically analyzed in a valid manner consistent with the stated purpose of the experiment but analysis contains a few minor errors • Demonstrate good understanding of advanced statistical foundation	measurements are valid and appropriate for the purpose of the experiment • Complete attempts made to perform such analyses as one-way and n-way analysis of variance and covariance, advanced ANOVA designs, and/or regression • Data is statistically analyzed in a valid manner consistent with the stated purpose of the experiment • Demonstrate excellent understanding of advanced statistical foundation	
3. Backs up all interpretation with valid results	• Cannot back up all interpretation with valid results; claims findings that are not evident from the data • Results are not clearly explained, level of detail is severely	• Can back up most interpretation with valid results but some interpretations speculative; does not claim findings that are not evident from the data	• Can back up most interpretation with valid results; does not claim findings that are not evident from the data • Results are explained but not as clearly, level	• Can back up all interpretation with valid results; does not claim findings that are not evident from the data • Results are clearly explained in a	

CRITERIA	Level Zero Inadequate	Level One Minimally Adequate	Level Two Meets Expectations	Level Three Exceeds Expectations	Level Met
	insufficient, and there are serious organizational issues • Tables/figures are not clear/concise in conveying the data	• Results are not very clearly explained, level of detail is insufficient, and there are more organizational issues • Tables/figures are not clear/concise in conveying the data	of detail is not as sufficient, and there are some organizational issues • Tables/figures are not as clear/concise in conveying the data	comprehensive level of detail and are well organized • Tables/figures clearly and concisely convey the data	
4. **Draws conclusions and makes recommendations and summarizes.**	• Interpretations/analysis of results severely lacking in thoughtfulness and insight, are not informed by the study's results, and do not address how they supported, refuted, and/or informed the hypotheses • Discussion of how the study relates to and/or enhances the present scholarship in this area is severely limited and/or absent altogether. • Suggestions for further research in this area are severely limited and/or absent altogether	• Interpretations/analysis of results lacking in thoughtfulness and insight, are not clearly informed by the study's results, and do not adequately address how they supported, refuted, and/or informed the hypotheses • Discussion of how the study relates to and/or enhances the present scholarship in this area is limited • Suggestions for further research in this area are limited	• Interpretations/analysis of results are sufficient but somewhat lacking in thoughtfulness and insight, are not as clearly informed by the study's results, and do not as thoroughly address how they supported, refuted, and/or informed the hypotheses • Discussion of how the study relates to and/or enhances the present scholarship in this area is adequate. • Suggestions for further research in this area are adequate	• Interpretations/analysis of results are thoughtful and insightful, are clearly informed by the study's results, and thoroughly address how they supported, refuted, and/or informed the hypotheses • Insightful discussion of how the study relates to and/or enhances the present scholarship in this area • Suggestions for further research in this area are insightful and thoughtful	
5. **Writes in APA Style**	Numerous errors or used old style APA	Has some APA errors	Few typos, proofed; follows conventions of current APA style with minimal error	Flawless- no APA errors found; no typos	
6. **Writes clearly and**	Unclear, rambles, grammatical errors,	Overall paper lacks coherence, organization,	Clear, fluent, grammar correct, professional, tone,	Superbly written overall	

CRITERIA	Level Zero Inadequate	Level One Minimally Adequate	Level Two Meets Expectations	Level Three Exceeds Expectations	Level Met
professionall y	unprofessional, lacks depth, skims surface, light weight	and clarity of writing	intelligent writing		
Explanation: Each member of the portfolio committee scores each of the above criteria after reading the completed paper by circling the applicable descriptor for each criterion. Students are expected to score "2" on each of the above. The committee members then total the points and average their results to determine the Final Score.					**Total:**

FINAL SCORE

❑ Rubric score ranges from 0-4 (0) **Missing Large Sections or Inappropriate Information**	❑ Rubric score range from 5-9 (1) **Does Not Meet Expectations**	❑ Rubric score ranges from 10-14 (2) **Meets Expectations**	❑ Rubric score ranges from 15-18 (3) **Exceeds Expectations**

Appendix C: Grading Rubric for Research-Based Papers

Student's Name:_____   Evaluator_____   Date: _____

CRITERIA	Level Zero Inadequate	Level One Minimally Adequate	Level Two Meets Expectations	Level Three Exceeds Expectations	LEVEL MET
1. **Establishes purpose of paper**	No clear purpose	Some purpose statement but vague or unclear	Clear logic. Uses foundation of professional literature	Superbly written introduction	
2. **Uses data-based studies as reflected in reference list**	Secondary sources, texts, articles from obscure/ questionable sources, testimonials	Insufficient data-based articles; overuse of opinion papers	Current & based on high quality research in major journals Reflects use of authorities	Superb selection of studies	
3. **Writes paper using major themes derived from data based studies.**	Disjointed, writes "abstracts" with/no synthesis, vague or unsupported themes	Follows a general outline but themes are not well developed	Clear & logical support for themes; good transitions; studies well synthesized, data supports themes	Superbly written body of paper	
4. **Draws conclusions and makes recommendations & summarizes.**	Few to no conclusions or not logically supported by rest of paper	Provides conclusions but they are underdeveloped	Conclusions logically derived from themes, clear and concise.	Superbly written closing section	
5. **Writes in APA Style**	Numerous errors or used old style APA	Has some APA errors	Few typos, proofed; follows conventions of current APA style with minimal error	Flawless- no APA errors found; no typos	
6. **Writes clearly and professionally**	Unclear, rambles, grammatical errors, unprofessional, lacks depth, skims surface, light weight	Overall paper lacks coherence, organization, and clarity of writing	Clear, fluent, grammar correct, professional, tone, intelligent writing	Superbly written overall	
Explanation: Each member of the portfolio committee scores each of the above criteria after reading the completed paper by circling the applicable descriptor for each criterion. Students are expected to score "2" on each of the above. The committee members then total the points and average their results to determine the Final Score.					**TOTAL:**

FINAL SCORE

❑ Rubric score ranges from 0-4 (0) Missing Large Sections or Inappropriate Information	❑ Rubric score range from 5-9 (1) Does Not Meet Expectations	❑ Rubric score ranges from 10-14 (2) Meets Expectations	❑ Rubric score ranges from 15-18 (3) Exceeds Expectations

Appendix D: Grading Rubric for Research Internship

Student's Name: _____   Evaluator: _____   Date: _____

The on-site Cooperating Mentor needs to perform the following tasks:

1. Review the interns' performance.
2. Read the student's self-evaluation of his/her work.
3. Assess the quality of the student's work by completing the score sheet.
4. Tally up the points awarded and enter the students total score for the 16 dimensions.
5. Sign the score sheet.
6. Give the completed score sheet to the university's supervising professor to fulfill NCATE and SACS data collection requirements.

Score Sheet
Professional Behavior Scoring Rubric

Scoring Dimension	Level Zero Inadequate	Level One Meets Expectations	Level Two Exceeds Expectations
1. Communication			
Oral Communications Skills	*Serious weakness in the ability to express oneself clearly and effectively.*	*Expresses self clearly and effectively.*	*Has an engaging expressive quality which articulates purpose and instills confidence in others.*
Written Communication Skills	*Serious weakness in the ability to express oneself clearly and effectively.*	*Expresses self clearly and effectively in written communication and directives.*	*Has an engaging expressive quality which articulates purpose and instills confidence in others in writing.*
Effectiveness of Making Suggestions and Expressing Ideas	*Does not understand nor demonstrate initiative.*	*Displays an understanding and enacts proactive stances when appropriate.*	*Is articulate and visionary.*
2. Leadership Potential			
Effectiveness as Facilitator	*Does not instill nor encourage*	*Displays the ability to guide the*	*Knows the strengths and*

Scoring Dimension	Level Zero Inadequate	Level One Meets Expectations	Level Two Exceeds Expectations
	teamwork.	*work of others.*	*interests of co-workers and assigns duties accordingly.*
General Knowledge of Administrative Areas	*Does not have a comprehensive understanding nor the inter-relationships/interdependencies of administrative units.*	*Does have a comprehensive understanding of the inter-relationships/interdependencies of administrative units.*	*Does have a comprehensive understanding of the inter-relationships/interdependencies of administrative units and effectively uses that knowledge to produce effective outcomes.*
Ability to See Beyond the Symptom and Identify the Real Problem	*Does not have good problem-solving skills and is constantly working on putting out fires.*	*Has the ability to prioritize and apply resources to solve problems.*	*Has the ability to prioritize and apply resources to solve problems. Sees problems as opportunities and effectively and efficiently resolves issues.*
Ability to Relate to Peers	*Has serious interpersonal issues with peers.*	*Has the ability to interact effectively and efficiently with peers.*	*Is adept at team work with peers.*
Effectiveness in Interacting with Individuals and Groups	*Lacks social skills necessary to be effective in working with individuals and groups.*	*Has the social skill necessary to be effective in working with individuals and groups.*	*Is adept at working effectively and efficiently with individuals and groups.*
3. Organizational Effectiveness			
Sensitivity to the Needs of the Organization in Relationship to the Needs of Individuals	*Does not reconcile the interdependencies of the organization and its workers.*	*Understands the interdependency of the organization and its individual.*	*Effectively takes advantage of the interdependency of the organization and its individual.*
Understanding of Systemic Relationships	*Does not understand the inter-relatedness of parts in the whole.*	*Understands the inter-relatedness of parts in the whole.*	*Effectively takes advantage of the interdependency of the parts in the whole.*
Flexibility	*Is rigid and unwilling to change.*	*Is open to change.*	*Has the ability to meld into different personas without losing integrity or authenticity.*
4. Work Ethic			

Scoring Dimension	Level Zero Inadequate	Level One Meets Expectations	Level Two Exceeds Expectations
Regard for Protection of Confidentiality	*Has displayed evidence of not being able to conduct himself or herself in areas of confidentiality.*	*Understands the necessary boundaries of confidentiality.*	*Is steadfast in maintaining appropriate boundaries in regard to confidential matters.*
Promptness in Responding in Requests and Assignments	*Has missed several important deadlines which have hindered the success of others.*	*Is punctual and dependable.*	*Is punctual, dependable and instills these qualities in others.*
Ability to Plan, Organize and Implement Assigned Tasks	*Has not displayed the ability to independently plan or organize the implementation of assigned tasks.*	*Has displayed the ability to independently plan and organize the implementation of assigned tasks.*	*Has displayed the ability to independently plan and organize the implementation of assigned tasks and instills such behavior in others as well.*
Motivation to Perform Well	*Does not have a discernable will to succeed.*	*Displays a clear will to succeed.*	*Displays a clear will to succeed and instills the same drive to success in others.*

Number of 1-point scores: _____ X 1 = _____

Number of 2-point scores: _____X 2 = _____

Total number of points: _____

Name of On-Site Mentor: _____

Signature of On-Site Mentor: _____

Name of Supervising Professor: _____

Signature of Supervising Professor: _____

Appendix E: Grading Rubric for Internship for Co-Teaching

Student's Name: _____   Evaluator: _____   Date: _____

	Score				
Area	0	1	2	3	Other
Co-Teaching Lecture	❑ Is missing **OR** ❑ Does not include PowerPoint slides **OR** ❑ Is not a full lecture (at least 50 min)	❑ Lecture objectives are unclear **OR** ❑ Activities do not match objectives **OR** ❑ Does not vary teaching strategies **OR** ❑ Does not include handouts **OR** ❑ Handouts do not enhance the content **OR** ❑ Does not include notes or talking points	❑ Instruction linked to explicitly stated objectives **AND** ❑ Includes PowerPoint presentation of full lecture accompanied by notes/talking points **AND** ❑ Includes appropriate variety of teaching strategies (e.g., lecture is "punctuated" with discussion or small-group activities) **AND** ❑ Includes handouts that enhance the content and encourage student participation, if appropriate **AND** ❑ Professor's evaluation shows lecture was adequate	❑ Meets all expectations for a "2" **AND** ❑ Shows advanced teaching skills (e.g., connections to "big ideas") **AND** ❑ Professor's evaluation shows the lecture was excellent	❑ Copy of PowerPoint presentation ❑ Copy of notes ❑ Copy of handouts ❑ Professor's evaluation of full lecture

Area	Score				
	0	1	2	3	Other
Co-Teaching Synthesis	❑ Missing summary of experiences OR ❑ Missing sample lectures with feedback OR ❑ Missing module summary	❑ Supervisors' feedback notes ongoing weakness in co-teaching OR ❑ Sample session plans weak in content or plan for delivery OR ❑ Not all modules completed	❑ Supervisors' feedback notes having met expectations for co-teaching AND ❑ Sample session plans have well developed content and effective plans for delivery AND ❑ All modules completed	❑ Supervisors' feedback and self-evaluation support excellence in co-teaching AND ❑ Sample session plans have outstanding content and variety of delivery AND ❑ All modules complete; some outstanding	❑ Summary of co-teaching experiences ❑ Sample session plan with PowerPoints & activities ❑ Feedback from supervisors ❑ Module checklist