

Qualifying Paper– Scholarly Writing Assessment **Key-Signature Assessment**

Context and Overview for Assessment

All doctoral students must successfully complete a qualifying paper prior to beginning formal work on their dissertation proposal. This phase begins once the student has completed all courses with the possible exception of ESR 616 or ESR 618 (the advanced research course).

Standards Addressed (State the set of professional, program and other relevant standards to which this assessment is aligned. In the rubric, indicate the specific standard/s each criterion aligns with.)

The Ed.D. in Teaching and Learning Doctoral Program is comprised of different majors, each of which draws from a different discipline. Connections to content standards occur at the level of major rather than program. This is a program level assessment that assesses the broader goals related to doctoral study that are contained in the NCE Conceptual Framework, the Doctoral Program Conceptual Framework, Program Level Outcomes, and University Level Outcomes.

Learning Outcome/s Addressed

Program Level Outcomes (PLO):

1. Understanding of relationships with and among authors, texts, and audiences in the form of speech, conversation, writing and enactment
2. Fostering appreciation of different types of knowledge, scholarship and research
3. Gain an advanced level of understanding and skills of collaborative learning and communication
4. Enhance knowledge of professional ethics and responsibilities

The Shared University-Level Outcomes (ULO) associated with this course: *(check all that apply)*

1. Students acquire content and conceptual knowledge
2. Students integrate content and conceptual knowledge into practice
3. Students communicate effectively to others
4. Students assess logically and critically to construct new knowledge
5. Students discern and enact social awareness, self-awareness and respect for human diversity

Directions for Completing the Assessment

The purpose of the qualifying paper is to demonstrate that students have mastered the knowledge, skills and dispositions of scholarly writing in their field of study. The student has several options for the focus of the qualifying paper. In collaboration with his or her chosen faculty or the

faculty advisor, the student can (1) construct a question or questions to reflect upon, investigate, and respond to, or (2) write a conceptual paper that constructs his or her theoretical framework or in some way intellectually presages the dissertation. Regardless of the option chosen, students must work with the chosen faculty or advisor to plan the paper and must address the criteria in the Scholarly Writing Rubric. To pass the Qualifying Paper and proceed to proposal, 85% of the criteria needs to be at a level of “Proficient” or “Distinguished” on the Scholarly Paper Evaluation Rubric. Any responses rated as “Unsatisfactory” will require revision. During the writing of the qualifying paper, the student is not allowed to get help or feedback from faculty or other doctoral students.

The student has 12 weeks in which to complete the qualifying paper. A minimum of three faculty readers evaluate each student’s paper, using the Scholarly Writing Rubric. The student who passes with “Acceptable” or “Advanced” on at least 85% of the rubric criteria in two revisions or less will be able to move to the dissertation proposal phase of the program and will be considered a “doctoral candidate.” If the paper requires revisions, the student meets with her/his chosen faculty/advisor to discuss the feedback given by the qualifying paper readers and plan for revisions. The chosen faculty/advisor lets the student know the time frame she or he will have to complete all the necessary changes. If the first revision does not meet the rubric standards, and, if the chosen faculty/advisor acknowledges that the student has demonstrated progress and is likely to be successful with additional time, the student may be offered one additional opportunity to revise the paper and resubmit for an evaluation.

Criteria and Rubric

Please read over the “Scholarly Paper Rubric” carefully to understand the components of scholarly writing you should include in the paper.

PERFORM- ANCE LEVEL	Alignment with PLO and ULOs NCE Ass. Domain	Missing (0)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Basic (2)	Proficient (3)	Distinguished (4)	Comments
Goal(s)	ULO #3	Element is missing.	Goals are not evident, unclear, or inappropriate for the assignment.	Some evidence of goals, but not fully developed, logical, or easily discernable.	Conveys clear goal(s) for writing.	Conveys clear and compelling goal(s) for writing.	
Rationale	ULO #3	Element is missing.	Rationale is not evident, unclear, or does not establish the	Some evidence of an implicit rationale, but it is not adequately	Articulates an explicit rationale that establishes the significance of	Articulates an explicit rationale that establishes the significance of the	

	OPR – Scholarly Writing		significance of the goals of the writing	developed, or does not sufficiently establish the goals of the writing.	the goals of the writing.	goals and is strongly supported by evidence.	
Introduction	ULO #3 OPR – Scholarly Writing	Element is missing.	Introduction does not communicate the depth and breadth of the topic.	Introduction communicates the depth and/or breadth of the topic but it is not adequately developed.	Introduction communicates the depth and breadth of the topic.	Introduction communicates the depth and breadth of the topic in a powerful way.	
Topic Knowledge							
Content Knowledge	ULO#1, PLO#1,2 Content Knowledge II	Element is missing.	Writing does not reflect an understanding of current (and when appropriate, classic) relevant research, theory, and scholarship.	Writing limited understanding of current (and when appropriate, classic) relevant research, theory, and scholarship.	Writing reflects an understanding of current (and when appropriate, classic) relevant research, theory and scholarship.	Writing reflects an advanced understanding current (and when appropriate, classic) relevant research, theory and scholarship.	
Connection between sources	ULO#1, PLO#1,2 Content Knowledge II	Element is missing.	Does not make connections between sources, and to the topic.	Makes some connections between sources, and to the topic.	Consistently makes connections between sources, and to the topic.	Makes strong connections between sources and to the topic through comparison, contrast, critique.	
Distinguishes between different types of literature	ULO#1, PLO#1,2	Element is missing.	Writing demonstrates limited	Writing demonstrates some	Writing demonstrates a good	Writing demonstrates an advanced and	

	Pedagogical Knowledge		understanding of the varied scholarly sources that are germane to their topic.	understanding of the varied scholarly sources that are germane to their topic.	understanding of the varied scholarly sources that are germane to their topic.	nuanced understandings of the varied scholarly sources that are germane to their topic.	
Theoretical perspectives	PLO#1,2 Content Knowledge	Element is missing.	Shows limited evidence of drawing upon theory appropriate to their topic and mode of analysis.	Shows some evidence of drawing on explicit theoretical perspectives appropriate to their topic and mode of analysis.	Shows evidence of drawing on explicit theoretical perspectives appropriate to their topic and mode of analysis.	Shows persuasive evidence of drawing on explicit theoretical perspectives appropriate to their topic and mode of analysis.	
Support of argument(s)	PLO#1,2 Pedagogical Knowledge	Element is missing.	Does not sufficiently support arguments through examples drawn from coursework, readings, inquiry, and educational experience.	Some support of arguments through examples drawn from coursework, readings, inquiry, and educational experience.	Sufficiently supports arguments through examples drawn from coursework, readings, inquiry, and educational experience.	Supports arguments through the use of well-developed examples drawn from coursework, readings, inquiry, and educational experience	
Multiple perspectives	PLO#1,2 Pedagogical Knowledge	Element is missing.	Does not acknowledge multiple perspectives on the topic that are pertinent to the goals of the review.	Acknowledgement of multiple perspectives on the topic that are pertinent to the goals of the review, but the distinctions between perspectives is not	Provides adequate explanation of multiple perspectives on the topic that are pertinent to the goals of the review.	Actively engages with multiple perspectives on the topic that are pertinent to the goals of the review.	

				adequately developed..			
Critical stance	ULO#4, 5 PLO# 1,2 & 4 Diversity	Element is missing.	Does not question research, theories, and ideas in relation to understanding and respecting diversity.	Some questioning of research, theories, and ideas in relationship to issues of diversity.	Uses evidence to support thoughtful questioning of research, theories, and ideas in relationship to issues of diversity and social justice.	Use evidence to form a persuasive argument that questions research, theories, and ideas that are related to issues of diversity and social justice.	
Reflexive stance*	ULO#4, 5 PLO# 1,2 & 4 Diversity	Element is missing.	Does not demonstrate relevant insight into the impact of one's personal and social identity, and context, on one's assumptions, values and perspectives.	Demonstrates some relevant insight into the impact of one's personal and social identity, and context, on one's assumptions, values and perspectives.	Demonstrates insight into the impact of one's personal and social identity, and context, on one's assumptions, values and perspectives.	Demonstrates deep and complex insight into the impact of one's personal and social identity, and context, on one's assumptions, values and perspectives. Identifies strengths and limitations in one's own thinking.	
Connections	ULO #2 PLO#1,2,4	Element is missing.	Does not describe connections between practice and theory.	Describes some logical connections between practice and theory.	Describes connections between practice and theory.	Thoughtfully describes connections between practice and theory.	

	Pedagogical Knowledge						
Implications	ULO #2 PLO#1,2,4 Impact	Element is missing.	Does not suggest implications for policy and/or practice,	Suggests some implications for policy and/or practice.	Suggests meaningful implications for policy and/or practice.	Suggests original and significant implications for policy and/or practice.	
Elements of Scholarly Writing							
Organization	ULO #3 Scholarly Writing	N/A	Ineffective organization with choppy presentation of ideas.	Some organization but the text does not flow smoothly between ideas.	Effective organization and the text flows smoothly with effective transitions between ideas.	Interesting and/or creative organization of the text that enhances the flow of ideas and strength of the argument.	
Voice	ULO#3 Scholarly Writing	N/A	Inconsistent and/or incoherent voice appropriate to genre and goals of the writing, (e.g. Little differentiation between writer's ideas and those of the cited authors.)	Somewhat consistent and coherent voice appropriate to genre and goals of the writing, (e.g. There is some differentiation between writer's ideas and those of the cited authors but at time there	Consistent and coherent voice appropriate to genre and goals of the writing, (e.g. Clear differentiation between writer's ideas and positions and those of the cited authors.)	Writer's voice is effectively present. Well-articulated personal standpoint in relation to the topic. (e.g. Thoughtful engagement between writer's ideas and positions and those of the cited authors.)	

				are some confusions.)			
Language Usage	ULO #3 Scholarly Writing	N/A	Significant errors in word usage, grammar, spelling and/or sentence structures that interfere with comprehension of the writing.	Some errors in English word usage, grammar, spelling and sentence structures but do not interfere with comprehension of the writing.	Employs appropriate English word usage, grammar, spelling and sentence structures.	Employs interesting and beautiful use of English language, and effective grammar, spelling and sentence structures.	
Formatting	ULO #3 Scholarly Writing	Element is Missing	Doesn't follow acceptable formatting style guide.	Inconsistent or partial use of acceptable formatting guide.	With very few errors, follows acceptable formatting style guide.	Consistently follows acceptable formatting style guide.	
Citation	ULO #3 Scholarly Writing	Element is Missing	Failure to adequately credit their sources.	Not always credits sources.	Consistently and appropriately cites sources	Consistently and appropriately cites all sources.	

* Reflexivity is an attitude of attending systematically to the context of knowledge construction, especially to the effect of the researcher, at every step of the research process. Given the complexity of the concept, this area is assessed holistically.