Department of Foundations of Education

Ph.D. in Education
Concentration in Research, Assessment and Evaluation (RAE)

Procedural Information and Guidelines

May 2024

Concentration Faculty

Lisa Abrams, Ph.D.
Michael Broda, Ph.D.
Chi-Ning (Nick) Chang, Ph.D.
Kamden Strunk, Ph.D.

Affiliate Faculty

David Naff, Ph.D.
Xun Lui, Ph.D.
Jesse Senechal, Ph.D.

Contents

<h1 style="text-align:center"><u>Welcome and Philosophy</u></h1>

WELCOME to the Research, Assessment and Evaluation (RAE) concentration of the Ph.D. in Education program. This handbook is designed to serve as a resource and guide for doctoral students in the RAE concentration. Aspects of the doctoral program that are unique to the RAE concentration are highlighted in this document. The RAE faculty periodically change and update information and requirements as appropriate. Students are also expected to be familiar with the SOE Ph.D. in Education Student/Faculty Handbook for general policies found on our handbooks page of our website: https://soe.vcu.edu/current-students/student-handbooks/
Refer to the VCU Bulletin for additional information about the program.
The School of Education doctoral program Canvas site is an excellent resource for current students. It contains forms required throughout the program. Students are strongly encouraged to visit this site regularly. It is the responsibility of all doctoral students to keep abreast of program requirements and changes in the program.

<u>RAE Program Philosophy</u>

The RAE concentration of the Ph.D. in education is designed for individuals conducting research, assessment and evaluation activities within agencies and educational organizations, as well as for those interested in teaching and studying research, assessment and evaluation methods at the postsecondary level. The program is designed to give students a comprehensive understanding of research, assessment and evaluation methods that can be applied in practical settings.
Emphasis in this concentration is placed on developing balanced proficiency in both quantitative and qualitative methods of inquiry, providing students with a breadth of methods to study varied educational and social research questions. Students may select a concentration in research, assessment or evaluation, through which advanced courses in appropriate areas are selected, both within the School of Education and other university departments. Cross-disciplinary work is encouraged.

<u>Admission to the RAE Concentration</u>

The RAE concentration faculty are committed to identifying individuals capable of and clearly committed to conducting quality research in higher education, K-12 education, and other related organizations, agencies, and settings. Students applying for admission to the Ph.D. concentration in RAE must:

1. Meet School of Education and Graduate School criteria for admission (check your entry year in the Graduate Bulletin).
2. Supply a written statement of professional goals including:
    • Professional/career goals and specialized academic interest areas.
    • Skills and/or characteristics that will facilitate the applicant's pursuit of the goals cited (e.g., research experience, statistical knowledge, etc.)
3. Participate in a personal interview with Research, Assessment and Evaluation faculty. Although an in-person interview with the candidate is highly preferred, a phone or Zoom/Skype interview with the candidate is acceptable.
        Applicants should be prepared to answer questions such as:
        ▪ What was the nature of your academic preparation and interests during your

baccalaureate/master's program?
- What factors influenced your decision to pursue research, assessment and/or evaluation as a career?
- What factors influenced your decision to pursue a doctoral degree?
- In what setting would you be most inclined to work following the completion of your degree? What factors, events, or experiences have led to this selection?
- What are your experiences with research?
- What do you believe your strengths are when it comes to being a doctoral student? What skills might you need to work on?
- Are there specific faculty research interests that appeal to you?
- What else do you wish to have the selection committee know about you?

4. Provide a minimum of three references and letters of recommendation from individuals in positions to evaluate an applicant's graduate study potential. Applicants should consider the inclusion of references who can address their academic ability and research capability.

Advising

Faculty in the RAE program aim to establish strong and supportive advising relationships with students. Over the course of the program students will work with an advisor to make course taking decisions, develop a program of study, assess progress, identify appropriate placements for the externship, choose co-curricular activities to help prepare for career goals, and possibly collaborate on research. It is expected that students will initiate meetings at least once per semester with their advisor.

The student-faculty relationship is a mutually chosen partnership. Students should feel free to change advisors. Students are encouraged to gain additional research experience with other faculty members as well.

Ph.D. in Education Competencies

The following is a list of minimal competencies that all Ph.D. in Education students must complete:

I. Analytical and Writing Skills
1. Demonstrate general and applied knowledge of the different conceptual approaches to research.
2. Demonstrate the ability to critically analyze, synthesize, and critique research literature. Students should be able to identify weaknesses in methodology as well as in the literature more broadly.
3. Write a succinct, coherent, and well-conceived research proposal on a selected topic in the second and third year.
4. Collect and analyze data and report findings.

II. Content Knowledge
1. Demonstrate knowledge of the critical issues and trends in research, assessment and evaluation through oral and written communication skills in courses, as well as

through the doctoral comprehensive exam.
2. Begin to develop an area of expertise in the field.

III. Professional Skills
 1. Develop doctoral level professional skills, including: (1) an understanding of teaching and research skills that are developed through doctoral study; (2) an understanding of the roles and responsibilities of faculty and of students in the doctoral training process.
2. Develop a detailed curriculum vitae documenting areas of expertise, professional skills, and experiences. The doctoral student and the advisor will work together to plan co-curricular activities to build the vitae.

Curriculum Overview

The Ph.D. in Education with a concentration in Research, Assessment and Evaluation, requires a minimum of 60 total graduate course credit hours, including nine hours of dissertation.

During the first 18-22 credit hours, students' main responsibility will be to complete Foundations program course work while reflecting on career goals, and pursuing research ideas. Students will work with their advisor prior to beginning coursework and as needed throughout the year to identify the appropriate sequence of courses.

Required Foundations Coursework (6 hours)**:**
EDUS Foundations of Educational Research and Doctoral Scholarship I
EDUS Foundations of Educational Research and Doctoral Scholarship II

Required Research Coursework (15 hours)**:**
EDUS 608 Educational Statistics
EDUS 710 Quantitative Research Design
EDUS 711 Qualitative Methods and Analysis
Collaborative research (3 credits):
        EDUC 697 Collaborative Scholarship OR
        EDUC 797 Directed Research
Research Elective (3 credits)

Concentration and Elective Courses (27 hours minimum)**:**
EDUS 661 Educational Evaluation: Models and Designs
EDUS 662 Educational Measurement and Evaluation
EDUS 663 Applied Multivariate Statistics in Education
EDUS 664 Multilevel Modeling in Education
EDUS 667 Applied Structural Equation Modeling in Education
EDUS 668 Applied Machine Learning in Education Research
EDUS 712 Mixed Methods Research
EDUS 713 Critical Methods in Educational Research for Justice and Equity
EDUS 714 Qualitative Data Analysis

Dissertation (9 hours; 3 of which can be EDUS890 Dissertation Seminar)

Externship (3 hours)
Students are encouraged to work with their advisor to identify an externship that will build on research, assessment and/or evaluation skills by working in a professional environment external to the School of Education. For example, students have found placements with state agencies (VA Department of Education, State Council for Higher Education) with the research departments of public K-12 school divisions, with institutional research offices at VCU or private companies. Specific possible sites include the following:

- VA State Department of Education
- Research offices of local school systems (e.g., Chesterfield and Henrico)
- University Institutional Research Office (e.g., VCU, John Tyler Community College)
- School of Education at a neighboring institution (e.g., Randolph Macon, University of Mary Washington)
- Work on a grant or in another department at VCU (One former student worked on a grant related to student health and fitness; another helped develop an advising system for another department.)
- VCU Office of Enrollment Services
- VCU Health Sciences
- VCU Center on Aging
- Virginia state offices (e.g., Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission)
- Private evaluation companies
- Several opportunities exist with SOE-affiliated university centers, including:
    a. The Literacy Institute/Excellence in Children's Early Language and Literacy/Virginia Literacy Foundation
    b. Center for School-Community Collaboration
    c. Center for Teacher Leadership
    d. Child Development Center
    e. Rehabilitation Research and Training Center
    f. Partnership for People with Disabilities

Developing a Program of Study

All Ph.D. students need to complete the required Program of Studies Form provided by the School of Education Doctoral Studies office. See Appendix A for the RAE concentration Planning Guide and course sequencing for both full and part time students.

One of the most important functions of the student's advisor is the development of a detailed program of study. The purpose of this document is to help plan and guide the student's doctoral program. The preliminary form should be completed during the first semester, and a tentative, final form should be completed after the qualifying exam.

The student, advisor, and concentration coordinator must approve programs of study. Major changes in the program of study must be approved in the same manner. The student's advisor may approve minor changes (e.g., changes in a co-curricular activity).

Co-Curricular Activities

The purpose of all co-curricular activities is to provide professional experience expected of Ph.D. students. Co-curricular activities may include participation in research, teaching, and grant preparation. These activities will be monitored by the advisor and concentration coordinator. Some activities are required of all PhD students in the Research, Assessment and Evaluation concentration, and others are determined with the student's specific career goals in mind.

Required:
_____ submit an individual/group proposal to a conference in year 1
_____ submit an individual/group proposal to a conference in year 2 or 3
_____ present/co-present at a regional or national conference
_____ co-author a written document, either a published peer-review paper with a faculty member or technical report, depending on the students' career interest.

Choose at least 1 from the list below in consultation with your advisor:
_____ serve as a TA for a course or teach a course (especially if interested in academia)
_____ participate in grant writing
_____ participate on a faculty-lead/SOE Center research team
_____ other, as advisor and concentration coordinator agree

First Year Review and Qualifying Assessment

The First Year Review and Qualifying Examination is completed after 18 credit hours have been completed, and before completing 24 credit hours. The purpose of the first year review is to assess the student's progress, complete the qualifying assessment, and facilitate thoughtful reflection to plan the remainder of the program.The first year review is a structured procedure in which students submit specific materials for a portfolio of evidence of progress in the program and for the qualifying examination assessment of core competencies from foundations and research methods courses. The performance products (e.g., personal statement, papers from courses, faculty evaluations, and other assessments) will be reviewed by concentration faculty and approval will be made for continuation in the program, with recommendations for further coursework and experiences.

Personal Statement

Each student will prepare a personal statement that will be included in the portofolio. The statement should not exceed 3 pages (double spaced, 1 inch margins, 12pt font) and address the following:
1. Identify the primary areas of growth you have experienced during the first year (18- 21 credits) and the factors that have contributed to your development.
2. Develop 3-5 goals for the next phase of the program. These goals can focus on activities connected to career planning, acquisition of content knowledge and skills, and research and/or teaching experiences.
3. Craft a preliminary research statement (1 page), that describes your emerging areas of interest and potential topics for continued exploration. Explain why these topics are of interest to you; why you think they are important to fields of education research,

assessment and evaluation; and develop 3-5 questions to guide your further study in these areas.

See Appendix B for a more complete description of the First Year Review and Qualifying Examination procedure for RAE concentration students.

Comprehensive Examination

The comprehensive examination will be taken after all required coursework is completed, but may be taken prior to or simultaneous with EDUS 890. The Research, Assessment, and Evaluation concentration comprehensive examination is portfolio-based. Students are strongly encouraged to develop their portfolio throughout their doctoral degree, as a number of required elements take substantial time to complete. The comprehensive examination is designed to assess all five of the concentration-specific student learning outcomes.

Additionally, the Research, Assessment, and Evaluation concentration expects students to develop competency across methodologies, while developing deep expertise in a smaller subset of methodologies. As a result, students must show evidence of competence in both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. In order to do so, they must submit a minimum of one artifact that is qualitative, and a minimum of one artifact that is quantitative in nature. The remaining artifacts can be qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods artifacts.

The portfolio for the comprehensive examination must include:
1) A document in which the student explains the artifacts they have chosen within each category, and how the artifacts relate to one another and the student's emerging research agenda. Students should also use this document to offer reflections on their own growth and development.
2) A research statement that explains the evolution of the student's research agenda, how their research experiences and artifacts have led to this agenda, and what future directions the student intends to take in their research, assessment, and/or evaluation work. Students should consider this document as similar to the research statement that is common in faculty and research-oriented career job application processes.
3) A current curriculum vitae, formatted appropriately for the student's career goals, that highlights relevant experiences.
4) Artifacts that show the student's proficiency and mastery in the following areas:
   a) **Theory and methodology expertise.** Examples of potential artifacts appear below, though other artifacts may be accepted as evidence. A minimum of three artifacts are required.
      i) Potentially Chapter 1 or 2 of a traditional dissertation prospectus, if there is substantive focus on theoretical frameworks or methodologies
      ii) Course papers that include strong theoretical or methodological components
      iii) Papers from 713 that focus on theory and methodology
      iv) Conference papers or publications that are theoretical or methodological in nature

b) **Research design and proposal writing.** Examples of potential artifacts appear below, though other artifacts may be accepted as evidence. A minimum of three artifacts are required.
   i) EDUS 710, 711, 712, 661, or other courses' projects that involve writing a research or grant proposal
   ii) Grant proposals
   iii) Chapter 3 of the traditional dissertation prospectus, or related sections of a three-article prospectus.

c) **Data analysis and interpretation.** Examples of potential artifacts appear below, though other artifacts may be accepted as evidence. A minimum of three artifacts are required.
   i) EDUS 663 final project, EDUS 664 final project, EDUS 667 final project, EDUS 662 final project, or other course projects that centered on data analysis and interpretation.
   ii) Completed empirical conference papers or manuscripts
   iii) Evaluation reports

d) **Professional communication of educational research.** Examples of potential artifacts appear below, though other artifacts may be accepted as evidence. A minimum of five artifacts are required, at least one of which must be first-authored by the student. Artifacts in this category may be duplicated from previous categories as appropriate (e.g., a publication used to demonstrate mastery of data analysis and interpretation can also be used as evidence of professional communication).
   i) Conference presentations (including paper, roundtable, or poster)
       (1) Can use up to two papers from MERC conference, SOE colloquium, VCU Graduate Student Association Research Gala, other VCU events
   ii) Publications
   iii) Workshops
   iv) Published reports or briefs
   v) Invited talks (that go beyond the normal scope of your student or employment role)

Artifact Requirements:
- For artifacts that were co-authored, students must include an explanation of their contribution to the product. Students may wish to refer to the CRediT Taxonomy in preparing this explanation.
- Artifacts included in the portfolio must not duplicate those submitted for the qualifying exam, unless there has been substantial additional development of the product since that time (for example, a course research proposal that was part of the qualifying exam could be included if it has since turned into a completed paper or presentation).
- If artifacts come from class assignments, students must explain how they addressed faculty feedback (if applicable).
- If students have a single project that resulted in multiple artifacts (e.g., a conference presentation and publication) they may count it in both categories, but may not count course assignments more than once.

The format in which students present their portfolio is up to them, assuming their advisor agrees. It may take the form of a Google drive folder containing all required documents, for example. Another possible format would be to organize the required materials as a website or e-portfolio. Such an online version of the portfolio might also be useful for students in their job search processes.

After submission of the written portfolio, the student's advisor will determine whether the portfolio is ready for defense. If it is, the advisor will schedule a meeting with the student, the advisor, and at least one other full-time RAE faculty member. At that meeting, which serves as the oral comprehensive examination defense, the student will explain their portfolio and discuss their body of work with the program faculty. At the defense meeting, the faculty will evaluate the student's portfolio using the rubric in this document. In the event of a disagreement between faculty on the ratings, the final rating will be the mean of faculty ratings. Students must have a final rating of 4 (exceeds expectations) in three of the four categories, and at least 3 (meets expectations) in the fourth. If ratings do not meet these standards, the comprehensive examination attempt is failed. For any category that is rated as a 3 or lower, the advisor will prepare a written summary of faculty comments. Students may re-submit their portfolio only once.

Note: Students who complete their comprehensive examination by the end of Fall 2024 may choose the format described in this document, or the previous format (which was a series of written comprehensive exam questions taken over the course of a limited period of time).

Evaluation Rubrics

Criterion	1 - Unsatisfactory	2 - Below Expectations	3 - Meets Expectations	4 - Exceeds Expectations	5 - Exemplary
Demonstrates general and applied knowledge of different theoretical/conceptual approaches that are used in research methodology, assessment and evaluation.	The artifacts do not show substantive expertise or engagement across theoretical/ conceptual models and methodologies in educational research.	The artifacts show minimal engagement with theoretical/conceptual models, primarily relying on basic or general methodologies without significant application to educational research contexts.	The artifacts demonstrate a satisfactory level of engagement with relevant theoretical/conceptual models and methodologies, showing an understanding of their application in educational research.	The artifacts reflect a thorough understanding and application of various theoretical/conceptual models and methodologies, indicating the ability to adapt and apply them creatively in educational research.	Shows strong evidence of deep engagement with theoretical/ conceptual models and varied methodologies in educational research.
Demonstrates ability to write succinct, coherent, and well-conceived research/evaluation proposals on a selected topic or program.	The artifacts do not show evidence of proficiency in writing clear or compelling research or evaluation proposals.	The artifacts demonstrate a basic attempt at writing research or evaluation proposals, but they lack clarity, coherence, or persuasive elements necessary for compelling proposals.	The artifacts show the capability to write research and evaluation proposals that are generally clear, coherent, and adequately conceived, with a logical flow and sound rationale.	The artifacts evidence the ability to write research and evaluation proposals that are not only clear and coherent but also insightful and persuasive, with well-supported arguments and innovative approaches.	The artifacts evidence the ability to write clear, compelling, and rigorous research and/or evaluation proposals.

Demonstrates the ability to apply rigorous methodologies (quantitative, qualitative and/or mixed) through designing a research study, collecting and analyzing data, and writing up findings.	The artifacts do not evidence rigor, substantive experience in data analysis and interpretation, have serious methodological flaws, or do not include empirical analysis.	The artifacts show some attempt at applying research methodologies but demonstrate significant misunderstandings or misapplications, leading to flawed or superficial analyses.	The artifacts demonstrate a competent application of research methodologies, with designs, data collection, and analyses that adhere to standard practices and yield valid findings.	The artifacts reflect a sophisticated application of research methodologies, showing creativity in design, thoroughness in data collection, and depth in analysis, resulting in insightful findings.	The artifacts show evidence of mastery in multiple modalities of data analysis and interpretation in a manner that is consistent with scholarly standards.
Demonstrates the ability to communicate scholarship to professional audiences (e.g., academic, K12 educators) in education and related fields.	The artifacts submitted do not show evidence of substantive professional communication of research.	The artifacts show evidence of limited substantive professional communication of research beyond the local level.	Shows evidence of at least five examples of professional communication of research, including at least one as a first-author or lead.	Shows strong and continuous evidence of rigorous publication and presentation at the national level, including at least one as a first-author or lead.	Shows strong and continuous evidence of rigorous publication and presentation at the national and international levels, including multiple as a first-author or lead..

In order for a student to pass a comprehensive examination attempt, they must score a 4 or higher in at least three categories, and must score a 3 or higher in all other categories. The rubric will be completed by RAE faculty based on a consensus rating. In the event the faculty cannot reach a consensus, the rating will be the average of the faculty's individual ratings.

Concept Paper Expectations and Evaluation

It is expected that the concept paper will be a roadmap for developing the dissertation proposal. Please see the guidelines in the SOE Ph.D. handbook.

Policy on Doctoral Student Teaching

Full-time doctoral students are able to teach one course during an academic year. Part-time students may have more flexibility if they do not already have a full-time job. Following SACS, the University accrediting body, we have the following policy regarding doctoral students obtaining teaching experience.

Qualifications

A master's degree in the teaching discipline or 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline. Full-time doctoral students must be in their second year of doctoral preparation. Part time students will need to have completed 18 credit hours.

Supervision

Graduate students may be asked to shadow a faculty member who is teaching an undergraduate or master's level class. Shadowing typically means attending most classes and meeting with the professor to talk about methods, issues, etc.

When teaching, the graduate student will meet on a regular basis with the supervising faculty member who typically teaches the course that the student is teaching for advice on developing the syllabus, suggestions for activities and supplemental materials, advice for handling issues that arise, etc. The graduate student will be evaluated periodically by the supervising faculty member and/or the department chair.

Procedure

Students who wish to be considered for teaching should submit a CV to the department chair along with a request of courses to teach. This should be accompanied by letters of support from the student's advisor and concentration coordinator.

Sample Plans of Study for Research, Assessment and Evaluation

Full-Time Study

	Fall Semester	Spring Semester	Summer Semester
Year 1 18-21 credits	**EDUS 608** **EDUS 702** **EDUS 711**	**EDUS 710** **EDUS 668/662** **EDUS 663**	**EDUS 703** **EDUC 697 or 797** Qualifying Examination
Year 2 18-21 credits	**EDUS 661** **EDUS 712** **EDUS 664 or 667**	**EDUS 713** **EDUS 714** **EDUS 668/662**	**EDUC 700** - Externship **Research Elective** Write concept paper Comprehensive Exam
Year 3 12-18 credits	**EDUS 890** **EDUS 664 or 667**	**EDUC 899**	**EDUC 899**

Part-Time Study (assuming two courses per semester)

	Fall Semester	Spring Semester	Summer Semester
Year 1 15 credits	**EDUS 608** **EDUS 702**	**EDUS 710** **EDUS 711**	**EDUS 703** Qualifying Examination
Year 2 12 credits	**EDUS 712** **EDUS 661 or Elective**	**EDUS 663** **EDUS 713**	**EDUC 697 or 797**
Year 3 12 credits	**EDUS 661 or Elective** **EDUS 664 or 667**	**EDUS 714** **EDUS 662**	**EDUC 700**-externship write concept paper Comprehensive Exam
Year 4	**EDUS 664 or 667** **EDUS 890**	**EDUS 668** **EDUC 899**	**EDUC 899**

First Year Review and Qualifying Assessment

Department of Foundations of Education
Research, Assessment and Evaluation Ph.D. Concentration

First Year Review and Qualifying Assessment

The first year review and related qualifying assessment is designed for three purposes: 1) to help students think critically about their experience and progress in the program; 2) to provide the basis for student planning of subsequent program courses and experiences; and 3) to provide a review by concentration faculty of student academic competence in areas covered by the qualifying assessment. A portfolio of materials will provide materials for the first year review and subsequent qualifying assessment.

First Year Review Portfolio Contents

The first year review and qualifying assessment portfolio will contain the following items:

1. Personal Statement

Each student will prepare a personal statement that will be included in the portofolio. The statement should not exceed 3 pages (double spaced, 1 inch margins, 12pt font) and address the following:

>   1. Identify the primary areas of growth you have experienced during the first year (18- 21 credits) and the factors that have contributed to your development.

>   2. Develop 3-5 goals for the next phase of the program. These goals can focus on activities connected to career planning, acquisition of content knowledge and skills, and research and/or teaching experiences.

>   3. Craft a preliminary research statement (1 page), that describes your emerging areas of interest and potential topics for continued exploration. Explain why these topics are of interest to you; why you think they are important to fields of education research, assessment and evaluation; and develop 3-5 questions to guide your further study in these areas.

2. Foundations and Research Course Rating Forms

Instructors in EDUS 702, EDUS 703, EDUS 608, EDUS 710, and EDUS 711 will provide a rating of the student on their level of competence of core course learning outcomes as demonstrated in the class.

3. Course Artifacts

The midterm examination from EDUS710, from EDUS608, and the Discipline paper from EDUS703 will be provided by appropriate instructors to be included in the portfolio.

4. Additional Writing Sample

Students will provide evidence of writing from a course or related project. This writing sample should be no more than 15 typed pages, double spaced.

5. Graduate Assistantship Evaluation(s)

Students who have a graduate assistantship are required to submit a completed evaluation from the faculty member(s) with whom they have worked.

6. Revised Program of Study

The student will complete the Revised Program of Study to the advisor for approval, who forwards it on to the concentration coordinator. Once approved and signed, it will be sent to the Office of Graduate Studies.

7. Updated Vita

Qualifying Assessment

The primary purpose of the Qualifying Assessment is to demonstrate knowledge of major research paradigms, philosophical assumptions undergirding research, ethics of research, and the designing and interpretation of quantitative and qualitative empirical methodologies. Verification of competence will be used as evidence for program Student Learning Objective 3:

> "Research Component: Students will acquire the prerequisite skills essential to understanding, designing, conducting, interpreting, and critiquing qualitative and quantitative research."

The qualifying assessment is also used to identify areas of research competence that need improvement, and to provide information for the first year review.
The qualifying assessment has three components: foundations of educational research and doctoral scholarship, quantitative methods, and qualitative methods. The content for each component is based on the following course(s) or equivalents that are appropriate to each of the areas:

Foundations of Educational Research
EDUS 702. Foundations of Educational Research and Doctoral Scholarship I
EDUS 703. Foundations of Educational Research and Doctoral Scholarship II

Quantitative Methods
EDUS 608. Educational Statistics
EDUS 710. Quantitative Research Design

Qualitative Methods
EDUS 711. Qualitative Methods and Analysis

With completion of 18-24 credit hours students must have instructor ratings of two of the three areas of competence. The ratings consist of course instructor assessment of major competencies from required courses, provided at the time each course is completed, with an indication of areas in need of improvement. The ratings will be used in conjunction with course artifacts to assess overall levels of competence in each of the three areas. Once all required research coursework is completed the portfolio will be used to designate successful completion of the qualifying assessment. Qualifying assessment results will be sent to the Office of Graduate Studies.

First Year Review and Qualifying Assessment Procedures

The student's faculty advisor will be responsible for maintaining the portfolio. Students are responsible for sending the advisor their personal statement, example of writing, and revised program of study. The advisor will obtain course ratings, course artifacts, EDUS 702 writing sample, and graduate assistantship evaluation if appropriate. Once the portfolio is complete the concentration faculty will meet to review the materials. Concentration faculty will then meet with the student for one hour to discuss the materials, provide feedback, and suggest subsequent activities that will enhance the student's program. At the end of the meeting the committee will determine: 1) whether there are any remedial activities that need to be completed as a contingency for full approval to move forward in the program; and 2) whether the student is recommended for continuation in the program. The student will be informed of their status and any recommendations for remediation within one week of the meeting.
When all qualifying assessment faculty course ratings forms have been obtained the advisor will either 1) approve the student as passing the Qualifying Assessment if no concerns are noted without a need to convene the first-year review committee; or b) reconvene the First-year review committee to determine if additional remediation is needed before the requirements are met. The advisor will inform the Office of Graduate Studies that the student has or has not met the requirements of the qualifying assessment.