|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean of Candidate Performance on Action Research Presentation**  **(4 point scale)** | | | | | | |
| 1-Does not meet expectations  2-Approaching expectations  3-Meets Expectations  4-Exceeds Expectations | Semester | | | | | |
| Spring 2014  N=9 | Fall  2013 | Spring 2013  N=11 | Fall  2012 | Spring 2012 | Fall  2011 |
| Explanation (why issue was chosen/description of the problem/purpose). | 3.667 |  | 3.545 |  |  |  |
| Specific question/hypothesis (relative to the problem). | 3.667 |  | 3.545 |  |  |  |
| Review of Literature (relative to the problem). | 3.667 |  | 3.545 |  |  |  |
| Methodology/Analysis of Data | 3.667 |  | 3.545 |  |  |  |
| Command of Subject Matter/Prepared/Clarity | 3.667 |  | 3.545 |  |  |  |
| Handouts (clear/appropriate information) | 3.667 |  | 3.545 |  |  |  |
| Peer Review (average score) | 3.667 |  | 3.545 |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean of Candidate Performance on Action Research Project**  **(4 point scale)** | | | | | | |
| 1-Does not meet expectations  2-Approaching expectations  3-Meets Expectations  4-Exceeds Expectations | Semester | | | | | |
| Spring 2014  N=9 | Fall  2013 | Spring 2013  N=12 | Fall  2012 | Spring 2012  N=14 | Fall  2011 |
| Elements  Abstract, introduction, literature review, and methods revised and of high quality. | 2.556 |  | 2.5 |  | 2.286 |  |
| Results  1. Describes the data that answer that question(s).  2. Describes the themes, categories, patterns.  3. Uses tables, graphs, and figures as necessary.  4. Appropriate APA style. | 2.556 |  | 2.5 |  | 2.286 |  |
| Discussion  1. Restates the general purpose of the study.  2. Briefly describes how the results were obtained.  3. Brief summary of findings (one or two paragraphs)  4. Describes how results compare or contrasts with other studies.  5. Appropriate APA style. | 2.667 |  | 2.5 |  | 2.286 |  |
| Conclusion  1. What is the grand significance of the results?  2. What theories are being developed of confirmed?  3. How may t his information be used by self, other teachers, school, or school system? (consider impact and potential impact, but don't over reach).  4. Limitations  5. Further research within the context as a reflection as a scholar and future scholarship.  6. What actions were implemented? Insightful questions for further research (continued inquiry).  7. APA style | 2.667 |  | 2.5 |  | 2.286 |  |
| References: Match literature cited in text. APA style. | 2.667 |  | 2.5 |  | 2.214 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean of Candidate Performance on EDUC 601 Action Research Proposal**  **(4 point scale)** | | | | | | |
| 1-Does not meet expectations  2-Approaching expectations  3-Meets Expectations  4-Exceeds Expectations | Semester | | | | | |
| Spring 2014  N=3 | Fall  2013  N=6 | Spring 2013  N=5 | Fall  2012 | Spring 2012 | Fall  2011 |
| Explanation (why issue was chosen/description of the problem/purpose). | 3 | 3.333 | 2.8 |  |  |  |
| Specific question/hypothesis (relative to the problem). | 3 | 3.333 | 2.8 |  |  |  |
| Review of Literature (relative to the problem). | 3 | 3.333 | 3 |  |  |  |
| Methodology/Analysis of Data | 1.667 | 3.333 | 2.8 |  |  |  |
| Command of Subject Matter/Prepared/Clarity | 3 | 3.333 | 3 |  |  |  |
| Handouts (clear/appropriate information) | 1.667 | 3.333 | 3 |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean of Candidate Performance on Cultural Plunge**  **(3 point scale)** | | | | | | |
| 1=Little or no Evidence (0-8)  2=Moderately Evident (9-12)  3=Evident (13-15) | Semester | | | | | |
| Spring 2014  N=4 | Fall  2013  N=4 | Spring 2013  N=4 | Fall  2012  N=6 | Spring 2012  N=7 | Fall  2011  N=10 |
| PART 1: Explain where you visited and why and five stereotypes about the focal group | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| PART 2: Describe emotional response to the experience and whether the plunge reinforced or challenged the popular stereotypes | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| PART 3: Personal and professional implications regarding your experience | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Command of grammar/usage/mechanics | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean of Candidate Performance on Content Knowledge/School Improvement/Student Learning**  **(4 point scale)** | | | | | | |
| 1=Not Addressed  2=Approaching Expectations  3=Meets Expectations  4=Exceeds Expectations | Semester | | | | | |
| Spring 2014  N=8 | Fall  2013  N=2 | Spring 2013  N=2 | Fall  2012  N=6 | Spring 2012  N=7 | Fall  2011  N=8 |
| **Artifact reflects knowledge of content and how to teach that content**: Teachers appreciate how knowledge in their subjects is created, organized and linked to other disciplines; command specialized knowledge of how to convey a subject to students; generate multiple paths to knowledge | 3.125 | 3 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.714 | 3.125 |
| **Artifact reflects the knowledge and/or ability to manage and monitor student learning:** Teachers use multiple methods to meet goals; orchestrate learning in group settings; place a premium on student engagement; regularly assess student progress; are mindful of their objectives | 3 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.333 | 3.429 | 3.125 |
| **Artifact reflects commitment to students and learning**: Teachers recognize individual differences in their students and adjust their practice accordingly; have an understanding of how students develop and learn; treat students equitably; mission extends beyond developing the cognitive capacity of their students | 3 | 3 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.714 | 3.25 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean of Candidate Performance on School/Family/Community**  **(4 point scale)** | | | | | | |
| 1=Not Addressed  2=Approaching Expectations  3=Meets Expectations  4=Exceeds Expectations | Semester | | | | | |
| Spring 2014  N=9 | Fall  2013  N=2 | Spring 2013  N=2 | Fall  2012  N=5 | Spring 2012  N=8 | Fall  2011  N=9 |
| **Artifact reflects the knowledge and/or ability to work with other professionals on instructional policy,** Teachers work collaboratively with other professionals. | 3.222 | 3 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3 | 2.778 |
| **Artifact reflects the knowledge and/or ability to work collaboratively with parents to engage them productively in the work of the school.** Teachers work collaboratively with parents. | 3.111 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.125 | 3 |
| **Artifact reflects knowledge and/or ability to seek and build partnerships with community groups and/or businesses**. Teachers take advantage of community resources. | 3.111 | 3 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.125 | 3 |
| **The artifact reflects collaboration to improve student learning.** Teachers contribute to school effectiveness by engaging in collaborative efforts in the learning community. | 3.222 | 3 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.125 | 3 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mean of Candidate Performance on Technology Artifact**  **(4 point scale)** | | | | | | |
| 1-Does not meet expectations  2-Approaching expectations  3-Meets Expectations  4-Exceeds Expectations | Semester | | | | | |
| Spring 2014  N=6 | Fall  2013  N=3 | Spring 2013  N=12 | Fall  2012 | Spring 2012  N=14 | Fall  2011 |
| The candidate designs developmentally appropriate technology driven learning opportunities that support diverse learners and address content standards. | 3.167 | 3.333 | 3.167 |  | 3.143 |  |
| The candidate identifies and locates technology resources and evaluates them for accuracy and suitability | 3.167 | 3.333 | 3.167 |  | 3.143 |  |
| The candidate applies technology to develop students' higher order skills and creativity | 3.167 | 3.333 | 3.083 |  | 3.143 |  |