Part A: Program Information

Name of Program: Master of Arts in Education
Assessment Coordinator for Dept/Program: Anne René Elsbree
Team Members: Kyle Landin, Jodi Robledo, Carol Van Vooren, Manuel Vargas and Anne René Elsbree

Date: 10/28/15

Team Members: Kyle Landin, Jodi Robledo, Carol Van Vooren, Manuel Vargas and Anne René Elsbree

Dept/Program Chair Signature: Manuel Vargas

Part B: Update on Prior Assessment Activity

1. Please provide an update on any or all of the following:

A. How have you involved your department or program in discussions about your Annual Assessment results from last semester
   a. School of Education Program Coordinators conducts a meeting twice a month. The topic of Program Assessment is addressed at each meeting and includes the coordinators in the assessment plan, course coordination, data collection and analysis.
   b. MA Faculty are invited to 3 MA Program Assessment Meetings a semester (10/14, 10/15, 10/22)

B. Action steps your department plans to take based on these assessment data?
   a. PSLO 1: Professional Dispositions – Revise Assessment Schedule in EDUC 622
      i. Week 3: Student Self-Assess with 1-4 score on all 6 PD areas w/ 2 behavioral evidence
      ii. Week 6: Instructors Assess with 1-4 score on all 6 PD areas
      iii. Week 9: Student Action Plan for improving PD – write 1 paragraph identifying an area of growth, steps for improvement, and data that will be collected for evidence of improvement.
   c. PSLO 3: Analyze Research – Continue Assessment Schedule in EDUC 622.
      i. Week 6: Students submit Research Article Critique
      ii. Week 8: Instructors assess using the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAr) Rubric.
      iii. Week 12: Student may resubmit Research Article Critique if their original submission did not earn the minimum requirement of 12/16 points.
      iv. Week 14: Instructor assesses Critique using the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement Rubric.
      v. Student may resubmit Research Article Critique to their Committee Chair if their second submission did not earn the minimum requirement of 12/16 points.
      vi. Committee Chair assesses Critique using the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement Rubric.
      vii. The candidate must pass the GWAR before registering for EDUC 698.
We collected evidence in 2014-15 on PSLO 1 & 3. The data from PSLO 1 & 3 was retrieved so late into the semester that it was not easy to use it to inform our instruction. We have refined the assessment schedule for PSLO 1: Professional Dispositions by making changes to the data collection process and the timing. The intention of these changes were to make the data collection complete before the end of the school year to make it possible for the assessment data to inform our instruction and program decisions.

**Part C: Assessment Activity**

2. Please indicate with a checkmark if any of the following will be revised during this cycle:
   - [ ] PSLOs
   - [ ] Curriculum Map
   - [ ] Assessment Schedule
   - [ ] Mission Statement

3. PSLO(s) assessed this year:
   - PSLO 1: Professional Dispositions
   - PSLO 2: Leadership
   - PSLO 3: Analyze Research
   - PSLO 4: Integrate Research

4. From what course(s) will you get student work?
   - EDUC 622 - PSLO 1: Professional Dispositions
   - EDUC 602 - PSLO 2: Leadership
   - EDUC 622 - PSLO 3: Analyze Research
   - EDUC 698 - PSLO 4: Integrate Research

5. Approximately, how many students will participate?
   - 30 students for PSLO 1: Professional Dispositions
   - 15 students for PSLO 2: Leadership
   - 40 students for PSLO 3: Analyze Research
   - 40 students for PSLO 4: Integrate Research

6. At what level is the PSLO covered in this course? (circle per your curriculum map)
   - EDUC 622 - PSLO 1: Professional Dispositions - Reinforced
   - EDUC 602 - PSLO 2: Leadership - Introduced
   - EDUC 622 - PSLO 3: Analyze Research - Reinforced
   - EDUC 698 - PSLO 4: Integrate Research - Advanced Level

6. Explain how you will determine if students have attained that level of the PSLO:
   - EDUC 622 - PSLO 1: Professional Dispositions - Reinforced
     This level of Reinforced is assessed using the Professional Disposition Rubric with the score of 3 or 4 out of 4 in all 6 areas.
   - EDUC 602 - PSLO 2: Leadership - Introduced
     This level of Introduced is assessed by a rubric for the Social Justice Action Plan assignment.
   - EDUC 622 - PSLO 3: Analyze Research - Reinforced
     This is assessed by the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement Rubric for the Research Article Critique assignment.
   - EDUC 698 - PSLO 4: Integrate Research - Advanced Level
     This is assessed by completion of the Thesis/Project. Faculty assess if the thesis/project meets the requirements based on a rubric that addresses criteria for Abstract and Chapters 1-5.

7. How will you evaluate the work? (e.g., rubric, MC exam, etc.)
   - Each assessment uses a rubric, see attached for PSLO 1 & 3 Rubric.

8. Please describe how the assessment supporting funds ($750) will be used:
   - Professional development funds for the assessment coordinator, Anne René Elsbree.

Reminder: Annual Assessment Reports are due to Academic Programs June 1, 2015.

Contact Melissa Simnitt in Academic Programs at msimnitt@csusm.edu OR x8880 with any questions regarding this form.
PSLO #1 Professional Disposition Implementation Procedures for Advanced Programs - General Option Master of Arts

The General Option Master of Arts Program assesses candidates' professional dispositions six times over the course of the program. The data points are described below and are guided by the professional dispositions rubric adopted by the School of Education.

### Disposition Assessment Data Points for General Option Master of Arts Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Disposition Data Points</th>
<th>Assessment of Professional Dispositions Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **DATA POINT #1**  
Candidate Self-Assessment - Admission Interview  
PSLO 1 Introduced | As part of the Interview for the General Option Master of Arts Program, candidates are introduced to the Professional Disposition Rubric for the General Option Master of Arts. Candidates are requested to review the rubric and self-score on the 4-point dispositional scale. Each candidate is required to write two paragraphs: 1.) The first paragraph identifies one dispositional area that is the candidate's strength with an explanation and an example. 2.) The second paragraph identifies one area that the candidate needs to work on, with an explanation and a plan for improving the disposition. |
| **DATA POINT #2**  
Candidate Self-Assessment  
EDUC 622 Week 3  
PSLO 1 Reinforced | By week 3 of EDUC 622, each candidate submits a self-rating (on the 4-point dispositional scale) for each disposition and provides two examples of behaviors that exemplify each disposition. |
| **DATA POINT #3**  
Instructors' Candidate Assessment  
EDUC 622 Week 6  
PSLO 1 Reinforced | By Week 6, EDUC 622 instructors review candidates' self-assessments and submit on Google Spreadsheet their dispositional ratings for each candidate. If a candidate is rated "unacceptable" in any disposition, the Statement of Concern process is activated.

If the candidate receives a 1 or 2, the culminating activity committee chair (EDUC 698 instructor) will meet with the student to review the action plan and support the student to improve to a 3 or 4 score before completing EDUC 698. |
| **DATA POINT #4:**  
Candidate Professional Disposition Action Plan  
EDUC 622 Week 9  
PSLO 1 Reinforced | By Week 9 of EDUC 622, each candidate will have read the instructor's assessment scores and use that to inform a Professional Disposition Action Plan (a written paragraph) that includes the following:
   a) Identifying one Professional Disposition area of growth;
   b) Steps for improvement;
   c) Data that will be collected for evidence of improvement. |

See the Professional Disposition Advanced Rubric on the next page,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Unacceptable 1</th>
<th>Approaches Target 2</th>
<th>Meets Target 3</th>
<th>Meets Advanced Target 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social Justice and Equity</td>
<td>Behaves in a manner that is discriminatory, intolerant, or close-minded. Resists working with some groups or individuals, makes derogatory remarks, or rejects views based on factors such as gender, exceptionailties, race, culture, religion, or socioeconomic background. Selects materials, designs activities, or interacts in ways that promotes stereotypes or demeans others. Does not take appropriate initiative to understand and identify student needs and/or provide learning experiences that meet the needs of all students. Fails to provide extra assistance or alternative learning experiences when needed. Repeatedly excludes some students from learning experiences. Gives preferential treatment to some students. Usually models respect and concern for equitable effort for all learners and responds to feedback on how to improve. Usually demonstrates understanding of diversity (race, gender, culture, exceptionailties) in written work and other expressions and revises according to feedback. Usually selects materials, designs activities and interacts with students in ways that demonstrate appreciation of diversity and demonstrates improvements based on constructive feedback. Consistently models respect for all learners. Behaves in ways that reflect concern and equitable effort on behalf of all. Written work and other expressions reflect understanding of diversity (race, gender, culture, exceptionailties). Consistently selects materials, designs activities, and interacts in ways that demonstrate appreciation of diversity (e.g., includes models from diverse backgrounds in learning experiences and provides opportunities for students to hear, consider, and discuss different viewpoints). Consistently advocates for inclusion and consideration of diverse perspectives. Consistently interacts in ways that consider individual differences and life experiences. Takes care to provide appropriate experiences for all students.</td>
<td>Consistently models respect for all learners. Behaves in ways that reflect concern and equitable effort on behalf of all. Written work and other expressions reflect understanding of diversity (race, gender, culture, exceptionailties). Consistently selects materials, designs activities, and interacts in ways that demonstrate appreciation of diversity (e.g., includes models from diverse backgrounds in learning experiences and provides opportunities for students to hear, consider, and discuss different viewpoints). Consistently advocates for inclusion and consideration of diverse perspectives. Consistently interacts in ways that consider individual differences and life experiences. Takes care to provide appropriate experiences for all students.</td>
<td>Consistently models respect for all learners. Behaves in ways that reflect concern and equitable effort on behalf of all. Written work and other expressions reflect understanding of diversity (race, gender, culture, exceptionailties). Consistently selects materials, designs activities, and interacts in ways that demonstrate appreciation of diversity (e.g., includes models from diverse backgrounds in learning experiences and provides opportunities for students to hear, consider, and discuss different viewpoints). Consistently advocates for inclusion and consideration of diverse perspectives. Consistently interacts in ways that consider individual differences and life experiences. Takes care to provide appropriate experiences for all students.</td>
<td>Works to influence others’ provision of services for those beyond those in his/her immediate setting. Seeks forums or leads efforts to advocate for inclusion and consideration of diverse perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidates practice the skills of collaboration in their professional interactions with instructors, advisors, students, colleagues, parents/guardians/caregivers and those in the wider community.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interacts with others (students, parents, colleagues) in ways that do not communicate respect. Uses destructive criticism, derogatory remarks, threats, physical coercion, or inappropriate language or behavior. Does not reasonably allow others to express ideas. Discourages or undermines the work of others.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usually interacts with others (students, parents, colleagues) in ways that communicate respect such as being courteous, demonstrating impartiality and responds positively to feedback for improving. Usually encourages and supports participation and success for all and is responsive to constructive feedback.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistently interacts with others (students, parents, colleagues) in ways that communicate respect such as being courteous, demonstrating impartiality, and providing opportunities for others to express or demonstrate their needs and viewpoints. Clearly values and builds relationships. Consistently encourages and supports participation and success for all.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistently interacts with others (students, parents, colleagues) in ways that communicate respect such as being courteous, demonstrating consistency and impartiality, and providing opportunities for others to express or demonstrate their needs and viewpoints. Clearly values and builds relationships. Consistently encourages and supports participation and success for all.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Advocates for the expression of diverse perspectives. Seeks forums and leads efforts to assist others in developing understanding and skills in being supportive of others (e.g., students, parents, colleagues).*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Unacceptable 1</th>
<th>Approaches Target 2</th>
<th>Meets Target 3</th>
<th>Meets Advanced Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td>Does not gather, analyze or use data to make informed decisions. Behaves in ways that reflect a belief that others should provide what is needed. Does not ask appropriate questions or take initiative to work toward achieving goals or solving dilemmas.</td>
<td>Usually analyzes professional contexts by appropriately seeking information to make decisions about practice and responds to constructive feedback. Usually seeks a variety of perspectives in exploring issues. Usually asks questions and takes action to achieve goals or solve dilemmas. Usually anticipates needs and assists others in obtaining resources.</td>
<td>Consistently analyzes professional contexts, by a) seeking information from a variety of sources to analyze student needs and b) planning and implementing appropriate decisions about professional practice. Consistently seeks a variety of perspectives in exploring issues. Consistently asks questions and takes action to achieve goals or solve dilemmas. Consistently anticipates needs and assists others in obtaining resources.</td>
<td>Consistently analyzes professional contexts, by a) seeking information from a variety of sources to analyze student needs and b) planning and implementing appropriate decisions about professional practice. Consistently seeks a variety of perspectives in exploring issues. Consistently asks questions and takes action to achieve goals or solve dilemmas. Consistently anticipates needs and assists others in obtaining resources. Provides leadership in solving dilemmas involving the procurement or distribution of resources. Actively seeks or leads opportunities to select or create appropriate new forums to advocate for students or the profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Approaches Target</td>
<td>Meets Target</td>
<td>Meets Advanced Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional Ethics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates make and act on well-reasoned, principled judgments.</td>
<td>Fails to consistently honor the needs and best interests of students, the work setting (school, district, university) or profession. Demonstrates a pattern of unprofessional behavior such as absence, tardiness, failure to complete tasks, inappropriate dress or personal behavior, violation of confidentiality, academic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating), or imposition of personal, religious, or political views upon others.</td>
<td>Usually honors the needs and best interests of students, the work setting and the profession and responds positively to feedback on how to improve. Usually makes well-reasoned, principled judgments regarding professional behaviors such as promptness, task completion, maintaining confidentiality, academic honesty, and appropriate separation of personal and professional domains.</td>
<td>Consistently honors the needs and best interests of students, the work setting (school, district, university), and the profession. Consistently makes well-reasoned, principled judgments regarding professional behaviors such as promptness, task completion, maintaining confidentiality, academic honesty, and appropriate separation of personal and professional domains.</td>
<td>Consistently honors the needs and best interests of students, the work setting (school, district, university), and the profession. Consistently makes well-reasoned, principled judgments regarding professional behaviors such as promptness, task completion, maintaining confidentiality, academic honesty, and appropriate separation of personal and professional domains. Actively seeks or leads forums to advocate for professional conditions and resources that will improve learning outcomes for students or the profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition</td>
<td>Unacceptable 1</td>
<td>Approaches Target 2</td>
<td>Meets Target 3</td>
<td>Meets Advanced Target 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Reflective Teaching and Learning</strong></td>
<td>Does not critically evaluate own professional practice or performance (e.g., interactions, written work, assessments) and the impact on student success. Fails to see the need for positive change. Does not provide substantive suggestions for positive self-improvement. Rejects suggestions from others directly or by failing to act. Offers excuses and/or assigns blame for negative results to students, parents, colleagues, or supervisors.</td>
<td>Usually demonstrates understanding of the relevant teaching/learning standards while being responsive to feedback. Usually evaluates own professional performance and the impact on student success. Usually generates ideas for potential improvements. Is usually open-minded and positive when receiving feedback, acting upon suggestions and feedback.</td>
<td>Consistently demonstrates understanding of the relevant teaching/learning standards. Consistently evaluates own professional practice and performance (e.g., interactions, written work, formal and informal assessments) and the impact on student success. Consistently generates ideas for potential improvements or revisions and applies them to future professional practice and performance. Is consistently open-minded and positive when receiving feedback from others. Consistently acts upon suggestions.</td>
<td>Consistently demonstrates understanding of the relevant teaching/learning standards. Consistently evaluates own professional practice and performance (e.g., interactions, written work, formal and informal assessments) and the impact on student success. Consistently generates ideas for potential improvements or revisions and applies them to future professional practice and performance. Actively seeks further information and perspectives from others to evaluate own performance and demonstrates in depth analysis and synthesis of viewpoints. Applies relevant teaching/learning standards in their work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Actively seeks further information and perspectives from others to evaluate own performance and demonstrates in depth analysis and synthesis of viewpoints. Applies relevant teaching/learning standards in their work.*
PSLO #3 Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) Implementation Procedure

The Master of Arts Program provides candidates up to three (3) opportunities to meet the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR). Candidates are provided two opportunities within the core course EDUC 622: Research Methods in Education. If the candidate requires a third opportunity, the candidate’s program coordinator works with the candidate and the candidate’s culminating experience committee to provide a third opportunity. The data points are described below and are guided by the GWAR Rubric provided by the CSUSM Office of Graduate Studies.

**GWAR Data Points for Master of Arts Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GWAR Data Points</th>
<th>GWAR Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA POINT #1:</strong> First Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement Opportunity</td>
<td>The Master of Arts candidates have a total of three (3) opportunities to pass the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) within the program. Candidates may opt out of the assessment within the program by passing an acceptable standardized test score, such as the Analytical Writing subtest of the Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT) or the Graduate Record Examinations (GRE). The candidate is responsible for ensuring their scores are filed with the CEHHS Student Services office and that instructor &amp; program coordinator are notified. As part of EDUC 622: Research Methods in Education course, candidates complete a formal paper to summarize and critique an empirical research study. This paper is scored with the GWAR Rubric. The assignment instructions and the GWAR are provided in the EDUC 622: Research Methods in Education syllabus. The CSUSM Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement Policy and Rubric can be retrieved from the Office of Graduate Studies website: <a href="https://www.csusm.edu/policies/active/documents/graduate_writing_assessment_requirement.html">https://www.csusm.edu/policies/active/documents/graduate_writing_assessment_requirement.html</a>. The GWAR assessment tool was designed and provided to the School of Education by the CSUSM Office of Graduate Studies. The assignment is due week 6 of the 15 week course, with feedback from the EDUC 622 instructor provided by week 8 (mid-semester). The EDUC 622 instructor will record each candidate’s scores and provide the data to the graduate program coordinator and assessment coordinator. If a candidate is not successful with passing the GWAR on the first attempt, the candidates may revise and resubmit (see DATA POINT #2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA POINT #2:</strong> Second Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement Opportunity</td>
<td>If a candidate is not successful on the first attempt, then the instructor informs the graduate program coordinator and assessment coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA POINT #3:</strong> Third Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement Opportunity</td>
<td>The culminating experience committee chairperson (EDUC 698 instructor) is responsible for remediating the student and providing a final opportunity to pass the GWAR. The culminating experience committee chairperson (EDUC 698 instructor) will record the candidate’s scores and provide the data to the graduate program coordinator and assessment coordinator. The program coordinator will assist the culminating experience chairperson to provide the candidate a third opportunity to pass the GWAR. The candidate must pass the GWAR before advancing to candidacy. Candidates who do not pass the GWAR on their third attempt will not be permitted to continue in the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See the next page for the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) Rubric.
CSUSM Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement Rubric

I. STYLE AND FORMAT

4: In addition to meeting the requirement for a "3," the paper consistently models the language and conventions used in the scholarly/professional literature appropriate to the student's discipline. The manuscript would meet the guidelines for submission for publication in a peer reviewed journal in the student's field of study.

3: While there may be minor errors, conventions for style and format are used consistently throughout the paper. Demonstrates thoroughness and competence in documenting sources; the reader would have little difficulty referring back to cited sources. Style and format contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper. Suitably models the discipline's overall scholarly style.

2: The style and format are broadly followed, but inconsistencies are apparent. There is selection of less suitable sources (non-peer reviewed literature, web information). Weak transitions and apparent logic gaps occur between topics being addressed. The style may be difficult to follow so as to detract from the comprehensibility of the manuscript.

1: While some discipline-specific conventions are followed, others are not. Paper lacks consistency of style and/or format. It may be unclear which references are direct quotes and which are paraphrased. Based on the information provided, the reader would have some difficulty referring back to cited sources. Significant revisions would contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper.

II. MECHANICS

4: In addition to meeting the requirements for a "3," the paper is essentially error-free in terms of mechanics. Writing flows smoothly from one idea to another. Transitions effectively establish a sound scholarly argument and aid the reader in following the writer's logic.

3: While there may be minor errors, the paper follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout. Errors do not significantly interfere with topic comprehensibility. Transitions and organizational structures, such as subheadings, are effectively used which help the reader move from one point to another.

2: Grammatical conventions are generally used, but inconsistency and/or errors in their use result in weak, but still apparent, connections between topics in the formulation of the argument. There is poor or improper use of headings and related features to keep the reader on track within the topic. Effective discipline-specific vocabulary is used.

1: Frequent errors in spelling, grammar (such as subject/verb agreements and tense), sentence structure, and/or other writing conventions make reading difficult and interfere with comprehensibility. There is some confusion in the proper use of discipline-specific terms. Writing does not flow smoothly from point to point; appropriate transitions are lacking.

III. CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION

4: In addition to meeting the requirements for a "3," excels in the organization and representation of ideas related to the topic. Raises important issues or ideas which may not have been represented in the literature cited. Would serve as a good basis for further research on the topic.

3: Follows all requirements for the paper. Topic is carefully focused. Clearly outlines the major points related to the topic; ideas are logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument. Paper is interesting and holds the reader's attention. Does a credible job summarizing related literature. General ideas are expanded upon in a logical manner thereby extending the significance of the work presented beyond a re-statement of known ideas.

2: Ideas presented closely follow conventional concepts with little expansion and development of new directions. Certain logical connections or inclusion of specific topics related to the student's area of study may be omitted. Ideas and concepts are generally satisfactorily presented although lapses in logic and organization are apparent. The reader is suitably introduced to the topic being presented such that the relationship to the student's area of study is obvious.

1: The paper is logically and thematically coherent, but is lacking in substantial ways. The content may be poorly focused or the scholarly argument weak or poorly conceived. Major ideas related to the content may be ignored or inadequately explored. Overall, the content and organization needs significant revision to represent a critical analysis of the topic.
IV. INTEGRATION AND CRITICAL ANALYSIS

4: In addition to meeting the requirement of a "3," the document presents the current state of knowledge for the topic being addressed utilizing a diversity of opinions. These various, and possibly conflicting, opinions are presented in a balanced manner and seamlessly woven together to illustrate a complete grasp of the literature across multiple research approaches utilizing appropriate national and international peer-reviewed journals. Essential findings of multiple sources are accurately and concisely paraphrased, analyzed, and integrated. Original sources are clearly identified and correctly cited in both the body of the text and the reference section. Organizationally, smooth and effective transitions between topics lead the reader through an orderly discussion of the topic being addressed. The gaps in current knowledge are clearly identified and significant directions and approaches that fill these gaps are identified.

3: There are inconsistencies in the organization and logic of the presentation, but still clear analysis of the presented materials. While synthesis of all aspects of the topic may show varying degrees of development, the overall consistency, thoroughness, and analysis result in a well-crafted document.

2: Identification of key topics or uncertainties in the field may be incomplete. New concepts resulting from a synthetic presentation of ideas is poorly developed or lacking. Complex topics and related concepts are awkwardly presented and linkages among topics may be unclear.

1: Weakness is evident in the coverage of the field and analysis resulting in incorrect or poorly developed synthesis of results. Analysis is limited to categorizing and summarizing topics. The resulting manuscript degrades the comprehensibility of the document and the identification of knowledge gaps.