

**EDCC 551 Action Research in Educational Settings
Spring 2012**

Course is required in the EMU M.A. in Education program Core Curriculum.

Credit Hours: 3 semester hours

Class Instructors: Don Steiner, Ph.D.
Office: CC 213
Email: steinerd@emu.edu

Class Meetings:

Friday, January 20	4:30 p.m.-7:30 p.m.	3 hrs.
Saturday, January 21	8:30 a.m.-3:30 p.m.	6 hrs.
Friday, February 10	4:30 p.m.-7:30 p.m.	3 hrs.
Saturday, February 11	8:30 a.m.-3:30 p.m.	6 hrs.
Friday, March 2	4:30 p.m.-7:30 p.m.	3 hrs.
Saturday, March 3	8:30 a.m.-3:30 p.m.	6 hrs.
Friday, April 13	4:30 p.m.-7:30 p.m.	3 hrs.
Saturday, April 14	8:30 a.m.-3:30 p.m.	6 hrs.
Friday, May 11	4:30 p.m.-7:30 p.m.	3 hrs.
Saturday, May 12	8:30 a.m.-3:30 p.m.	6 hrs.

*Individual appointments may be included 45 hrs.

Course Description:

This course is designed to give an overview of action research, particularly action research that is conducted within educational settings. Emphasis is placed upon gaining an understanding of the difference between qualitative and quantitative research design, as well as becoming competent in setting up an action research project. Participants are taught within the course to use computer technology to conduct a literature review, collect, analyze and interpret data. Participants prepare an action research proposal, ready to be fine-tuned with their program mentor. (NOTE: This course extends over five months and requires submission of proposal sections throughout the course.)

Conceptual Framework: “Preparing Caring, Reflective Teachers for a Changing World”

The EMU Teacher Education Program has chosen the theme *Preparing Caring, Reflective Teachers for a Changing World*” as the conceptual framework from which its beliefs and outcomes are based. The Teacher Education Program envisions preparing informed lifelong leaders and learners who value the dignity of all persons and are ready and willing to share a pilgrimage of openness and continuous growth as they invite others to join them. These caring, reflective educators will offer healing and hope in a diverse world. Six performance outcomes focus all course and candidate outcomes.

M.A. in Education Program Outcomes:

Scholarship: to acquire advanced knowledge through core curriculum and specialty area courses and to organize and integrate that knowledge into professional practice. **(S)**

Inquiry: to generate questions and to use critical thinking to self-assess, to view problems from multiple perspectives, to make informed decisions and to engage in action research for educational change. **(I)**

Professional Knowledge: to acquire advanced pedagogical and specialty area knowledge in order to create cultures of change and manage environments conducive to learning, setting high expectations and implementing appropriate instructional and assessment practices. **(PK)**

Communication: to develop communication strategies (verbal, nonverbal, and technological) which support collaboration and resourcefulness to empower self and others. (C)

Caring: to develop a nurturing spirit that advocates for students, encourages social and ethical responsibility, and promotes peacebuilding in diverse settings. (Ca)

Leadership: to act as social change agents by working collaboratively to bring about fair and just systemic change within educational contexts. (L)

Course Outcomes:

Upon completion of this course the student should have the ability to:

1. Define action research. (S)
2. Define the difference between qualitative and quantitative research. (S)
3. Identify four models of action research. (S)
4. Design a research project including:
 - a. formulating thorough, but pertinent, research questions
 - b. conducting literature reviews using electronic resources
 - c. designing and/or choosing effective data collection instruments and procedures
 - d. setting up the procedures regarding 'gaining access' to conduct research within an educational setting (S, I, Ca)
5. Reflectively analyze and develop personal responses to the following questions:
 - a. Why is action research so important in the educational world?
 - b. Historically, why have we accepted some research and rejected others?
 - c. How can the practitioner become a participant-researcher in an action research project?
 - d. What are ways in which action research can be designed and written to impact policy change?
 - e. How can a participant-researcher take on the role of advocacy based upon research findings? (S, I, Ca)

Required Texts:

Mertler, C.A. (2012). *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE publications.

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th reprinted ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Eastern Mennonite University Master of Arts in Education Program (2012). *A guide to action research project*. Harrisonburg, VA: Eastern Mennonite University.

Course Requirements:

1. Attendance in all class sessions. Absences must be kept to a minimum. Please contact the instructor if any absence is anticipated. University policy includes lowering of grade for absences for a day or part of a day. An "A" grade cannot be earned by any student who misses a weekend or the equivalent without the instructor's consent.
2. Participation in class activities designed to increase knowledge about action research.
3. Analysis of course readings. [Textual reading and articles as distributed in class.]
4. Design an action research project proposal. **(Submit each section as instructed below on the following due dates: specific short term assignments may also be included at the instructors discretion):**

- A) Develop the title page, table of contents, and a 2-page mini literature review that includes at least three research references on the topic of the problem you have identified. **Due February 11.**
- B) Write an introduction and literature review draft, all of which will be explained in detail during class. Briefly, the introduction is the part where you give a general rationale for the study and describe the research question. You do not state the research question explicitly yet! The background for the study is developed thorough the literature review with a minimum of 15 research studies. The majority of the studies must be from 2005 or later. Seminal or “ground breaking” studies may be older. The overall purpose and rationale is included in the introduction section. As per APA, do not use explicitly the heading **Introduction** since the opening automatically signals this. Under literature review, a subheading of Research Question will be included. **Due March 3.**
- C) Write the method section of your study. Identify participants including the selection process as applicable. Identify the apparatus you will use including a narrative description for each apparatus used and how data will be collected. Describe your procedures thoroughly. Revise total document into a draft copy of your final proposal. **Due April 14.**
- Final Components: revise steps A-C above. Identify potential limitations of the design of the study. Reflect on contribution of this study to the field of research and include the following: Unsigned permission letters to conduct AR Project in schools, unsigned permission letter to parents of subjects, actual copies of apparatus/instruments used unless they standardized or commercial assessments. In such case, provide a reference for the standardized document. Also include a timeline for your study. Some of these same documents will also be needed to obtain Institutional Review Board approval. **Due May 25, 5:00 p.m. Submit an electronic copy of your final Action Research proposal to Don Steiner. steinerd@emu.edu**

A Guide to Action Research Project contains a rubric entitled *Action Research Proposal Rubric* that will be used by your instructor to assign a grade for your proposal. Once a grade has been assigned and your mentor has signed off on the Institutional Review Board (IRB) *Faculty Approval of Student Research* form, you may submit your application to the IRB for approval to begin your study. Should you choose to conduct your study over the summer months, you should not plan to have official IRB approval before June 15, 2012.

Course Evaluation:

Grades will be submitted May 25, 2012. See Action Research Proposal Rubric. A grade of C+ or better in EDCC 551 Action Research in Educational Settings is required to proceed to EDPC 611 Action Research Project. This includes permission to collect data and to begin working with your assigned mentor. The student is expected to revise the action research proposal until the course instructor determines that a grade of C+ or better has been achieved.

Mentor Assignments:

Upon completion of *EDCC 551 Action Research in Educational Settings*, you will be assigned a mentor by the Director of the M.A. in Education. Your mentor will review your action research proposal and may require revisions prior to signing off on your IRB *Faculty Approval of Student Research* form granting you permission to begin data collection. In most cases the earliest completion date for your final project will be April 2013.

Institutional Review Board:

Action Research proposals are subject to review by the EMU Institutional Review Board. See page 26 of *A Guide to Action Research Project Spring 2012*. More information will be presented near the end of the course regarding the candidate's responsibility for submitting the IRB application.

Editing Service:

Each candidate is offered 4 hours of free editing by an EMU approved editor during *EDPC 611 Action Research Project*. *Note that this support service does not apply to this course.* When the candidate wishes to access the editing service, an electronic copy of the action research paper is submitted to the mentor who then forwards the paper to the editor for editing assistance. The editor provides electronic feedback to the candidate. Additional editing may be arranged between the candidate and the editor, and will be billed to the student's account.

Class Format:

The following learning strategies will be used throughout the class sessions:

- | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| a. lecture | h. group summaries |
| b. lecture-discussion | i. peer critique |
| c. socratic questioning | j. electronic search |
| d. shared inquiry | k. reflective writing |
| e. observational analysis | l. participant-observer research |
| f. jigsaw reading | m. analytical writing |
| g. small group interaction | |

Class Schedule**Session I****Friday, January 20**

Topic: Introduction to Action Research	Activity
---	-----------------

1.0 Class introductions, class norms, expectations, course overview	Shared Inquiry
---	----------------

1.1 Our collective goal: Starting with the "end in mind" Keeping perspective	Shared Inquiry
---	----------------

1.2 What is action research? Traditional research? Purposes of action research (Mertler: Ch. 1)	Online search
--	---------------

key concepts:

models of action research
what action research is
what action research isn't
importance of action research
applications of action research
"rigor" in action research

1.3 Observing and coming up with or refining questions	Shared inquiry & reflection Video/DVD
--	--

1.4 Research topic worksheet: Mertler p. 68 (2 nd ed.); p. 75 (3 rd ed.). Answer 1 & 4 Questions and Activities p. 68 (2 nd ed.); p. 81 (3 rd ed.)	Inquiry
---	---------

Saturday, January 21

1.5 Overview of the Action Research Process

1.6 Sharing research topics

1.7 What is the action research process? (Mertler: Ch. 2)

Small group
Online search &
Shared Inquiry

key concepts:

quantitative research methodologies

qualitative research methodologies

deductive reasoning

inductive reasoning

non-experimental research

1.8 Research Orientation, Question and Topic Search
(EBSCO Host, ERIC, and First Search, conducting
electronic searches, Endnote and other)

Computer lab
Jennifer Ulrich, Library

1.9 Beginning the literature review

Mini-writing lab

Write 3 paragraphs (225 words) connecting the three sources
you retrieved and be prepared to share in small group. (This is a practice
exercise that may be used for Assignment for Session II.)

1.10 Refining the Problem Statements and Writing Clear
Concise Problem

Discussion

Handout 1.1 "Initial Overview and Focusing Question"

Handout 1.2 "Research Problem, Question and Hypothesis"

1.11 Action Research Example

Power Point

1.12 Questions and Answers over Session I

Feedback

**Assignment for Session II-- February 10 & 11: Write a 3-page mini-literature review on
your topic. Your mini-literature review must include 5 sources and follow APA
guidelines complete with title page, correct formatting, and documentation. Attach a
reference page and clearly document your sources according to APA 6th edition.**

**Identify any questions you still have regarding material or concepts in Mertler,
chapters 1-3.**

Read Mertler chapters 4, Developing a Research Plan & 9, Writing Up Action Research

Session II

Friday, February 10, 2012

Topic: Developing a Research Plan

Activity

2.0 Review concepts in Mertler, Chapters 1-3

Group Activity

2.1 Developing a Research Plan—Mertler, Chapter 4

Discussion

2.2 Selecting a research design to match your question

Peer review &
discussion

2.3 Share 3-page mini-literature review on your topic in small group.

Peer Critique &
Feedback

2.4 Settling on your action research question

Sharing

2.5 The Emotional Roller Coaster: Can I Still Do This? Jigsaw

2.6 Overview of APA Manual and APA binder— ppt
<http://gseacademic.harvard.edu/~instruct/articulate/APA/player.html>
<http://www.wisc.edu/writing/Handbook/DocAPA.html>

Saturday, February 11

Topic: Search and Literature Review Activity

2.7 Sharing Research Topics Discussion—Pair

2.8 Defining Key Terms: To be selected

2.9 TBA

2.10 Focus on Mertler, Chapter 9—writing Writing workshop

2.11 Individual Conferences (TBD): Modifications in schedule as appropriate

Assignment for March 2 & 3. Review text (Mertler) Chapters 4 (Basic Research Designs). Propose several instruments or apparatuses you might use for data collection based on your preliminary action research question. Also, read Mertler, chapters 5 & 6. Build your literature review to 10 or more sources.

Session III

Friday, March 2, 2012

Topic: Basic Design and Writing Activity

3.0 Focus on Instrumentation/Apparatus Simulation

3.1 Guidelines for Action Research Proposals: Discussion/Overview

3.2 Methodology: Participants, Apparatus, and Procedures Examination copies

3.3 Follow-up: Topics Document Camera

Saturday, March 3

Topic: Basic Design and Writing Continued Activity

3.4 Individual Conferencing

3.5 Data Collection and Analysis Simulation

3.6 Comparison of Design Models Lecture Discussion

3.7 Questionnaires & Surveys Analysis and Practice

3.8 Case Study Analysis and Practice

3.9 Taking stock of progress

3.10 Topics to be announced

3.11 Individual Conferencing

Assignment for April 13 & 14. Review text (Mertler) as needed. Be prepared to share or demonstrate your instrumentation you plan to use for your data collection based on action research question. Also, read Mertler, chapters 7 & 8. Build your literature review to 20 or more sources. (25 resources expected)

Session IV

Friday, April 13, 2012

Topic: Action Research—Synthesizing the Parts

Activity

4.0 Table discussion on literature reviews to date

Group Work

4.1 Review of methods section to date

Group Work

4.2 Individual Conferences as needed

Saturday, April 14

Topic: Action Research—Synthesizing the Parts

Activity

4.3 AR Presentations TBA

AR Presentations
(2011 group)
Discussion

4.4 Focus on Mertler, Chapter 7

4.5 Critiquing educational research

Group Work

4.6 Organizing raw data

Simulation

4.7 Graphing raw data

Power Point

4.8 Describing Procedure

Writing the Results, Discussion, and Abstract sections

4.8 Sharing of Rough Drafts

4.9 Individual Conferencing

Assignment for May 11 & 12. Review text (Mertler) as needed. Be prepared to share your AR proposal (rough draft) with your prospective mentor)

Session V

Friday, May 11, and Saturday, May 12, 2012

Topic: Action Research—Synthesizing the Parts: Rough Draft

Activity

Meet with mentors either in Session 9 or 10

Topics: TBD

Individual Conferences

Action Research Proposal Rubric (EDCC 551 Action Research in Educational Settings)

Revised 1/14/1

APA 6th edition format expected!

Student: _____ Mentor: _____ Date: _____

DUE:			
	Exemplary - 3	Competent - 2	Does Not Meet Expectations – 1
Title Page	Complete (page header, running head, etc.) and APA format	---	Incomplete or inaccurate information and/or not APA format
Table of Contents	Complete information (headings, page numbers) with APA format	---	Incomplete or inaccurate information and/or not APA format
Statement of the Problem (in Proposal only)	A complete and accurate overview of the problem with framing questions; concisely written (120-word limit)	A complete and accurate overview of the problem with framing questions	Potentially helpful details missing from overview and framing questions

DUE:			
Lit. Review: Introduction of the problem	A complete and accurate introduction of the problem; concisely written	A complete and accurate overview of the problem	Potentially helpful details missing from introduction
Lit. Review: Content, Topics Addressed	Summary of topics provides excellent, thorough background to research question; analyzes/synthesizes strengths and weaknesses of current research	Summary of topics is adequate; sufficient topics included; thorough background completed in relation to research question; author bias removed	Review of literature is incomplete, not broad enough, topics not included, over-reliance on meta-analysis, and/or not written in own words
Lit. Review: Documentation	Tightly, correctly documented according to APA format; consistent with style and flow of writing; accurate citation of sources	Documentation is adequate and follows APA format (year, page, etc.), minimum 20 research and theory-based sources	Documentation contains errors, missing details and/or incorrect APA formatting
Lit. Review: Purpose and rationale	Excellent summary and analysis of main points in literature	Summarizes main points in literature review to support the	Summary of literature review is incomplete, does not adequately

	review of support the intention and reason for the study	intention and reason for the study	support intention and reason for the study
Research Question	Clearly identifies relationship to action research; concise/explicit wording	Relevant to the teacher's classroom/professional practice; clearly identified in paper	Question is vague, poorly worded and/or not identifiable
References	Correct APA formatting used to cite minimum 25+ research and theory-based sources	References cited as per APA; minimum 20 research and theory-based sources	Some references are missing, and/or not all sources are cited, and/or has incorrect APA formatting

DUE:			
Method: Participants	Rich complete description of context of study: school, community, participants, researcher; how participants were selected; <u>maintains anonymity</u>	Adequate description of context of study: school, community, participants, researcher; how participants were selected; <u>maintains anonymity</u>	Incomplete description of context of study, lacks clarity, and/or components are missing

DUE:			
Method: Apparatus	Rich description of purpose and structure of each apparatus; data collection tools ensure validity and reliability; research design addresses research question	Description of purpose and structure is provided; data collection tools ensure validity and reliability; may have small inconsequential errors	Shows careless or little attention to detail; validity and/or reliability is at risk
Method: Procedures	Procedures followed are excellent for fulfilling research needs; written in a detailed, sequential, logical, and easy to follow manner	Procedures followed fulfill research needs; written in a sequential, logical, easy to follow manner; research design is clearly articulated	Procedures are not clear, not sequential, not logical, and/or not coherent; needs more depth in explanation
Appendix: Apparatus	Data collection tools address the research question and ensure	Data collection tools are designed to acquire data that answers the	Shows careless or little attention to detail; validity and/or

	validity and reliability; format enhances purpose of each apparatus	research question (validity and reliability is ensured); format is professional, logical and sequential	reliability is at risk; format detracts from purpose of apparatus
--	--	---	---

DUE:			
Method: Limitations (to be re-written in Discussion)	Shows in-depth reflective thinking and analysis about methodology	Shows reflective thinking about methodology	Inadequately addresses limitations of methodology
Method: Contribution to Field of Research (to be re-written in Discussion)	Shows analysis of connection of action research to current field of research	Shows understanding of connection of action research to current field of research	Inadequately connects action research to field of research
Appendix: Permission Letters	Procedures establish sacred trust and respect participant involvement; ensure anonymity and confidentiality	Permission is requested from all participants; identifies purpose and procedure of study; anonymity, confidentiality, ethical issues are addressed	Procedures are not sufficiently articulated; participant anonymity and confidentiality is at risk
Appendixes	Formatted and cited in text per APA standards	Format and citation is technically correct, presentation could be slightly improved	Appendixes missing and/or not cited per APA standards

WRITING STANDARDS APPLY TO ALL SUBMISSIONS:			
APA Technical Standards	Exceptional technical writing standards met	Technical writing standards met (page header, running head, citations, references, etc.)	Technical writing standards require improvement and/or are not met
*Content (quality of the information/ideas and sources/details used to support them)	Has clarity of purpose; has depth of content; displays insight and originality of thought; demonstrates quality and breadth of resources	Has clarity of purpose; has substantial information and sufficient support; contains originality of thought; uses quality resources	Has clarity of purpose; lacks depth of content and may depend on generalities or the commonplace; has little originality of thought; uses mostly quality resources
*Structure (logical order or sequence of the	Is coherent and logically developed; uses very effective	Is coherent and logically developed; uses smooth transitions	Is coherent and logically (but not fully) developed; has some

writing)	transitions		awkward transitions
*Conventions (appearance of the writing: sentence structure, usage, mechanics, documentation)	Has virtually no errors of conventions	Has minimal errors of conventions	Is understandable <u>but</u> has noticeable problems of sentence structure, usage, mechanics or documentation
*Style (personality of the writing: word choice, sentence variety, voice, attention to audience)	Is concise, eloquent and rhetorically effective; has nicely varied sentence structure; is engaging and thought-provoking	Displays concern for careful expression; has some variation in sentence structure; is engaging	Has some personality <u>but</u> lacks imagination and may be stilted and may rely on clichés; has little variation in sentence structure; is not very interesting to read

*taken from EMU's Writing Standards – Graduate Level

The final action research proposal, with all components and revisions, is due 3 weeks after the last EDCC 551 class session. The student is expected to revise the action research proposal until the course instructor determines that a grade of C+ or better has been achieved.

After receiving instructor feedback on the final course assignment, the student should expect another round of revisions to be reviewed by the instructor before a course grade is given. It is reasonable to expect that course grades will be submitted by June 30, 2010.

The instructor will submit a final grade for EDCC 551, calculated as follows.

Calculation of the Rubric Score:

Total rubric points earned: _____ / 66

Divided by the number of rubric categories: _____ / 22

Equals Average Rubric Score: _____

Final Grade Calculation:

Based on Calculation of the Rubric Score, grades will be allocated as follows:

Rubric score average:	Grade:
3-2.4	A
2.2-2.3	A-
2.1	B+
2.0	B
1.9	B-
1.8	C+
1.7 and below	Unacceptable

A grade of C+ or better in EDCC 551 Action Research in Educational Settings is required to proceed to EDPC 611 Action Research Project, begin data collection, **and** begin working with the mentor. The student is expected to revise the action research proposal until the course instructor determines that a grade of C+ or better has been achieved.

Action Research Project (EDPC 611 Action Research Project) Rubric

Student: _____ **Mentor:** _____ **Date:** _____

Title Page (from Proposal)	Complete (page header, running head, etc.) and APA format	---	Incomplete or inaccurate information and/or not APA format
Table of Contents (from Proposal)	Complete information (headings, page numbers) with APA format	---	Incomplete or inaccurate information and/or not APA format
Abstract (replaces Statement of Problem from Proposal)	A complete and accurate reflection with excellent overview of all components of action research; concisely written	A complete and accurate reflection and overview of action research; 120 words limit	Potentially helpful details missing from accurate reflection and overview of action research
Lit. Review: Introduction of the problem (from Proposal)	A complete and accurate introduction of the problem; concisely written	A complete and accurate overview of the problem	Potentially helpful details missing from introduction
Research Question	Clearly identifies relationship to action research; concise/explicit wording	Relevant to the teacher's classroom/professional practice; clearly identified in paper	Question is vague, poorly worded and/or not identifiable
Lit Review: Content, Topics Addressed (enhanced from Proposal)	Summary of topics provides excellent, thorough background and rationale to research question; analyzes/synthesizes strengths and weaknesses of current research	Summary of topics is adequate; sufficient topics included; thorough background and rationale completed in relation to research question; author bias removed	Review of literature is incomplete, not broad enough, topics not included, over-reliance on meta-analysis, and/or not written in own words
Lit Review: Documentation (enhanced from Proposal)	Tightly, correctly documented according to APA format; consistent with style and flow of writing; accurate citation of sources	Documentation is adequate and follows APA format (year, page, etc.), minimum 20 research and theory-based sources	Documentation contains errors, missing details and/or incorrect APA formatting
Lit. Review: Purpose and rationale (from	Excellent summary and analysis of main points in literature	Summarizes main points in literature review to support the	Summary of literature review is incomplete, does not adequately

Proposal)	review of support the intention and reason for the study	intention and reason for the study	support intention and reason for the study
Method: Participants (enhanced from Proposal)	Rich complete description of context of study: school, community, participants, researcher; how participants were selected; <u>maintains anonymity</u>	Adequate description of context of study: school, community, participants, researcher; how participants were selected; <u>maintains anonymity</u>	Incomplete description of context of study, lacks clarity, and/or components are missing
Method: Apparatus (enhanced from Proposal)	Rich description of purpose and structure of each apparatus; data collection tools ensure validity and reliability; research design addresses research question	Description of purpose and structure is provided; data collection tools ensure validity and reliability; may have small inconsequential errors	Shows careless or little attention to detail; validity and/or reliability is at risk
Method: Procedures (enhanced from Proposal)	Procedures followed are excellent for fulfilling research needs; written in a detailed, sequential, logical, and easy to follow manner	Procedures followed fulfill research needs; written in a sequential, logical, easy to follow manner; research design is clearly articulated	Procedures are not clear, not sequential, not logical, and/or not coherent; needs more depth in explanation
Method: Limitations (enhanced from proposal)	Shows in-depth reflective thinking and analysis about methodology	Shows reflective thinking about how limitations in proposal were addressed, in past tense	Inadequately addresses limitations of methodology
Results	Findings are accurately and thoroughly reported from each apparatus; care for accurate detail is given; includes computer-generated charts/graphs	Findings are reported from each apparatus; includes computer-generated charts/graphs that are easy to understand	Findings need elaboration; may include inaccuracies, and/or are not easy to understand
Results: Tables and Figures	Accurately report and label research; completely conforms	Generally report and label research; conforms to APA	Tables and figures are present but may include inaccurate

	to APA standards	standards	reporting, and/or does not conform to APA standards
Discussion	Results reflect thorough and clear discussion; includes pros and cons of findings; answers and analyzes research question	Results generally discussed, includes pros and cons of findings; answers research question	Results poorly discussed, difficult to comprehend and relate to findings of study, may not include pros or cons of findings, and/or research question not answered
Discussion: Implications of Study	Implications for this study and future research considerations are clearly identified and analyzed	Implications for this study and future research considerations are identified	Either the implications for this study or future research considerations were not identified or are sketchy
Discussion: Contribution to Field of Research (revised and relocated from proposal)	Shows analysis of connection of action research to current field of research	Shows understanding of connection of action research to current field of research	Inadequately connects action research to field of research
References (enhanced from Proposal)	Correct APA formatting used to cite minimum 25+ research and theory-based sources	References cited as per APA; minimum 20 research and theory-based sources	Some references are missing, and/or not all sources are cited, and/or has incorrect APA formatting
Appendix: Permission Letters (enhanced from Proposal)	Procedures establish sacred trust and respect participant involvement; ensure anonymity and confidentiality	Permission is requested from all participants; identifies purpose and procedure of study; anonymity, confidentiality, ethical issues are addressed	Procedures are not sufficiently articulated; participant anonymity and confidentiality is at risk
Appendix: Apparatus (enhanced from Proposal)	Data collection tools address the research question and ensure validity and reliability; format enhances purpose of each apparatus	Data collection tools are designed to acquire data that answers the research question (validity and reliability is ensured); format is professional, logical and sequential	Shows careless or little attention to detail; validity and/or reliability is at risk; format detracts from purpose of apparatus
Appendixes	Formatted and cited in text per APA standards	Format and citation is technically correct, presentation could be	Appendixes missing and/or not cited per APA standards

		slightly improved	
WRITING STANDARDS APPLY TO ENTIRE PAPER:			
APA Technical Standards	Exceptional technical writing standards met	Technical writing standards met (page header, running head, citations, references, etc.)	Technical writing standards require improvement and/or are not met
*Content (quality of the information/ideas and sources/details used to support them)	Has clarity of purpose; has depth of content; displays insight or originality of thought; demonstrates quality and breadth of resources	Has clarity of purpose; has substantial information and sufficient support; contains originality of thought; uses quality resources	Has clarity of purpose; lacks depth of content and may depend on generalities or the commonplace; has little originality of thought; uses mostly quality resources
*Structure (logical order or sequence of the writing)	Is coherent and logically developed; uses very effective transitions	Is coherent and logically developed; uses smooth transitions	Is coherent and logically (but not fully) developed; has some awkward transitions
*Conventions (appearance of the writing: sentence structure, usage, mechanics, documentation)	Has virtually no errors of conventions	Has minimal errors of conventions	Is understandable <u>but</u> has noticeable problems of sentence structure, usage, mechanics or documentation
*Style (personality of the writing: word choice, sentence variety, voice, attention to audience)	Is concise, eloquent and rhetorically effective; has nicely varied sentence structure; is engaging and thought-provoking	Displays concern for careful expression; has some variation in sentence structure; is engaging	Has some personality <u>but</u> lacks imagination and may be stilted and may rely on clichés; has little variation in sentence structure; is not very interesting to read

*taken from EMU's Writing Standards – Graduate Level

Calculation of the Rubric Score:

Total rubric points earned: _____ / 78

Divided by the number of rubric categories: _____ / 26

Equals Average Rubric Score: _____

Grade Calculation:

Based on Calculation of the Rubric Score, grades will be allocated as follows:

Rubric score average: Grade:

3 - 2.5	A
2.4	A-
2.3	B+
2.2- 2.1	C+
2.0 below	Unacceptable

A grade of C+ or better in EDPC 611 Action Research Project is required to receive credit for the course. The student is expected to revise the action research project until the mentor determines that a grade of C or better has been achieved. A grade of C+ is required for enrollment in the Action Research Project.

Additional Readings:

- Anderson, G., Herr, K., & Nihlen, A. (1994). *Studying your own school: An educator's guide to practitioner research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- 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.
- Burns, A. (1999). Definitions and processes. In *Collaborative action research for English language teachers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bush, J. (2000). "Here's what I did:" Making "sharing" research meaningful for teaching. *English Education*.
- Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1993). Action research in education. In Martyn Hammersley (Ed.), *Controversies in classroom research* (2nd ed., pp. 235-245). Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Certo, J. L., & Fox, J. E. (2002). Retaining quality teachers [Electronic version]. *High School Journal*, 86(1), pp. 57-76.
- Chattin-McNichols, J., & Loeffler, M. H. (1989, July). Teachers as researchers: The first cycle of the teachers' research network. *Young Children*, 10-27.
- Elliott, J. (1991). A practical guide to action research. In *Action research for educational change*. Bristol, PA: Open University Press.
- Elliott, J. (1991). The dilemmas and temptations of the reflective practitioner. In *Action research for educational change*. Bristol, PA: Open University Press.
- Elliott, J. (1991). The fundamental characteristics of action research. In *Action research for educational change* (pp. 49-56). Bristol, PA: Open University Press.
- Hobson, D. (1996). Learning with each other: Collaboration in teacher research. In G. Burnaford, J. Fischer, & D. Hobson (Eds.), *Teachers doing research* (pp. 93-108). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hopkins, D. (1993). Why classroom research by teachers? In *A teacher's guide to classroom research* (pp. 32-41). Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

- Hostetler, K. (2005). What is “good” education research? *Educational Researcher*, 34(6), 16-21.
- Kim, J. S. & Sunderman, G. L. (2005). Measuring academic proficiency under the No Child Left Behind Act: Implications for educational equity. *Educational Researcher*, (34)8, 3-13.
- Klingner, J. K. Scanlon, D., & Pressley, M. (2005). How to publish in scholarly journals. *Educational Researcher*, 34(8), 14-19.
- McLaughlin, C. (2005). The feeling of finding out: The role of emotions in research. *Educational Action Research*, 11(1), 65-77.
- Pogrow, S. (1996). Reforming the wannabe reformers: Why education reform almost always end up making things worse. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77(10), 656-663.
- Rager, K. B. (2005). Self-care and the qualitative researcher: When collecting data can break your heart. *Educational Researcher*, (34)4, 23-27.
- Rogers, C. (1992). Research into teachers’ expectations and their effects. In M. Hammersley (Ed.), *Case studies in classroom research* (pp.159-179). Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Schoen, F., & Schoen, A. (2003). Action research in the classroom: Assisting linguistically different learner with special needs. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 35(3), 16-25.
- Smeltzer Erb, C. (1998). Improving the motivation of a general level student. *Orbit*, 29(3), 44-45.
- Sullivan, P., & Elifson, K. In the field with snake handlers. In C. Smith & W. Kornblum (Eds.), *In the field: Readings on the field research experience* (33-38). Westport, CT: Praeger.