

2012-2013 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
 MA in Education, Special Education Concentration Program

Introduction: The 30-unit Masters in Education, Special Education Concentration program is integrally related to the special education credential programs offered by the College of Education. Candidates admitted to the MA program are either concurrently enrolled in the Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Credential program, the Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Credential program or the Early Childhood Special Education in the College of Education at CSUS or have completed a California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) approved Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe, and/or Early Childhood Education Specialist Credential program prior to being considered for the MA. Admittance priority is given to applicants who are CSU Sacramento credential students or graduates. Candidates in the program have three options for their culminating requirement: a comprehensive written exam, a project or a thesis.

There is a program coordinator who works collaboratively with members of the Special Education Area Group (SEAG), which is comprised of faculty teaching in the three education specialist credential programs, to review candidate applications, advise students, score MA comprehensive exam responses, and sponsor MA thesis or projects, and to evaluate the program.

Please see Table One below for the current program learning outcomes and Table Two for number of candidates completing the program in Spring/Summer 2012, Fall 2012, and Spring 2013.

Table One: Program Learning Outcomes

		Learning Outcomes
#1: Expertise	Knowledge	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands different models of curriculum design as well as the different schools of curriculum development.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands different special education instructional models and corresponding derivatives and modifications.
	Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses technology to locate and access resources on curriculum and instruction.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reads and analyzes literature on curriculum and instruction
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a special education theoretical framework for the coherence of all components in a curriculum, components being: student characteristics, content discipline, standards and frameworks, materials, instructional strategies, environment, and evaluation.
	Dispositions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approaches knowledge as dynamic, not static.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Becomes reflective professional able to evaluate special education policies and practices critically using research to support position
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Becomes empowered to make decisions on curriculum and instruction that meets the needs of students.

# 2: Leadership/ Change Agent	Knowledge	• Understands the school as an American institution with a history of social inequity.
		• Understands the nature of institutional change per special education.
	Skills	• Does a critical review and analysis of special education issues and trends.
		• Develops a logical argument as to changes that can be made in special education through curriculum development and implementation.
	Dispositions	• Collaborates with others in informing public about special education problems with schools.
		• Takes the initiative in planning for an effective staff development on special education curriculum and instruction that is research based.

#3: Intellectual Curiosity	Knowledge	• Understands how past and current political and economic factors (among others) affect special education and its implementation
	Skills	• Studies and questions existing special education practices and looks for appropriate solutions.
		• Assesses existing curriculum and its impact on student learning and overall goals of special education.
	Dispositions	• Values and problematizes the scientific method of gathering information and gaining knowledge.
		• Takes a broad-minded approach to special education issues and suspends closure.

#4: Research: Qualitative and Quantitative	Knowledge	• Knows the basic processes of experimental research and other quantitative methods.
		• Knows the principles of a variety of qualitative methods including ethnography, action research, and narrative research
	Skills	• Can apply basic statistical tools to interpret numerical data
		• Can apply principled qualitative data collection and analysis strategies and tools.
	Dispositions	• Values the importance of using valid and reliable data collection tools.
		• Values the importance of making valid conclusions and inferences from data.

#5: Academic Writing	Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knows the conventions of a variety of academic genres (e.g. the teacher research report, the traditional journal article, the review of literature.)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands APA format and principles regulating titles and headings, documentations, and related matters.
	Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can apply productive informal writing strategies as tools for learning and for research.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can compose academic prose for a variety of audiences including peers, professors, and the larger scholarly and professional community.
	Dispositions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes participation in the special education academic discourse community.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes collaboration, peer review (in classrooms and out), vigorous and rigorous analysis of evidence.

Table Two: Candidates Who Completed the MA Program, 2012-2013

	Spring/Summer 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013
Number candidates completing the program	21	3	20

1. As a result of last year’s assessment effort, have you implemented any changes for your assessment including learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment tools (methods, rubrics, curriculum map, or key assignment, etc.), and/or the university baccalaureate learning goals?

One tool that has been changed is the Applicant Review Sheet and Rating Rubric for the Special Education Master’s Admissions Fall 2013 (please see Appendix A)

2. As a result of last year’s assessment effort, have you implemented any other changes at the department, the college or the university, including advising, co-curriculum, budgeting and planning?

Due to the reorganization of the College of Education, the MA in Education, Special Education Concentration program is now housed in Graduate and Professional Studies in Education. The reorganization resulted in a change of department leadership and faculty members from this program now have new department colleagues. The program coordinator meets on a monthly basis with other coordinators in Graduate and Professional Studies in Education and the program faculty continues to meet as a group once a month to review program data, discuss program issues, and implement any necessary revisions.

One of the collaborative efforts that occurred during the COE reorganization was the development of a cross-disciplinary 3 unit pro-seminar, EDGR 260: Writing and Research Across Disciplines. This writing intensive course will be considered a core required course and will also fulfill the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR).

In addition to the insertion of this core course to the program sequence, the faculty took the opportunity to make some additional changes in the curriculum as a result of previous assessment efforts. These changes are currently being reviewed by the University Curriculum Subcommittee and the plan is to have these changes be in effect for students admitted to the MA program for Fall 2013. These program changes are as follows:

- With the addition of another 3 unit core course, the content knowledge elective requirement will change from 15 to 18 units to 12 to 15 units. (Note: Variable units are due to the unit requirements for culminating experience selected; EDS 500: MA thesis and EDS 501: MA project require 6 units; EDS 298: MA seminar in special education/exam requires 3 units.)
 - For students concurrently in Mild/Moderate Credential Program, EDS 276 A/B is required and then they can select the remaining content elective units from the following: EDS 220, EDS 221, EDS 225A/B, EDS 229A/B, EDS 230 A/B, EDS 237A/B, EDS 292A/B and/or as approved by advisor.
 - For students concurrently in Moderate/Severe Credential Program, they can select from the following courses for the content knowledge elective units: EDS 205, EDS 206, EDS 207, EDS 208, EDS 209, EDS 216A/B, EDS 218, EDS 220, EDS 221, EDS 230A/B, EDS 292 A/B and/or as approved by advisor.
 - For students concurrently in Early Childhood Special Education Credential Program, they can select from the following courses for the content knowledge elective units: EDS 201A/B, EDS 209, EDS 210A/B, EDS 211A/B, EDS 212A/B, EDS 216A/B, EDS 230A/B and/or as approved by advisor.
- Students will need to complete their content knowledge elective courses, student teaching/internship and EDGR 260 as prerequisites to EDS 250, EDS 251 and EDS 297. The justification for this change is that students need to have the content knowledge from the elective courses, to have successfully completed student teaching/internship and to complete the writing intensive course in order to be successful in the other core MA courses and the culminating experience.
- Students must advance to candidacy prior to enrolling in the MA core classes (EDS 250, EDS 251, EDS 297) and culminating experience (EDS 298, EDS 500, and/or EDS 501). The justification for this change is that students will have completed the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) and completed at least 12 units in the graduate program by the time they would enroll in these classes.
- EDS 298, Master's Seminar in Special Education is currently a 3 unit, credit/no credit course. The proposed change is to have it be a graded course in order to reflect the required assignments to prepare for the written comprehensive exam.

Finally, in response to the Faculty Senate’s recent recommendation clarifying the acceptance of “C” grades toward a graduate degree, another program change has been to add the following language to our program description regarding degree requirements:

- A cumulative 3.0 GPA or higher in all coursework;
- No single course in which a student receives a grade below B- will be counted as credit toward the degree unless the student has petitioned for acceptance of the course, and the petition has been accepted and approved by the Special Education faculty.

3. What PROGRAM (not course) learning outcome(s) have you assessed this academic year?

All program learning outcomes have been assessed this year through two key assessments that are used to make critical decisions about the candidate learning and competence prior to being recommended for an MA: Review of Literature and the Culminating Experience. Table Three below provides additional details about the nature of each of these key assessments.

Table Three: Overview of Key Assessments for M.A. in Special Education Program

Assessment Tool	Type of Assessment (formative/summative)	When administered	Details about Administration	Learning Outcomes Addressed
Assessment #1. Review of Literature	Formative	During a course (EDS 250) often taken in the penultimate semester of the program	Course instructor assesses work based on a rubric designed by faculty (See Appendix B for example of rubric)	Program Learning Outcomes 1, 3 & 5
Assessment #2. Culminating Experiences (Thesis, Project or Comprehensive Exam	Summative	During courses (EDS 298, or 500, and 501) in the final phase of the program	Faculty advisors assess performance based on criteria designed by department and university (See Appendix C for guidelines/rubric for rating individual student responses to MA culminating exam questions)	Program Learning Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5

As summarized in Table Two, our program had 21 program completers in Spring/Summer 2012, 3 program completers in Fall 2012, and 20 program completers in Spring 2013. In Table Four below, we summarize the data related to performance as measured by the 2 key assessments detailed in Table Three.

Table Four: Aggregate Data on Students and/or Program Completers

Assessment Tools	Spring/Summer 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013
Assessment #1. Review of Literature Related to Special Education Issue/Topics	NA for this semester (Special Ed. MA students take in Fall semester)	N=28 % earned grade of A= 75% % earned grade of A-= 7% % earned grade of B+=11% % earned grade of B-= 7%	NA for this semester (Special Ed. MA students take in Fall semester)
Assessment #2. Culminating Experiences (% approved thesis or project; and/or % passed 4 out of 5 written exam responses)	For MA comprehensive exam: N=18; % passed= 100% For MA Thesis/Project: N=3; % approved=100%	For MA comprehensive exam: N=1; % passed= 100% For MA Thesis/Project: N=2; % approved=100%	For MA comprehensive exam: N=19; % passed= 90% For MA Thesis/Project: N=3; % approved=100%

4. What method(s)/measure(s) have you used to collect the data? See Table Three.

5. What are the criteria and/or standards of performance for the program learning outcome? See Table Three.

6. What data have you collected? What are the results and findings, including percentage of students who meet each standard? See Table Four.

a. In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations?

Overall, candidate performance on the key assessments reveals a high degree of success in the areas measured by these indicators. More specifically, program completers are meeting the SEAG Learning Outcomes of Expertise, Leadership/Change Agent, Intellectual Curiosity, Quantitative and Qualitative Research, and Academic Writing as demonstrated on both formative and summative assessments at various points in the program.

b. In what areas do students need improvement?

One area for improvement is related to candidate performance on the formative assessment, the review of literature assignment that candidates complete while enrolled in EDS 250: Education Research. The SEAG faculty proposed the addition to the core curriculum of EDGR 260: Writing and Research Across Disciplines to not only fulfill the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR), but also to assist candidates in increasing their skills in evaluating, synthesizing and writing about research related to special education topics.

7. As a result of this year's assessment effort, do you anticipate or propose any changes for you program (e.g., structures, content, or learning outcomes)?

a. If so, what changes do you anticipate? How do you plan to implement those changes?

As a result of this year's assessment efforts, it is proposed that the SEAG faculty will review the current program learning outcomes and revise/update them in Fall 2013. It is anticipated that based on the revised learning outcomes as well as the implementation of the revisions to the program, the assessment measures and criteria for performance will change accordingly. For example, a key assessment will be added in relation to EDGR 260, the graduate writing intensive course that the MA candidates will begin taking in Fall 2013.

b. How do you know if these changes will achieve the desired results?

Any new assessment tools will be pilot tested in 2013-2014 to determine whether they provide us with appropriate, meaningful data from which to guide candidate development and to assist in making other program decisions.

8. Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year? How?

The program will continue to assess all learning outcomes and revise assessments as the learning outcomes are reviewed and assessed in Fall 2013.

Appendix A

Special Education Master's Admissions Fall 2013: Applicant Review Sheet & Rating Rubric

Applicant's Name _____

Applicant's Sac ID # _____

Departmental Reviewer _____

Reviewer's Signature _____ Date _____

Elements for Reviewing Master's Applicants

Rating

GPA	GPA for Last 60 units of university/college coursework _____ 3.0 or higher required			
	<input type="checkbox"/> New CSUS Credential Applicant/Concurrent MA Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Current CSUS Preliminary Credential Candidate <input type="checkbox"/> CSUS Preliminary Credential Holder/Readmit (1-2 yrs) <input type="checkbox"/> CSUS Preliminary Credential Holder/Readmit (3+ yrs) <input type="checkbox"/> Non-CSUS Preliminary Credential Holder	M/M <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Mod/S <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ECSE <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
(2) Current Letters of Recommendation or Evaluator Rating Forms	1. Letters are current (within 2 years) specific per application & address field and/or academic skills. -OR- 2. <i>Evaluator Rating Form</i> (for applicants currently in CSUS special education credential program)			
Essay	Essays address the applicant's goals as a MA student and show evidence of graduate level writing skills.			
TOTAL				

The Rating Rubric on the next page is used to establish ratings in each of the above categories, and then all applicants are rank ordered for OGS according to over-all/total score achieved.

REVIEWER NOTES:

Master's in Special Education: Applicant Rating Rubric 2013

Revised 4/15/13 JGG

Elements for Review	9-10 Outstanding	7-8 Good	5 - 6 Satisfactory	3-4 Weak	1-2 Deny
Last 60 units GPA	3.75- 4.0	3.5- 3.74	3.25 -3.4 or justifying evidence for GPA 3.0 – 3.4	3.0 – 3.24	Below 3.0
Credential Status (CA)	Currently in CSUS preliminary credential program or New TPAC applicant	Past CSUS credential candidate/Readmit (1-2 yrs)	Past CSUS Credential Candidate/Readmit (3+ yrs)	Non-CSUS preliminary credential holders	No evidence of CA special education credential or enrollment plan in CSUS programs
Letters of Recommendation or Evaluator Rating	2 current letters/evaluator forms from appropriate sources with attention to appropriate experience, academic ability and motivation	1-2 letters /evaluator forms or e-mails with attention to appropriate experience, academic ability and motivation	1-2 letters /evaluator forms or e-mails with general indication of support	No written recommendations or evaluator forms OR letters /evaluator form with weak explanations as a basis for support	Letter(s)/evaluator forms from inappropriate sources, weak evidence of support OR no written recommendations
Essay	Evidence of high level graduate writing skills and critical thinking (OR Evidence of graduate WPG or other proficiency measure) Evidence of strong commitment to ongoing professional growth OR Evidence of WPG or other proficiency measure	Evidence of high level graduate writing skills Evidence of commitment to ongoing professional growth	Evidence of adequate graduate level writing skills Essay may be vague in terms of applicant's goals.	Inadequate skills at written English at a graduate level Essay does not address professional goals and may simply state a wish for an MA.	Evidence of poor graduate level writing skills OR Essay not included

Appendix B

Review of the Literature: A Set of Rubrics EDS 250

This set of rubrics are intended to support special education graduate students in writing an effective review of the literature to serve as Chapter 2 in a thesis or project or alternative culminating experience in the College of Education at California State University, Sacramento. The set is not exhaustive and does not address all of the issues a faculty adviser or faculty second reader may consider, especially regarding content, reasoning, and analysis. Further, if there is a conflict between any aspect of this rubric and aspects pointed out by the faculty adviser and/or department chair, students are expected to privilege the advice of the adviser and/or chair.

The rubrics are built around five guiding questions, each of which is discussed generally below:

- How well does the review discuss the literature?
 - The emphasis in this question is placed on the word “discuss.” Academic discussions usually develop themes, elaborate on connections, raise concerns and questions, point out similarities and differences, evaluate the logic and force of theoretical arguments, and the like. Reviews that simply list or summarize studies need revision.
- How well does the review express ideas and reduce bias in language?
 - This question focuses on elements of writing including diction, cohesion and coherence, syntactic conventions and style, and sensitivity to fairness in references to people in groups of various kinds.
- How well is the information organized?
 - This question asks writers to consider the overall structure of the text with particular attention to cues that guide readers to the varying levels of importance of ideas.
- How well and fully documented is the review?
 - This question gets at the heart of a review of the literature in that it asks writers to do a thorough yet carefully focused search of the literature as a foundation for the discussion. It also requires writers to understand the nature of plagiarism and to avoid it in the paper. Finally it requires writers to construct and present full citations in a Reference List according to APA guidelines.
- How well does the review follow APA Editorial Style?
 - This question points to the need to pay close attention to the surface elements of text to ensure that conventions valued by the academic community are not violated (e.g., punctuation, hyphenation, spelling, abbreviations, headings, etc.)

Guiding Question 1: How well does the review discuss the literature?

Needs Revision	Acceptable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discusses literature tangentially relevant to the research question or problem or includes literature for purely historical reasons • Cites irrelevant work or leaves the task of discovering relevance to the reader • Emphasizes irrelevant findings and conclusions or includes nonessential details • Lists summaries or reports of referenced works as isolated pieces of information • Provides too much or insufficient elaboration (writes for a non-professional or narrow audience) • Treats controversies or other information in the research with bias or engages in ad hominem attacks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discusses the literature pertinent to the research question or problem while avoiding an exhaustive historical review • Cites works directly relevant to the issues under study and explains or highlights their relevance • Emphasizes relevant findings and conclusions from previous research while avoiding nonessential details • Develops logical connections among referenced works past and present as they relate to the research question or problem (i.e., uses the literature to build a theoretical argument or framework) • Elaborates on ideas sufficiently for the widest possible professional audience while avoiding “a complete digest” (APA, p. 71) • Treats controversies in the research fairly and avoids ad hominem attacks

Guiding Question 2: How well does the review express ideas and reduce bias in language?

Needs Revision	Acceptable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents ideas more or less randomly with some discontinuity in words, concepts, and thematic development • Communicates information with abrupt shifts between topics or subtopics • Demonstrates one or more of the following: “redundancy, wordiness, jargon, evasiveness, overuse of the passive voice, circumlocution, and clumsy prose” (APA, pp. 67-68) • Present ideas unconventionally either occasionally or consistently • Uses words that are not fair to individuals/groups (describes at appropriate level of specificity, is sensitive to labels, acknowledges participation, avoids ambiguity in sex identity/role, uses preferred terms to refer to sexual orientation, demonstrates specificity and sensitivity in references to racial/ethnic identity, uses “nonhandicapping” language refers appropriately to age (APA, pp. 71-77) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents ideas in an order and “...aim[s] for continuity in words, concepts, and thematic development from the opening statement to the conclusion” (APA, p. 65) • Communicates information smoothly through transitions from one topic or subtopic to the next • Presents ideas economically and avoids “redundancy, wordiness, jargon, evasiveness, overuse of the passive voice, circumlocution, and clumsy prose” (APA, p. 67) • Presents ideas conventionally (use of verbs, subject-verb agreement, pronoun-antecedent agreement, use of modifiers, use of relative pronouns and subordinate conjunctions, parallel construction) (APA, pp. 77-86) • Uses words that are fair to individuals/groups (describes at appropriate level of specificity, is sensitive to labels, acknowledges participation, avoids ambiguity in sex identity/role, uses preferred terms to refer to sexual orientation, demonstrates specificity and sensitivity in references to racial/ethnic identity, uses “nonhandicapping” language, refers appropriately to age (APA, pp. 71-77)

Guiding Question 3: How well is the information organized?

Needs Revision	Acceptable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops ideas in one continuous chunk or in overlapping chunks or in sections not clearly marked • If sections are present, may have one or more sections with only one subheading • Outline of the hierarchy of ideas is not clear nor marked by headings and subheadings • May present topics or ideas of equal importance at unequal heading levels or may not mark topics or ideas of equal importance at all • May not use tables or figures when appropriate or may use them but not tell the reader what to look for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops ideas in clearly marked sections • Develops each section with either no subsections or at least two subsections (APA, p. 62) • Outlines the hierarchy of ideas in the review by using headings to convey the sequence and levels of importance (APA, p. 62) • Presents topics of equal importance at the same heading level throughout the review (APA, pp. 62-63) • Uses tables and/or figures to summarize ideas when appropriate and “always tell[s] the reader what to look for... and provides sufficient explanation to make them readily intelligible” (APA, p. 125)

Guiding Question 4: How well and fully documented is the review?

Needs Revision	Acceptable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cites and discusses few or no reports of empirical studies relevant to the research question or problem • Refers to and discusses few relevant review articles when these articles are available • Cites and uses few or no relevant theoretical articles, methodological articles, and case studies when these articles are available • Uses quotations when paraphrase is appropriate or quotes inaccurately and/or unconventionally or distorts meaning through ellipsis • Does not credit all sources (plagiarism) • Uses reference citations in text inappropriately • Presents an incomplete reference list or presents a bibliography or presents citations unconventionally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cites and discusses reports of empirical studies relevant to the research question or problem • Refers to and discusses relevant review articles • Cites and uses relevant theoretical articles, methodological articles, and case studies as appropriate • Uses quotations appropriately, accurately, and conventionally (APA, pp. 117 – 120) • Credits all sources whether paraphrasing or quoting • Uses reference citations appropriately in text (APA, pp. 207 – 214) • Presents a reference list (not a bibliography) including “works that specifically support” the review (APA, p. 215)

Guiding Question 5: How well does the review follow APA Editorial Style?

Needs Revision	Acceptable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates occasional or consistent noncompliance with the APA Editorial Guidelines “to ensure clear, consistent presentation of the printed word” in matters of punctuation, hyphenation, spelling, abbreviations, tables, headings, grammar, citations, and references (APA, p. 77) • Presents statistics in text in a manner that conflicts with APA conventions (pp. 138 – 147) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates compliance with the APA Editorial Guidelines “to ensure clear, consistent presentation of the printed word” in matters of punctuation, hyphenation, spelling, abbreviations, tables, headings, grammar, citations, and references (APA, p. 77) • Presents statistics in text in accordance with APA conventions (pp. 138 – 147)

Appendix C

Please put the Student's Code Number here: _____

Indicate which question you are scoring here: _____
(for example, Cross categorical # 3)

Special Education Master's Comprehensive Exam Guidelines for Rating Individual Student Responses

<p>Student does not attempt to answer the question or only restates the question; content is deficient. Student response is significantly below passing.</p>	<p>Ratings: 0-3.0</p>
<p>Student attempts to answer the question but misses the point of the question, fails to address significant components of the question, includes misinformation on important points or fails to respond in a coherent manner. Citations are missing or inaccurate. Student response is significantly below passing.</p>	<p>Ratings: 3.1-6.0</p>
<p>Student answers the question partially. Minor points may be incorrect, but most points are accurately described and cited. On the whole, the answer is coherent, but it does not demonstrate an ability to analyze or synthesize information. It may be simply a list of definitions or citations. It may be characterized by poor organization, many grammatical errors, diction problems or confused word choice. Student response is below passing/marginal.</p>	<p>Ratings: 6.1-7.9</p>
<p>Student answers the question adequately. Minor points may be incorrect or missing, but important points are accurately explained and cited. The answer is not sophisticated but demonstrates basic knowledge of the topic and ability to analyze and synthesize. There may be some grammatical errors, but they do not interfere with the discussion. Student is Marginal/passing.</p>	<p>Ratings: 8.0-8.4</p>

<p>Student answers the question, addressing all major points. The answer is organized, coherent accurately cited, and generally well-written. The discussion demonstrates an understanding of the issues and an ability to analyze and synthesize information. A personal position is provided but may not be clearly supported by the discussion. Student response is passing.</p>	<p>8.5-8.9</p>
<p>Student answers the question fully and demonstrates an ability to synthesize information from a variety of sources. The response is well-written and generally error-free. It includes accurate citations and clear and convincing support as rationale for a personal position. Student response is a high pass.</p>	<p>9.0-9.4</p>
<p>Student answers in a sophisticated style using citations, data and/or other sources to effectively support arguments. Essentially, the response is error-free and may be highly creative. The answer demonstrates an exceptional ability to integrate theory and practice in support of a personal position which may or may not be controversial student response is worthy of acknowledgement as a merit pass.</p>	<p>9.5-10</p>