



## **Student Development in Higher Education Program**

*Signature Assignment for SDHE 548*

*Qualitative Research Project on Student Subpopulation*

### **Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed:**

SLO #5: Demonstrate understanding of student affairs scholarship in the analyses, syntheses, and evaluation of current research as part of the design and implementation of formative evaluations and research projects.

### **Description of the Signature Assignment**

Students will prepare a group comprehensive research report on a specific demographic of college students. This report will include extensive analyses and syntheses of the extant literature, results from an original qualitative study, implications for research, and recommendations for practice.

### **Directions for Students**

The purpose of this assignment is for students to gain experience in conducting a qualitative research project and to gain a rich understanding of the experience of at least one demographic subgroup of college students. Working in groups of five, students will complete a comprehensive research project addressing one demographic group of college students. Students will break down the project into the following tasks.

#### *Preliminary Literature Review*

Each group will develop an extensive analysis and synthesis of the research literature regarding their selected population. The literature review should have no fewer than 10 scholarly references per group member. Students should draw upon literature from educational, sociological, psychological, counseling, and anthropological journals.

#### *Interview Protocol and Analyses Summary*

Group members will collectively develop an interview protocol, and then each student will select and interview two (2) current undergraduate college students representative of the population that the group is studying. Students will transcribe their interviews and complete a cover sheet for the interview. During and after the interview process, groups will develop a coding system for analysis of their data.

#### *Institutional Review Board Application (Optional).*

In order to present or publish the final results of the research project outside of class, students must receive approval from the Institutional Review Board. Though not required, this is strongly encouraged. Additional information will be provided in class – while students may complete this IRB application after the course is completed, they are encouraged to complete the application immediately after receiving feedback on the interview protocol from the instructor – target the 8th week of class.

#### *Final Paper*

Each group will prepare a final research paper, not to exceed 35 pages in length, not including references and appendices. This paper should be complete with an abstract, introduction, literature review, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. The discussion section of the paper should be strong and include multiple recommendations for meeting the needs of students in the selected population that are consistent with the literature and the results of the investigation.

### *Final Presentation*

Student groups will present a power point presentation in class that reviews the results of their investigation. The presentation must include a 15-minute oral presentation. Groups should provide an executive-style summary of their investigation and its results as a handout to classmates. The presentation should be sufficiently scholarly in use of literature, choice of methodology, and discussion of results and implications to impress professionals/scholars within a specific area of the discipline. At the same time, presentations should be sufficiently accessible in language, style, and presentation to be meaningful to a broader audience of student affairs professionals.

**Scoring Rubric:**

Criteria	4 = Exceeds expectations	3 = Meets expectations	2 = Meets some expectations	1 = Does not meet expectations	0 = Unable to score; incomplete or missing work	Weight	Final Score
<b>Preliminary Literature Review</b>	The literature review is comprehensive and extremely well written. The literature review is well organized and represents strong conceptual and intellectual arguments. The synthesis of the literature was excellent; utilizing an integrative style of writing that included critical analysis and application of the literature to higher education contexts. It includes a balance of qualitative, quantitative, and policy articles.	The literature review is mostly complete and most sections are well written. The literature review is mostly organized, with a few sections that need improvement in this area. Most of the literature review represented strong conceptual and intellectual arguments. The synthesis of the literature review was good, with a few sections that need further development. A more integrative style of writing is needed in some areas and there are a few sections that need more critical analysis and application of the literature to higher education contexts. The literature review could present a slightly better balance of qualitative, quantitative and policy articles.	The literature review is partially complete, well written only in some sections and there are a several sections that need major work with regard to organization. The literature review needs work to develop stronger conceptual and intellectual arguments and content. The synthesis of the literature is too often written as individual summaries of articles, rather than an integrative summary of themes across the literature. More critical analysis and application of the literature to higher education contexts is needed in several sections throughout the paper. The literature review does not present an adequate balance of qualitative, quantitative and policy articles.	The literature review is only partially complete and most of the literature needs to be reorganized. There is significant work to be done to develop strong conceptual and intellectual arguments and content. The synthesis of the literature is almost solely written as a series of individual summaries of articles. The literature lacks critical analysis and application of the literature to higher education contexts. The literature review over relies on two of the three types of articles (qualitative, quantitative and policy articles) and is not balanced.	The literature review is not complete. The literature review utilizes one of the three types of articles (qualitative, quantitative and policy articles) and is not balanced.	x1=	

Criteria	4 = Exceeds expectations	3 = Meets expectations	2 = Meets some expectations	1 = Does not meet expectations	0 = Unable to score; incomplete or missing work	Weight	Final Score
<b>Interview Protocol</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The protocol is comprehensive.</li> <li>The interview is appropriate for the specified population.</li> <li>The interview is grounded in the literature, with clear links to the literature.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The protocol is mostly comprehensive, with only minor gaps.</li> <li>The interview is mostly appropriate for the specified population, with little revision recommended.</li> <li>The interview is somewhat grounded in the literature, with only minor gaps in linkages to the literature.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The protocol is partially complete, with some gaps.</li> <li>The interview is mostly appropriate for the specified population, with some revisions recommended.</li> <li>The interview is only partially grounded in the literature, with some gaps in linkages to the literature.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The protocol is not partially complete, with significant gaps.</li> <li>The interview is moderately appropriate for the specified population, with significant revisions recommended.</li> <li>The interview is grounded in the literature, in a very limited manner, with significant gaps in linkages to the literature.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The protocol is not complete.</li> <li>The interview is not appropriate for the specific populations, with significant additional work required to complete the task.</li> <li>The interview is not grounded in the literature and linkages to literature do not exist.</li> </ul>	x1=	
<b>Interview Analyses &amp; Summary</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The summary of the interview is comprehensive.</li> <li>The interpretation of the interview is appropriate for the specified population.</li> <li>The interview summary is contextualized in the literature in a critical manner, with thoughtful and thorough analyses.</li> </ul> <p>The coding scheme is well-developed and applied appropriately.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The summary of the interview is mostly comprehensive, with only minor gaps.</li> <li>The interpretation of the interview is mostly appropriate for the specified population, with minor revisions recommended..</li> <li>The interview summary is contextualized in the literature in a somewhat critical and thoughtful manner and the analyses are mostly thoughtful and thorough.</li> </ul> <p>The coding scheme is well-developed with few minor gaps and mostly applied appropriately.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The summary of the interview is partially complete, with some gaps.</li> <li>The interpretation of the interview is mostly appropriate for the specified population, with some revisions recommended.</li> <li>The interview summary is only partially contextualized in the literature, with some gaps in linkages to the literature.</li> <li>The coding scheme is not fully developed with identifiable gaps and applied inappropriately in some areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The summary of the interview is not partially complete, with significant gaps.</li> <li>The summary of the interview is only moderately appropriate for the specified population, with significant revisions recommended.</li> <li>The summary of the interview is grounded in the literature, in a very limited manner, with significant gaps in linkages to the literature.</li> </ul> <p>The coding scheme is not well developed with significant gaps and applied inappropriately in most areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The summary of the interview is not complete.</li> <li>The summary of the interview is not appropriate for the specified populations, with significant additional work required to complete the task.</li> <li>The summary of the interview is not grounded in the literature and linkages to the literature do not exist.</li> </ul> <p>The coding scheme is not provided or is developed at the most basic level, with many gaps and applied insufficiently inappropriately in most areas.</p>	x2=	

Criteria	4 = Exceeds expectations	3 = Meets expectations	2 = Meets some expectations	1 = Does not meet expectations	0 = Unable to score; incomplete or missing work	Weight	Final Score
<b>Final Paper</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Background literature is presented fairly with no obvious gaps or misrepresentations.</li> <li>• Research studies, their methods and findings are used to bolster arguments.</li> <li>• The literature is presented in an excellent manner within appropriate literature, practical, policy and/or theoretical traditions.</li> <li>• Implications for research are presented in a thorough and critical manner.</li> <li>• Recommendations for practice are presented in thorough and critical manner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Background literature is presented fairly with minor gaps or misrepresentations.</li> <li>• Research studies, their methods and findings are used to bolster arguments, with minor omissions or weaknesses.</li> <li>• The literature is presented in a more than acceptable manner within appropriate literature, practical, policy, and/or theoretical traditions.</li> <li>• Implications for research are presented in a thorough and critical manner, with minor gaps or omissions.</li> <li>• Recommendations for practice are presented in thorough and critical manner, with minor gaps or omissions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Background literature is presented fairly with some gaps or misrepresentations.</li> <li>• Research studies, their methods, and findings are used to bolster arguments, with some omissions or weaknesses.</li> <li>• The literature is partially complete with regard to the appropriate literature, practical, policy and/or theoretical traditions.</li> <li>• Implications for research are only partially contextualized in the literature, with some gaps in linkages to other sections of the paper.</li> <li>• Recommendations for practice are presented in thorough and critical manner, with some gaps or omissions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Background literature is partially complete with some significant gaps or misrepresentations.</li> <li>• Research studies, their methods, and findings are inadequately used to bolster arguments, with some omissions or weaknesses.</li> <li>• The literature is only partially complete with regard to the appropriate literature, practical, policy and/or theoretical traditions and overlies on one or two types of literature.</li> <li>• Implications for research are only partially contextualized in the literature, with significant gaps in linkages to other sections of the paper.</li> <li>• Recommendations for practice are presented in thorough and critical manner, with significant gaps or omissions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Background literature is incomplete with significant gaps or misrepresentations.</li> <li>• Research studies, their methods, and findings are inadequately used to bolster arguments, with significant omissions or weaknesses.</li> <li>• The literature is incomplete with regard to the appropriate literature, practical, policy and/or theoretical traditions.</li> <li>• Implications for research are not contextualized in the literature, with minimal linkages to other sections of the paper presented.</li> <li>• Recommendations for practice are missing or inadequately presented.</li> </ul>	x4 =	

Criteria	4 = Exceeds expectations	3 = Meets expectations	2 = Meets some expectations	1 = Does not meet expectations	0 = Unable to score; incomplete or missing work	Weight	Final Score
<b>Quality of writing in final paper</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Language is used skillfully to communicate complex ideas clearly.</li> <li>• Writing is grammatically correct.</li> <li>• Transitions/connections in the paper are logical and smooth and help the reader follow the organization of the paper.</li> <li>• The writing is engaging and lively.</li> <li>• The organization of the paper is clear and effectively organized by headings and subheadings.</li> <li>• The ideas of other scholars are consistently credited by appropriate citations.</li> <li>• Quotations are presented in the proper format and are not overused.</li> <li>• A scholarly voice is projected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Language is used skillfully to communicate complex ideas clearly in most of the paper.</li> <li>• Writing is grammatically correct in most of the paper, with few grammatical errors.</li> <li>• Connections in the paper are mostly logical and smooth. The organization of the paper, with few sections with poor transitions, is largely easy to follow.</li> <li>• The writing is engaging and lively in most of the paper.</li> <li>• The organization of the paper is mostly clear and effectively organized by headings and subheadings.</li> <li>• The ideas of other scholars are consistently credited by appropriate citations.</li> <li>• Quotations are presented in the proper format and are not overused.</li> <li>• A scholarly voice is projected throughout most of the paper.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The writing gets in the way of communication by the writer and understanding by the reader.</li> <li>• The writing quality feels unfinished and reads like an early draft.</li> <li>• Transitions between sentences, paragraphs, and sentences are poor or confusing.</li> <li>• There are recurrent errors of grammar, syntax, style, spelling, or punctuation.</li> <li>• The paper is only partially well organized by headings and subheadings.</li> <li>• The ideas of other scholars are not appropriately credited by use of citations, or are misrepresented.</li> <li>• Direct quotations are overused or are improperly cited.</li> <li>• The writing style is not scholarly in tone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• APA style guidelines are ignored or are used inconsistently.</li> <li>• There are many errors of grammar, syntax, style, spelling, or punctuation.</li> <li>• The paper is not satisfactorily organized by headings and subheadings.</li> <li>• The ideas of other scholars are not appropriately credited by use of citations, or are misrepresented.</li> <li>• The writing style is not scholarly in tone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• APA style guidelines are ignored and not used</li> <li>• There are many recurrent errors of grammar, syntax, style, spelling, or punctuation throughout the paper. The presentation is sloppy.</li> <li>• The ideas of other scholars are not appropriately credited by use of citations, or are misrepresented.</li> <li>• The paper is not organized by headings and subheadings.</li> <li>• The writing style is not scholarly in tone.</li> </ul>	x1=	

Criteria	4 = Exceeds expectations	3 = Meets expectations	2 = Meets some expectations	1 = Does not meet expectations	0 = Unable to score; incomplete or missing work	Weight	Final Score
<b>Final Presentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students able to respond to all questions.</li> <li>• All sections of the report are presented.</li> <li>• The handouts and Power Point presentation is accurate, engaging and informative and well-developed.</li> <li>• Group shared speaking time equitably.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students able to respond to nearly all questions.</li> <li>• Nearly all sections of the report are presented.</li> <li>• The handouts and Power Point presentation is accurate, mostly engaging and informative and mostly well-developed.</li> <li>• Group members mostly shared speaking time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students able to respond to some all questions.</li> <li>• Nearly all sections of the report are presented.</li> <li>• The handouts and Power Point presentation is accurate, somewhat engaging informative and fairly well-developed.</li> <li>• Group members mostly shared speaking time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students able to respond to few questions.</li> <li>• Only some sections of the report are presented.</li> <li>• The handouts and Power Point presentation is somewhat accurate, not very engaging or informative and not well-developed.</li> <li>• Group members did not share speaking time adequately and two or more members dominated or were largely silent during the presentation and Q &amp; A.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students able to respond to very few questions.</li> <li>• Few or none of the sections of the report are presented.</li> <li>• The handouts and Power Point presentation were missing or inaccurate, not engaging, ill-informed or under-developed.</li> <li>• Group members did not share speaking time and one member dominated the presentation and Q &amp; A.</li> </ul>	x1 =	
<b>Total</b>							

### Legend

Letter Grades	Total Points	College of Education Assessment Scale Equivalent
<b>A</b>	<b>36-40</b>	4 (Exceeds Expectations)
<b>B</b>	<b>32-35.99</b>	3 (Meets Expectations)
<b>C</b>	<b>28-31.99</b>	2 (Meets Some Expectations)
<b>D</b>	<b>24-27.99</b>	1 (Does Not Meet Expectations)
<b>F</b>	<b>0-23.99</b>	0 (Can't Score)