SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: **EDUCATION POLICY & EQUITY**	Department: **Educational Studies**
Degree or Certificate Level: **Ph.D.**	College/School: **School of Education**
Date (Month/Year): **December 17, 2020**	Primary Assessment Contact: **Jennifer Buehler, Program Director**

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? **Spring**, **Summer, and Fall 2020**

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? **New program developed & approved Fall 2018**

1. Student Learning Outcomes
Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

The Education Policy and Equity doctoral program is currently in the middle of its second year. There are six students enrolled in the first cohort and four students enrolled in the second cohort.

Since we submitted our first program assessment report in January 2020, at the end of the program's first semester, our work to develop, administer, and assess the new program has focused on the following two major tasks, both of which were noted in last year's report:

- Design a model and a process for **Annual Graduate Student Reviews**
- Design a model and a process for the **Research Methods Exam**, taken at the end of students' third semester

We completed our first cycle of annual graduate student reviews in June. Each student completed a narrative evaluation of their work over the past year, met with their adviser for an individual evaluation meeting, and received a written evaluation report at the end of the process. Each of these documents is provided as supporting materials for this year's assessment report; however, annual student reviews are not listed for consideration on our program assessment plan.

We are now in the process of finalizing, and will soon be administering, the first iteration of the research methods exam. The documents we've developed in support of that exam are also provided here as supporting materials for this year's assessment report.

When we resume the program assessment process, which will occur at the end of January 2021 when we score and discuss student work on the research methods exam, we will focus our assessment work on the following two outcomes:

- Outcome #3: Students will be able to evaluate competing theoretical frameworks that are employed in the design of education policy research.

- Outcome #5: Students will be able to apply research tools and methods to analyze educational problems.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning
Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

NOTE: There are no Madrid students enrolled in our program.

See Question #1 above. The exam papers turned in by six students who comprise our first cohort will be the first artifacts of student learning that we analyze for assessment of student learning.

3. **Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process**
   What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

The EPE faculty group consists of seven members. This group has worked together from the beginning to build the program, recruit students, develop roadmaps for the program of study, and shape program culture.

Regarding assessment work during this cycle, the group worked together steadily through monthly Summer and Fall 2020 faculty meetings to develop the aforementioned **research methods exam**. Everyone in our faculty group contributed to this process. We kept the following "running record of decisions" as we went along:

DECISIONS MADE IN JULY:
- **Timing**: Exam held in January before start of classes, one day, in person or on Zoom, 3 hours in morning & 3 hours in afternoon
- **General work** in the morning followed by **choice** in afternoon between qual OR quant
- **Evaluation of the quality of a research article** (one qual, one quant) will be one major exam task (akin to a manuscript review w/ real world relevance); provide the articles in advance; update with new articles each year to prevent cheating; prompt provided when they arrive
- **Questions left on the table:**
  - Need to line up a **set of articles** to choose from (1-3 qual, 1-3 quant)
  - What **features of the articles** would we direct students to analyze in order to show their methodological understanding? (see Rina's evaluation criteria)
  - For **afternoon component**: Each group works on a **scenario** that students would be asked to evaluate/investigate using their chosen methodology; what is the scenario and what methodological issues would you direct students to address in a planned research intervention?
  - Further discussion of a "floating component" (to be slotted in the morning OR afternoon): Each group, qual and quant, works on a set of **methodological concepts** (e.g. validity, triangulation, etc.) that students should be able to define/discuss/apply EITHER in the context of analyzing the quality of a published research article OR designing a research intervention for a given scenario

IDEAS GENERATED IN AUGUST:
- The task of **making sense of discrepant findings on the same issue** (this might be a morning task and part of evaluating published articles)
  - e.g. within a complicated policy landscape, how do we weigh findings that don't give us a clear picture
  - what do different studies/approaches/publications tell us about the nature of knowledge production
- Afternoon scenario might ask them to select qual OR quant as their methodological intervention, **then justify the choice**
  - BUT how much structure to put in the prompt … aim for structured but not prescriptive
  - Unaddressed: Exactly how we'll evaluate their work on the exam

DECISIONS MADE IN SEPTEMBER (while generating talking points for student preview session):
- Students who fail part of the exam will fail the whole exam (expectation is demonstration of **baseline competency** in both qual & quant)
- Targeted intervention for those who lack baseline competency will be tied to **targeted retakes**: only retake the part you failed
- **Lit review work** becomes part of preparing for morning session: given two articles ahead of time, both on the same topic, read into the topic so you bring synthesis-level understanding to it

DECISIONS MADE ON MOVING FORWARD DAY (September 23, 2020):
- Afternoon session: scenario can **focus on the pandemic** and the issue of teacher mobility & retention
- Centering on an issue that has long been important in the **research literature** & tying it to **current moment**
- Focus could address **equity** by looking at COVID "hot spots" and differences between teacher experience in urban districts & other places

- Morning session: **readings should tie to afternoon scenario** (e.g., read into the topic to get baseline foundation in the issues, then apply to a current scenario)

DECISIONS MADE IN OCTOBER:
- 5 quantitative articles on teacher turnover/teacher attrition found and shared by Cameron

DECISIONS MADE IN NOVEMBER:
- Articulated **criteria** for focal article selection (reputable journal, recent work, strong theoretical framework & data analysis sections, recognizable author names)
- Discussed & modified proposed **rubric** for morning session
- Clarification of **problem/focal area** for the exam (e.g., WHY teachers leave the profession, not the impact of their departure on students)
- Settled on **two focal articles** and a **conceptual piece** for background reading
- Generated **language** to frame the morning exam task & draft **problem statement** to introduce the afternoon exam task

DECISIONS MADE & ACTION STEPS IN DECEMBER:
- Revised **time frame** for exam. Rather than a task completed all in one day, students will have one week to complete Part One (formerly morning session) and two days to complete Part Two (formerly afternoon session).
- Developed guidelines and procedures for **formatting**, **turning in, and scoring** student work (student work will be anonymized), and then **reporting results** to students
- Language for success is demonstrating **proficiency**, not baseline competency, in both qual & quant methodology
- Worked together to develop **draft exam documents** for Part One and Part Two
- Approved a **rubric** for Part Two
- Developed an **info sheet** to share at the student info session in December
- Made final tweaks to **exam documents** and **rubrics**

The research methods exam will be administered from **January 12-19, 2021** (Part One) and from **January 21-23, 2021** (Part Two).

4. **Data/Results**
   What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

   We will answer this question on our next EPE program assessment report.

5. **Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions**
   What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

   We will answer this question on our next EPE program assessment report.

6. **Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings**
   A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

   We will answer this question on our next EPE program assessment report.

   B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies	• Course content • Teaching techniques • Improvements in technology • Prerequisites	• Course sequence • New courses • Deletion of courses • Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings
Changes to the Assessment Plan	• Student learning outcomes • Artifacts of student learning • Evaluation process	• Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics) • Data collection methods • Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

We will answer this question on our next EPE program assessment report.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

N/A

7. **Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes**

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

We will be able to answer this question after we have assessed the results of the first research methods exam.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

N/A

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

N/A

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

We will continue to make intentional decisions linked to assessment work as we build the EPE program.

Next steps in program development will include the following: a) revising the **research methods exam** based on the results of its first round of implementation; b) developing expectations and a process for **written comprehensive exams**; c) developing expectations and a process for **dissertation proposals and defenses**; d) developing expectations and a process for **dissertations** themselves as well as **dissertation defenses**.

Regarding **assessment**, as we take stock of what student work on the research methods exam tells us, we will circle back to make **changes at the coursework level** of the program to improve student learning related to Outcomes #3 and #5.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools and/or revised/updated assessment plans along with this report.

Research Methods Qualifying Examination: Part I Evaluation Rubric

Domain	Distinguished (A Level)	Proficient (B Level)	Basic (C Level)	Unsatisfactory (D Level)
Summary of Policy Issue & Context (/5 Points)	Policy issue and potential solutions are clearly described and articulated, with no important omissions	Policy issue and potential solutions are mostly clearly described and articulated, with some important omissions	Policy issue and solutions are communicated in a confusing manner with many omissions	Policy issue and solutions are not articulated
Synthesis of Relevant Research Evidence & Concepts (/10 Points)	Major studies and concepts are included Research findings are accurately summarized	Most major studies and concepts are included with a few key omissions Research findings are summarized with some error	Many major studies and concepts are missing Research findings are summarized with many errors	No research findings are included
Identification & Explanation of Research Approaches (/15 Points)	Empirical approaches are described in depth with minimal error Quantitative and qualitative approaches are accurately explained and critically analyzed. This includes discussing how they complement one another, their strengths, and their weaknesses.	Empirical approaches are described with moderate error. Quantitative and qualitative approaches are discussed, with some consideration of complementarity	Empirical approaches are discussed in insufficient depth with significant error Quantitative and qualitative approaches are considered without reference to their strengths and weaknesses	Empirical approaches are not discussed
Policy Conclusions, Opposing Findings, & Areas of Future Research (/10 Points)	Major conclusions identified and clearly described Policy recommendations / areas of further research are logical and well described Opposing findings are identified; possible reconciliation is considered	Major conclusions identified and described with some error Policy recommendations / areas of further research are discussed Opposing findings are broached	Major conclusions are not clearly described Policy recommendations / areas of further research are described with major omissions Opposing findings are unclear	Major conclusions are not described Policy recommendations / areas of further research are not described Opposing findings are not described
Clarity of Writing (/5 Points)	Language is clear and free of grammatical errors and/or typos Writing is well-structured and flows logically	Language is clear with minimal grammatical errors and/or typos Writing structure could use minor improvements	Language requires improvement, including grammatical errors and/or typos Writing structure requires substantial attention	Language lacks clarity and contains significant grammatical errors and/or typos No clear writing structure is evident

References **(/5 Points)**	Research evidence is cited sufficiently and correctly	References and citations include minor mistakes and/or omissions	References and citations include substantial mistakes and/or omissions	References and citations are not included

Total: /50 Points

Comments:

Research Methods Qualifying Examination: Part II Evaluation Rubric

Domain	Distinguished (A Level)	Proficient (B Level)	Basic (C Level)	Unsatisfactory (D Level)
Introduction & Literature Review (/5 Points)	Policy concern is clearly identified and contextualized within the extant literature	Policy concern and key literature are addressed with minor omissions	Policy concern and relevant literature are identified in an insufficient manner	Policy concern and relevant literature are not addressed
Identification of the Problem & Context (/5 Points)	Specific policy problem and context are detailed thoroughly Equity considerations are well-articulated	Specific policy problem and context are discussed with some omission Equity considerations are discussed in an incomplete manner	Policy problem, context, and equity considerations are addressed with major omissions	Policy problem, context, and equity considerations are not broached
Empirical Approach (/15 Points)	Empirical strategy is clearly articulated, including relevant models / protocols, identification strategies, and analysis procedures Methodological assumptions are clearly articulated; This includes discussions about how to improve validity and trustworthiness of findings Empirical approach is justified within the extant literature; Strengths and weaknesses are considered	Empirical strategy, including relevant models / protocols, identification strategies, and analysis procedures, and methodological assumptions, is described with some error Empirical approach is adequately situated within the literature; Strengths/weaknesses are broached	Empirical strategy is explained poorly; models / protocols contain significant errors Empirical approach is not situated within the existing literature	Empirical strategy does not address the relevant problem and does not consider relevant examples in the literature
Data & Sample (/10 Points)	Data and sample are clearly identified If original data are collected, sampling strategies / data collection methods are explained thoroughly; For secondary data, data sources are explained thoroughly Construct is clearly defined Relevant variables are enumerated exhaustively	Data and sample are considered, with some omissions Sampling strategies / data collection methods for original data/data sources for secondary data / relevant variables / construct are considered, though additional explanation is necessary	Data and sample (and associated sampling / data collection methods / construct) are discussed inadequately	Data and sample do not address the issue at hand and/or are not considered

Implications & Limitations (/5 Points)	Implications are communicated clearly Limitations and areas for future analysis are well-defined	Implications are communicated with some omissions Limitations and areas for future analysis are voiced insufficiently	Implications are ambiguous Limitations and areas for future analysis are unclear	Implications, limitations, and areas for future analysis are not considered
Clarity of Writing (/5 Points)	Language is clear and free of grammatical errors and/or typos Writing is well-structured and flows logically	Language is clear with minimal grammatical errors and/or typos Writing structure could use minor improvements	Language requires improvement, including grammatical errors and/or typos Writing structure requires substantial attention	Language lacks clarity and contains significant grammatical errors and/or typos No clear writing structure is evident
References (/5 Points)	Research evidence is cited sufficiently and correctly	References and citations include minor mistakes and/or omissions	References and citations include substantial mistakes and/or omissions	References and citations are not included

Total: /50 Points

Comments:

Exam topic

Teacher turnover has long been a problem in education. Issues of teacher recruitment, retention, and attrition have been historically laced with equity issues. Given schools' varying approaches to educating students during the pandemic, along with students' dramatically different levels of access to educational resources while learning from home, equity issues as they affect teachers' lives and students' learning have become newly relevant in the moment of COVID-19.

Over the past twenty years, educational researchers have produced a wealth of literature on the topic of teacher turnover. One portion of the literature has focused on understanding why teachers stay or leave, while another body of work has tested policy interventions designed to improve recruitment and retention of high-quality teachers, particularly in high-need communities.

Your task in the EPE research methods exam will be twofold. In Part One, you will consider the literature on teacher turnover broadly and, within the context of that literature, evaluate the methodological rigor, the strengths and limitations, and the contributions of two focal articles on the topic, one quantitative and the other qualitative. In Part Two, you will design an original research study that is focused on investigating the problem of teacher turnover in the current moment of coronavirus.

Introductory resource:

Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teacher turnover: Why it matters and what we can do about it*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

How to prepare
- Begin building your knowledge of the topic of the teacher turnover by reading the introductory resource listed above. The policy report by Carver-Thomas and Darling-Hammond presents a conceptual overview of the topic. You will not be asked to write about this policy report on the methods exam.
- Working from the policy report's list of references as well as your own search of education research databases, find and read other articles on teacher turnover in order to develop an informed understanding of the problem and knowledge of how it has been previously addressed in the research literature.
- You are welcome to discuss the introductory policy report and additional articles you find with your classmates.
- Prepare notes to bring with you to the exam. These may include annotations on the focal articles themselves, lists of key points, comparative charts or tables, etc. You will be allowed unlimited, unrestricted access to resources during the entire exam period.
- Consider how you will design a research study that is informed by the current research base and intended to assess the effect of COVID-19 on teacher turnover.

Logistics

- **Time frame for Part One.** Your work on Part One of the research methods exam will begin on Tuesday morning, January 12. You will receive an email at 9 a.m. that includes the prompt for Part One, the rubric for Part One, and the two focal articles that will be the basis for your analysis. You will have eight days to complete your work on Part One. All papers are due at 11:59 p.m. on Tuesday, January 19.

- **Time frame for Part Two.** Your work on Part Two of the research methods exam will take place on Thursday, January 21. You will receive an email at 9 a.m. that includes the prompt for Part Two and the rubric for Part Two. You will have 48 hours, or two full days, to write up your study design. All papers are due at 9 a.m. on Saturday, January 23. Part-time students will have the option of completing Part Two over the weekend on Saturday, January 23 and Sunday, January 24.

- **Resources**. As noted above in "how to prepare," during the exam you will be free to consult any resources that will inform your thinking on Part One as well as Part Two. However, once the exam period begins, we expect you to work independently from your classmates.

- **Turn in procedures**. You will email each exam document as an attachment to Elizabeth Nutt in the SOE Dean's Suite. You will do this at the end of Part One and again at the end of Part Two.

- **Format.** Your papers for Part One and Part Two should be formatted as Microsoft Word documents, double-spaced, Times New Roman, 12-point font, 1-inch margins.

- **All work will be anonymized**. You should not include identifying information anywhere on your exam document or in the file name. Similar to blind review of journal articles, your work will be anonymized by Elizabeth before it is shared with faculty for grading.

- **If you have questions**. After you receive the materials for Part One on Tuesday, January 12, EPE faculty members will be available to answer questions that afternoon on a Zoom call that will be held at 4 p.m. Once this live question and answer period has ended, any further questions should be posed publicly to the entire group by using "reply all" in response to the email that introduces Part One.

- **Scoring**. Your work on Part One and Part Two will be scored by a team of EPE faculty members using rubrics you will receive with other exam materials on the morning when you begin your work. You will receive the rubric for Part One on Tuesday, January 12. You will receive the rubric for Part Two on Thursday, January 21. Each rubric consists of a series of evaluative categories that add up to a total of 50 points. A score of 40 points out of 50 is considered minimum for passing each part of the exam.

- **Results**. You will receive your exam results from your adviser two weeks after you complete the work on Part Two. You will receive written feedback in the form of track changes comments on the papers themselves, a scored rubric for Part One and Part Two, and summary comments on each rubric. If you fail either part of the methods exam, you will be required to take that part, and only that part, over again in May.

Exam topic

Teacher turnover has long been a problem in education. Issues of teacher recruitment, retention, and attrition have been historically laced with equity issues. Given schools' varying approaches to educating students during the pandemic, along with students' dramatically different levels of access to educational resources while learning from home, equity issues as they affect teachers' lives and students' learning have become newly relevant in the moment of COVID-19.

Over the past twenty years, educational researchers have produced a wealth of literature on the topic of teacher turnover. One portion of the literature has focused on understanding why teachers stay or leave, while another body of work has tested policy interventions designed to improve recruitment and retention of high-quality teachers, particularly in high-need communities.

Your task in the EPE research methods exam will be twofold. In Part One, you will consider the literature on teacher turnover broadly and, within the context of that literature, evaluate the methodological rigor, the strengths and limitations, and the contributions of two focal articles on the topic, one quantitative and the other qualitative. In Part Two, you will design an original research study that is focused on investigating the problem of teacher turnover in the current moment of coronavirus.

Introductory resource:

Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teacher turnover: Why it matters and what we can do about it*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

How to prepare
- Begin building your knowledge of the topic of the teacher turnover by reading the introductory resource listed above. The policy report by Carver-Thomas and Darling-Hammond presents a conceptual overview of the topic. You will not be asked to write about this policy report on the methods exam.
- Working from the policy report's list of references as well as your own search of education research databases, find and read other articles on teacher turnover in order to develop an informed understanding of the problem and knowledge of how it has been previously addressed in the research literature.
- You are welcome to discuss the introductory policy report and additional articles you find with your classmates.
- Prepare notes to bring with you to the exam. These may include annotations on the focal articles themselves, lists of key points, comparative charts or tables, etc. You will be allowed unlimited, unrestricted access to resources during the entire exam period.
- Consider how you will design a research study that is informed by the current research base and intended to assess the effect of COVID-19 on teacher turnover.

Logistics

- **Time frame for Part One.** Your work on Part One of the research methods exam will begin on Tuesday morning, January 12. You will receive an email at 9 a.m. that includes the prompt for Part One, the rubric for Part One, and the two focal articles that will be the basis for your analysis. You will have eight days to complete your work on Part One. All papers are due at 11:59 p.m. on Tuesday, January 19.

- **Time frame for Part Two.** Your work on Part Two of the research methods exam will take place on Thursday, January 21. You will receive an email at 9 a.m. that includes the prompt for Part Two and the rubric for Part Two. You will have 48 hours, or two full days, to write up your study design. All papers are due at 9 a.m. on Saturday, January 23. Part-time students will have the option of completing Part Two over the weekend on Saturday, January 23 and Sunday, January 24.

- **Resources**. As noted above in "how to prepare," during the exam you will be free to consult any resources that will inform your thinking on Part One as well as Part Two. However, once the exam period begins, we expect you to work independently from your classmates.

- **Turn in procedures**. You will email each exam document as an attachment to Elizabeth Nutt in the SOE Dean's Suite. You will do this at the end of Part One and again at the end of Part Two.

- **Format.** Your papers for Part One and Part Two should be formatted as Microsoft Word documents, double-spaced, Times New Roman, 12-point font, 1-inch margins.

- **All work will be anonymized**. You should not include identifying information anywhere on your exam document or in the file name. Similar to blind review of journal articles, your work will be anonymized by Elizabeth before it is shared with faculty for grading.

- **If you have questions**. After you receive the materials for Part One on Tuesday, January 12, EPE faculty members will be available to answer questions that afternoon on a Zoom call that will be held at 4 p.m. Once this live question and answer period has ended, any further questions should be posed publicly to the entire group by using "reply all" in response to the email that introduces Part One.

- **Scoring**. Your work on Part One and Part Two will be scored by a team of EPE faculty members using rubrics you will receive with other exam materials on the morning when you begin your work. You will receive the rubric for Part One on Tuesday, January 12. You will receive the rubric for Part Two on Thursday, January 21. Each rubric consists of a series of evaluative categories that add up to a total of 50 points. A score of 40 points out of 50 is considered minimum for passing each part of the exam.

- **Results**. You will receive your exam results from your adviser two weeks after you complete the work on Part Two. You will receive written feedback in the form of track changes comments on the papers themselves, a scored rubric for Part One and Part Two, and summary comments on each rubric. If you fail either part of the methods exam, you will be required to take that part, and only that part, over again in May.

Research Methods Qualifying Exam
Part One: Article Analysis
Education Policy and Equity Ph.D. Program
Spring 2021

Part One of the research methods exam will assess your skill in critically evaluating research literature. Your discussion of the focal articles presented below will reveal your general knowledge of the issue of teacher turnover as well as your knowledge of both quantitative and qualitative research methods.

First, read the two focal articles you received today:

Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2011). Teacher mobility, school segregation, and pay-based policies to level the playing field. *Education Finance and Policy 6*(3), 399-438.

Barnatt, J., Terrell, D. G., D'Souza, L. A., Jong, C., Cochran-Smith, M., Viesca, K. M., Gleeson, A. M., McQuillan, P., & Shakman, K. (2017). Interpreting early career trajectories. *Educational Policy 31*(7), 992-1032.

Consider these two articles in relation to the broader body of literature you have been reviewing on teacher turnover. With this literature in mind, write an analysis of the two focal articles that addresses their methodological rigor, strengths and limitations, and contributions to our understanding of the topic of teacher turnover.

In your analysis, you should be prepared to do the following: explain the context for the problem of teacher turnover; summarize the policy issues involved; situate the two focal articles within a larger body of research on the topic; identify, explain, evaluate, and critique the research methods used in each article; summarize the findings as well as the limitations of each article; and, finally, discuss the major conclusions, contributions, and policy implications of each article, paying particular attention to how the articles complement one another, how one evaluates the strengths and limitations of contrasting approaches to studying the problem, and how one reconciles discrepant and/or divergent findings.

Logistics
- **Due date.** Your work on Part One begins at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, January 12. It is due at 11:59 p.m. on Tuesday, January 19.
- **Format.** Your paper should be written as a Microsoft Word document, double-spaced, Times New Roman, 12-point font, 1-inch margins.
- **Resources**. You are free to consult any resources that will inform your thinking on the exam. Once the exam period begins, we expect you to work independently.
- **All work is anonymized**. Do not include identifying information anywhere on the document or in the file name. Similar to blind review of journal articles, your work will be anonymized by Elizabeth before it is shared with faculty for grading.
- **Turn in procedures**. Email your document as an attachment to Elizabeth Nutt in the SOE Dean's Suite.

- **Questions.** EPE faculty members will be available to answer questions about Part One on a Zoom call that will be held on Tuesday afternoon, January 12, at 4 p.m. After this live question and answer period, any further questions should be posed publicly to the entire group by using "reply all" in response to the email that introduced Part One.

Research Methods Qualifying Exam
Part Two: Study Design
Education Policy and Equity Ph.D. Program
Spring 2021

Part Two of the research methods exam will assess your ability to design a research study that responds to a problem scenario related to teacher turnover. The problem scenario is described below.

Given the strain that COVID-19 has placed on educators, and given the possibility that many educators may depart the profession in response to the challenges of this moment, your task is to design a study that utilizes either quantitative or qualitative methodology to investigate the problem of teacher turnover during the pandemic and discuss policy implications based on the findings you believe your study will provide.

Broadly, your study should seek to understand the effects of COVID-19 on teacher turnover in a specific context. In your study design, you should be prepared to do the following: identify a context for the study you propose; explain your research design, including the conceptual and/or theoretical frameworks and methodological tools you will use to carry out the study; outline your plan for data collection and analysis; discuss the strengths and limitations of your study design; discuss policy implications for the work you propose; and identify areas for future research.

Logistics
- **Due date.** Your work on Part Two begins at 9 a.m. on Thursday, January 21. It is due at 9 a.m. on Saturday, January 23. NOTE: Part-time students will have the option of completing Part Two over the weekend on Saturday, January 23 and Sunday, January 24.
- **Format.** Your paper should be written as a Microsoft Word document, double-spaced, Times New Roman, 12-point font, 1-inch margins.
- **Resources**. You are free to consult any resources that will inform your thinking on the exam. Once the exam period begins, we expect you to work independently.
- **All work is anonymized**. Do not include identifying information anywhere on the document or in the file name. Similar to blind review of journal articles, your work will be anonymized by Elizabeth before it is shared with faculty for grading.
- **Turn in procedures**. Email your document as an attachment to Elizabeth Nutt in the SOE Dean's Suite.
- **Questions.** If you have questions about Part Two, you should pose them publicly to the entire group by using "reply all" in response to the email that introduced Part Two.

Graduate Student Annual Review
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

During the month of April, EPE will conduct its first annual review of Ph.D. students. Accordingly, please submit a self-evaluation of your progress toward the degree in the past year to your academic adviser by **April 1, 2020.**

The purpose of the annual review is to guide you in taking stock of your academic and career development while providing feedback to us on the program. This is an opportunity for you to share information about your academic accomplishments and goals, your plans for achieving those goals, and how we as faculty members can support you. In addition, this is an opportunity to share any concerns about the program and/or suggestions for improvement.

Your self-evaluation will be reviewed by EPE program faculty during the April faculty meeting and will serve as the basis for an individual annual review meeting with your academic adviser that same month. Annual reviews will also inform work on program assessment as required by the SLU provost's office.

Please organize your report into the following eight sections. Note that lists of examples provided below are not exhaustive; include any information that you feel is relevant.

1. **Coursework completed in 2019-20.** List courses taken with grades earned and specific content studied/methodological training received/papers written in each course.
2. **Research activities in 2019-20.** Describe research completed in the past year including any/all of the following: work completed for your research assistantship; research projects tied to coursework or the PRiME Center; research conducted in collaboration with local stakeholders; other mentored research activities; self-initiated research activities; projects currently underway. Include names of faculty mentors and/or other collaborators.
3. **Work products in 2019-20.** List your work products in any of the following areas: academic presentations; publications; conference presentations; grants submitted; awards. Indicate your role in each product (e.g., primary author, co-author, contributing author, etc.).
4. **Professional development in 2019-20**. List your professional development experiences in any of the following areas: professional meetings attended; workshops attended; teaching skills certifications through the Reinert Center for Transformative Teaching and Learning (CTTL); participation in or sponsorship of study groups; professional memberships.
5. **Program milestones achieved in 2019-20** (e.g., research methods qualifying exam, comprehensive exam, dissertation proposal defense).
6. **Dissertation plans.** Describe your dissertation plans including topic and/or research question, methodology, and ideas for intervention in the field.
7. **Goals for 2020-21.** Include anticipated coursework, scholarly activities, and program milestones you expect to achieve.
8. **Other information.** What else would be useful for us to know about your work in the past year and/or the program as we review your accomplishments and future plans?

Use the following questions to prepare for conversation with your adviser during your annual review meeting:

- What **disciplinary knowledge** in the field of education policy have you gained in the past year?
- What **methodological tools** have you acquired in the past year that prepare you to make a research intervention in your field of interest?
- How do your **work products** in the past year contribute to the identity you are constructing as a future academic, researcher, or policymaker?
- How have your **professional development experiences** in the past year contributed to the skill set you are building as a future academic, researcher, or policymaker?

Graduate Student Annual Review
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Student's Name_____

Name of Adviser_____

Academic Year_____

Results of evaluation

Advisers, please check one of the following:

☐ **Making satisfactory progress**
All program requirements are being met; terms of assistantship are being met; quality of performance is strong.

☐ **Not meeting expectations**
Most, but not all, program and assistantship requirements are being met; quality of performance needs improvement.

☐ **On academic probation**
Quality of performance is unacceptable. The following conditions, itemized below, must be met during the fall semester in order to be removed from probation. Failure to meet these conditions may result in loss of fellowship/assistantship and/or dismissal from the program.

1.

2.

3.

Advisers, after taking into account the information provided on the student's self-evaluation, **please provide written feedback in the space below** regarding the student's accomplishments during the past year along with areas for growth. Written feedback should both guide the student and inform our annual program assessment process.

Adviser written feedback here:

Advisers, after discussing this review with the student, make sure s/he signs below and receives a copy of your review. Submit the report and the student's self-evaluation to the Program Director by May 1.

If the student did not submit a self-evaluation, place an X in this box. ☐

I have discussed this review with my adviser:_____ _____

                                                  (Student's signature)   (Date signed)

I have received a copy of this report:_____ _____

                                                  (Student's signature)   (Date signed)

Adviser signature:_____ _____

                                                                    (Date signed)

EPE Program Learning Outcomes

1. Students will be able to evaluate issues in education policy and their impact on educational outcomes for students, with an emphasis on marginalized groups.
2. Students will be able to design and execute policy research that extends the knowledge base in education policy and equity.
3. Students will be able to evaluate competing theoretical frameworks that are employed in the design of education policy research.
4. Students will be able to identify forms of inequity (racial, gender, class, ability, etc.) in education policy and the effect of inequity on student outcomes.
5. Students will be able to apply research tools and methods to analyze educational problems.