

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST INDIES,
ST. AUGUSTINE**

**Post-Graduate Diploma in Education
EDRS 5450 The Reflective Practitioner**

Rubric for Action Research Project Report (2018-2019)

PART A – REPORT ON INTERVENTION (80%)

FRAGMENT (4 MARKS)

Descriptors			
4 marks	3 – 2 marks	1 mark	0 marks
A 300-word summary statement that meets all of the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • research problem/issue • significance to the researcher • methodology • findings • overall conclusion • keywords • reflects actual study undertaken 	A 300-word summary statement that meets at most, four of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • research problem/issue • significance to the researcher • methodology • findings • overall conclusion • keywords • reflects actual study undertaken 	A 300-word summary statement that meets at most, two of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • research problem/issue • significance to the researcher • methodology • findings • overall conclusion • keywords • reflects actual study undertaken 	No summary statement provided

PTER 1 – INTRODUCTION (20 MARKS)

Context of Study (10 marks)

Research questions/hypotheses (5 marks)

Significance of the study (5 marks)

Reflective journal entry 1 (see Part B Rubric at end)

a		Descriptors			
nd	10 – 9 marks	8 – 6 marks	5 – 3 marks	2 – 0 marks	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The description of the problem, its context and history (global, regional, local, district, theoretical) thoroughly clarifies the issue and research environment. Area of focus has been well conceptualized, that is, your rationale: what actually influenced you to do the study; the issue/problem is clearly articulated in a way that indicates that it is necessary and worthwhile, aligns with the background and clearly provides the purpose of the study. The intervention as a probable solution has been thoroughly justified against the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The description of the problem, its context and history (global, regional, local, district, theoretical) satisfactorily clarifies the issue and the research environment. Area of focus has been fairly well conceptualized, that is, your rationale: what actually influenced you to do the study; The issue/problem is fairly well articulated in a way that indicates that it is necessary and worthwhile, aligns with the background and provides the purpose of the study. The intervention as a probable solution to the issue has been 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The description of the problem, its context and history (global, regional, local, district, theoretical) is limited and does not adequately clarify the issue and the research environment. Area of focus has been fairly well conceptualized, that is, your rationale: what actually influenced you to do the study; The issue/problem is not sufficiently articulated in a way that indicates that it is necessary and worthwhile, somewhat aligns with the background and provides the purpose of the study. The intervention has not been adequately justified as a probable solution. 	<p>The description of the problem, its context and history (global, regional, local, district, theoretical) is not relevant to the issue and the research environment in which it is embedded and the purpose of the study has not been well conceptualized.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>The intervention has not been adequately justified as a viable solution to the issue and the literature used to support the development of the intervention is not articulated in a way that indicates that it is necessary and worthwhile, nor has the literature used to support the development of the intervention nor the articulation of the issue/problem nor the purpose of the study provided.</p>	

	nature of the problem.	satisfactorily justified.		
	5 marks	4 – 3 marks	2 marks	1 – 0 marks
h is/ ses	Research questions/Hypotheses are complete, clearly expressed, and reflect the purpose of the study.	Research questions//Hypotheses are complete and clearly expressed, but partially reflect the purpose of the study.	Research questions//Hypotheses are complete and clearly expressed, but do not reflect the purpose of the study.	Research questions/Hypotheses incomplete, unclear or unsupportive of the purpose OR absent.
	5 – 4 marks	3-2 marks	1 – 0 marks	
nce idy	The usefulness of the study has been justified against the gains that it brings to the immediate participants (researcher, students, discipline, department and school) in terms of the investment in time or resources in the project	The usefulness of the study in general has been justified but does not validate why immediate participants (researcher, students, discipline, department and school) should invest time or resources in the project.	The significance of the study is absent or does not in any way validate why the study is one of import	

PTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW (16 MARKS)

Descriptors

16 – 14 marks	13 – 11 marks	10 – 5 marks	4 – 0 marks
<p>The literature reviewed reflected the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent overview of the topic/issue that builds a clear and compelling case for the intervention. • The literature is clearly pertinent to answering the research questions/hypotheses in the study. • Thoroughly describes the literature surrounding the proposed intervention by citing at least 3 relevant examples. • Acknowledges the potential challenges inherent in intervention studies, if any. • High level of critical analysis of the literature (pros and cons) to justify your choice of intervention. • Includes current and/or seminal research. 	<p>The literature reviewed reflected the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good overview of the topic/issue that makes a fair attempt at building a case for the intervention. • The literature is mostly pertinent to answering the research questions/hypotheses in the study. • Adequately describes the literature surrounding the proposed intervention by citing at least 3 relevant examples. • Acknowledges some of the potential challenges inherent in intervention studies, if any. • Medium level of critical analysis of the literature (pros and cons) to justify your choice of intervention. • Literature reviewed includes fairly current and/or seminal research.. 	<p>The literature reviewed reflected the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair overview of the topic/issue that makes a poor attempt at building a case for the intervention. • The literature is somewhat pertinent to answering the research questions/hypotheses in the study. • Poorly describes the literature surrounding the proposed intervention although at least 3 relevant examples are cited. • Acknowledges a few of the potential challenges inherent in intervention studies, if any. • Low level of critical analysis of the literature (pros and cons) to justify your choice of intervention. • Literature reviewed includes fairly current and/or seminal research. 	<p>The literature reviewed reflected the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No overview of the issue that establish research worthines intervention, ackno • The literature is no pertinent to answer research questions/hypothes study. • Does not describe literature surround proposed intervent • Does not acknowle whether or not the any existing poten challenges inherent intervention studie • No critical analysi literature (pros and justify your choice intervention. • No evidence of rea from current and/o research.

PTER 3 – METHODOLOGY (30 MARKS)

- Design (5 marks)
- Participants (4 marks)
- Data collection methods and instruments (6 marks)
- Implementation plan (6 marks)
- Data analysis strategies (6 marks)
- Ethical issues (3 marks)
- Reflective journal entry 2 (see Part B Rubric at end)

Criteria		Descriptors			
		5 – 4 marks	3 marks	2 marks	1 – 0 marks
Design		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Action Research design has been clearly explicated and strongly supported with literature. • The design is clearly aligned to the nature of the research questions/hypotheses. • Strengths and limitations of the design are given and supported by reference to the literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Action Research design has been clearly explicated, and satisfactorily supported with literature. • The design is partially aligned with the nature of the research questions/hypotheses. • Strengths and limitations of the design are given and supported by reference to the literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Action Research design has been explicated, but not supported with literature. • The design is poorly aligned with the nature of the research questions/hypotheses. • Strengths and limitations of the design are given but not supported by literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Action Research design of the study has not been clearly explicated. • The design is not aligned with the nature of the research questions/hypotheses. • Strengths and limitations of the design are not given.
Participants		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sampling method used has been thoroughly explained and justified. • Relevant descriptors and/or demographics of the participants that may impact upon the findings or their interpretations have been thoroughly explained and justified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sampling method used has been satisfactorily explained and justified. • Relevant descriptors and/or demographics of the participants that may impact upon the findings or their interpretations have been adequately clarified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sampling method used has been poorly explained and justified. • Relevant descriptors and/or demographics of the participants that may impact upon the findings or their interpretations have been poorly clarified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sampling method used has not been explained and justified. • Relevant descriptors and/or demographics of the participants that may impact upon the findings or their interpretations have not been clarified.

	clarified. • Choice of participants has been thoroughly justified.	• Choice of participants has been satisfactorily justified.	• Choice of participants has been poorly justified.	• Choice of participants has not been justified.
lection s and ents	6 – 5 marks	4 – 3 marks	2 – 0 marks	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Choice of data collection method clearly identified and thoroughly justified. • All instruments used are appropriate for the type of data to be collected for each research question. • Instruments have been described and thoroughly justified. • Samples are appended. • Origin of instruments has been indicated, and permission for its use is evident (where appropriate). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Choice of data collection method somewhat identified and partially justified. • Most instruments used are appropriate for the type of data to be collected for each research question. • Instruments have been described and adequately justified. • Samples of some instruments are appended. • Origin of instruments has been partially indicated, and permission for its use is evident (where appropriate). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Choice of data collection not identified or justified. • Few instruments used are appropriate for the type to be collected for each question. • Instruments have been poorly described and justified. • Samples of instruments are not appended. • Origin of instruments has been indicated, and permission for its use is not evident (where appropriate). 	
ntation n	6 – 5 marks	4 – 3 marks	2 – 0 marks	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature of the intervention and its procedures (example phases or timeline) for implementation are clearly explicated. • Relevant and substantial evidence is appended, example Unit Plan AND all lesson plans OR for educational administration students, clinical supervision session plans and evaluation instruments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature of the intervention and its procedures (example phases or timeline) for implementation are adequately explicated. • Relevant and adequate evidence is appended, example Unit Plan AND some of the lesson plans are appended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature of the intervention and its procedures (example phases or timeline) for implementation are not adequately explicated. • Unsatisfactory evidence is appended. 	
	6 – 5 marks	4 – 3 marks	2 – 0 marks	

analysis issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The analysis strategies related to each type of data and research question/hypotheses have been presented, and are appropriate and accurate. • Strategies have been thoroughly justified with relevant literature. • Data analysis processes have been thoroughly described. • Intended representations of findings have been appropriately explained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The analysis strategies related to some types of data and some research questions/hypotheses have been presented, and are somewhat appropriate and accurate. • Strategies have been partially justified with some relevant literature. • Data analysis processes have been satisfactorily described. • Intended representations of findings have been partially explained.. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The analysis strategies related to some types of data and research questions/hypotheses have been presented, and are somewhat appropriate and accurate. • Strategies have been poorly justified with no relevant literature. • Data analysis processes have not been described. • Intended representations of findings have not been explained.
issues	3 marks	2 marks	1 – 0 marks
	<p>There is strong evidence of ethical considerations in appropriate areas, which may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive issues • Vulnerability of participants • Conflict of interests • Selection of participants • Risk to participants/researcher • Confidentiality and anonymity <p>Ethical considerations have been strongly supported by the literature.</p>	<p>There is satisfactory evidence of ethical considerations in appropriate areas, which may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive issues • Vulnerability of participants • Conflict of interests • Selection of participants • Risk to participants/researcher • Confidentiality and anonymity <p>Ethical considerations have been marginally supported by the literature.</p>	<p>There is little evidence of ethical considerations in appropriate areas, which may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive issues • Vulnerability of participants • Conflict of interests • Selection of participants • Risk to participants/researcher • Confidentiality and anonymity <p>Ethical considerations have not been supported by the literature.</p>

PTER 4 – PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS (30 MARKS)

Presentation and interpretation of findings (15 marks)

Discussion of findings (15 marks)

	Descriptors
--	--------------------

ion ation s	15 – 12 marks	11 – 9 marks	8 – 6 marks	5 – 0 marks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings for each research question are appropriately presented. Representations of findings are thoroughly elaborated through appropriate narratives, tables, graphs, etc. Findings are thoroughly interpreted in relation to research questions/hypotheses, purpose. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings for each research question are sufficiently presented. Representations of findings are sufficiently elaborated through appropriate narratives, table, graphs, etc. Findings are satisfactorily interpreted in relation to research questions/hypotheses and purpose. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings for each research question are presented. Representations of findings are not sufficiently elaborate through appropriate narratives, table, graphs, etc. Findings are not sufficiently interpreted in relation to research questions/hypotheses and purpose. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a lack of evidence appropriate data analysis for each research question. Representations of findings are not elaborated through appropriate narratives, graphs, etc. Findings are not interpreted in relation to research questions/hypotheses and purpose.
n of	15 – 12 marks	11 – 9 marks	8 – 6 marks	5 – 0 marks
	Findings are thoroughly discussed in relation to the research questions AND research literature.	Findings are sufficiently discussed in relation to the research questions AND research literature.	Findings are not sufficiently discussed in relation to the research questions AND research literature.	Findings are not discussed in relation to the research questions AND research literature.

PTER 5 – IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION (20 MARKS)

Implications for Researcher and other Teachers/Administrators (10 marks)

Recommendations (6 marks)

Conclusions (4 marks)

Reflective journal entry 3 (see Part B Rubric at end)

Criteria	Descriptors
-----------------	--------------------

Implications of the study: Implications for researcher and teachers/ administrators and in context	10 -8 marks	7-5 marks	4 – 1 marks	0
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implications of the study are related to its significance as articulated in Chapter 1. • An insightful description of the impact of the study for the researcher, participants and colleagues/department/administrators/school. • Constraints of the study are provided, are reasonable, and clearly based on researcher reflections on the research process. • Evidence of how these constraints were addressed during the study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implications of the study are somewhat related to its significance as articulated in Chapter 1. • A somewhat insightful description of the impact of the study for the researcher, participants and colleagues/department/administrators/school. • Constraints of the study are partially provided, are marginally reasonable, and somewhat based on researcher reflections on the research process. • Some evidence of how these constraints were addressed during the study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implications of the study are poorly related to its significance as articulated in Chapter 1. • A poor description of the impact of the study for the researcher, participants and colleagues/department/administrators/school. • Constraints of the study are partially provided, are not reasonable, and not based on researcher reflections on the research process. • Some evidence of how these constraints were addressed during the study. 	Fail provisional imp
Recommendations	6 – 5 marks	4 – 3 marks	2 – 1 marks	0
	<p>Recommendations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reasonable AND thoroughly supported by reflection on the research process • based on supporting evidence from the findings. 	<p>Recommendations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reasonable AND adequately supported by reflection on the research process • based on supporting evidence from the findings. 	<p>Recommendations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reasonable BUT not supported by the researcher’s reflection on the research process • not based on supporting evidence from the findings. 	Fail provisional recommendations
Conclusions	4 marks	3 marks	2 – 1 marks	0

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear evidence that the conclusions were based on the research. • A clear conclusive statement is made that evaluates the intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some evidence that the conclusions were based on the research. • A satisfactory conclusive statement is made that evaluates the intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the conclusions were not based on the research. • A poor conclusive statement is made that evaluates the intervention. 	No con artic
--	--	--	---	--------------------

ALTIES (-15 MARKS)

Criteria	Descriptors		
	- 5 marks	- (4 - 3) marks	- (2 - 1) marks
Academic writing	Consistently violates ALL of the following APA requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within-text citation • Reference list • Match between within-text citation and listed references • Conventions for tables, graphs and figures. • Conventions for headings, subheadings, and running title 	Sometimes violates most of the following APA requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within-text citation • Reference list • Match between within-text citation and listed references • Conventions for tables, graphs and figures. • Conventions for headings, subheadings, and running title 	Rarely violates the following requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within-text citation • Reference list • Match between within-text citation and listed references • Conventions for tables, graphs and figures. • Conventions for headings, subheadings, and running title
Academic English	Consistently violates the following conventions of academic English: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct use of grammar • Correct use of punctuation • Sentences that are well structured, and communicate the researcher's ideas as intended. 	Sometimes violates to the following conventions of academic English: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct use of grammar • Correct use of punctuation • Sentences that are well structured, and communicate the researcher's ideas as intended. 	Rarely violates the following conventions of academic English: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct use of grammar • Correct use of punctuation • Sentences that are well structured and communicate the researcher's ideas as intended.

tion of	– 5 marks	– (4 – 3) marks	– (2 – 1) marks
t	Report meets none of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arranged in appropriate chapters • Chapters arranged into sections • Sections arranged into well-developed and logically sequenced paragraphs • Clear transition between paragraphs • Coherence within chapters 	Report meets at most, three of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arranged in appropriate chapters • Chapters arranged into sections • Sections arranged into well-developed and logically sequenced paragraphs • Clear transition between paragraphs • Coherence within chapters 	The report meets most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arranged in appropriate chapters • Chapters arranged into sections • Sections arranged into well-developed and logically sequenced paragraphs • Clear transition between paragraphs • Coherence within chapters
it			– 5 marks Report exceeds 6,500-word limit more than 10% (650 words) and includes Executive Summary, references, and appendices.

score for Part A is out of a total of 120, and is converted to a score out of 80.

CT B – REFLECTIVE JOURNAL (20%)

Journal Entry 1: What was your experience developing the focus of your study?

(= total criteria mark divided by 3)

Criteria	Exemplary 18-20	Intermediate 14-17	Satisfactory 10-13	Unsatisfactory 0-9
What motivated you to do this study? What were the main factors that influenced you to do the study? Example: statement of Interests, literature, research, change/improve practice, professional development, others	An excellent articulation of factors.	A good articulation of factors.	A reasonable articulation of factors.	An incoherent and unclear articulation of factors.
What was your beginning point and what contextual factors influenced your choice? For example, were you an adept researcher, intermediate researcher, or novice? What factors in your school/department/classroom/school community; and your personal culture: values, beliefs, norms influenced your choice?	An excellent exposition on all areas.	A good exposition on some or all areas.	A reasonable exposition on some or all of the areas.	An incoherent and unclear exposition on some or all areas.
How did you engage the school staff and others (e.g., parents, colleagues in other schools, tutors, etc.) to work collaboratively to refine the focus of your study?	An excellent explanation on the collaborative process with relevant examples.	A good explanation on the collaborative process with some relevant examples.	A reasonable explanation on the collaborative process with few relevant examples.	A weak explanation on the collaborative process with no relevant examples.

Journal Entry 2: What was your experience designing and implementing your intervention? (40 marks = total criteria)

Criterion	Exemplary 9-10	Intermediate 7-8	Satisfactory 5-6	Unsatisfactory 0-4
How did you experience your process of choosing data collection methods and approaches to your data?	An excellent reflection that clearly describes how you came to the decisions regarding data collection methods and analysis	A good reflection that describes how you came to the decisions regarding data collection methods and analysis	A reasonable reflection that describes how you came to the decisions regarding data collection methods and analysis	A reflection that does not clearly describe how you came to the decisions regarding data collection methods and analysis

Criterion	Exemplary 18-20	Intermediate 14-17	Satisfactory 10-13	Unsatisfactory 0-9
How did you describe your experience of thoughtfully selecting aspects of the intervention related to the design process?	Selections provide a clear "story" of the experiences. The aspects selected and examples used are held together by a main idea or theme. The impression created is of high cohesion within the description of the experiences.	Selections provide a fairly clear "story" of the experiences. The aspects selected and examples used are fairly effective in conveying a main idea or theme. The impression created is of relatively high cohesion within the description of the experiences.	Selections provide a moderately clear "story" of the experiences. The aspects selected and examples used are somewhat effective in conveying a main idea or theme. The impression created is of just adequate cohesion within the description of the experiences.	Selections provide virtually no 'story' of the experiences. Aspects selected and examples used do not convey a main idea or theme. The description of experiences may just be a collection of episodes with no attempt to weave them together and tell a cohesive 'story' of the experience of implementing the intervention.

Criterion	Exemplary 9-10	Intermediate 7-8	Satisfactory 5-6	Unsatisfactory 0-4
How do you implement in practice context, what from the action research process does doing the	A reflection showing excellent application	A reflection showing good application	A reflection showing some reasonable level of application	A reflection showing no application

Journal Entry 3: How has engagement in this action research project changed you? (40 marks = total criteria marks)

	Exemplary 18-20	Intermediate 14-17	Satisfactory 10-13	Unsatisfactory 0-9
How much has engagement in this action research project changed you? Discuss both growth and challenges as you experience the action research process and how this has changed you on the following levels: Personal level Professional level	An excellent reflection that covers all the areas in the criteria	A good reflection that covers all or some of the areas in the criteria	A reasonable reflection that covers all or some the areas in the criteria	A weak reflection that does not cover all the areas in the criteria
What do you intend to carry out further work on in your plan or new action research projects?	An excellent articulation of future action research possibilities	A good articulation of future action research possibilities	A reasonable articulation of future action research possibilities	An unclear articulation of future action research possibilities

Score for Part B is out of a total of 100, and is converted to a score out of 20.

total score on this assessment is the sum of the weighted scores for Part A and Part B for a score out of 100.