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**Purpose of the Qualifying Exam**

To satisfy Ed.D. program requirements, doctoral students must successfully complete a comprehensive qualifying exam (QE). The QE for the doctoral degree is an important milestone in the doctoral student’s progress in the program. The QE determines whether the student is academically prepared to advance to candidacy and to begin independent research. The QE is usually attempted during the summer of the student’s second year in the program after completing a significant portion of required coursework a

The QE evaluates the student’s academic preparation in the field of educational leadership including the understanding of relevant research methods and applications.

**Student QE Eligibility**

A student is eligible to attempt the QE after completing 30 SCHs in the program (including transfer and/or competency-based credit). An eligible student must maintain a minimum of a 3.0 GPA in all coursework completed (not including those courses graded “S” or “IP”).

Before June 15 of the summer in which the student intends to attempt the QE, the student shall submit a written request by email to a Program Director to attempt the QE. The QE may not be attempted until a QE request has been approved by a Program Director. A Program Director will email the student approving or disapproving the student’s intention to attempt the QE.

Ed.D. Higher Education Pathway Director

Dr. Janet Hindman [jhindman@wtamu.edu](mailto:jhindman@wtamu.edu)

Ed.D. EC-12 Pathway Director

Business and Finance Pathway Director

Dr. Eddie Henderson [ehenderson@wtamu.edu](mailto:ehenderson@wtamu.edu)

**QE Format**

The QE is a written exam of three hours administered in a proctored setting. The exam is administered in the WTAMU Canyon or Amarillo campus computer center using WTAMU computing resources on a date determined by the program. The date, time, and place of the administration is posted on the program’s website. The specific format of the exam is determined by the program.

If a student requires modifications to attempt the QE, the student must notify a Program Director by email 30 days prior to the exam administration. A student, who due to extraordinary circumstances is unable to attend the on-campus administration of the exam, must contact a Program Director and arrange for an alternative proctored administration of the exam. All “first-attempt” exams must be completed before August 1.

Students attempting the exam will be required to present photo identification at the time and place scheduled for the exam.

The QE is a high-stakes exam. As such, the QE must be the result of a doctoral student’s individual efforts. Collaboration between the student and others completing the QE is prohibited and constitutes academic dishonesty. Students may not access or use any resources during the exam administration. Students may be dismissed from the program for any form of academic dishonesty and/or ethics violations.

The QE is composed of two Sections. Each Section is scored independently. The outcome of each Section will be “Pass” or “Not Pass.” Failure of either Section constitutes a failure of the exam.

**QE Section One**

Time Allowed 60 Minutes

In Section One of the QE, the student will demonstrate their command of the knowledge base in their selected areas of study at a level that demonstrates expertise in that area and readiness to conduct empirical research in the field to reveal and create new knowledge. The student will synthesize and apply their knowledge and professional experience to the analysis of program-specific goals and learning outcomes.

The student will complete the following task:

Select one ***Ed.D. Program Learning Goal*** or one ***Ed.D. Candidate Learning Outcome*** and write a critical analysis of what you have learned in the doctoral program based upon your coursework and your experience as a leader (approximately 400-500 words). Be as specific as possible in your answers and/or references. Writing should be clear, scholarly writing with adherence to word count and formatting requirements that synthesizes what you have learned and how you may apply that learning to your present or future leadership roles.

***Ed.D. Program Learning Goals***

*Our program learning goals are to prepare:*

1. *Visionary and effective educational leaders grounded in research who are equipped to meet specific challenges in rural educational settings.*
2. *Leaders who are responsive to the cultural, sociopolitical, economic, and emergency management contexts of rural communities.*
3. *Leaders who are capable of innovative solutions within areas of limited resources and access conditions.*

***Ed.D. Candidate Learning Outcomes***

*Candidates will:*

1. *Critically analyze the cultural, sociopolitical, and economic milieu impacting educational organizations within rural and small urban areas.*
2. *Create settings that support accessible and equitable learning opportunities for all members.*
3. *Engage in diverse, scholarly activities to evaluate current educational organizations, to inform decision-making, and to provide new directions for organizational improvement.*

Evaluation of Section One

The student’s responses will be rigorously assessed by a committee of three to five doctoral core faculty members (QE Assessment Committee).

Responses will be assessed based on the following criteria:

1. Selection of one *Ed.D. Program Learning Goal* or one *Ed.D. Candidate Learning Outcome* for the writing response.

2. Critical analysis and application of coursework and professional experience to Goal or Outcome selected.

3. Clarity, coherence, and organization of the written response.

4. Adherence to the specified word count and formatting requirements (APA 7 Manual Style).

Additionally, the student’s responses will be reviewed as to punctuation, capitalization, sentence structure, vocabulary, grammar, and organization.

Attached hereto as Appendix A is the scoring rubric that will be used to assess the student’s written response to Section One.

**Break between Section One and Section Two**

A break of 20 minutes will be scheduled between the administration of Section One and Section Two.

**QE Section Two**

Time Allowed: 120 minutes

In Section Two of the QE, the student will be provided a research article from an AERA (American Educational Research Association) or *Journal of College and Character* publication relevant to the field of educational leadership. The student will be required to critically analyze the article and demonstrate an understanding of the research.

The student will complete the following tasks:

1. Read the provided research article carefully, focusing on the research problem,

methodology, findings, and conclusions.

1. Identify the **implications** of the research (approximately 400-500 words) that includes:

a. Two to three key findings from the study with the most significant implications for educational leadership;

b. An explanation of how each key finding contributes to understanding the research

problem or topic;

c. A discussion of how the findings may inform educational leadership practice, policy, or

decision-making;

d. Potential applications of the findings in real-world educational settings; and

e. Two to three recommendations for future research based on the study's findings and remaining gaps or questions.

1. Identify the **limitations** of the research (approximately 400-500 words) that includes:

a. Two to three major limitations of the study, such as sample size, selection, or representativeness; research design or methodology; data collection or analysis methods; or potential biases or confounding variables;

b. An explanation of how each limitation might impact the interpretation or

generalizability of the findings;

c. Suggestions for how future research could address these limitations or improve upon

the current study's design; and

d. A reflection on how the limitations may affect the implications discussed in

the previous section.

Evaluation of Section Two

A student’s response will be rigorously assessed by a committee of three to five doctoral core faculty members (QE Assessment Committee).

A student’s response will be assessed based on the following criteria:

1. Identification and explanation of key findings and their implications for educational

leadership.

2. Critical analysis of the study's limitations and their potential impact on the findings.

3. Suggestions for future research and improvements to the study's design.

4. Clarity, coherence, and organization of the written response.

5. Adherence to the specified word count and formatting requirements.

Attached hereto as Appendix B is the rubric by which Section Two will be scored. Students must earn a passing score of four (4) points to pass Section Two.

Attached hereto as Appendix C is a QE Student Preparation Guide for Section Two.

Additionally, the student’s responses will be reviewed as to punctuation, capitalization, sentence structure, vocabulary, grammar, and organization.

**Results of QE**

Students are required to pass the QE to continue in the doctoral program and conduct the empirical research required to fulfill the scholarly delivery requirements of the program (Scholarly Delivery 2).

The QE Assessment Committee shall inform the student of its decision of “Pass” or “Not Pass.” The Committee shall notify the student of their exam results and report the student’s QE outcome to the Graduate School. If the decision is negative, the Committee shall provide the student a written statement of the reason(s) for the adverse decision.

In the event that a student does not earn a passing score on the Qualifying Exam, the student will be permitted one additional opportunity to pass the exam. Within 15 days of receiving notice that the student has failed the exam, the student shall submit a written request via email to a Program Director requesting a second exam attempt.

The second exam may take a different format depending on which parts of the exam the student did not pass, and how the QE Assessment Committee may best evaluate the clearing of the deficiencies noted in the first exam. The QE Assessment Committee may require students to submit a rewrite of their written response addressing committee concerns/questions. The Committee may require students to retake all or portions of the examination. The Committee may request an oral examination to be administered virtually by the faculty. A written memo to the student from the QE Assessment Committee will clarify the deficiencies in the first exam, the requirements of the second exam, how the student should meet these requirements, and provide a specific timeline for meeting the requirements.

A failure of the second examination will result in the student’s dismissal from the program.

In order to appeal a decision by the QE Assessment Committee, a student must submit a written request to a Program Director within 30 days of receiving notification of the adverse decision. The request must state the reasons for the appeal and provide any supporting documentation. Any such appeal is reviewed by the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean of the Terry B. Rogers College of Education and Social Sciences, and one or more graduate faculty members appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School. The review shall be concluded and student notified of the outcome within 30 days of initiation of the formal appeal. The Dean of the Graduate School will notify the student in writing of the outcome of the appeal.

**Questions**

Students having questions concerning the QE should contact a Program Director for clarification:

Ed.D. Higher Education Pathway Director

Dr. Janet Hindman [jhindman@wtamu.edu](mailto:jhindman@wtamu.edu)

Ed.D. EC-12 Pathway Director

Business and Finance Pathway Director

Dr. Eddie Henderson [ehenderson@wtamu.edu](mailto:ehenderson@wtamu.edu)

**Appendix A - QE Writing Test Scoring Rubric\***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Scorepoint*** | ***Ideas and Analysis*** | ***Development and Support*** | ***Organization*** | ***Language Use and Style*** |
| **Score 6:**  **Written responses at this scorepoint demonstrate effective skill in writing a reflective, critical analysis essay** | The writer generates an essay that reflectively and critically engages with multiple perspectives on the selected program goal or learning outcome. The essay’s thesis establishes and employs an insightful context for analysis of the selection and its perspectives. The analysis examines implications, complexities and tensions, and/or underlying values and assumptions. | Development of ideas and support for points made deepen insight and broaden context. An integrated line of skillful reasoning and illustration effectively conveys the significance of the essay. Qualifications and complications enrich and bolster ideas and analysis. | The response exhibits a skillful organizational strategy. The response is unified by a controlling idea or purpose, and a logical progression of ideas increases the effectiveness of the essay. Transitions between and within paragraphs strengthen the relationships among ideas. | The use of language and style enhance the writer’s essay. Word choice is skillful and precise. Sentence structures are consistently varied, clear, and coherent. Stylistic and register choice, including voice and tone, are strategic and effective. While a few errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics may be present, they do not impede understanding. |
| **Score 5:**  **Responses at this scorepoint demonstrate well-developed skill in writing a reflective, critical analysis essay** | The writer generates an essay that productively engages with multiple perspectives on the selection. The thesis reflects precision in thought and purpose. The writer establishes and employs a thoughtful context for analysis of the selection and its perspectives. The analysis addresses implications, complexities and tensions, and/or underlying values and assumptions. | Development of ideas and support for points made deepen understanding. A mostly integrated line of purposeful reasoning and illustration capably conveys the significance of the essay. Qualifications and complications enrich ideas and analysis. | The response exhibits a productive organizational strategy. The response is mostly unified by a controlling idea or purpose, and a logical sequencing of ideas contributes to the effectiveness of the essay. Transitions between and within paragraphs consistently clarify the relationships among ideas. | The use of language and style work in service of the points made. Word choice is precise. Sentence structures are clear and varied often. Stylistic and register choices, including voice and tone, are purposeful and productive. While minor errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics may be present, they do not impede understanding. |
| **Score 4:**  **Responses at this scorepoint demonstrate adequate skill in writing a reflective, critical analysis essay** | The writer generates an essay that engages with multiple perspectives on the selection. The thesis reflects clarity in thought and purpose. The writing establishes and employs a relevant context for analysis of the selection and its perspectives. The analysis recognizes implications, complexities and tensions, and/or underlying values and assumptions. | Development of ideas and support for ideas clarify meaning and purpose. Lines of clear reasoning and illustration adequately convey the significance of the essay. Qualifications and complications extend ideas and analysis. | The response exhibits a clear organizational strategy. The overall shape of the response reflects an emergent controlling idea or purpose. Ideas are logically grouped and sequenced. Transitions between and within paragraphs clarify the relationships among ideas. | The use of language and style conveys the ideas with clarity. Word choice is adequate and sometimes precise. Sentence structures are clear and demonstrate some variety. Stylistic and register choices, including voice and tone, are appropriate for the rhetorical purpose. While errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics are present, they rarely impede understanding. |
| **Score 3:**  **Responses at this scorepoint demonstrate some developing skill in writing a reflective, critical analysis essay** | The writer generates an essay that responds to multiple perspectives on the selection. The thesis reflects some clarity in thought and purpose. The essay establishes a limited or tangential context for analysis of the selection and its perspectives. Analysis is simplistic or somewhat unclear. | Development of ideas and support for ideas are mostly relevant but are overly general or simplistic. Reasoning and illustration largely clarify the ideas but may be somewhat repetitious or imprecise. | The response exhibits a basic organizational structure. The response largely coheres, with most ideas logically grouped. Transitions between and within paragraphs sometimes clarify the relationships among ideas. | The use of language and style are basic and only somewhat clear. Word choice is general and occasionally imprecise. Sentence structures are usually clear but show little variety. Stylistic and register choices, including voice and tone, are not always appropriate for the rhetorical purpose. Distracting errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics may be present, but they generally do not impede understanding. |
| **Score 2:**  **Responses at this scorepoint demonstrate weak or inconsistent skill in writing a reflective, critical analysis essay** | The writer generates an essay that weakly responds to multiple perspectives on the selection. The essay’s thesis, if evident, reflects little clarity in thought and purpose. Attempts at analysis are incomplete, largely irrelevant, or consist primarily of restatement of the issue and its perspectives. | Development of ideas and support are weak, confused, or disjointed. Reasoning and illustration are inadequate, illogical, or circular, and fail to fully clarify the ideas in the essay. | The response exhibits a rudimentary organizational structure. Grouping of ideas is inconsistent and often unclear. Transitions between and within paragraphs are misleading or poorly formed. | The use of language and style are inconsistent and often unclear. Word choice is rudimentary and frequently imprecise. Sentence structures are sometimes unclear. Stylistic and register choices, including voice and tone, are inconsistent and are not always appropriate for the rhetorical purpose. Distracting errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics are present, and they sometimes impede understanding. |
| **Score 1:**  **Responses at this scorepoint demonstrate little or no skill in writing a reflective, critical analysis essay** | The writer fails to generate an essay that responds intelligibly to the task. The writer’s intentions are difficult to discern. Attempts at analysis are unclear or irrelevant. | Ideas lack development and ideas lack support. Reasoning and illustration are unclear, incoherent, or largely absent. | The response does not exhibit an organizational structure. There is little grouping of ideas. When present, transitional devices fail to connect ideas. | The use of language and style fail to demonstrate skill in responding to the selection. Word choice is imprecise and often difficult to comprehend. Sentence structures are often unclear. Stylistic and register choices are difficult to identify. Errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics are pervasive and often impede understanding. |

\* Based upon the ACT and SAT Writing Rubrics

**Appendix B – QE Section Two Scoring Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Points** | **Task 1: Implications**  **section** | **Task 2: Limitations**  **section** | **Task 3: Style and**  **mechanics** |
| 6 | Insightfully identifies and analyzes 2-3 key findings and their implications for educational  leadership.  Provides thorough explanations of how each key finding contributes to understanding the research problem or topic, discusses how findings can inform practice, policy, or decision-making, and potential applications.  Thoroughly examines 2-3 major limitations of the study, such as sample size, selection, or representativeness; research design or methodology; data collection or analysis methods; or potential biases or confounding variables. | Provides 2-3 compelling and well-developed suggestions for future research based on the study’s findings and remaining gaps or questions.  Provides a thorough explanation of how each limitation might impact the interpretation or generalizability of the findings.  Provides compelling suggestions for how future research could address these limitations or improve upon the current study’s design. | Exhibits a clear, logical, and coherent organization of ideas.  Demonstrates superior facility with the conventions of standard written English. |
| 4-5 | Competently identifies and analyzes 2-3 key findings and their implications for educational leadership.  Provides adequate explanations of how each key finding contributes to understanding the research problem or topic, discusses how findings can inform practice, policy, or decision-making, and potential applications.  Adequately examines 2-3 major limitations of the study, such as sample size, selection, or representativeness; research design or methodology; data collection or analysis methods; or potential biases or confounding variables. | Offers 2-3 solid suggestions for future research based on the study's findings and remaining gaps or questions.  Provides an adequate explanation of how each limitation might impact the interpretation or generalizability of the findings.  Offers solid suggestions for how future research could address these limitations or improve upon the current study's design. | Presents a generally clear and logical organization of ideas.  Displays strong control of the conventions of standard written English. |
| 2-3 | Partially identifies and analyzes key findings and their implications for educational leadership.  Provides superficial explanations of how each key finding contributes to understanding the research problem or topic, limited discussion of how findings can inform practice, policy, or decision- making, and potential applications.  Superficially examines the study's limitations, such as sample size, selection, or representativeness; research design or methodology; data collection or analysis methods; or potential biases or confounding variables. | Provides 1-2 suggestions for future research based on the study's findings and remaining gaps or questions but may lack depth.  Provides a superficial explanation of how each limitation might impact the interpretation or generalizability of the findings.  Provides some suggestions for how future research could address these limitations or improve upon the current study's design but may lack depth. | Exhibits an uneven organization of ideas, with some logical connections.  Shows adequate control of the conventions of standard written English, with some errors. |
| 0-1 | Fails to identify and analyze key findings and their implications for educational leadership.  Does not provide explanations of how each key finding contributes to understanding the research problem or topic, lacks discussion of how findings can inform practice, policy, or decision-making, and potential applications.  Does not examine the study's limitations, such as sample size, selection, or representativeness; research design or methodology; data collection or analysis methods; or potential biases or confounding variables. | Lacks suggestions for future research based on the study's findings and remaining gaps or questions.  Does not provide an explanation of how each limitation might impact the interpretation or generalizability of the findings.  Lacks suggestions for how future research could address these limitations, or improve upon the current study's design. | Displays a lack of organization and logical connection of ideas.  Contains numerous errors in the conventions of standard written English that severely impede understanding. |

**Appendix C – QE Section Two Student Preparation Guide**

Reading Scholarly Articles

Guidance from David Rudge and adapted by Dr. Vince Nix

Adapted from [http://homepages.wmich.edu/~rudged/dir614.html](http://homepages.wmich.edu/%7Erudged/dir614.html) and [http://homepages.wmich.edu/~rudged/dis614.html](http://homepages.wmich.edu/%7Erudged/dis614.html) with permission of the author (David Rudge), accessed 6/20/12.

**What is a scholarly article?**

Scholarly articles are written by professionals and published in academic journals, some peer reviewed, some not. The peer reviewed, and some editor-reviewed articles have gone through a rigorous process of ‘peer’ review before being accepted for publication in a journal. Scholarly articles serve a number of purposes: many present original research findings by the author(s), and commonly this research is used to support or refute an existing theory, or to advance a new theory. Other articles review the literature on a particular topic in order to summarize a related body of research findings; these can be text-based or numerically based reviews. Still others may present a new or modified research methodology (a way of collecting or analyzing data). What makes these articles “scholarly” is that the author(s) is (are) carefully constructing an argument that is based on evidence generally collected along the lines of the scientific methods.

**Some suggestions on how to read a scholarly article**

The first goal of reading any scholarly article is to understand the context. To do this, first identify the author’s purpose in writing the article. Is he/she sharing original research? Presenting a new theory? Summarizing the literature in order to make a particular argument or developing a new or extending an old methodology? At this point, it can also be helpful to identify for whom the article is written – peers, students, or an audience outside of the field, among others.

Next, identify what the author's main conclusion is and what evidence he/she uses in favor of that conclusion. Here is important to understand if the main conclusions are in fact related to the principle aim or ‘purpose’ of the piece of inquiry (research). It's only when you understand the author's views that you are in a position to evaluate the argument and assess whether you agree or disagree with the author and to determine which parts of the article, e.g., methodology, analytics, are persuasive and which parts are not.

Surprisingly, the best way to approach an academic article for the first time is to skim the whole before actually reading it. Quickly reviewing the text will give you an idea of the overall structure of the paper, the author's purpose and audience, the author’s writing style, and often some idea of how the author presents evidence to support his/her point of view. The most important thing to do is locate the author's purpose and main conclusion, as it is (usually) the main thesis that each of the various parts of the article support

Once you have begun to read the article, start keeping a list of terms and how the author defines or uses them. The strength of the author's argument as a whole often depends upon the extent to which he/she can win the assent of the reader to particular definitions of specific terms. Many arguments about the morality of abortion, to give you one example, depend heavily upon a specific definition of personhood. Sometimes during the course of the article, the author will redefine a term, and if so, it is important to keep track of what the author's motivations are for adopting a different definition.

You should also keep a list of the evidence the author uses in support of the main conclusion. In many ways, this evidence comes in two forms: (1) the a-priori selection of supporting literature presented in the introduction portion of the paper and (2) the methodology and analytics of data. Not all scholarly papers present new data; however, empirical research articles recount studies and thus there will be data (quantitative and or qualitative) presented and analyzed. As you might expect, each piece of the author's argument in favor of the main conclusion must itself be justified and this often involves the use of sub- arguments for particular claims supporting the main conclusion.

Articles often contain other persuasive elements, which, while not part of the formal argument, can nevertheless work in the author's favor. An author's writing style, for instance, can serve to present the issues in such a way as to suggest that the author has truly considered all serious objections to his/her position. Vivid or striking examples can be so compelling as to win the reader's assent (e.g., photographs of fetuses at ten weeks are often used by anti-abortionists).

Almost all academic writing has some rhetorical elements--for our purposes, it is important to recognize and distinguish these forms of persuasion from the author's formal argument.

You should be wary of ignoring whole sections of the author's article as unrelated to the argument for the main conclusion or some sub-argument. Peer-reviewed articles of the sort we will be reading have gone through multiple drafts, in which the author has repeatedly attempted to refine the prose of the article to clarify the connections between each of the points raised to the main conclusion and excise unrelated or tangential lines of thought.

**Specific suggestions for studying articles**

This guidance is meant to help you identify what the author said and how he/she constructs his/her argument based on the evidence presented, the thesis and main conclusion(s) of the article. You should do this part in three steps: (1) skim the article to get a sense of what it is about, (2) read the article once or twice to identify what the author's evidence for the conclusion is, and (3) summarize and identify (reconstruct) the author's argument, rereading sections of the text as necessary.

1. You can find the title of the article and the author(s) name(s) on the very first page of the article. The topic or subject of the article may be contained in the title, but sometimes finding the topic of the article is less straightforward. The title, "A modest proposal," for instance, does not tell you what the article is about. Many scholarly articles begin with an abstract, which is a brief summary of the evidence and the conclusions the authors reach based on the evidence (this is a good place to start if there is an abstract). Authors also sometimes introduce the topic of discussion by pointing out its connections to broader issues, and as such, the first paragraph may be misleading. After skimming the entire article, ask yourself what the article as a whole is about.

Identifying the main thesis or purpose of the article is the next step. You may find it lurking in an introductory paragraph, as when the author announces his/her intentions: "The purpose of this article is to demonstrate that capital punishment is wrong." Sometimes it will appear in a concluding paragraph. As noted above, authors often provide sub-arguments for particular pieces of evidence they use to support their main conclusion. Therefore, the pitfall you must vigilantly avoid is mistaking a sub-argument for the main argument of the paper. One of the best ways to identify the main conclusion is to consider, if you had to say it in one sentence, what the author(s) would like you to believe about the topic, e.g. "The central claim the author of this article would like the reader to believe is ....")

2. To identify the important terms of the article a useful rule of thumb is that you should (1) write down any terms that are unfamiliar to you, (2) write down any terms the author defines or otherwise characterizes, and (3) consider writing down terms that appear to have important roles in the author's argument. This can be very important for understanding how the author operationalizes important variables in the study.

3. Identify the author's primary evidence for the main conclusions – this step deconstructs the methodology and analytics. What are the author’s conclusions based on? For example, how many participants were in the study and how were they selected? Based on what you know and are able to understand you should be able to articulate in just a few sentences what the author's argument is for his/her main conclusion.

**WORKSHEET**

PART I. WHAT THE AUTHOR REALLY SAID

1. Directions: Skim the article as a whole to answer the first few questions below and get a sense of the structure of the article and the author's writing style.

APA REFERENCE: PURPOSE OF ARTICLE: MAIN CONCLUSION:

1. Directions: As you read the article, write down any important /unfamiliar terms and start a list of the reasons or evidence the author provides in favor of the main conclusion (next page).

TERMS: List any terms or concepts that are unfamiliar or appear to be important. If the author provides a definition, be sure to write that down too. Circle any you feel need clarification or discussion.

Important terms Definitions

EVIDENCE: List any evidence the author provides for the main conclusion. Each of these may appear as a sub-conclusion of its own argument. If you spot evidence in favor of a sub- conclusion, list that as well and identify which sub-conclusion it supports. Circle any that you feel need of clarification or discussion.

1. EVIDENCE FOR MAIN CONCLUSION (what/where does the data and how does the analysis of the data lead the author(s) to their conclusions?)
2. EVIDENCE FOR SUB-CONCLUSIONS AND SUB-CONCLUSION SUPPORTED (what/where does the data and how does the analysis of the data lead the author(s) to their conclusions?)

IDENTIFY OTHER PERSUASIVE ELEMENTS. Were there any other aspects of this article, such as the way it was presented, its use of examples, the author's writing style, etc., that made the article persuasive or non-persuasive? List any you find.

1. Directions: After reading the article, complete the following.

SUMMARIZE, using the evidence you found above, and how this evidence leads to the main conclusion. State points directly rather than "he says" or "it's about." (Do not evaluate the argument here.)

PART II. - WHAT I THINK ABOUT THIS - The questions below ask you to evaluate the article.

FIRST REACTIONS. List or write up any reactions you have to the article. Do you agree with the author? Why or why not? (Do not comment on everything--just the things you either strongly agree or disagree with.)

WHERE DOES THE AUTHOR GO WRONG? Remembering the argument you found for the author on page 2, identify what part of the argument, either evidence or the logic linking the premises to the conclusion, you think is mistaken. (Even if you agree with the author, play the devil's advocate by identifying what you consider the weakest point of the argument.)

WHAT IS THE STRONGEST PART OF THE AUTHOR'S ARGUMENT? Again, identify one part of the argument you think works well.

DEVELOP YOUR OWN POSITION - State your own position on this issue and sketch how you might support it. (If you find the author's argument compelling, suggest another way one might support the same position.)