*DePaul University ⯁ School for New Learning ⯁ Graduate Programs*

*1 E. Jackson (mailing); 14 E. Jackson (office location), Chicago, IL 60604* *snlgrad@depaul.edu*

**Integrating Project: *FINAL PRODUCT Review Form***

***(MA Program in Applied Professional Studies/MAAPS)***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STUDENT’S NAME 🢂** |  |
| **Student DePaul ID # 🢂** |  |
| **Student’s Faculty Mentor 🢂** |  |
| **Fac. Mentor’s Email Address 🢂** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Assessor:*** | \_\_\_Student/Author | \_\_\_Professional Advisor | \_\_\_Faculty Mentor |

Date this REVIEW is due to SNL: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**OVERVIEW:** The Integrating Project is an original, independently conducted project that both incorporates elements of theory and practice and demonstrates integration of Liberal Learning and Graduate Focus Area competencies. As such, it is designed to:

1. involve new learning while also building upon & integrating learner’s existing knowledge/skills;
2. engage the learner in deepening and/or expanding his/her base of knowledge and skills;
3. locate the topic of exploration within the relevant literature (i.e., the larger context);
4. employ a systematic method(s) of inquiry—working with a credible base of data/information;
5. contribute to current knowledge or practice and/or offer direction for further applications; and,
6. have utility/relevance to other persons, groups, organizations, larger systems and/or the world of ideas.

**INQUIRY APPROACHES:** Students may orient their inquiry for the Integrating Project from among several approaches.[[1]](#footnote-1),[[2]](#footnote-2) Four general approaches are listed below which may, in some cases, overlap. The remainder of this form is dedicated to the particular approach (bolded and outlined below) that the student is proposing to employ in this project:

|  |
| --- |
| **⯈Discovery: This approach is characterized by advancing knowledge through original research. The student collects original data, using a recognized method(s) of research. The data are analyzed and interpreted typically for the purpose of advancing or creating knowledge. Students’ inquiry in the discovery mode may be characterized by contributing to the building of an important idea, rather than something that can be applied in the short term.**  |
| **⯈Creative/Artistic Expression:** This approach is characterized by advancing understanding through creative efforts drawing upon one or more media for expression. The student identifies an audience, purpose, and process(es) as touchstones for assessing the relevancy and innovation of the creative effort. Drawing on literature, practicing artists/writers, and/or other appropriate sources, the student should place his/her creative efforts in the context of genres or traditions that inform his/her choices and processes. Students' inquiry in the creative mode may be characterized by contributing to the understanding of events, ideas, people, and or issues through the evocative capacities of the arts in one form or another.  |
| **⯈Integration:** This approach is characterized by synthesizing knowledge in creative ways. In this mode of inquiry, the student seeks to synthesize specialized knowledge (her/his own and others) into new patterns of understanding and meaning. Often, perspectives from multiple disciplines/fields are woven together with the student’s critical reflection on practice to arrive at new interpretations. This approach may include collection of some original data, or it may rely on existing data and information.   |
| **⯈Practice Enhancement:**This approach involves applying knowledge to practical, real world problems and situations. In this mode of inquiry, the student seeks toimprove or enhance specific practices based on explanations of ideas derived from relevant literature and the students' interpretations of his/her own observation and experiences within a given setting. In this context, the student will show her/his understanding of how practice(s) and the ideas behind it (models, principles, etc.) interrelate. The student’s effort will involve designing, implementing, evaluating, and/or advancing practice in a defined setting. The student will collect primary data to support decisions or provide evidence of outcomes as appropriate to each of these phases.  |

**Integrating Project FINAL PRODUCT: Discovery Approach**

Please assess the Integr. Proj. FINAL PRODUCT in accordance with each of the following areas:

**(1)** TITLE PAGE: This page includes: (a) the **project title**; (b) **names** of the Student, Faculty Mentor, Professional Advisor and Outside Assessor; (c) the student’s **Cluster Number**; (d) the title of the student’s **Graduate Focus Area**; and (e) the date of **final product submission**.

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessor’s Comments:** |
| ***Review in brief:*** | *\_\_\_\_-Satisfactory* | *\_\_\_\_Unacceptable* |

**(2)** PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This section provides a brief overview/rationale of the project. It includes: (a) a statement of **purpose** clarifying the problem, issue or situation addressed; and, (b) the **research question or hypothesis** (including rationale) investigated.

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessor’s Comments:** |
| ***Review in brief:*** | *\_\_\_\_-Strong* | *\_\_\_\_-Satisfactory* | *\_\_\_\_Unacceptable* |

1. PROJECT CONTEXT: This section provides an explanation of the background and context of the project. It includes: (a) a discussion of the project from the standpoint of a **comprehensive literature review** relevant to the research question; (b) an **analysis** of relevant and/or competing ideas.

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessor’s Comments:** |
| ***Review in brief:*** | *\_\_\_\_-Strong* | *\_\_\_\_-Satisfactory* | *\_\_\_\_Unacceptable* |

**(4)** METHODS: This section provides an explanation of the data/information gathered and by what methods. It includes: (a) a description of the **information/data** collected; (b) a description of, and rationale for, the **methods** (supported by appropriate literature pertaining to research methods) used in the collection of data; and, (c) an explanation of adherence to **Human Subjects’ guidelines** as appropriate.

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessor’s Comments:** |
| ***Review in brief:*** | *\_\_\_\_-Strong* | *\_\_\_\_-Satisfactory* | *\_\_\_\_Unacceptable* |

 **(5)** DATA ANALYSIS & PRESENTATION: This section provides an explanation of how data/information was analyzed and interpreted (i.e., beyond simple description). It includes: (a) an explanation of the **analysis process**; (b) an explanation of its **alignment** to/with the data collected; and, (c) an explanation of the **findings** (i.e., findings within the bounds of the data collected).

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessor’s Comments:** |
| ***Review in brief:*** | *\_\_\_\_-Strong* | *\_\_\_\_-Satisfactory* | *\_\_\_\_Unacceptable* |

**(6)** IMPLICATIONS: This section provides an explanation of how this project impacts the field as well as the student. It includes: (a) a description of the **implications** of this project for the field as well as its **intended audience**; (b) an explanation of how the process of developing the project enabled the students to engage his/her **ability to think—do—reflect**; and, (c) an explanation of the **Liberal Learning components** that that the student drew upon in accomplishing this project.

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessor’s Comments:** |
| ***Review in brief:*** | *\_\_\_\_-Strong* | *\_\_\_\_-Satisfactory* | *\_\_\_\_Unacceptable* |

**(7)** ABSTRACT: This stand-alone section provides a concise (350-500 word) summary of the entire Integrating Project—what was done, why, how, with what key outcomes/implications for the student’s Graduate Focus Area?

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessor’s Comments:** |
| ***Review in brief:*** | *\_\_\_\_-Strong* | *\_\_\_\_-Satisfactory* | *\_\_\_\_Unacceptable* |

⬥ ⬥ ⬥ ⬥ ⬥ ⬥ ⬥ ⬥ ⬥ ⬥ ⬥ ⬥

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessor Name 🢂** |  |
| **Email Address 🢂** |  |

**Please submit Review Form to:**

**-Faculty Mentor (email on first page); OR,** **snlgrad@depaul.edu****.**

***If mailing, use: MAAPS Program, School for New Learning, DePaul University, 1 E. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604.***
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