Dissertation Proposal Rubric

ST = Stewards of the Discipline (knowledge); RI = Reflective Inquirer (skills); ME = Mindful Educator (dispositions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Rubric: 3 Point Scale</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Acceptable</th>
<th>3 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Introduction                  | • Background context for study is poorly developed within the context of relevant literature and/or theories  
• Poorly developed rationale or purpose for the study. Purpose was unfocused and unclear.  
• No or poorly formed hypotheses or research question(s). | • Background context for study is appropriately developed within the context of relevant literature and/or theories  
• Appropriately developed rationale or purpose for the study. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear.  
• Adequately formed hypotheses or research question(s). | • Background context for study is clearly developed within the context of relevant literature and/or theories  
• Clearly developed rationale or purpose for the study. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear.  
• Thoughtfully formed hypotheses or research question(s). |
| Quality Literature Review     | • Inadequate in review of relevant literature based on the number and quality reviewed and thoroughness of description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.  
• Inadequately identifies the gaps in the literature exist  
• Little to no synthesis of reviewed literature content to make conclusion(s). | • Adequate in review of relevant literature based on the number and quality and thoroughness of description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.  
• Adequate identification of gaps in the literature exists to merit study.  
• Provides an adequate analysis and synthesis of literature. | • Provides significant review of relevant literature based on the number and quality reviewed and thoroughness of description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.  
• Insightful in identifying where gaps in the literature exist  
• Thoughtful conclusions made based on review of literature |
| Methods                       | • Little, poorly communicated or lack of description of participants, setting, research methodology, procedures, and statistical analyses (as applicable to study)  
• Methodology proposed has | • Most needed details communicated with respect to description of participants, setting, research methodology, procedures, and statistical analyses (as applicable to study) | • All needed details communicated with respect to description of participants, setting, research methodology, procedures, and statistical analyses (as applicable to study)  
• Methodology proposed |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Writing</th>
<th>• Writing represents inadequate focus and coherence, organization, development of ideas, and standard writing conventions of the English language (e.g., spelling, capitalization, punctuation, grammar, usage).</th>
<th>• Writing represents adequate focus and coherence, organization, development of ideas, and standard writing conventions of the English language (e.g., spelling, capitalization, punctuation, grammar, usage).</th>
<th>• Writing represents exceptionally focus and coherence, organization, development of ideas, and standard writing conventions of the English language (e.g., spelling, capitalization, punctuation, grammar, usage).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APA Style</td>
<td>• In inadequate compliance</td>
<td>• In adequate compliance</td>
<td>• In more than adequate compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Defense</td>
<td>• Inadequately responds to questions posed, responses are poorly communicated. • Presentation, discussion, and/or responses to questions are inadequately supported by research, and/or demonstrate little evidence of knowledge of question content area • Inadequately articulates responses to questions • Less than adequately discusses many of the major implications of the position(s) made in paper.</td>
<td>• Adequately responds to questions posed, responses are poorly communicated. • Presentation, discussion, and/or responses to questions are adequately supported by research, and/or demonstrate little evidence of knowledge of question content area • Adequately articulates responses to questions • Adequately discusses many of the major implications of the position(s) made in paper.</td>
<td>• Exceptionally responds to questions posed, responses are poorly communicated. • Presentation, discussion, and/or responses to questions are strongly supported by research, and/or demonstrate little evidence of knowledge of question content area • Thoroughly articulates responses clearly, effectively, and fluently. • Thoroughly discusses many of the major implications of the position(s) made in paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>