Ed.D. – Thematic Dissertation in Leadership Practice Dissertation
ASSESSMENT RUBRIC Chapters 1 - 3 (Proposal)

CATEGORY	Above Standards	Approaching Standards	Below Standards
PROBLEM STATEMENT	• All elements of the research proposal, including the problem statement, provide a clear, strong statement about the need to conduct research into the educational leadership problem. • The problem statement frames the issue or problem to be studied in all of its complexity. • The problem statement situates the issue or problem in specific context and discusses the background of the problem.	• Some elements of the research proposal, including the problem statement, provide a statement about the need to conduct research into the educational leadership problem. • The problem statement frames an issue or problem, but the problem is defined too narrowly or too broadly or does not delineate the complexity of the problem. • The problem statement situates the problem in a context, but the context is not fully explained. The background of the problem is discussed minimally.	• The proposal is not clear, especially with respect to the problem statement and does not discuss why the proposed topic and research question merits investigation. • The problem statement does not frame a compelling educational leadership research problem situated in a specific context.
LITERATURE REVIEW	• The literature review clearly delineates how the review of the research literature is directly linked to the research questions. • The review identifies the most important theories that will be examined and provides a rationale for the theoretical and/or conceptual frameworks to be used in the study. • The review is an integrated, critical analysis of most relevant and current published knowledge on the topic. • The review is organized around major ideas or themes. The researchers' interpretation of the literature reviewed is clearly presented.	• The literature review somewhat delineates how the review of related research is linked to the research questions. • The review identifies a few theories that will be examined and somewhat substantiates the rationale for the theoretical and/or conceptual frameworks to be used in the study. • The review is a summary of articles published on the topic but is not a critical analysis of the most relevant and current published knowledge on the topic. The review requires expansion and re-organization around major ideas or themes. • The researcher's interpretation of the literature is minimally evident.	• The literature review does not link the research question to the scholarly literature; there is a disconnect between the research questions and the literature reviewed. • The review does not identify the most important aspects of the theory that will be examined or substantiate the rationale for the theoretical and/or conceptual frameworks for the study. • The review presents a few peer reviewed articles published on the topic or unrelated to the topic. The articles are not critically analyzed or integrated into themes. The review requires substantial expansion and re-organization around major ideas or themes. • The researcher's interpretation of the literature is minimally evident or missing.

Major portions of rubric taken from California State-Fullerton – Carnegie Project

CATEGORY	Above Standards	Approaching Standards	Below Standards
METHODOLOGY	• The proposed research design is presented clearly and logically. • Literature pertaining to the research epistemology and methodology is thoroughly reviewed and cited with few errors. 'In text' citations are used correctly. • Relationships between the research hypotheses or research questions and the selected methodology are discussed without ambiguity. • The justification for why the selected methodology is most effective for exploring the research questions and how other methodologies would be less effective is well supported. • The self-aware role of the researcher and his or her relationship to the context of the study and the identification of personal biases are reflexively detailed.	• The proposed research design is presented. • Literature pertaining to the research epistemology and methodology is thoroughly reviewed and cited but contains errors. Some 'in text' citations are used. • Relationships between the research hypotheses or research questions and the selected methodology are discussed minimally. • The justification for why the selected methodology is most effective is somewhat supported. • The self-aware role of the researcher and his or her relationship to the context of the study and the identification of personal biases are relatively detailed.	• Sections of the proposed research design are presented. • A few articles pertaining the research epistemology and methodology are reviewed and cited with several errors or 'in text' citations are used incorrectly. • Relationships between the research hypotheses or research questions and the selected methodology are not discussed. • A justification for why the selected is most important was not well supported or discussed. • The self-aware role of the researcher and his or her relationship to the context of the study and the identification of personal biases are not detailed.
POTENTIAL FOR CONTRIBUTION	• There is substantive evidence that the higher education research problem is significant and worthy of sustained, systematic study. • Inquiry into this problem has definite potential for contributing to the literature and for solving problems of practice.	• There is a reasonable argument that the higher education research problem is significant and worthy of sustained, systematic study. • Inquiry into this problem has definite potential for contributing to the literature and for solving problems of practice.	• Little justification has been made to indicate that the problem will contribute to the literature or to solving problems of higher education practice.

Major portions of rubric taken from California State-Fullerton – Carnegie Project

CATEGORY	Above Standards	Approaching Standards	Below Standards
SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSITION	• The proposal reflects a well-informed perspective about the higher education research problem grounded in the research literature and/or in empirical data analyses. • Some evidence such a research studies, demographic data, empirical data, facts, statistics, examples, and real-life examples are incorporated to support the researcher's argument for conducting the study. • The reader's reactions are anticipated and addressed effectively.	• The proposal reflects an informed perspective about the higher education research problem grounded in the research literature and/or in empirical data analyses. • Some evidence such a research studies, demographic data, empirical data, facts, statistics, examples, and real-life examples are incorporated to support the author's argument for conducting the study. • Some attempt to anticipate the reader's reaction to this discussion is included.	• The proposal does not reflect an informed perspective about the higher education research problem grounded in the research literature and/or in empirical data analyses.
EVIDENCE AND EXAMPLES	• All of the citations from the literature, from empirical studies, and from other empirical sources lend support to the researcher's proposed study. • The appendix is complete and includes research instruments, documents related to the study, consent forms, IRB documents.	• Most of the citations from the literature, from empirical studies, and from other empirical sources lend support to the researcher's proposed study. • The appendix is somewhat complete and includes research instruments, documents related to the study, consent forms, IRB documents.	• Evidence and examples used to support the researcher's argument for conducting the study are irrelevant, vague, or mismatched. • The appendix is incomplete and does not include research instruments, documents related to the study, consent forms, IRB documents.
SEQUENCING	• The proposal is written logically and coherently using the appropriate sequencing and organization.	• The proposal is written somewhat logically and coherently using sequencing that would benefit from some restructuring.	• The proposal is confusing in its organization; the content sequencing is illogical.
WRITING STANDARDS	• Meets or exceeds standards for scholarly doctoral level writing	• Meets writing standards for doctoral level writing.	• Does not meet doctoral level writing standards.

Major portions of rubric taken from California State-Fullerton – Carnegie Project

Writing Standards

TRAIT	A	B	C	D	F
Logic & Organization	• Develops ideas cogently • Organizes ideas logically within paragraphs and connects them with effective transitions • Clear and logically consistent organization relating • all ideas together	• Develops unified and coherent ideas within paragraphs with generally adequate transitions • Clear overall organization relating most ideas together	• Develops and organizes ideas in paragraphs that are not necessarily connected with transitions • Some overall organization, but some ideas may seem illogical and/or • unrelated	• Does not develop ideas cogently, organize them logically within paragraphs or connect them with clear transitions • Uneven or ineffective overall organization	• Does not develop ideas cogently, organize them logically within paragraphs and connect them with clear transitions • Uneven and ineffective overall organization
Evidence	• Ample, relevant, concrete evidence and persuasive support for every debatable assertion • Uses multiple, reliable sources which are assessed critically • Maintains own voice	• Relevant, concrete evidence and persuasive support for most debatable assertions • Uses multiple or reliable sources which are not always assessed critically	• Merely adequate evidence and support for most assertions • Uses single or multiple sources, which may be unreliable and used uncritically	• Weak evidence and persuasive support • Uses limited source(s), and/or relies predominantly on sweeping generalizations, narration, description, or summary	• Little or no evidence or support connected to essay's topic or claim, relies solely on author's experiences, questionable sources • Outside the genre of academic prose
Citations	• Research support quoted, paraphrased, and cited, and well- • integrated into prose	• Research support correctly quoted, cited, and paraphrased	• Research support adequately quoted, cited, and paraphrased	• Research support incorrectly quoted, cited, and paraphrased	• Research support incorrectly quoted, cited, and paraphrased

Major portions of rubric taken from California State-Fullerton – Carnegie Project

TRAIT	A	B	C	D	F
Control of Language	• Exact control of language, including effective word choice and sentence variety • Superior facility with the conventions of standard written English	• Clear and effective control of language, including word choice and sentence variety • Competence with the conventions of standard written English	• Intermittent control of language, including word choice and sentence variety • Minor errors in standard written English	• Intermittent control of language, including word choice and sentence variety • Major errors in standard written English impeding understanding	• Poor control of language, includes problems with word choice and sentence structure • Frequent errors in standard written English
Presentation Quality	• Looks sharp • Very professional	• Attractive, quality presentation	• Neat, no problems	• Some problems with appearance	• Very poor quality, shows little pride in the presentation of • the work
Analysis	• Sophisticated and complex	• Shows understanding of interrelationships, • thoughtful	• Show a grasp of course content	• Presents only facts, parrots' textbook, logical fallacies	• No analysis

Major portions of rubric taken from California State-Fullerton – Carnegie Project