Doctoral Qualifying Paper Assessment Instrument STUDENT NAME: SEMESTER: STANDARD 1: Problem Statement, Rationale, and Key Terms 1 - Approaching 2 - Meets 3 Exceeds 0 - Unacceptable **Expectations** Expectations Expectations The Problem Statement The Problem Statement The Problem Statement The Problem Statement unacceptable if it is only approaches only meets expectations exceeds expectations if if it omits one or more missing one or more of *expectations* if it is it includes all of the the six elements missing one or more of of the six elements following elements to the level described as described in Category 3 the six elements described in Category 3 and the elements described in Category 3 or the elements included follows: included have the and the elements are as follows: (1) the problem following included have the (1) the problem statement/question is statement/ question is clearly stated in an characteristics: following (1) there is no central characteristics: clearly stated, but not in interrogative form; problem statement/ an interrogative form; (2) the statement is (1) the problem statement/ question is (2) the statement is not question; placed early in the (2) there are no not clear: necessarily placed early paper, preferable within secondary questions or the first page or two; (2) statement is not in the paper; they are not clearly (3) secondary questions necessarily placed early (3) secondary questions stated and/or relevant to in the paper; are not clearly linked to are clearly linked to the the problem; (3) not all secondary main question/problem the main (3) one-third or more of questions are explicitly question/problem statement: the studies in the stated: statement: (4) the problem literature review are not (4) some studies in the (4) relevance of some statement/question explicitly linked to the literature review are not studies in the literature informs the literature problem statement/ explicitly linked to the review such that there review is not problem statement/ question; sufficiently explicit; are no studies discussed (4) limited rationale/ question; (5) some rationale/ not clearly related to the justification is given for (5) minimal rationale/ justification is given for problem; (5) clear and extensive investigation of the justification is given for the problem, but is problem; investigation of the limited: rationale/justification is (5) key terms are left problem: (6) some necessary key given for investigation of the problem; out or not defined. (6) few of the necessary terms are omitted or not (6) all necessary key key terms are included clearly defined. and are not clearly terms are included and defined. well defined. Committee Member Comment:

Doctoral Qualifying Paper Assessment Instrument STUDENT NAME: STANDARD 2: Literature Review							
				0 – Unacceptable	1 - Approaching	2 - Meets	3 Exceeds
				<u> </u>	Expectations	Expectations	Expectations
The Literature Review	The Literature Review	The Literature Review	The Literature Review				
is unacceptable if it	only approaches	only meets expectations	exceeds expectations if				
omits one or more of the	<i>expectations</i> if it omits	if it omits one or more	all of the following are				
elements in Category 3	one or more of the	of the elements in	present:				
and/or the elements	elements in Category 3	Category 3 or the	(1) the discussion is				
included have the	or the elements have the	elements have the	organized around the				
following	following	following	research questions				
characteristics:	characteristics:	characteristics:	posed;				
(1) the literature review	(1) the discussion is	(1) the discussion is	(2) it is clear why the				
is organized around a	organized around the	organized around the	particular studies being				
central research	research questions	research questions	reviewed are included in				
questions;	posed;	posed;	the review, i.e., the				
(2) it is not clear why	(2) it is not clear why	(2) the discussion of the	research questions/				
more than five studies	three-five studies	literature review is not	problems behind the				
reviewed are included in	reviewed are included in	clear as to why one or	studies being reviewed				
the review, i.e., their	the review, i.e., their	two studies reviewed	are clearly stated and				
research questions/	research questions/	are included in the	linked to the research				
problems are not	problems are not	review, i.e., their	question/problem of the				
explicit or linked to the	explicit or linked to the	research	candidate's study;				
study;	study;	questions/problems are	(3) no study that bears				
(3) more than four of	(3) three or four of the	not explicit or linked to	importantly on the				
the studies that bear	studies that bear	the candidate's study;	candidate's research				
importantly on the	importantly on the	(3) one or two studies	question/problem is				
candidate's research	candidate's research	that bear importantly on	omitted from the				
question/ problem are	question/problem are	the candidate's research	review;				
omitted from the	omitted from the	question/problem are	(4) the literature review				
review;	review;	omitted from the	concludes with a				
(4) the literature review	(4) the literature review	review;	conceptual framework				
does not conclude with	concludes with a	(4) the literature review	that clearly results from				
a conceptual	conceptual framework	concludes with a	or is linked to the				
framework.	but the framework is not	conceptual framework	review and contains				
	systematically built on	but either the	explicit propositions				
	the review.	framework itself is not	about or a formal model				

completely clear or it is

not consistently linked

to the review, i.e., does

not emerge out of the literature discussed.

of what the candidate's

research is likely to find

based on the literature.

Doctoral Qualifying Paper Assessment Instrument			
STUDENT NAME:			
STANDARD 6: Writing/Formatting			
0 - Unacceptable	1 – Approaching Expectations	2 – Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
The Writing/Formatting is unacceptable if: (1) 60 percent or less of the paper's paragraphs have topic sentences; the paragraphs do not systematically develop the topic sentence nor do they conclude with a summary sentence; (2) 60 percent or less of the paragraphs in the paper are linked with transition sentences and paragraphs; (3) 60 percent or less of the section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follow; (4) less than 80 percent of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are many spelling errors; (5) APA style not used.	The Writing/Formatting is approaching expectations if: (1) 60-80 percent of the paper's paragraphs have topic sentences and equal percentage of paragraphs systematically develop the topic sentence and conclude with (a summary sentence; 2) 60-80 percent or less of the paragraphs in the paper are linked with transition sentences and paragraphs; (3) 60-80 percent or less of the section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follows; (4) less than 90 percent of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are some spelling errors; (5) use of APA style not consistent throughout.	The Writing/Formatting meets expectations if: (1) 90 percent of the paper's paragraphs have topic sentences; the paragraphs systematically develop the topic sentence and conclude with a summary sentence and the candidate agrees to revise those paragraphs which do not meet expectation; (2) 90 percent of the paragraphs in the paper are linked with transition sentences and paragraphs and the candidate agrees to revise those paragraphs which do not meet expectation; (3) 90 percent of the section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follows, and the candidate agrees to revise those headings which do not meet expectation; (4) all of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are no spelling error; (5) there are some places where APA style is not used.	The Writing/Formatting exceeds expectations if: (1) all of the paper's paragraphs have topic sentences; the paragraphs systematically develop the topic sentence and conclude with a summary sentence; (2) all of the paragraphs in the paper are logically ordered and linked with transition sentences and paragraphs; (3) all section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follows; (4) all of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are no spelling errors; (5) APA style is used throughout the paper.

Doctoral Prospectus (Proposal) Paper Assessment Instrument STUDENT NAME: SEMESTER: STANDARD 1: Problem Statement, Rationale, and Key Terms 1 - Approaching 2 - Meets 3 Exceeds 0 - Unacceptable **Expectations** Expectations Expectations The Problem Statement The Problem Statement The Problem Statement The Problem Statement unacceptable if it is only approaches only *meets expectations* exceeds expectations if missing one or more of if it omits one or more it includes all of the *expectations* if it is following elements to the six elements missing one or more of of the six elements the level described as described in Category 3 the six elements described in Category 3 and the elements described in Category 3 or the elements included follows: included have the are as follows: (1) the problem and the elements following included have the (1) the problem statement/question is statement/ question is clearly stated in an characteristics: following (1) there is no central characteristics: clearly stated, but not in interrogative form; problem statement/ (1) the problem an interrogative form; (2) the statement is statement/ question is (2) the statement is not question; placed early in the (2) there are no not clear: necessarily placed early paper, preferable within secondary questions or the first page or two; (2) statement is not in the paper; they are not clearly (3) secondary questions (3) secondary questions necessarily placed early stated and/or relevant to in the paper; are not clearly linked to are clearly linked to the the problem; (3) not all secondary the main main question/problem questions are explicitly (3) one-third or more of question/problem statement: the studies in the stated: (4) the problem statement: literature review are not (4) some studies in the (4) relevance of some statement/question explicitly linked to the literature review are not studies in the literature informs the literature problem statement/ explicitly linked to the review is not review such that there problem statement/ question; sufficiently explicit; are no studies discussed (4) limited rationale/ question; (5) some rationale/ not clearly related to the justification is given for (5) minimal rationale/ justification is given for problem; the problem, but is (5) clear and extensive investigation of the justification is given for problem; investigation of the limited: rationale/justification is (5) kev terms are left (6) some necessary key problem: given for investigation of the problem; out or not defined. (6) few of the necessary terms are omitted or not clearly defined. key terms are included (6) all necessary key and are not clearly terms are included and defined. well defined. Committee Member Comment:

Doctoral Prospectus (Proposal) Paper Assessment Instrument STUDENT NAME:

STANDARD 2: Literature Review

	1 – Approaching	2 - Meets	3 Exceeds
0 - Unacceptable	Expectations	Expectations	Expectations
The Literature Review	The Literature Review	The Literature Review	The Literature Review
is <i>unacceptable</i> if it	only <i>approaches</i>	only <i>meets expectations</i>	exceeds expectations if
omits one or more of the	<i>expectations</i> if it omits	if it omits one or more	all of the following are
elements in Category 3	one or more of the	of the elements in	present:
and/or the elements	elements in Category 3	Category 3 or the	(1) the discussion is
included have the	or the elements have the	elements have the	organized around the
following	following	following	research questions
characteristics:	characteristics:	characteristics:	posed;
(1) the literature review	(1) the discussion is	(1) the discussion is	(2) it is clear why the
is organized around a	organized around the	organized around the	particular studies being
central research	research questions	research questions	reviewed are included in
questions;	posed;	posed;	the review, i.e., the
(2) it is not clear why	(2) it is not clear why	(2) the discussion of the	research
more than five studies	three-five studies	literature review is not	questions/problems
reviewed are included in	reviewed are included in	clear as to why one or	behind the studies being
the review, i.e., their	the review, i.e., their	two studies reviewed	reviewed are clearly
research questions/	research questions/	are included in the	stated and linked to the
problems are not	problems are not	review, i.e., their	research
explicit or linked to the	explicit or linked to the	research	question/problem of the
study;	study;	questions/problems are	candidate's study;
(3) more than four of	(3) three or four of the	not explicit or linked to	(3) no study that bears
the studies that bear	studies that bear	the candidate's study;	importantly on the
importantly on the	importantly on the	(3) one or two studies	candidate's research
candidate's research	candidate's research	that bear importantly on	question/problem is
question/ problem are	question/problem are	the candidate's research	omitted from the
omitted from the	omitted from the	question/problem are	review;
review;	review;	omitted from the	(4) the literature review
(4) the literature review	(4) the literature review	review;	concludes with a
does not conclude with	concludes with a	(4) the literature review	conceptual framework
a conceptual	conceptual framework	concludes with a	that clearly results from
framework.	but the framework is not	conceptual framework	or is linked to the
	systematically built on	but either the	review and contains
	the review.	framework itself is not	explicit propositions
		completely clear or it is	about or a formal model
		not consistently linked	of what the candidate's
		to the review, i.e., does	research is likely to find
		not emerge out of the	based on the literature.
		literature discussed.	

Doctoral Prospectus (Proposal) Paper Assessment Instrument				
STUDENT NAME:				
STANDARD 3: Methodology				
0 – Unacceptable	1 – Approaching Expectations	2 – Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations	
The Methodology is	The Methodology	The Methodology <i>meets</i>	The Methodology	
unacceptable if:	approaches	<i>expectations</i> if it omits	exceeds expectations if	
(1) the candidate has no	expectations if:	one or more elements in	all of the following are	
research design or	(1) the candidate's	category 3 or the	present:	
proposes to use an	research design	elements have following	(1) the candidate's	
incorrect design;	whether qualitative,	characteristics:	research design	
(2) important constructs	quantitative or mixed-	(1) the candidate's	whether qualitative,	
or missing and/or are	methods is not	research design	quantitative or mixed-	
inappropriately defined	appropriate because it is	whether qualitative,	methods is not only	
for the particular	either missing elements	quantitative or mixed-	appropriate but it is also	
research problem.	or employing	methods is	comprehensive in scope,	
	inappropriate	appropriate and can still	but can still be done in a	
	procedures;	be done in a reasonable	reasonable time frame;	
	(2) some constructs or	time frame;	(2) the candidate has	
	missing and/or	(2) the candidate has	appropriate and	
	inappropriately defined	appropriate and effective definitions of	effective definitions of all constructs relevant to	
	for the particular research problem.	most of the constructs		
	research problem.	relevant to the research	the research problem; (3) if applicable, the	
		problem;	candidate has valid and	
		(3) if applicable, the	reliable measures in	
		candidate has valid and	place to produce	
		reliable measures in	meaningful evidence	
		place to produce	regarding the constructs	
		meaningful evidence	under study.	
		regarding the constructs	under study.	
		under study.		
Committee Member Com	ment:			

Doctoral Prospectus (Proposal) Paper Assessment Instrument STUDENT NAME: STANDARD 6: Writing/Formatting 1 - Approaching 2 - Meets 3 Exceeds 0 - Unacceptable **Expectations** Expectations Expectations The Writing/Formatting The Writing/Formatting The Writing/Formatting The Writing/Formatting is approaching exceeds expectations if: is unacceptable if: meets expectations if: (1) 60 percent or less of *expectations* if: (1) 90 percent of the (1) all of the paper's the paper's paragraphs (1) 60-80 percent of the paper's paragraphs have paragraphs have topic have topic sentences; paper's paragraphs have topic sentences; the sentences: the the paragraphs do not topic sentences and paragraphs paragraphs systematically develop equal percentage of systematically develop systematically develop the topic sentence nor the topic sentence and the topic sentence and paragraphs do they conclude with a systematically develop conclude with a conclude with a summary sentence; the topic sentence and summary sentence and summary sentence; (2) 60 percent or less of conclude with (a the candidate agrees to (2) all of the paragraphs the paragraphs in the summary sentence; revise those paragraphs in the paper are paper are linked with which do not meet logically ordered and 2) 60-80 percent or less transition sentences and of the paragraphs in the expectation; linked with transition (2) 90 percent of the paper are linked with paragraphs; sentences and (3) 60 percent or less of transition sentences and paragraphs in the paper paragraphs; the section headings paragraphs; are linked with (3) all section headings indicate the content or indicate the content or (3) 60-80 percent or less transition sentences and main idea of the content of the section headings paragraphs and the main idea of the content that follow: indicate the content or candidate agrees to that follows: (4) less than 80 percent revise those paragraphs main idea of the content (4) all of the sentences are grammatically of the sentences are that follows: which do not meet grammatically correct (4) less than 90 percent expectation; correct and there are no and there are many of the sentences are (3) 90 percent of the spelling errors; spelling errors; grammatically correct section headings (5) APA style is used and there are some (5) APA style not used. indicate the content or throughout the paper. spelling errors; main idea of the content (5) use of APA style not that follows, and the consistent throughout. candidate agrees to revise those headings which do not meet expectation; (4) all of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are no spelling error; (5) there are some

places where APA style

is not used.

Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Instrument STUDENT NAME: SEMESTER: STANDARD 1: Problem Statement, Rationale, and Key Terms 1 - Approaching 2 - Meets 3 Exceeds 0 - Unacceptable **Expectations** Expectations Expectations The Problem Statement The Problem Statement The Problem Statement The Problem Statement unacceptable if it is only approaches only *meets expectations* exceeds expectations if if it omits one or more missing one or more of *expectations* if it is it includes all of the the six elements missing one or more of of the six elements following elements to the level described as described in Category 3 the six elements described in Category 3 and the elements described in Category 3 or the elements included follows: included have the and the elements are as follows: (1) the problem following included have the (1) the problem statement/question is statement/ question is clearly stated in an characteristics: following (1) there is no central characteristics: clearly stated, but not in interrogative form; problem statement/ (1) the problem an interrogative form; (2) the statement is statement/ question is (2) the statement is not question; placed early in the (2) there are no not clear: necessarily placed early paper, preferable within secondary questions or the first page or two; (2) statement is not in the paper; they are not clearly (3) secondary questions necessarily placed early (3) secondary questions stated and/or relevant to in the paper; are not clearly linked to are clearly linked to the the problem; (3) not all secondary main question/problem the main (3) one-third or more of questions are explicitly question/problem statement: the studies in the stated: (4) the problem statement: literature review are not (4) some studies in the (4) relevance of some statement/question explicitly linked to the literature review are not studies in the literature informs the literature problem statement/ explicitly linked to the review is not review such that there problem statement/ question; sufficiently explicit; are no studies discussed (4) limited rationale/ question; (5) some rationale/ not clearly related to the justification is given for (5) minimal rationale/ justification is given for problem; investigation of the justification is given for the problem, but is (5) clear and extensive problem; investigation of the limited: rationale/justification is (5) kev terms are left problem: (6) some necessary key given for investigation of the problem; out or not defined. (6) few of the necessary terms are omitted or not key terms are included (6) all necessary key clearly defined. and are not clearly terms are included and defined. well defined. Committee Member Comment:

Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Instrument				
STUDENT NAME:				
STANDARD 2: Literature Review				
0 – Unacceptable	1 – Approaching Expectations	2 – Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations	
The Literature Review is unacceptable if it omits one or more of the elements in Category 3 and/or the elements included have the following characteristics: (1) the literature review is organized around a central research questions; (2) it is not clear why more than five studies reviewed are included in the review, i.e., their research questions/ problems are not explicit or linked to the study; (3) more than four of the studies that bear importantly on the candidate's research question/ problem are omitted from the review; (4) the literature review does not conclude with a conceptual framework.	The Literature Review only approaches expectations if it omits one or more of the elements in Category 3 or the elements have the following characteristics: (1) the discussion is organized around the research questions posed; (2) it is not clear why three-five studies reviewed are included in the review, i.e., their research questions/ problems are not explicit or linked to the study; (3) three or four of the studies that bear importantly on the candidate's research question/problem are omitted from the review; (4) the literature review concludes with a conceptual framework but the framework is not systematically built on the review.	The Literature Review only meets expectations if it omits one or more of the elements in Category 3 or the elements have the following characteristics: (1) the discussion is organized around the research questions posed; (2) the discussion of the literature review is not clear as to why one or two studies reviewed are included in the review, i.e., their research questions/ problems are not explicit or linked to the candidate's study; (3) one or two studies that bear importantly on the candidate's research question/problem are omitted from the review; (4) the literature review concludes with a conceptual framework but either the framework itself is not completely clear or it is not consistently linked to the review, i.e., does not emerge out of the literature discussed.	The Literature Review exceeds expectations if all of the following are present: (1) the discussion is organized around the research questions posed; (2) it is clear why the particular studies being reviewed are included in the review, i.e., the research questions/ problems behind the studies being reviewed are clearly stated and linked to the research question/problem of the candidate's study; (3) no study that bears importantly on the candidate's research question/problem is omitted from the review; (4) the literature review concludes with a conceptual framework that clearly results from or is linked to the review and contains explicit propositions about or a formal model of what the candidate's research is likely to find based on the literature.	

Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Instrument				
STUDENT NAME:				
STANDARD 3: Methodology 1 - Approaching 2 - Meets 3 Exceeds				
0 – Unacceptable	1 – Approaching Expectations	Expectations	Expectations	
The Methodology is unacceptable if: (1) the candidate has no research design or proposes to use an incorrect design; (2) important constructs or missing and/or are inappropriately defined for the particular research problem.	The Methodology approaches expectations if: (1) the candidate's research design—whether qualitative, quantitative or mixed—methods—is not appropriate because it is either missing elements or employing inappropriate procedures; (2) some constructs or missing and/or inappropriately defined for the particular research problem.	The Methodology meets expectations if it omits one or more elements in category 3 or the elements have following characteristics: (1) the candidate's research design-whether qualitative, quantitative or mixedmethods is appropriate and can still be done in a reasonable time frame; (2) the candidate has appropriate and effective definitions of most of the constructs relevant to the research problem; (3) if applicable, the candidate has valid and reliable measures in place to produce meaningful evidence regarding the constructs under study.	The Methodology exceeds expectations if all of the following are present: (1) the candidate's research design- whether qualitative, quantitative or mixed- methods is not only appropriate but it is also comprehensive in scope, but can still be done in a reasonable time frame; (2) the candidate has appropriate and effective definitions of all constructs relevant to the research problem; (3) if applicable, the candidate has valid and reliable measures in place to produce meaningful evidence regarding the constructs under study.	
Committee Member Com	ment:			

Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Instrument			
STUDENT NAME:			
STANDARD 4: Data Analysis and Discussion			
0 - Unacceptable	1 – Approaching	2 - Meets	3 Exceeds
	Expectations	Expectations	Expectations
The Data Analysis and	The Data Analysis and	The Data Analysis and	The Data Analysis and
Discussion is	Discussion approaches	Discussion meets	Discussion exceeds
unacceptable if one of	expectations if one of	expectations if one of	expectations if all of the
the elements in	the elements in	the elements in	following elements are
Category 3 is missing	Category 3 is missing	Category 3 is missing	present:
and/or they have the	and/or they have the	and/or they have the	(1) the data analysis
following	following	following	begins with a
characteristics:	characteristics:	characteristics:	restatement of the main
(1) the data analysis	(1) the data analysis	(1) the data analysis	problem under
does not begin with a	does not begin with a	begins with a	investigation;
restatement of the main	restatement of the main	restatement of the main	(2) if quantitative, a
problem under	problem under	problem under	thorough and
investigation;	investigation;	investigation;	comprehensive
(2) if quantitative, an	(2) if quantitative, an	(2) if quantitative, an	discussion of key
marginal discussion of	marginal discussion of	adequate discussion of	descriptive statistics; if
key descriptive	key descriptive	key descriptive	qualitative, a thorough
statistics; if qualitative,	statistics; if qualitative,	statistics; if qualitative,	and comprehensive
marginal discussion	marginal discussion	an adequate discussion	discussion apropos to
apropos to the coding or	apropos to the coding or	apropos to the coding or	the coding or emerging
emerging themes;	emerging themes;	emerging themes;	theme;
(3) if quantitative, a	(3) if quantitative, a	(3) if quantitative, an	(3) if quantitative, a
marginal examination of	marginal examination of	adequate examination of	thorough and
bi-variate relationships	bi-variate relationships	bi-variate relationships	comprehensive
or correlation matrices;	or correlation matrices;	or correlation matrices;	examination of bi-
(4) a marginal analysis	(4) a marginal analysis	(4) an adequate analysis	variate relationships or
controlling for third	controlling for third	controlling for third	correlation matrices;
variables leading up to	variables leading up to	variables leading up to	(4) a thorough and
multi-variate analysis if	multi-variate analysis if	multi-variate analysis if	progressively
appropriate.	appropriate.	appropriate.	sophisticated analysis
			controlling for third
			variables leading up to
			multi-variate analysis if
			appropriate.
Committee Member Com	ment [,]		

Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Instrument				
STUDENT NAME:				
STANDARD 5: Sumr	STANDARD 5: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations			
0 - Unacceptable	1 – Approaching	2 – Meets	3 Exceeds	
The Summary,	The Summary,	Expectations The Summary,	Expectations The Summary,	
Conclusions and	Conclusions and	Conclusions and	Conclusions and	
Recommendations are	Recommendations	Recommendations meet	Recommendations	
unacceptable if one or	approaches expectations	expectations if one or	exceed expectations if	
more of the elements in	if one or more of the	more of the elements in	all of the following are	
Category 3 are missing	elements in Category 3	Category 3 are missing	present:	
and/or the elements	are missing and/or the	and/or the elements	(1) the summary	
have the following	elements have the	have the following	presents a thorough	
characteristics:	following	characteristics:	overview of the study,	
(1) summary is missing	characteristics:	(1) the summary	its purpose,	
or inappropriate;	(1) the summary	presents marginal	conceptualization,	
(2) inappropriate or no	presents marginal	overview of the study,	design, and major	
conclusions;	overview of the study,	its purpose,	findings;	
(3) discussion and	its purpose,	conceptualization,	(2) conclusions reached	
recommendations of	conceptualization,	design, and major	are well-articulated and	
Implications of the	design, and major;	findings;	properly constrained	
findings for theory,	(2) conclusions reached	(2) conclusions reached	and limited to the	
research and practice	are marginally	are adequately	findings from the study;	
are either not included	constrained and limited	articulated and	(3) implications of the	
or inappropriately addressed.	to the findings from the	sufficiently constrained and limited to the	findings for theory,	
addressed.	study;		research and practice	
	(3) implications of the	findings from the study;	are thoroughly discussed and	
	findings for theory,	(3) implications of the	recommendations made.	
	research and practice are discussed and	findings for theory, research and practice	recommendations made.	
	recommendations made.	are discussed and		
	recommendations made.	recommendations made.		
		recommendations made.		
Committee Member Comment:				

Doctoral Qualifying Paper Assessment Instrument			
STUDENT NAME:			
STANDARD 6: Writing/Formatting			
0 – Unacceptable	1 – Approaching Expectations	2 – Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
The Writing/Formatting is unacceptable if: (1) 60 percent or less of the paper's paragraphs have topic sentences; the paragraphs do not systematically develop the topic sentence nor do they conclude with a summary sentence; (2) 60 percent or less of the paragraphs in the paper are linked with transition sentences and paragraphs; (3) 60 percent or less of the section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follow; (4) less than 80 percent of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are many spelling errors; (5) APA style not used.	The Writing/Formatting is approaching expectations if: (1) 60-80 percent of the paper's paragraphs have topic sentences and equal percentage of paragraphs systematically develop the topic sentence and conclude with (a summary sentence; (2) 60-80 percent or less of the paragraphs in the paper are linked with transition sentences and paragraphs; (3) 60-80 percent or less of the section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follows; (4) less than 90 percent of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are some spelling errors; (5) use of APA style not consistent throughout.	The Writing/Formatting meets expectations if: (1) 90 percent of the paper's paragraphs have topic sentences; the paragraphs systematically develop the topic sentence and conclude with a summary sentence and the candidate agrees to revise those paragraphs which do not meet expectation; (2) 90 percent of the paragraphs in the paper are linked with transition sentences and paragraphs and the candidate agrees to revise those paragraphs which do not meet expectation; (3) 90 percent of the section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follows, and the candidate agrees to revise those headings which do not meet expectation; (4) all of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are no spelling error; (5) there are some places where APA style is not used.	The Writing/Formatting exceeds expectations if: (1) all of the paper's paragraphs have topic sentences; the paragraphs systematically develop the topic sentence and conclude with a summary sentence; (2) all of the paragraphs in the paper are logically ordered and linked with transition sentences and paragraphs; (3) all section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follows; (4) all of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are no spelling errors; (5) APA style is used throughout the paper.