

## Doctoral Qualifying Paper Assessment Instrument

**STUDENT NAME:** \_\_\_\_\_ **SEMESTER:** \_\_\_\_\_

### STANDARD 1: Problem Statement, Rationale, and Key Terms

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

QP Committee Advisor's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

## Doctoral Qualifying Paper Assessment Instrument

**STUDENT NAME:**

**STANDARD 2: Literature Review**

<b>0 – Unacceptable</b>	<b>1 – Approaching Expectations</b>	<b>2 – Meets Expectations</b>	<b>3 Exceeds Expectations</b>
<p>The Literature Review is <i>unacceptable</i> if it omits one or more of the elements in Category 3 and/or the elements included have the following characteristics:</p> <p>(1) the literature review is organized around a central research questions;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(3) more than four of the studies that bear importantly on the candidate’s research question/ problem are omitted from the review;</p> <p>(4) the literature review does not conclude with a conceptual framework.</p>	<p>The Literature Review only <i>approaches expectations</i> if it omits one or more of the elements in Category 3 or the elements have the following characteristics:</p> <p>(1) the discussion is organized around the research questions posed;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(3) three or four of the studies that bear importantly on the candidate’s research question/problem are omitted from the review;</p> <p>(4) the literature review concludes with a conceptual framework but the framework is not systematically built on the review.</p>	<p>The Literature Review only <i>meets expectations</i> if it omits one or more of the elements in Category 3 or the elements have the following characteristics:</p> <p>(1) the discussion is organized around the research questions posed;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(3) one or two studies that bear importantly on the candidate’s research question/problem are omitted from the review;</p> <p>(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.</p>	<p>The Literature Review <i>exceeds expectations</i> if all of the following are present:</p> <p>(1) the discussion is organized around the research questions posed;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(3) no study that bears importantly on the candidate’s research question/problem is omitted from the review;</p> <p>(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.</p>

Committee Member Comment:

## Doctoral Qualifying Paper Assessment Instrument

**STUDENT NAME:**

**STANDARD 6: Writing/Formatting**

<b>0 – Unacceptable</b>	<b>1 – Approaching Expectations</b>	<b>2 – Meets Expectations</b>	<b>3 Exceeds Expectations</b>
<p>The Writing/Formatting is <i>unacceptable</i> if:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(2) 60 percent or less of the paragraphs in the paper are linked with transition sentences and paragraphs;</p> <p>(3) 60 percent or less of the section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follow;</p> <p>(4) less than 80 percent of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are many spelling errors;</p> <p>(5) APA style not used.</p>	<p>The Writing/Formatting is <i>approaching expectations</i> if:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>2) 60-80 percent or less of the paragraphs in the paper are linked with transition sentences and paragraphs;</p> <p>(3) 60-80 percent or less of the section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follows;</p> <p>(4) less than 90 percent of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are some spelling errors;</p> <p>(5) use of APA style not consistent throughout.</p>	<p>The Writing/Formatting <i>meets expectations</i> if:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(4) all of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are no spelling error;</p> <p>(5) there are some places where APA style is not used.</p>	<p>The Writing/Formatting <i>exceeds expectations</i> if:</p> <p>(1) all of the paper’s paragraphs have topic sentences; the paragraphs systematically develop the topic sentence and conclude with a summary sentence;</p> <p>(2) all of the paragraphs in the paper are logically ordered and linked with transition sentences and paragraphs;</p> <p>(3) all section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follows;</p> <p>(4) all of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are no spelling errors;</p> <p>(5) APA style is used throughout the paper.</p>

Committee Member Comment:

## Doctoral Prospectus (Proposal) Paper Assessment Instrument

**STUDENT NAME:**

**SEMESTER:**

### STANDARD 1: Problem Statement, Rationale, and Key Terms

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

Committee Member Comment:

Prospectus Committee Chair's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

## Doctoral Prospectus (Proposal) Paper Assessment Instrument

**STUDENT NAME:**

### STANDARD 2: Literature Review

0 – Unacceptable	1 – Approaching Expectations	2 – Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
<p>The Literature Review is <i>unacceptable</i> if it omits one or more of the elements in Category 3 and/or the elements included have the following characteristics:</p> <p>(1) the literature review is organized around a central research questions;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(3) more than four of the studies that bear importantly on the candidate’s research question/ problem are omitted from the review;</p> <p>(4) the literature review does not conclude with a conceptual framework.</p>	<p>The Literature Review only <i>approaches expectations</i> if it omits one or more of the elements in Category 3 or the elements have the following characteristics:</p> <p>(1) the discussion is organized around the research questions posed;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(3) three or four of the studies that bear importantly on the candidate’s research question/problem are omitted from the review;</p> <p>(4) the literature review concludes with a conceptual framework but the framework is not systematically built on the review.</p>	<p>The Literature Review only <i>meets expectations</i> if it omits one or more of the elements in Category 3 or the elements have the following characteristics:</p> <p>(1) the discussion is organized around the research questions posed;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(3) one or two studies that bear importantly on the candidate’s research question/problem are omitted from the review;</p> <p>(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.</p>	<p>The Literature Review <i>exceeds expectations</i> if all of the following are present:</p> <p>(1) the discussion is organized around the research questions posed;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(3) no study that bears importantly on the candidate’s research question/problem is omitted from the review;</p> <p>(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.</p>

Committee Member Comment:

## Doctoral Prospectus (Proposal) Paper Assessment Instrument

**STUDENT NAME:**

**STANDARD 3: Methodology**

<b>0 – Unacceptable</b>	<b>1 – Approaching Expectations</b>	<b>2 – Meets Expectations</b>	<b>3 Exceeds Expectations</b>
<p>The Methodology is <i>unacceptable</i> 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.</p>	<p>The Methodology <i>approaches expectations</i> 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.</p>	<p>The Methodology <i>meets expectations</i> 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 mixed-methods-- 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.</p>	<p>The Methodology <i>exceeds expectations</i> 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.</p>

Committee Member Comment:

## Doctoral Prospectus (Proposal) Paper Assessment Instrument

**STUDENT NAME:**

### STANDARD 6: Writing/Formatting

0 – Unacceptable	1 – Approaching Expectations	2 – Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
<p>The Writing/Formatting is <i>unacceptable</i> if:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(2) 60 percent or less of the paragraphs in the paper are linked with transition sentences and paragraphs;</p> <p>(3) 60 percent or less of the section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follow;</p> <p>(4) less than 80 percent of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are many spelling errors;</p> <p>(5) APA style not used.</p>	<p>The Writing/Formatting is <i>approaching expectations</i> if:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>2) 60-80 percent or less of the paragraphs in the paper are linked with transition sentences and paragraphs;</p> <p>(3) 60-80 percent or less of the section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follows;</p> <p>(4) less than 90 percent of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are some spelling errors;</p> <p>(5) use of APA style not consistent throughout.</p>	<p>The Writing/Formatting <i>meets expectations</i> if:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(4) all of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are no spelling error;</p> <p>(5) there are some places where APA style is not used.</p>	<p>The Writing/Formatting <i>exceeds expectations</i> if:</p> <p>(1) all of the paper’s paragraphs have topic sentences; the paragraphs systematically develop the topic sentence and conclude with a summary sentence;</p> <p>(2) all of the paragraphs in the paper are logically ordered and linked with transition sentences and paragraphs;</p> <p>(3) all section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follows;</p> <p>(4) all of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are no spelling errors;</p> <p>(5) APA style is used throughout the paper.</p>
<p>Committee Member Comment:</p>			

## Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Instrument

**STUDENT NAME:**

**SEMESTER:**

### STANDARD 1: Problem Statement, Rationale, and Key Terms

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

Committee Member Comment:

Dissertation Committee Chair's Signature \_\_\_\_\_



## Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Instrument

**STUDENT NAME:**

### STANDARD 2: Literature Review

<b>0 – Unacceptable</b>	<b>1 – Approaching Expectations</b>	<b>2 – Meets Expectations</b>	<b>3 Exceeds Expectations</b>
<p>The Literature Review is <i>unacceptable</i> if it omits one or more of the elements in Category 3 and/or the elements included have the following characteristics:</p> <p>(1) the literature review is organized around a central research questions;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(3) more than four of the studies that bear importantly on the candidate’s research question/ problem are omitted from the review;</p> <p>(4) the literature review does not conclude with a conceptual framework.</p>	<p>The Literature Review only <i>approaches expectations</i> if it omits one or more of the elements in Category 3 or the elements have the following characteristics:</p> <p>(1) the discussion is organized around the research questions posed;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(3) three or four of the studies that bear importantly on the candidate’s research question/problem are omitted from the review;</p> <p>(4) the literature review concludes with a conceptual framework but the framework is not systematically built on the review.</p>	<p>The Literature Review only <i>meets expectations</i> if it omits one or more of the elements in Category 3 or the elements have the following characteristics:</p> <p>(1) the discussion is organized around the research questions posed;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(3) one or two studies that bear importantly on the candidate’s research question/problem are omitted from the review;</p> <p>(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.</p>	<p>The Literature Review <i>exceeds expectations</i> if all of the following are present:</p> <p>(1) the discussion is organized around the research questions posed;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(3) no study that bears importantly on the candidate’s research question/problem is omitted from the review;</p> <p>(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.</p>

Committee Member Comment:

## Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Instrument

**STUDENT NAME:**

**STANDARD 3: Methodology**

<b>0 – Unacceptable</b>	<b>1 – Approaching Expectations</b>	<b>2 – Meets Expectations</b>	<b>3 Exceeds Expectations</b>
<p>The Methodology is <i>unacceptable</i> 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.</p>	<p>The Methodology <i>approaches expectations</i> 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.</p>	<p>The Methodology <i>meets expectations</i> 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 mixed-methods-- 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.</p>	<p>The Methodology <i>exceeds expectations</i> 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.</p>

Committee Member Comment:

## Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Instrument

**STUDENT NAME:**

### STANDARD 4: Data Analysis and Discussion

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

Committee Member Comment:

## Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Instrument

**STUDENT NAME:**

### STANDARD 5: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

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

Committee Member Comment:

## Doctoral Qualifying Paper Assessment Instrument

**STUDENT NAME:**

**STANDARD 6: Writing/Formatting**

<b>0 – Unacceptable</b>	<b>1 – Approaching Expectations</b>	<b>2 – Meets Expectations</b>	<b>3 Exceeds Expectations</b>
<p>The Writing/Formatting is <i>unacceptable</i> if:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(2) 60 percent or less of the paragraphs in the paper are linked with transition sentences and paragraphs;</p> <p>(3) 60 percent or less of the section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follow;</p> <p>(4) less than 80 percent of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are many spelling errors;</p> <p>(5) APA style not used.</p>	<p>The Writing/Formatting is <i>approaching expectations</i> if:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(2) 60-80 percent or less of the paragraphs in the paper are linked with transition sentences and paragraphs;</p> <p>(3) 60-80 percent or less of the section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follows;</p> <p>(4) less than 90 percent of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are some spelling errors;</p> <p>(5) use of APA style not consistent throughout.</p>	<p>The Writing/Formatting <i>meets expectations</i> if:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(4) all of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are no spelling error;</p> <p>(5) there are some places where APA style is not used.</p>	<p>The Writing/Formatting <i>exceeds expectations</i> if:</p> <p>(1) all of the paper’s paragraphs have topic sentences; the paragraphs systematically develop the topic sentence and conclude with a summary sentence;</p> <p>(2) all of the paragraphs in the paper are logically ordered and linked with transition sentences and paragraphs;</p> <p>(3) all section headings indicate the content or main idea of the content that follows;</p> <p>(4) all of the sentences are grammatically correct and there are no spelling errors;</p> <p>(5) APA style is used throughout the paper.</p>
<p>Committee Member Comment:</p>			