

# Dissertation Manuscript - Evaluation Rubric

Chapter 1	Does Not Meet 0.01 points	Meets 1 point
<b>Introduction Remarks</b>	<p>The study overview is incomplete or unclear.</p> <p>Key elements are inadequately addressed, all points are not supported in the literature, key concepts lack coherence and clarity. Not framed to proper program of study.</p>	<p>A clear overview of the study is provided.</p> <p>There is a flow from general to specific of the topic. Major points are adequately supported by the literature (Applied degree frames in practice – PhD frames in adding to the literature).</p>
<b>Statement of the Problem</b>	<p>The description of the problem is incomplete or unclear. No evidence is provided indicating the problem exists. Evidence to support the problem is dated. Lacks alignment with the material in the Introduction.</p> <p>The significance of the problem is not discussed is unclear or not discussed. (Applied problem is not discussed in evidence of the local problem and larger population / PhD problem is not framed in the literature beyond a specific site documenting the need for and importance of the study).</p>	<p>A clear problem is explained and supported through the material in the Introduction. Strong evidence (most within the past 5 years) is provided and discussed.</p> <p>(Applied problem discussed in evidence of the local problem and larger population / PhD problem framed in the literature beyond a specific site documenting the need for and importance of the study).</p>
<b>Purpose of the Study</b>	<p>The purpose for the study is incomplete or unclear. Key elements are inadequately addressed and does not align to the stated problem, study details are not supported, and/or lack coherence and clarity.</p>	<p>The purpose of the study is described and aligns to the stated problem, a summary of how the study will be/was conducted is provided.</p>
<b>Introduction to Theoretical/Conceptual Framework</b>	<p>The discussion of the theory(ies) or conceptual framework is incomplete, unclear, or missing. Key elements are inadequately addressed, all points are not supported, and/or there is a lack of coherence and clarity.</p> <p>If multiple theories are used, a clear explanation for their interrelationship is lacking or missing.</p>	<p>The theory(ies) or conceptual framework used to frame the study are identified and explained through use of the literature and study topic.</p> <p>If multiple frameworks are used, a description is provided for how they interrelate within the context of the study topic and literature.</p>

<b>Nature of Study</b>	The brief overview of the study is incomplete or unclear. The proposed method and design are not clearly described. Components of the study design, variables/constructs, instruments and analyses are missing. Little to no explanation for the chosen method and design is provided.	A brief overview of the study design, variables/constructs, instruments, and analyses is provided based on current literature describing why the proposed method and design were chosen to address the study's research question(s).
<b>Research Questions/Hypotheses</b>	<p>The research questions are incomplete or lack coherence, clarity, not testable, and/or not aligned to the problem and purpose.</p> <p>The core concepts and/or operational variables are missing.</p> <p>The hypotheses (quantitative studies only) are incomplete or lack coherence and clarity, are not testable or not aligned to problem, purpose, and/or design.</p>	<p>Research question(s) are directly answerable beyond a yes/no response, fairly specific and testable based on the data collected. Research questions are aligned with design and support the problem and purpose.</p> <p>The core concepts (qualitative) and/or operational variables (quantitative) are included.</p> <p>If hypotheses are included (quantitative studies only), they are singular, clear, balanced, specific, and testable based on the data collected and align to the study problem, purpose, and design.</p>
<b>Significance of the Study</b>	The anticipated contribution of the study is incomplete or unclear. The need for the study is not discussed and there is a lack of current literature supporting claims. The significance does not align with the problem.	A summary of the contribution the study will provide to the larger field of study is provided. The need for the study is described and aligned with the problem and is supported with current literature.
<b>Definition of Key Terms</b>	The definitions of key terms are incomplete or unclear. Personal descriptions are used, too many common words are used, methods and theoretical terms are included.	Definitions are provided with appropriate citations for most terms related to the dissertation topic. Terms are in alphabetical order.
<b>Summary</b>	The summary of the study is incomplete or unclear, lacks focus on the need and purpose of the study, method and design, anticipated outcomes, and transitions into the next chapter.	Chapter ends with a basic summary of the need and purpose of the study, method and design, anticipated contributions, and transitions into the next chapter.

Chapter 2	Does Not Meet 0.01 points	Meets 1 point
<b>Introductory Remarks/Literature Search Strategies</b>	<p>The section is missing; or some topic areas are not included in the introduction or are not explained clearly.</p> <p>The chapter outline is not provided and the literature search strategies are missing.</p>	<p>The reader is adequately oriented to the topic areas covered. An outline of the flow of the chapter is presented.</p> <p>All major themes/concepts are introduced. Literature search strategies are presented.</p>
<b>Full Theoretical/Conceptual Framework</b>	<p>The section is missing; or some theoretical foundations of the research are not discussed or some relevant theories are omitted.</p> <p>Student fails to adequately elaborate on theoretical/conceptual framework introduction in Chapter 1.</p>	<p>Most theories and concepts are covered in detail to orient the reader to the research.</p> <p>Description(s) of the theory(ies)/conceptual framework(s) are provided and supported in the literature. The sources of the framework are described and provide the rationale for the choice of the framework for the study through substantiation in the literature.</p>
<b>Themes or Subtopics</b>	<p>Themes are random and unorganized, concepts are not ordered, and some relevant themes are omitted.</p> <p>Themes do not follow a logical progression. All points of view are not addressed and relations are not with the problem, purpose, and research questions. Chapter reads more like a book report rather than a synthesized discussion of scholarly literature.</p>	<p>Themes are arranged logically analyzing all points of view with prior research and findings on the topic.</p> <p>Within each theme, topics are discussed from broad to narrow associated with the problem, purpose, research questions and associated concepts. Critically evaluated scholarly literature noting areas of convergence and divergence.</p>
<b>Summary</b>	<p>The section is missing; or some relevant information or themes are omitted.</p> <p>The summary does not follow logically from the literature review or the introduction.</p>	<p>All relevant information is adequately covered and refers to most of the major themes introduced in the Introduction.</p> <p>The reader is left with enough information to be familiar with the topics necessary to begin reading about the research methodology.</p>

Chapter 3	Does Not Meet 0.01 points	Meets/NA 1 point
<b>Introductory Remarks</b>	<p>The section is missing; or some topic areas are not included in the Introduction or are not explained clearly.</p> <p>The chapter outline is not provided and/or is unclear.</p>	<p>The reader is adequately oriented to the topic areas covered. An outline of the logical flow of the chapter is presented.</p> <p>All major themes/concepts are introduced.</p>
<b>Research Methodology and Design</b>	<p>There is a lack of alignment among the chosen research method and design and the study's problem, purpose, and research questions.</p> <p>There is a lack of justification and alternate choices for methods.</p> <p><i>For Qualitative Studies:</i> Lacks clear discussion of the study phenomenon, boundaries of case(s), and/or constructs explored.</p>	<p>Describes how the research method and design are aligned with the study problem, purpose, and research questions.</p> <p>Uses scholarly support to describe how the design choice is consistent with the research method, and alternate choices are discussed.</p> <p><i>For Qualitative Studies:</i> Describes the study phenomenon, boundaries of case(s) and/or constructs explored.</p>
<b>Population and Sample</b>	<p>Lacks a description of the sample, demographics, and the representation of the sample to the broader population.</p> <p>There is little to no description of the inclusion/exclusion criteria used to select the participants (sample) of the study.</p> <p><i>For Quantitative Studies:</i> A power analysis is not described and appropriately cited.</p>	<p>Provides a description of the target population and the relation to the larger population.</p> <p>Inclusion/exclusion criteria for selecting participants (sample) of the study are noted.</p> <p><i>For Quantitative Studies:</i> Power analysis is described and appropriately cited.</p>

<b>Materials/Instrumentation</b>	<p>Lacks a description of the instruments associated with the chosen research method and design used. Details missing regarding instrument origin, reliability, and validity.</p> <p><i><b>For Quantitative Studies:</b></i> (e.g., tests or surveys). Lacks explanation of any permission needed to use the instrument(s) and cites properly. Instrument permissions are missing in appendices</p> <p><i><b>For Qualitative Studies:</b></i> (e.g., observation checklists/protocols, interview or focus group discussion Handbooks). Did not clearly explain the process for conducting an expert review of instruments (e.g., provides justification of reviewers being credible – reviewers may include, but not limited to NCU dissertation team members, professional colleagues, peers, or non-research participants representative of the greater population); and/or did not clearly explain use of a field test if practicing the administration of the instruments is warranted.</p> <p><i><b>For Pilot Study:</b></i> Does not clearly explain the procedure for conducting a pilot study (did not conduct pilot) if using a self-created instrument (e.g., survey questionnaire); does not include explanation of a field test if practicing the administration of the instruments is warranted.</p>	<p>Provides a description of the instruments associated with the chosen research method and design used. Includes information regarding instrument origin, reliability, and validity.</p> <p><i><b>For Quantitative Studies:</b></i> (e.g., tests or surveys). Includes any permission needed to use the instrument(s) and cites properly.</p> <p><i><b>For Qualitative Studies:</b></i> (e.g., observation checklists/protocols, interview or focus group discussion Handbooks). Describes process for conducting an expert review of instruments (e.g., provides justification of reviewers being credible – reviewers may include, but not limited to NCU dissertation team members, professional colleagues, peers, or non-research participants representative of the greater population); describes use of a field test if practicing the administration of the instruments is warranted.</p> <p><i><b>For Pilot Study:</b></i> Explains the procedure for conducting a pilot study (requires IRB approval for pilot) if using a self-created instrument (e.g., survey questionnaire); explains use of a field test if practicing the administration of the instruments is warranted.</p>
<b>Operational Definitions of Variables (Quantitative Studies Only)</b>	<p>Discussion of the study variables examined is lacking information and/or is unclear.</p>	<p>Describes study variables in terms of being measurable and/or observable.</p> <p>(Reviewer - mark Meets/NA for Qualitative studies)</p>
<b>Procedures</b>	<p>Procedures are not clear or replicable. Steps are missing; recruitment, selection, and informed consent are not established. IRB ethical practices are missing or unclear.</p>	<p>Describes the procedures to conduct the study in enough detail to practically replicate the study, including participant recruitment and notification, and informed consent. IRB ethical practices are noted.</p>

<b>Data Collection and Analysis</b>	<p>Does not clearly provide a description of the data and the processes to collect data. Lack of alignment between the data collected and the research questions and/or hypotheses of the study.</p> <p><i><b>For Quantitative Studies:</b></i> Does not clearly provide the data analysis processes including, but not limited to, clearly describing the statistical tests performed and the purpose/outcome, coding of data linked to each RQ, the software used (e.g., SPSS, Qualtrics).</p> <p><i><b>For Qualitative Studies:</b></i> Does not clearly identify the coding process of data linked to RQs; does not clearly describe the transcription of data, the software used for textual analysis (e.g., Nivo, DeDoose), and does not justify manual analysis by researcher. There is missing or unclear explanation of the use of a member check to validate data collected.</p>	<p>Provides a description of the data collected and the processes used in gathering the data. Explains alignment between the data collected and the research questions and/or hypotheses of the study.</p> <p><i><b>For Quantitative Studies:</b></i> Includes the data analysis processes including, but not limited to, describing the statistical tests performed and the purpose/outcome, coding of data linked to each RQ, the software used (e.g., SPSS, Qualtrics).</p> <p><i><b>For Qualitative Studies:</b></i> Identifies the coding process of data linked to RQs. Describes the transcription of data, the software used for textual analysis (e.g., Nivo, DeDoose), and describes manual analysis by researcher. Describes the use of a member check to validate data collected.</p>
<b>Assumptions/Limitations/Delimitations</b>	<p>Does not clearly outline the assumptions/limitations/delimitations (or has missing components) inherent to the choice of method and design.</p> <p><i><b>For Quantitative Studies:</b></i> Does not include or lacks key elements such as, but not limited to, threats to internal and external validity, credibility, and generalizability.</p> <p><i><b>For Qualitative Studies:</b></i> Does not include or lacks key elements such as, but not limited to threats to credibility, trustworthiness, and transferability.</p>	<p>Outlines the assumptions/limitations/delimitations to the choice of method and design.</p> <p><i><b>For Quantitative Studies:</b></i> Includes key elements such as, but not limited to, threats to internal and external validity, credibility, and generalizability.</p> <p><i><b>For Qualitative Studies:</b></i> Includes key elements such as, but not limited to threats to credibility, trustworthiness, and transferability.</p>
<b>Ethical Assurances</b>	<p>Lacks discussion of compliance with the standards to conduct research as appropriate to the proposed research design and is not aligned to IRB requirements.</p>	<p>Describes compliance with the standards to conduct research as appropriate to the proposed research design and aligned to IRB requirements.</p>
<b>Summary</b>	<p>Chapter does not conclude with a summary of key points from the Chapter - elements are missing, incomplete, and/new information is presented.</p>	<p>Chapter concludes with an organized summary of key points discussed/presented in the Chapter.</p>

Chapter 4	Does Not Meet 0.01 points	Meets 1 point
<b>Introductory Remarks</b>	Overview of the purpose of the research study is missing, lacking clarity, and/or is overly lengthy; containing unneeded discussions. The organization of the chapter is missing or unclear; including the organization of the chapter around the research question(s)/hypotheses.	An adequate overview of the purpose of the research study is provided. The organization of the chapter is described and is structured mainly around the research question(s)/hypotheses.
<b>Trustworthiness/Validity and Reliability of Data</b>	Lacks clear discussion of trustworthiness/validity and reliability of data. Any factors impacting interpretation of data collection or analyses are missing or unclear.  Note: Topics of discussion will differ based on method. Qualitative to include, but not limited to, credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Quantitative to include, but not limited to, validity, reliability, and assumptions of statistical tests.	Describes trustworthiness/validity and reliability of data. Factors impacting interpretation of data collection or analysis are noted.  Note: Topics of discussion will differ based on method. Qualitative to include, but not limited to, credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Quantitative to include, but not limited to: validity, reliability, and assumptions of statistical tests.
<b>Results</b>	Presents results, themes, and/or statistical significance that are not aligned to research questions or hypotheses. There is a lack of structure in analysis and the steps for analysis are missing or unclear.  There is a presence of interpretation and discussion in this section of the results. There is an absence of tables and figures or they are present but not clear or appropriate.	Presents results in line with the research questions or hypotheses. The structure of the analysis is mostly organized and aligned with the questions.  Presents results with little to no interpretation. Themes are aligned to the research questions and any statistical significance or relevance is highlighted. Tables and figures are used and presented appropriately.
<b>Evaluation of Findings (Brief)</b>	Brief report of what findings mean is missing, unclear, or overly long. Results are not clearly interpreted in light of the theoretical/conceptual framework.  Little to no connection back to the scholarly literature.	Description of what findings mean is included. Discussion includes theoretical/conceptual framework identified earlier.  Most findings are compared to the scholarly literature.
<b>Summary</b>	Chapter does not conclude with a summary of key points from the Chapter, elements are missing, incomplete, and/new information is presented.	Chapter concludes with an organized summary of key points discussed/presented in the chapter.

Chapter 5	Does Not Meet 0.01 points	Meets 1 point
<b>Introductory Remarks</b>	<p>The section is missing; or some topic areas are not included in the introduction or are not explained clearly.</p> <p>The chapter outline is unclear or not provided.</p>	<p>The reader is adequately oriented to the topic areas covered. An outline of the flow of the chapter is presented.</p> <p>All major themes are introduced and explained.</p>
<b>Implications (Discussion of Findings)</b>	<p>Findings are not clearly aligned to questions or hypotheses.</p> <p>Conclusions are vague and unsubstantiated in study findings. Over generalizations are present. There is a lack of organization of results to study problem, purpose, theory/conceptual framework, and significance.</p> <p>There is lack or unclear discussion for suggestions in practice (Applied) or how the findings can contribute to the existing research base of scholarly literature (PhD).</p>	<p>Findings are discussed by research question and hypotheses.</p> <p>Clear conclusions are presented based on actual research findings. Results are framed in the context of the literature review, problem, purpose, alignment with the theory/conceptual framework, and significance of the study.</p> <p>Includes discussion of the suggestions for practice (Applied) and, in the context of the literature, how the study builds to the existing body of research (PhD).</p>
<b>Recommendations for Practice</b>	<p>Recommendations are vague or inappropriate. Discussion for practical application of findings and future research are missing or lacking clarity.</p> <p>Frequently overstates the applicability of findings.</p>	<p>Discusses recommendations for how the findings of the study can be applied to practice and/or theory. Supports recommendations with some connections to the scholarly literature from Chapter 2.</p> <p>Might overstate the applicability of the findings at times.</p>
<b>Recommendations for Future Research</b>	<p>Study findings are not clearly tied to recommendations and/or scholarly literature from Chapter 2 and other current findings.</p> <p>Recommendations are vague or not appropriate.</p> <p>Discussion for practical application of findings and future research are missing or lacking clarity.</p>	<p>Based on the framework, findings, and implications, explains what future researchers might do to learn from and build upon this study.</p> <p>Justifies these explanations with some connection to scholarly literature from Chapter 2 and other current findings.</p> <p>Discusses how future researchers can improve upon this study, given its limitations. Explains what the next logical step is in this line of research.</p>



<b>Conclusions</b>	No clear conclusions are presented. There is a lack of organization around the importance of the study and how the results respond to the study problem, demonstrate significance, and contribute to exciting literature or practice.	Descriptive conclusion including summary of study, importance of study, and the problem addressed. Discussion includes ‘take-home’ message of the study to the professional and academic organizations as stakeholders for the study findings.
--------------------	---	--

<b>Format/ Writing/ Presentation</b>	<b>Does Not Meet 0.01 points</b>	<b>Meets 1 point</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	The abstract does not contain the problem, purpose, findings, and recommendations.	The abstract contains the problem, purpose, findings, and recommendations.
<b>Citations</b>	Numerous old (beyond five years) resources used, claims are unsubstantiated in the literature, research bias is present and claims based on personal opinion are included. Frequent use of anthropomorphisms and informal language is noted.	Current (no later than five years old – unless seminal research), relevant, scholarly literature is used appropriately, all claims are substantiated in the literature, there is an absence of personal opinion, avocation, bias, anthropomorphisms, and informal language.
<b>References</b>	References are not aligned from the text to the reference list and vice versa. References are not documented properly to DOI notations. Some references do not exist and some links are not properly working.	References are aligned from the text to the reference list and vice versa. References reflect proper DOI notations and are documented appropriately. All references exist and all links are properly working.
<b>Appendices</b>	Appendices lack organization, missing components, or incomplete details There is misalignment between text and appendices.	Appendices are appropriate to the manuscript including elements such as, but limited to, survey tools and instruments. There is alignment between text and appendices.
<b>Dissertation Manuscript: Tense</b>	Verb tenses are not matched with the manuscript.	All discussions related to the study are written in past tense.
<b>APA Format - Writing/Presentation</b>	Inconsistently applies fundamental APA formatting for TOC, List of Tables, and List of Figures. The template requirements are not followed.  Inconsistently applies fundamental APA formatting throughout the DM. The template requirements are not followed.	Consistently applies fundamental APA formatting for TOC, List of Tables, and List of Figures The template requirements are followed.  Consistently applies fundamental APA formatting throughout the DM. The template requirements are followed.
<b>Writing/Presentation</b>	Does not follow conventions of scholarly writing, grammar, and punctuation.	Follows conventions of scholarly writing, grammar, and punctuation.