Chapter 2 (Quantitative) Rubric – EDAD

Each criterion can receive one of three ratings: Major Revisions Needed, Minor Revisions Needed, or Approved. The student can move forward with the paper only when each criterion receives the Approval rating. In the table below, the requirements for approval are discussed in detail. A Minor Revisions Needed rating means that most, but not all, of the requirements are met and a Major Revisions Needed rating means that most, if not all, of the requirements are unmet. After all criteria have received ratings, the rater will then be able to make a global judgement regarding Chapter 2: Additional revisions needed or Ready for review. If additional revisions are needed, Qualtrics will return the rubric and the document to the student and the student will be instructed to revise the chapter based on the feedback in the rubric. If the document is ready for review, Qualtrics will return the rubric and the paper to the student, and the paper will proceed to the next step (see written workflow).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Criterion | Requirements for Approval |
| 1. Hypothesis | Hypotheses are formulated and stated such that they are well-aligned with the research questions presented in Chapter 1. All constructs are operationalized and variables named in the hypotheses, and are clearly aligned with constructs described in the theoretical framework. Alternative hypotheses are presented accurately. |
| 2. Approach | The research design and methodological approach are described, explained, and justified based on the nature of problem of practice, and the scholarly literature underlying these design choices. The research design and methodology are well-aligned with the research questions. The action plan reflects appropriate action for the setting, context, and problem of practice. |
| 3. Participants | Attributes of participants are described, explained, and justified (where appropriate). The sample frame (strategy), sample size, recruitment (participation) procedures, demographics, and any inclusion or exclusion criteria are described, explained, and justified. |
| 4. Setting | The setting and context of the research, and if applicable, the process of choosing the sponsoring organization are fully described, explained, and justified. The benefits of the setting and context to the practitioner are described, explained, and justified with support from the scholarly literature. |
| 5. Data Collection Procedures | The data collection process is explained in detail, including acquisition, coding, measurement scales, and operationalization of variables, all of which are well aligned, and supported by the scholarly literature. |
| 6. Instrument | The instrument used is described fully, and its applicability is justified. Citations are included for both successful and unsuccessful use and modifications of the instrument. The response scale is clearly explained and the variables are clearly defined. |
| 7. Data Analysis Method | The analytical process and techniques used, and the software choice (including the software provider and version) for data analysis are specified, explained, and justified. |
| 8. Data Analysis Procedures | The data analysis procedures are specified, explained, and justified, citing scholarly literature to support their selection. The procedures selected are well-aligned with the research question(s). |
| 9. Validity and Reliability | Evidence from previous research of validity and reliability of the instruments selected and alignment between measurement concepts and variables is fully described, explained, and justified. |
| 10. Ethical Considerations | Privacy concerns of respondents are fully assessed; maintenance of confidentiality and data security is addressed; risk/benefit analysis is presented; vulnerability of population (as appropriate) is fully addressed. |