Chapter 1 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 1: 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. Setting | The setting for the research is described and its selection is explained and defended as appropriate to the question under study. Alignment with the relevance of the research to similar settings and populations is made. Compelling reasons for selecting the research problem and setting in terms of benefits to students, organizations and the researcher are offered. |
| 2. Context | The context for the research, its historical, cultural, and social perspectives, clearly determine its relevance to like settings and populations where the application of the intervention may be applied to support student success. |
| 3. Problem of Practice | The intervention clearly connecting an improvement strategy, grounded in scholarly and practitioner literature, to a current and well defined problem of practice. The problem and intervention are explained using context-relevant examples which may be of use to populations with a similar problem. |
| 4. Purpose | The purpose of the study is articulated such that it formulates a compelling reason for why the research should be attempted. |
| 5. Significance | The significance of the research and how it adds value to both the scholarly literature and practitioner's repertoire is explained in detail. Implications for the work are presented in the context of both previous and future growth in the service of the target population and the larger field. |
| 6. Theory | The review coherently summarizes relevant scholarly and practitioner literature; enforces its practical value to students. A cohesive theoretical framework to understanding the problem of practice is supported by a critical review of the scholarly and practitioner literature; contains an clear explanation, justification, and alignment of theoretical framework(s) relevant to the problem of practice, and establishes a clear connection among the details of the design, data, analysis, results, conclusions, limitations, and implications of the study. |
| 7. Disciplinary Knowledge | The review of supporting scholarly literature reflects superior disciplinary knowledge demonstrated by analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of empirical evidence from major and contemporary disciplinary-relevant theories, and research that led to the creation of new evidence based knowledge clearly relevant to the problem of practice. |
| 8. Evidence from Previous Action Research | The review of supporting scholarly and practitioner literature reflects a comprehensive and integrated analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of previous action research relevant to the current problem of practice. Connects details of the design, data analysis, results, conclusions, implications, and recommendations relevant to the proposed research. Synthesizes similarities and differences of previous action research and evaluates the evidence in the context of the current problem of practice. |