

Dissertation Handbook



California State University, Sacramento
Doctorate in Educational Leadership Program

Table of Contents

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
<i>Doctorate Student Dissertation Information</i>	
Program Benchmarks	1-2
Selecting Dissertation Committee	3
Nomination of Doctoral Dissertation Committee	4
Advice for Working with your Committee	5
Dissertation Process	6
Functions of Dissertation Proposal	7-8
Institutional Review Board	9
Dissertation Proposal Guidelines	10-14
Planning Dissertations: Proposal Presentation	15
Dissertation Proposal Defense Form	16-17
Intent to Defend Dissertation	18
Dissertation Defense Presentation - Guidelines	19
Dissertation Defense Presentation - Questions to Consider	20
Dissertation Defense Forms	21
Ed.D. Dissertation Defense Form	22-23
Dissertation Formatting Guide	24
Thesis/Dissertation Formatting Workshops	25
<i>Dissertation Guidelines – Faculty & Students</i>	
Dissertation Guidelines	26
Oral Dissertation Defense Rubric	27-28
Written Dissertation Criteria Rubric	29-30
Criteria for Evaluating/Writing Dissertations	31-42
<i>Research Helps</i>	
Chapter 3 Methodology Organizer	43-46
Chapter 3 Research Organizer	47

Program Benchmarks

(Three Semesters in Academic Year: (1) Fall, (2) Spring, and (3) Summer)

Task	Process	Timeline	Responsible Party
Writing Placement for Graduates	Form can be found at: http://www.csus.edu/gradstudies/forms/index.html	Beginning of first fall semester	Student submits to the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS)
Dissertation Prospectus	Preparation takes place in EDD 606, Quantitative Research Methods II	End of second fall semester	EDD 606, Quantitative Research Methods II
Successful completion of course sequence	Work with Academic Advisor, Director and Associate Director	Second spring semester	OGS and Program Director tracks
Advancement to Candidacy	Student secures necessary signatures Form can be found at: http://www.csus.edu/gradstudies/forms/index.html	Second spring semester February 1	Student submits to OGS
Intent to take the Qualifying Exam	Form can be found at: http://www.csus.edu/gradstudies/forms/index.html	Second spring semester February 1	Student submits to OGS
Results of Qualifying Exam	Exams are evaluated and scored	Second summer semester mid-June	EDD Office submits to OGS
Nomination of Dissertation Committee	Student and Primary Advisor decide on the composition of this committee and Student submits Doctoral dissertation committee form	Second summer semester	Student submits to EDD office
Defense of Dissertation Proposal	Student submits the Completion of dissertation proposal defense form	Beginning of third fall semester	Student submits to the Ed.D. Office staff

IRB Approval	Student works with IRB office to obtain Human Subjects Committee Approval Information and Deadlines can be found at their website at: http://www.csus.edu/research/irb/	No later than the beginning of third fall semester	Student notifies Primary Advisor and committee members
Continuous dissertation research	Works closely with Primary Advisor and committee members on chapters	No later than the beginning of third fall semester	Student must maintain communication with dissertation advisor and all committee members
Dissertation Formatting Workshop	Students are required to attend a minimum of one Thesis Formatting Workshop and obtain proof of attendance for later use	Beginning of third fall semester in EDD 617	Office of Graduate Studies
Application for Graduation Form	Students secure necessary signatures Form can be found at: http://www.csus.edu/gradstudies/forms/index.html	Third spring semester February 1	Student submits to OGS
Intent to Defend Dissertation	Form can be found at: http://www.csus.edu/gradstudies/forms/index.html	Third spring semester February 1	Student submits to OGS

Dissertation Defense	Student prepares final draft of dissertation to present to dissertation committee	Beginning of third spring semester	Student requests room with EDD office
Dissertation Defense	EDD dissertation defense form – Student secures necessary signatures	Following Dissertation Defense Presentation	Student submits to EDD office
Graduation Checkout	Student submits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electronic Approved copy of Dissertation • Title page, Abstract page, original signatures printed on regular paper • Two copies of dissertation receipt form • Culminating Experience Processing Receipt • Proof of Attendance to Thesis/Dissertation Workshop 	No later than first Friday of May (graduation month)	Student submits to the Office of Graduate Studies

Dissertation Process

Methods Classes

- Focus on dissertation procedures and processes

Dissertation Prospectus

- Presentation of Dissertation topic in a Poster Session format
- End of second fall semester

Dissertation Proposal/IRB Proposal

- Beginning of third fall semester

Dissertation Defense Presentation

- Third spring semester
- Full draft of Dissertation should be submitted 2 weeks prior to Presentation

Advice on Selecting Your Dissertation Committee

Questions to Consider when Selecting your Dissertation Committee Members

- 1) What specific expertise will the member bring to your dissertation committee?
 - a. Why do you want this person on your committee?
 - b. Does the person have expertise in the subject matter of your study?
 - c. Does the person have expertise in the methodology you plan to use in your study?
- 2) How well do you know the person you intend to invite?
 - a. Have you established a positive, professional relationship with this person?
 - b. Does this person know the quality of your work?
 - c. Have you had enough interactions with this person to take direction and advice from the person?
- 3) Will the person make the time to contribute to your work?
 - a. Can you expect this person to remain on your committee for the duration (normally 12-18 months)?
 - b. Can you expect to receive timely and constructive feedback on your work from this person?
- 4) How well will your committee members work together as a team?
 - a. Does your Chair know the committee members and does the Chair have a positive, professional relationship with the members?
 - b. Do your committee members know each other professionally or personally?
 - c. What is the history of the relationships between your committee members?

Advice on Working with Your Dissertation Committee

Working with your committee

1. Open and consistent communications with your committee and, especially, your Chair are critical to your successful progress.
2. Work closely with your Chair to see how she or he wants you to submit your work to the committee. (Normally, all chapters or sections of chapters are submitted to your Chair for review first. After the Chair provides you with feedback and you make necessary changes, typically you resubmit to the Chair who then either sends your work on to the other committee members or directs you to send them your work.
3. Ask your Chair how she or he would like you to interact with committee members to get feedback from your committee members on your work. (Often the Chair will request that all reviewed work be funneled through the Chair and then the feedback is passed on to you for corrections and changes.)
4. If you receive feedback on your work that is unclear to you or appears contradictory, take your concerns to your Chair.
5. Your Chair and committee members are busy people, yet they should be responsive to you, just as you need to be responsive to them. Send your Chair regular updates on the progress of your work. Send your committee members' periodic updates on your progress.
6. If you are not receiving timely feedback on the work you submit to your committee, contact your Chair with your concerns. You need to strike a balance between persistence and becoming bothersome.
7. Your Chair will determine when it is time for you to defend your dissertation proposal and your dissertation. You will need to take an active role in scheduling the dates of defense. Along with your Chair, you will need to schedule these defenses well ahead of time so committee members can read and contemplate your work in an ample amount of time.
8. When a proposal or dissertation defense is scheduled you should provide the necessary forms for the committee members to sign. (See the Student Handbook for these forms.)
9. Remember, your Chair is the final arbiter of your committee. Work closely with your Chair on all matters pertaining to your study.

Functions of a Dissertation Proposal

Krathwohl & Smith (2005)

Justification for the dissertation study

Researchers employ theory, method, evidence, and reasoning to produce findings they claim are important and relevant to the questions of interest. The reasoning producing the findings and relating them to the problem constitutes an argument that is the heart of the dissertation proposal. This argument justifies conducting the study and supports the meaning and utility of the results found. The primary function of the dissertation proposal, then, is to provide the justification for the inquiry.

Therefore, in doing the study, the student develops the following points into a reasoned argument:

1. Why is it worth studying, what will be studied.
2. What is already known, how that relates to the proposed study, and how it coalesces into an argument for:
 - An extrapolation of past knowledge to predict the outcome of the study,
 - Or, if not a prediction, some anticipation of possible outcomes,
 - Or knowledge of what area to study in order to likely attain payoff.
3. How the study will proceed: what method will be used; data gathered; and situations, circumstances, and persons involved.
4. How those data represent future situations, circumstances, and/or persons in such a way as to relate usefully and meaningfully to the problem, question, or area of investigation proposed.

As might be expected, these points relate to the proposal as well as to the dissertation study itself. The first three points are covered in the proposal, the fourth in the dissertation report.

The Proposal as Work Plan

The proposal as a work plan is the most common function a proposal serves. It sets forth what work will be done, why, and with what anticipated result. Most proposals include a timeline. The work plan allows faculty to judge the investigation's importance, feasibility, efficiency, and likely success. The material in the following sections of this book will assist you in developing a strong work plan.

The Proposal as Evidence of Ability

A dissertation proposal may also serve as evidence of ability—the student's knowledge of the topic, understanding of the relevant literature, grasp of appropriate inquiry procedures and methods, analytic and design skills, and certainly, organizational and writing skills are all reflected in the proposal. A student who produces a strong proposal in these respects can have greater confidence that she/he is indeed prepared to undertake the proposed inquiry. And the faculty, by assessing the proposal's clarity, organization, attention to detail, readiness and her/his need for additional preparation, support, or supervision.

Proposal as Request for Commitment

A draft prospectus may be used to identify persons who might serve as collaborators, consultants, or participants in the inquiry. A more complete version may be used to solicit faculty participation on the dissertation committee. Either of these versions may be useful in gaining the approval of gatekeepers of sites from which one hopes to collect data. The proposal also commits the faculty to helping the student meet the challenges the project will present. A full draft of the proposal may be used to seek financial or institutional support.

The Proposal as Contract

A proposal may come to serve as a contract as it changes from a request for commitment to an accepted agreement of work to be done. Approval of the proposal may entail faculty and institutional obligation to provide support, resources, and ultimately a doctoral degree if the work is completed as proposed. Because approval by the dissertation committee may constitute an institutional contract to accept the basic elements of the proposal, a dissertation committee may be particularly careful to ensure that the proposed study is well designed, complies with institutional guidelines and local norms, and is feasible.

The Proposal as Evaluative Criterion

Once accepted, a dissertation proposal can become an evaluative criterion used to judge the direction and quality of the ensuing work. The more specific and detailed the proposal is, the more likely it will be used to monitor the progress of the inquiry. The student may be expected to implement the study as planned, inform the faculty of further details as she works them out, and provide justification when seeking approval for any major changes to the study as proposed. The proposal may also serve as an evaluative criterion in judging the quality of the final dissertation report.

Partial Dissertation Draft

Although most students must adjust the proposal and final dissertation format to fit his/her studies, in most cases, dissertation advisors ask for a proposal that amount to a partial dissertation draft—the first three chapters: statement of problem, review of the literature, and description of method. Presumably, if there are subsequently no significant changes in the study's process or design, these three early chapter drafts can be used in the final dissertation report with only minor modifications.

For the faculty, a full three-chapter proposal provides the strongest basis for several of the functions of a proposal (for example, evidence of ability, contractual obligation, and subsequent evaluative criterion). For the student, substantial initial work is required without formal assurance that the study being planned will be acceptable, but once such a proposal is approved, the student is well on his way to completing the entire study. Most often, however, proposals provide a sketchier coverage of the study than the development of chapters implies. This better fits the level of knowledge of the student at the time the proposal is written, as well as allowing for the almost inevitable adjustments required later to fit newly revealed realities.

Institutional Human Subjects Review Board

Any research conducted by Sacramento State faculty, staff or students involving human subjects or any research related activity involving human subjects that utilizes Sacramento State time, facilities resources and/or students must be reviewed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) to ensure compliance with applicable federal and campus policy.

The IRB is the committee charged with the implementation of campus and federal policies to safeguard the rights and welfare of human subjects participating in research activities by the University or its affiliates. Guidelines for human subject protection are available on the Office of Research Administration Web site at <http://www.csus.edu/research/irb/>.

IRB Approval of Ed.D. Research*

1. Appropriate Institutional Human Subjects Review Board approvals must be received in order for dissertation research that involves human subjects to be conducted.
2. The dissertation committee chair is normally the faculty member who signs the IRB forms and works with the student to ensure that human subjects review requirements are met on a timely basis.
3. Failure to obtain required IRB approvals prior to collection of data on human subjects may disqualify a student from making any use of those data.

*Students should consult with their dissertation chair regarding what is necessary to satisfy IRB requirements. Note that some dissertation projects may be exempt from IRB review.

Dissertation Proposal Guidelines

California State University, Sacramento

Doctorate in Educational Leadership

The following provides a checklist for both students and faculty to consider when reviewing the dissertation proposal.

On all Front and End pages

1. Abstract provides a concise description of the study, brief statement of the problem, and exposition of methods and procedures and a summary of findings and implications
2. Table of Contents, list of tables, figures, graphics and pictures are clear and organized
3. The appendices include all research instruments, IRB approval, and consent forms
4. References are complete and in proper APA format

Writing and Format

1. Dissertation
 - a. Follows a standard form and has a professional, scholarly appearance
 - b. Is written with correct grammar, punctuation, and spelling
 - c. Includes citations: direct quotations, paraphrasing, facts and references to research studies
 - d. Relies on original sources
 - e. Fully references in-text citations in the reference list
2. The dissertation is written in scholarly language (accurate, balanced, objective and tentative) The writing is clear, precise, fluid, and comprehensible
3. The dissertation is logically and comprehensively organized. The chapters add up to an integrated "whole."
4. Subheadings are used to identify the logic and movement of the dissertation, and transitions between chapters are smooth and coherent

Chapter Checklist:

Chapter 1

1. Introduction
 - a. Should include a clear statement demonstrating that the focus of the study is on a significant problem worthy of study
 - b. Includes brief, well-articulated summary of research literature that substantiates the study, with references to more detailed discussions in Chapter 2
2. Problem Statement
 - a. Describes the issue or problem to be studied
 - b. Situates the issue or problem in context
 - c. Contains a purpose statement stating the specific objectives of the research
 - d. In quantitative studies, concisely states what will be studied by describing at least two variables and a conjectured relationship between them
 - e. Describes the need for increased understanding about the issue to be studied
3. Nature of the Study

- a. Specific Research Questions, Hypotheses, or Research Objectives (as appropriate for the study) are clearly described. Reference is made to more detailed discussions in Chapter 3
 - b. Purpose of the study is described in a logical, explicit manner
 - c. The theoretical base or in qualitative studies the conceptual framework is ground in the research literature
4. The Theoretical Base or Conceptual Framework
 - a. Delineates the theoretical concepts of the issue or problem under investigation
 - b. Provides descriptions of the ideas or concepts and their relevance to the issue or problem chosen for study
 - c. Briefly links the descriptions to prior knowledge and research
5. Operational Definitions
 - a. Technical terms or special word uses are provided and conceptually justified
6. Assumptions, Limitations, Scope and Delimitations
 - a. Identifies facts assumed to be true but not actually verified
 - b. Identifies potential weaknesses of the study and the bounds of the study
7. The Significance of the Study
 - a. Provides a rationale for the study with application to educational leadership, generation or extension of knowledge, implications for social or organizational change, and/or advancement of a methodological approach for examining the issue or problem under study
8. Conclusion
 - a. Transition Statement contains a summary of key points of the study and an overview of the content of the remaining chapters in the study

Chapter 2

1. Introduction
 - a. Describes the content of the review
 - b. Explains the organization of the review,
 - c. Justifies the strategy used for searching the literature
2. Review of research and literature
 - a. Is clearly related to the problem statement, research questions and hypotheses
 - b. Compares/contrasts different points of view or different research outcomes
 - c. Illustrates the relationship of the study to previous research
 - d. Contains concise summaries of scholarly works that help
 - e. Defines the most important aspects of the theory that will be examined or tested (for quantitative studies)
 - f. Substantiates the rationale or conceptual framework for the study (for qualitative studies)
3. Literature-based Descriptions
 - a. Cites the research variables (quantitative studies), or
 - b. Describes potential themes and perceptions to be explored (qualitative studies)
 - c. The content of the review is drawn from acceptable peer-reviewed journals or there is a justification for using other sources
4. Methodology
 - a. Literature related to the method(s) is reviewed
 - b. Literature is related to the use of differing methodologies to investigate the outcomes of interest is reviewed

5. The review is an integrated, critical essay on the most relevant and current published knowledge on the topic

Chapter 3 – Qualitative Studies

1. Introduction describes how the research design derives logically from the problem or issue statement
2. Design describes the qualitative tradition or paradigm that will be used, the choice of paradigm is justified
3. The Role of Researcher in the data collection procedure is described
4. Where appropriate, questions and sub questions are coherent answerable, few in number, clearly stated, and open-ended. When it is proposed that questions will emerge from the study, initial objectives are sufficiently focused.
5. The context for the study is described and justified. Procedures for gaining access to participants are described. Methods of establishing a researcher-participant working relationship are appropriate
6. Measures for ethical protection of participants are adequate
7. Criteria for selecting participants are specified and appropriate to the study. Justification for the number of participants, is balanced with depth of inquiry (the fewer the participants the deeper the inquiry per individual).
8. Choices about selection of data are justified. Data collected are appropriate to answer the questions posed in relation to the qualitative paradigm chosen. How and when the data were collected and recorded is described
9. How and when the data will be or were analyzed is articulated. Procedures for dealing with discrepant cases are described. If a software program is used in the analysis, it is clearly described. The coding procedure for reducing information into categories and themes is described
10. If an exploratory study was conducted, its relation to the larger study is explained
11. Measures taken for protection of participants' rights are summarized

Chapter 3 – Quantitative Studies

1. Introduction includes a clear outline of the major areas of the chapter
2. Research Design and approach
 - a. Includes a description of the research design and approach
 - b. Provides justification for using the design and approach
 - c. Derives logically from the problem or issue statement
3. Setting and Sample
 - a. Describes the population from which the sample will be or was drawn
 - b. Describes and defends the sampling method including the sampling frame used
 - c. Describes and defends the sample size
 - d. Describes the eligibility criteria for study participants
 - e. Describes the characteristics of the selected sample
4. If a treatment is used, it is described clearly and in detail
5. Instrumentation and Materials
 - a. Presents descriptions of instrumentation or data collection tools to include name of instrument, type of instrument, concepts measured by instrument, how scores are calculated and their meaning, processes for assessment of reliability and validity of the

- instrument(s), processes needed to complete instruments by participants, where raw data are or will be available (appendices, tables, or by request from the research).
- b. Includes a detailed description of data that comprise each variable in the study
- 6. Data Collection and Analysis includes
 - a. An explanation of descriptive and/or inferential analyses used in the study
 - b. Nature of the scale for each variable
 - c. Statements of hypotheses related to each research question
 - d. Description of parametric, nonparametric, or descriptive analytical tools used
 - e. Description of data collection processes
 - f. Description of any pilot study results, if applicable
- 7. Measures taken for protection of participants' rights are summarized

Chapter 3 – Mixed-Methods Studies

1. Introduction includes a brief overview of what will be presented in the chapter.
2. Research Design and approach
 - a. Includes a description of the research design and approach.
 - b. Provides justification for using the design and approach.
3. Role of the Researcher
 - a. Describes your involvement with the participants and the data.
4. Research Questions
 - a. Two to four questions (and sub-questions if applicable).
 - i. At least one qualitative and one quantitative question.
 1. At least one of the quantitative questions must require an infernal statistic (t-Test, ANOVA, Correlation, Regression, Chi-square, etc.).
5. Setting Population & Sample
 - a. Description of the setting in of the study.
 - b. Description of the population your participants will be selected from.
 - c. Rationale for sampling (Who and Why?)
6. Data Collection and Instrumentation
 - a. Sequential strategy: Collect data in two distinct phases.
 - i. QN → QL or QL → QN.
 - b. Concurrent strategy: Collect both QN and QL data simultaneously.
 - c. Describe how, when and where you will collect your data:
 - i. Qualitative methods: interviews, open-ended survey, observations, use of recording devices, etc.
 - ii. Quantitative methods: surveys/ questionnaires, pre/post-tests, preexisting/ archive/ data base records, test scores etc.
 - d. Describe measure taken to ensure reliability of instrumentation:
 - i. Qualitative methods: pre-existing surveys, member checking, construct validity of questions, etc.
 - ii. Quantitative methods: pre-existing surveys/ tests, test retest, pilot tests, construct validity, interrater reliability, homogeneity of groups, etc.
7. Data Analysis
 - a. Sequential Strategy: Discuss and interpret findings in two distinct phases, in the order of the methods used (QN → QL or QL → QN).
 - b. Concurrent Strategy: Combine both forms of data to seek convergence among the results.

8. Protection of Participants

Explain all measures taken to protect participants and their data (anonymity, voluntary participation, storage and disposal of data, etc.).

Chapter 4 – Qualitative Studies **Overview**

1. Chapter 4 is structured around the research questions and/or hypotheses addressed in the study, reporting findings related to each; the process by which the data are generated, gathered, and recorded is clearly described
2. The systems used for keeping track of data and emerging understanding (research logs, reflective journals, cataloging systems) are clearly described
3. Findings
 - a. Build logically from the problem and the research design
 - b. Are presented using “thick description”
 - c. Are presented in a manner that addresses the research questions
4. Discrepant cases and non-confirming data are included in the findings
5. Patterns, relationships, and themes described as findings are supported by the data. All salient data are accounted for in the findings
6. A discussion on Evidence of Quality shows how this study followed procedures to assure accuracy of the data (e.g. trustworthiness, member checks, triangulation, etc.). Appropriate evidence occurs in the appendixes (sample transcripts, researcher logs, field notes, etc.). (May appear in Chapter 5).

Chapter 4

1. Research tools:
 - a. Data collection instruments have been used correctly
 - b. Measures obtained are reported clearly, following standard procedures
 - c. Adjustments or revisions to the use of standardized research instruments have been justified and any effects on the interpretation of findings are clearly described
2. Overall, data analysis (presentation, interpretation, explanation) is consistent with the research questions or hypotheses and underlying theoretical/conceptual framework of the study
3. Data analyses
 - a. Logically and sequentially address all research questions or hypotheses
 - b. Where appropriate, outcomes of hypothesis-testing procedures are clearly reported (e.g., findings support or fail to support).
 - c. Contains statistical accuracy
4. Tables and Figures
 - a. Contribute to the presentation of findings
 - b. Are self-descriptive, informative, and conform to standard dissertation format
 - c. Are directly related to and referred to within the narrative text included in the chapter
 - d. Have immediately adjacent comments
 - e. Are properly identified (titled or captioned).
 - f. Show copyright permission (if not in the public domain).
5. The comments on findings address observed consistencies and inconsistencies and discuss possible alternate interpretations
6. In a concluding section of Chapter 4, outcomes are logically and systematically summarized and interpreted in relation to their importance to the research questions and hypotheses

Chapter 5

1. Chapter 5 begins with a brief Overview of the study, the questions or issues being addressed, and a brief summary of the findings
2. Interpretation of Findings
 - a. Includes conclusions that address all of the research questions
 - b. Contains references to outcomes in Chapter 4
 - c. Covers all the data
 - d. Is bounded by the evidence collected
 - e. Relates the findings to a larger body of literature on the topic, including the conceptual/theoretical framework
3. Program Objectives
 - a. Are clearly grounded in the significance section of Chapter 1 and outcomes presented in Chapter 4
 - b. The implications are expressed in terms of tangible improvements to individuals, communities, organizations, institutions, cultures or societies
4. Recommendations for Actions
 - a. Flow logically from the conclusions and contain steps to useful action
 - b. States who needs to pay attention to the results
 - c. Indicates how the results might be disseminated
5. Recommendations for Further Study point to topics that need closer examination and may generate a new round of questions
6. Qualitative studies include a reflection on the author's experience with the research process and a discussion possible of personal biases or preconceived ideas and values, possible effects of the researcher on the participants or the situation, and changes in thinking as a result of the study
7. The chapter closes with a strong concluding statement making the "take-home message" clear to the reader

Planning for your Dissertation Proposal Presentation

When planning for your dissertation proposal presentation, follow these steps to ensure a thorough and successful process.

- 1) Be sure that your committee chair and the rest of your committee members have had plenty of time to read your first three chapters and comment on them prior to your scheduling the proposal hearing. Working with your dissertation chair, be prepared to explain why you may not have taken a committee member's advice prior to the hearing so that he/she knows you heard his/her ideas. This approach will ensure you have a productive proposal presentation.

Keep in mind that your committee may have additional suggestions to improve your first three chapters of your dissertation once they all get together at the proposal hearing. Do not be offended or thrown off if that happens. That is inherent to the inquiry process and is a positive aspect of it. This process will strengthen your dissertation.

- 3) Prepare a 20 minute succinct presentation of your first three chapters. Be sure to address the following questions in that presentation.

- A. What is the title of your study?
- B. What is the purpose of your research?
- C. Why are you pursuing this line of research? What problems are you trying to address?
- D. Who do you plan to study (e.g., population sample) and why?
- E. What are your research questions or hypothesis (if applicable)?
- F. What is your proposed methodology?
- G. How could a practitioner incorporate what you plan to discover into his/her daily practice?

- 4) Work with your committee's schedule and Ed.D. Office (916-278-2282) to schedule a time and room to present your dissertation proposal. You will need at least 90 minutes of time (20 minutes for your presentation and 70 minutes for committee discussion).

IMPORTANT REMINDER: GET YOUR COMMITTEE CHAIR'S PERMISSION TO SCHEDULE THE PROPOSAL HEARING. SHE OR HE WILL TELL YOU WHEN YOU ARE READY.

- 5) Come prepared and open to discuss ways in which to improve your first three chapters.

Ed.D. students are responsible for having their Dissertation Committee complete this form once they have completed their Dissertation Proposal Defense and immediately submit to the Ed.D. Office.



California State University, Sacramento
Doctorate in Educational Leadership
College of Education
6000 J Street • Eureka Hall 328 • Sacramento, CA 95819-6079
(916) 278-2282 • www.csus.edu/edd

Completion of Dissertation Proposal Defense Form

Title of Dissertation: _____

Student Name: _____

Location of Proposal Defense: _____

Date and Time of Proposal Defense: _____
Date Time

My signature below indicates the above named student has completed their proposal defense.

Signature (chairperson) Date

Signature (member) Date

Signature (member) Date

Signature (member) Date

Signature (member) Date

For **Dissertation Committee Chairperson only**: The above named student has:

- Satisfactorily passed his/her proposal defense without revisions to proposal
- Satisfactorily passed his/her proposal defense with revisions to proposal:
Revisions due: _____
Date
- Had his/her proposal defense deferred and will be rescheduled (Please attach letter)
- Not satisfactorily completed his/her proposal defense (Please attach letter)

Ed.D. students are responsible for having their Dissertation Committee complete this form once they have completed their Dissertation Proposal Defense and immediately submit to the Ed.D. Office.

Name of Student: _____ **Date of Proposal Defense:** _____

The following revisions are **required** for completion of dissertation proposal:

ABSTRACT/LITERATURE REVIEW

METHODS

Subjects:

Procedures/Data collection:

Data Analysis:

Date revisions required back to Dissertation Committee Chairperson for approval: _____
Date

The following revisions are *suggested* (but not required):

Name of Dissertation Committee Chairperson Signature of Committee Chairperson Date
(Please Print)

Name of Student Signature of Student Date
(Please Print)

Ed.D. students are responsible for completing this form and submitting to the Office of Graduate Studies by the deadline date. This form can be found at: <http://www.csus.edu/gradstudies/forms.htm>



Office of Graduate Studies
Ed.D / Ph.D.
Intent to Defend Dissertation

Student ID #: _____ Date: _____
Last Name: _____ First: _____ MI: _____
Address: _____ City: _____ ST: _____ Zip _____
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Program of Study (please check one area only):		
<input type="checkbox"/> Ed.D	Note Concentration: <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-Kindergarten – Grade 12 Educational Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Community College / Postsecondary Educational Leadership	
<input type="checkbox"/> Ph.D.	List degree title or department name: _____	
Semester and year in which the Dissertation Defense will be initiated:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fall _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Spring _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Summer _____

List the proposed committee members and briefly state why you selected them or what role they will play in assisting you in your proposed area of research:

Chair Person: _____ Department: _____
Reason: _____
Member # 1: _____ Department: _____
Reason: _____
Member #2: _____ Department: _____
Reason: _____

To the best of my knowledge the information provided is correct and I have completed the qualifying exam for candidacy. In signing this document, I agree to the public notification of the defense and the invitation for the campus community to attend the defense.

Student Signature: _____ Date: _____

Return this form to:
California State University, Sacramento
Office of Graduate Studies
Riverfront Center, Room 206
6000 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95819-6112

OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES USE ONLY	
<input type="checkbox"/> Approved	<input type="checkbox"/> Denied
_____ Dean of Graduate Studies	_____ Date
Comments: _____	

Dissertation Defense Presentation – Guidelines

Estimated time: 1 to 1:15

Candidate Presentation

(30 minutes)

-Focus on Chapters 4 & 5



Committee Questions

(First Priority - 15 minutes)

Public Attendee Questions

(Second Priority - if time allows, or committee preference)



Committee Debriefs

(10 minutes)

-Without Candidate or Public Attendees



Committee Decision

-Reconvene with Candidate for Committee decision

-Committee signs Dissertation Defense Form



Public Recognition

-Dissertation Approval announced to Public

Dissertation Defense Presentation – Questions to Consider

The following is a list of questions that should be considered when preparing for the 'Committee

Questions' section of the Dissertation Defense Presentation:

- a) The rationale for your review of literature. You must know why you chose the literature to review that you chose and anticipate questions about literature you might not have chosen to review and why.
- b) Explaining and defending the statistics you used. Would other stats have been better? Know exactly what the stats you used mean, and what the results mean. Read thoroughly in a research book all you can about the stats you used.
- c) Knowing why you chose the sample you did, what your sampling means
- d) Knowing the theoretical base and the paradigm for your study.
- e) How to respond to questions that are beyond what you studied.
- f) The limitations of your study, or what you would have done differently

Dissertation Defense Forms

There are two 'Dissertation Defense Forms' that students need to submit at the time of their Final Dissertation Defense. One of the forms, seen on the next page, is for the Ed.D. department. This form helps faculty and students track revisions that are asked of students to complete prior to submission or give the 'ok' to students that they have defended without any revisions needed.

→ Please check with the Ed.D. office for the form required by the Office of Graduate Studies

Ed.D. students are responsible for having their Dissertation Committee complete this form once they have completed their FINAL Dissertation Defense. Immediately submit to the Ed.D. Office once you have defended.



California State University, Sacramento
Doctorate in Educational Leadership
College of Education
6000 J Street • Eureka Hall 328 • Sacramento, CA 95819-6079
(916) 278-2282 • www.csus.edu/edd

Completion of Dissertation Defense Form

Title of Dissertation: _____

Student Name: _____

Location of Defense: _____

Date and Time of Defense: _____
Date Time

My signature below indicates the above named student has completed their defense.

Signature (chairperson) Date

Signature (member) Date

Signature (member) Date

Signature (member) Date

Signature (member) Date

For **Dissertation Committee Chairperson only**: The above named student has:

Satisfactorily passed his/her defense without revisions to defense

Satisfactorily passed his/her defense with revisions to defense:

Revisions due: _____
Date

Had his/her defense deferred and will be rescheduled (Please attach letter)

Not satisfactorily completed his/her defense (Please attach letter)

Ed.D. students are responsible for having their Dissertation Committee complete this form once they have completed their FINAL Dissertation Defense. Immediately submit to the Ed.D. Office once you have defended.

Name of Student: _____ **Date of Defense:** _____

The following revisions are **required** for completion of dissertation defense:

ABSTRACT/LITERATURE REVIEW

METHODS

Subjects:

Procedures/Data collection:

Data Analysis:

Date revisions required back to Dissertation Committee Chairperson for approval: _____
Date

The following revisions are *suggested* (but not required):

Name of Dissertation Committee Chairperson Signature of Committee Chairperson Date
(Please Print)

Name of Student Signature of Student Date
(Please Print)

Dissertation Formatting Guide

A sample document on the formatting of a Dissertation is available as a Microsoft Word document at the following link:

http://www.csus.edu/gradstudies/forms/templates/dissertation_copyright.doc

Thesis/Dissertation Formatting Workshops

Please check the following website for the most up-to-date schedule:

[https://www.csus.edu/gradstudies/currentstudents/thesis-project-dissertation/
formattingworkshops.html](https://www.csus.edu/gradstudies/currentstudents/thesis-project-dissertation/formattingworkshops.html)

Dissertation Guidelines

- **Dissertation Rubrics**
- **Faculty Criteria for Evaluating Dissertations**

Ed.D. Students – please consider reviewing the documents below
Faculty – for use as a Dissertation Chair or Committee Member

CSUS Ed.D. Oral Dissertation Defense Rubric

	1	2	3	4	5	Score
1 Organization	Lacked sequence in presentation or missing information. Presented too little/much material for allotted time.	Poor sequence or illogical presentation of information. Some relevant information not presented. Presentation not well timed.	Some information presented out of sequence. Had some pacing and timing problems.	Information presented nearly complete and relevant and presented in logical sequence. Pace and timing appropriate.	Information presented was complete and in logical order. Easy to follow. Very well-timed and well-paced.	
2 Originality	Problem/purpose lacked creativity or not new. Duplication of previous work. Design/approach inappropriate and/or ignored previous well-established work in area.	Problem/purpose limited in originality and creativity. Design/approach only marginally appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose moderately original or creative. Design/approach moderately appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose fairly original or creative. Design/approach appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose very creative or original with new and innovative ideas. Explored original topic and discovered new outcomes. Design/approach introduced new or expanded on established ideas.	
3 Significance/ Authenticity	Project has no significance/authenticity to field and will make no contribution.	Project has little relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make little contribution.	Project only moderate relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make a nominal contribution.	Project has fair relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make good contribution.	Project extremely relevant or has significant importance/authenticity to field and will make an important contribution.	
4 Discussion and summary	Little or no discussion of project findings/outcomes. Displayed poor grasp of material. Conclusion/summary not supported by findings/outcomes.	Major topics or concepts inaccurately described. Considerable relevant discussion missing. Conclusions/summary not entirely supported by findings/outcomes.	Few inaccuracies and omissions. Conclusions/summary generally supported by findings/outcomes.	Discussion sufficient and with few errors. Greater foundation needed from past work in area. Conclusions/summary based on outcomes and appropriate, included no recommendations.	Discussion was superior, accurate, engaging, and thought-provoking. Conclusions/summaries and recommendations appropriate and clearly based on outcomes.	

<p>5 <i>Delivery</i></p>	<p>Presenter unsettled, uninterested, and unenthused. Presentation was read. Inappropriate voice mannerisms, body language, and poor communication skills. Poor quality of slides/presentation materials; did not enhance presentation/performance.</p>	<p>Presenter unenthused, monotonous and relied extensively on notes. Voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills sometimes inappropriate. Poor quality of slides/presentation material; poor enhancement of presentation/performance.</p>	<p>Displayed interest and enthusiasm. Read small parts of material. Occasionally struggled to find words. Generally appropriate voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Moderate quality of slides/presentation materials.</p>	<p>Relied little on notes. Displayed interest and enthusiasm. Good voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Good quality of slides/presentation materials; enhanced presentation/performance.</p>	<p>Relied little on notes. Expressed ideas fluently in own words. Genuinely interested and enthusiastic. Exceptional voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Exceptional slides/presentation quality materials; greatly enhanced presentation/performance.</p>	
<p>6 <i>Relationship to Educational Leadership and Program Trends</i></p>	<p>Fails to demonstrate the goals of the program. Lacks critical analysis of policy and informed decision making. Deficient displays of transformational leadership.</p>	<p>Vaguely demonstrates the goals of the program. Poor critical analysis of policy and informed decision making. Vague displays of transformational leadership.</p>	<p>Moderately demonstrates the goals of the program. Moderate critical analysis of policy and informed decision making. Moderate displays of transformational leadership.</p>	<p>Good demonstration of the goals of the program. Satisfactory critical analysis of policy and informed decision making. Good displays of transformational leadership.</p>	<p>Excellent demonstration of the goals of the program. Excellent critical analysis of policy and informed decision making. Excellent displays of transformational leadership.</p>	

Comments :

Student's Name: _____ Committee Member's Names: _____
Date: _____

CSUS Ed.D. Written Dissertation Criteria Rubric

	1	2	3	4	5	Score
1 Introduction	Failed to convey project in context of literature. No rationale. Purpose was unfocused and unclear.	Vaguely conveyed project in context of literature. Weak rationale. Purpose was poorly focused and not sufficiently clear.	Project moderately conveyed in context of literature. Moderately clear rationale. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear.	Conveyed project within context of literature. Moderately-strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.	Clearly conveyed project within context of literature. Strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.	
2 Review of Literature	Failed to review literature relevant to the study. No synthesis, critique or rationale. Lacks description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.	Inadequate review of literature relevant to the study. Poorly organized. Weak rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Insufficient description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.	Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Moderately well organized. Some mention of the relatedness of scholarship. Moderately clear rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Somewhat focused description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.	Review of the literature is fairly well organized, acknowledging the relatedness of the research and scholarship. The rationale for including/excluding various theoretical perspectives/empirical studies are apparent. Includes description of research samples and methodologies.	Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Well organized, with nuanced critique regarding the relatedness of the research and scholarship reviewed. Includes specific criteria for inclusion/exclusion of various theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Clearly describes research samples, methodologies, & findings.	
3 Theoretical Framework	Failed to explicitly convey the theoretical framework that guides the research study. Lacks using theoretical framework to conceptualize the research topic. Does not illustrate comprehensive review of theories related to the study's focus.	Vaguely conveyed theoretical framework that guides the study. Weak use of the theoretical framework to conceptualize the research topic. Does not sufficiently illustrate a comprehensive review of theories related to the study's focus.	Theoretical framework moderately conveyed that guides the study. Moderate use of the theoretical framework to conceptualize the research topic. Comprehensive review of theories related to the study's focus was moderate.	Theoretical framework that will guide the study stated fairly clear. Good use of the theoretical framework to conceptualize research topic. Strong comprehensive review of theories related to the study's focus.	Clearly conveyed the theoretical framework that guides the research study. Use of theoretical framework to conceptualize the research topic project is excellent. Very strong comprehensive review of theories related to the study's focus.	
4 Methods / Approach	Little or no description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Inadequate description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Moderate or excessive description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Most detail included/slightly excessive detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/ approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Appropriate detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	

5 <i>Data Analysis</i>	Results and findings not consistent with the data collected. Data lacks organization. Data does not address the purpose of the study.	Data is vaguely consistent with the results and findings of the study. Data is poorly organized. The data very poorly addresses the purpose of the study.	Results and findings moderately consistent with the data analyzed. Data is reasonably organized. Data moderately addresses the purpose of the study.	Good consistency of the results and findings reflecting the data. Good organization of the data. Data strongly addresses the purpose of the study.	Data is very consistent with the results and findings of the study. Data is exceptionally organized. The use of data to address the purpose of the study is excellent.	
	Absence of pertinent results. Table/figures are absent or inappropriate, not labeled, and no legend.	Few pertinent results. Table/figures are inappropriate or incomplete, poorly labeled, and inadequate legend.	Some pertinent results not reported; results presented in clear and concise manner. Table/figures generally labeled appropriately and included legend.	Most pertinent results reported and in fairly clear and concise manner. Table/figures labeled appropriately and included legend.	All pertinent results reported and in clear and concise manner. Table/figures are labeled appropriately and included legend.	
	Little or no discussion of project findings/outcomes. Displayed poor grasp of understanding. Conclusion/summary not supported by findings/outcomes.	Major topics or concepts inaccurately described. Considerable relevant discussion missing. Conclusions/summary not entirely supported by findings/outcomes.	Discussion is too brief/excessive, needs to be more concise of major findings/outcomes. Several inaccuracies and omissions. Conclusions/summary generally based on findings/outcomes.	Discussion sufficient and with few errors, though not particularly engaging or thought-provoking. Greater foundation needed from past work in area. Conclusions/summary based on outcomes and appropriate, but included no recommendations.	Brief and concise discussion of major findings/outcomes. Was superior, accurate, engaging, and thought-provoking. Conclusions/summaries and recommendations appropriate and clearly based on outcomes.	
	The dissertation lacks clarity and precision. Sentences are poorly constructed and confusing. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling reflects poor grasp of basic writing conventions. Narrative absent. Incorrect use of 5th edition APA.	The dissertation is unclear throughout. Frequent errors in word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The narrative discussion lacks focus and coherence. Frequent errors in use of 5th edition APA conventions.	The dissertation is moderately clear. Several errors in word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The narrative lacks focus. Uneven application of 5th edition APA conventions.	The dissertation is written with clarity and precision. Writing is understandable. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling are adequate. The narrative is logical and coherent. Mostly correct use of 5th edition APA.	The dissertation is written with great clarity and precision. Each sentence is understandable. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling are excellent. The narrative is logical and coherent. Correct use of 5th edition APA.	
	Fails to demonstrate the goals of the program. Lacks critical analysis of policy and informed decision making. Deficient displays of transformational leadership.	Vaguely demonstrates the goals of the program. Poor critical analysis of policy and informed decision making. Vague displays of transformational leadership.	Moderately demonstrates the goals of the program. Moderate critical analysis of policy and informed decision making. Moderate displays of transformational leadership.	Good demonstration of the goals of the program. Satisfactory critical analysis of policy and informed decision making. Good displays of transformational leadership.	Excellent demonstration of the goals of the program. Excellent critical analysis of policy and informed decision making. Excellent displays of transformational leadership.	

Comments :

Student's Name: _____ Committee Member's Names: _____
Date: _____

Criteria for Evaluating Dissertations
California State University, Sacramento
Doctorate in Educational Leadership

Selecting a Topic of Study

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Is the topic researchable, given time, resources, and availability of data?

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Is there personal/professional interest in the topic in order to sustain attention?

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Will the results of the study be of interest to others?

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Is the study likely to be publishable in a scholarly journal?

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Does the study a) fill a void, b) replicate, c) extend, or d) develop new ideas in the scholarly literature?

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Will the project contribute to your career goals?

Comments:

Abstract

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Does it contain the purpose of the study?

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Does it contain the study population?

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Does it summarize the methodology?

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Does it summarize the primary finding?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it summarize the significance of the study?

___Yes___No___N/A

Is it less than 120 words (APA)?

___Yes___No___N/A

If publishing in a journal or writing a proposal for a grant, does the abstract match journal/grant requirements?

Comments:

Title of the Study

___Yes___No___N/A

Are unnecessary words eliminated?

___Yes___No___N/A

If a double title, is the colon in the correct place?

___Yes___No___N/A

Are articles and prepositions eliminated?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it include the focus or topic of the study?

___Yes___No___N/A

Is it brief?

For Quantitative Studies

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it denote a further understanding of the topic?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it identify a theory, model, or conceptual framework to be tested in the study?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it clearly note the independent and dependent variables will be related or whether two or more groups will be compared in terms of the dependent variable(s)?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it illustrate an effect or relationship?

For Qualitative Studies

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it denote a further understanding of the topic?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it represent a non-directional approach versus a directional approach?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it use words that convey an emerging design because of the inductive mode of the qualitative research process?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it eliminate words that suggest a directional approach to the study if a qualitative methodology?

Comments:

Introduction

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it set the stage for the entire study?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it create reader interest in the topic?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it establish the problem that leads to the study (see Problem Statement)?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it place the study within the larger context of the scholarly research?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it reach out to a specific audience?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it conclude with a statement of purpose?

Purpose of the Study

___Yes___No___N/A

Is it concise and to the point?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it use such words as “purpose, intent, and objective” to call attention to this statement as a central controlling idea in a study?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it clearly mention the central concept or idea being expressed?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it provide a general definition of the central concept or idea?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it include words denoting the method of inquiry to be used in data collection, analysis, and the process of research?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it mention the unit of analysis or research site?

Comments:

Statement of the Problem

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it stimulate interest in your study?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it convey an issue to which a broad readership can relate?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it specify the problem leading to the study?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it indicate why the problem is important by giving a historical/theoretical background?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it avoid using idiomatic expressions or trite phrases?

Considerations, If Applicable

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it use short sentences for impact?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it use numeric information for impact?

Comments:

Research Questions

___Yes___No___N/A

Is it clearly stated?

___Yes___No___N/A

Is it specific in its focus?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it match with the intended methodology?

Comments:

Definition of Terms

___Yes___No___N/A

Are all terms that individuals outside the field of study may not understand defined?

___Yes___No___N/A

Are all terms defined when they first appear?

___Yes___No___N/A

Are all terms that need defining included in this section?

Comments:

Limitations

___Yes___No___N/A

Are all the potential weaknesses of the study described?

___Yes___No___N/A

Are the limitations appropriate to the methodology?

Comments:

Delimitations

___Yes___No___N/A

Are all the ways that describe how the study will be narrowed in scope included?

___Yes___No___N/A

Are the delimitations appropriate to the methodology?

Comments:

Literature Review

___Yes___No___N/A

Is it organized around and related directly to the thesis or research question you are developing?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it synthesize results into a summary of what is and is not known?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it identify areas of controversy in the literature?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it formulate questions that need further research?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it place each work in the context of its contribution to the understanding of the subject under review?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it describe the relationship of each work to the others under consideration?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it identify areas of prior scholarship to prevent duplication of effort?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it point the way forward for further research?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it place one's original work (in the case of theses or dissertations) in the context of existing literature?

___Yes___No___N/A

Is it organized into categories or themes?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it have its own introduction, body, and concluding sections?

Comments:

Methodology Section

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it discuss the type of methodology used (e.g., quantitative or qualitative)?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it identify the specific type of methodology selected (e.g., case studies, grounded theory, quasi-experimental design, etc.)?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it explain the purpose of the method using citations?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it explain why that method was selected?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it describe the target, sample and setting of the population of the study?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it identify and explain the sampling design using citations?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it explain why that sampling design was selected?

___Yes___No___N/A

Is the sampling design appropriate to the methodology selected?

___Yes___No___N/A

Is the sample described in enough detail to understand who is included in this study but in a manner that still maintains confidentiality?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it describe the instruments or data extraction and manner in which the data will be collected using citations?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it describe how the instruments or variable selected were selected and/or designed using citations?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it explain, using data, how valid and reliable the instruments are (if applicable)?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it explain how the instruments were piloted/tested (if applicable)?

___Yes___No___N/A

Are the instruments contained in the appendix?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it identify and describe how data will be analyzed using citations?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it detail the steps of how, when, and who will collect and analyze the data?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it describe how data will be triangulated, if applicable?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it describe how findings will be validated or audited, if applicable?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does it describe, in detail, how confidentiality of subjects will be maintained throughout every aspect of the study?

Comments:

Summary of Findings

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Does this section begin with a summary of the findings?

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Does it report key findings of the study?

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Are key findings supported by references to the data?

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Do key findings address the research questions or hypothesis?

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Are key findings reported in an organized manner (such as by research question or hypotheses)?

___Yes___ No___ N/A

If found, are key findings that contradict each other reported?

Comments:

Discussion/Conclusion

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Does this section begin with a summary of the primary interpretation of the findings and the conclusion?

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Is literature used to contradict or affirm the interpretation of findings and conclusion?

___Yes___ No___ N/A

Is the conclusion affirmed by the findings?

___Yes___No___N/A

Does the discussion proceed in an organized manner (such as by research question or hypotheses)?

___Yes___No___N/A

Is the theory or hypothesis that was tested affirmed or denied?

___Yes___No___N/A

Do the findings and their interpretation support the conclusion regarding the theory or hypothesis?

___Yes___No___N/A

Do you address what your data do not tell you about your research questions?

Comments:

Comments continued:

Recommendations

___Yes___No___N/A

What are the key recommendations for future research on this topic?

___Yes___No___N/A

What are the key recommendations for practice?

___Yes___No___N/A

Are the recommendations based on the findings?

___Yes___No___N/A

What are the recommendations for policy based on the findings?

Comments:

Research Helps: Chapter 3
Methodology Organizer
Prepared by: JoLynn Langslet, Ph.D.
in the EDD 615 - Dissertation Proposal Seminar

Qualitative

- ❑ **Introduction**
 - Brief overview of what you will present in the chapter.
- ❑ **Research Design**
 - Brief explanation of why this method is appropriate.
- ❑ **Role of the Researcher**
 - Describe your involvement with the participants and data.
- ❑ **Research Questions**
 - Two to four main questions (and sub-questions if applicable), all open-ended.
- ❑ **Setting, Population & Sample**
 - Description of the setting in which your study takes place.
 - Description of the population from which your participants will be selected.
 - Rationale for sampling (who and why?).
- ❑ **Data Collection & Instrumentation**
 - How, when and where you will collect your data (interviews, open-ended survey, observations, transcription, etc.).
 - Describe measures taken to ensure reliability and validity of instrumentation and design (pre-existing surveys, member checking, construct validity of questions, etc.).
- ❑ **Data Analysis**
 - Describe your methods for data analysis (types of coding, extraction of themes, triangulation, etc.).
 - Explain how you will analyze data for **each** research question.
- ❑ **Protection of Participants**
 - Explain all measures taken to protect participants and their data (anonymity, voluntary participation, storage and disposal of data, etc.).

Chapter 3
Methodology Organizer
Prepared by: JoLynn Langslet, Ph.D.
in the EDD 615 - Dissertation Proposal Seminar

Quantitative

? **Introduction**

- Brief overview of what you will present in the chapter.

? **Research Design**

- Brief explanation of why this method is appropriate.

? **Role of the Researcher**

- Describe your involvement with the participants and data.

? **Research Questions**

- Two to four main questions (and sub-questions if applicable)
- Although one or more questions may require only descriptive statistics (pie graph, bar graph, percentage chart, etc.), at least one question must require an inferential statistic (t-Test, ANOVA, Correlation, Regression, Chi-square, etc.).

? **Setting, Population & Sample**

- Description of the setting in which your study takes place.
- Description of the population from which your participants will be selected.
- Rationale for sampling (who and why?).

? **Data Collection & Instrumentation**

- How, when and where you will collect your data (surveys/questionnaires, pre/post-tests, pre-existing/archive records, test scores, etc.).
- Describe measures taken to ensure reliability and validity of instrumentation and design (pre-existing surveys/tests, test-retest, pilot tests, construct validity, interrater reliability, homogeneity of groups, etc.).

? **Data Analysis**

- Describe your methods for data analysis (t-Test, ANOVA, Correlation, Regression, Chi-square, or a combination, etc.).
- Explain how you will analyze data for **each** research question.

? **Protection of Participants**

- Explain all measures taken to protect participants and their data (anonymity, voluntary participation, storage and disposal of data, etc.).

Chapter 3
Methodology Organizer
Prepared by: JoLynn Langslet, Ph.D.
in the EDD 615 – Dissertation Proposal Seminar

Mixed-Methods

☐ **Introduction**

- Brief overview of what you will present in the chapter.

☐ **Research Design**

- Brief explanation of why this method is appropriate.

☐ **Role of the Researcher**

- Describe your involvement with the participants and data.

☐ **Research Questions**

- Two to four main questions (and sub-questions if applicable).
- You must have at least one quantitative and one qualitative question.
- At least one quantitative question must require an inferential statistic (t-Test, ANOVA, Correlation, Regression, Chi-square, etc.).

☐ **Setting, Population & Sample**

- Description of the setting in which your study takes place.
- Description of the population from which your participants will be selected.
- Rationale for sampling (who and why?).

☐ **Data Collection & Instrumentation**

- **Sequential Strategy:** Collect data in two distinct phases, either QN → QL or QL → QN.
- **Concurrent Strategy:** Collect both QN & QL data simultaneously.
- For both strategies, describe how, when and where you will collect your data:
 - Qualitative methods: interviews, open-ended survey, observations, use of recording devices, transcription, etc.
 - Quantitative methods: surveys/questionnaires, pre/post- tests, pre-existing/archive/data base records, test scores, etc.
- For both strategies, describe measures taken to ensure reliability of instrumentation:
 - Qualitative methods: pre-existing surveys, member checking, construct validity of questions, etc.
 - Quantitative methods: pre-existing surveys/tests, test-retest, pilot tests, construct validity, interrater reliability, homogeneity of groups, etc.

☐ **Data Analysis**

- **Sequential Strategy:** Discuss and interpret findings in two distinct phases, in the order of the methods used (QN → QL or QL → QN).
- **Concurrent Strategy:** Combine both forms of data to seek convergence among the results.

☐ **Protection of Participants**


- Explain all measures taken to protect participants and their data (anonymity, voluntary participation, storage and disposal of data, etc.).

Chapter 3

Research Question Organizer

Prepared by: JoLynn Langslet, Ph.D.

in the EDD 615 - Dissertation Proposal Seminar

	Type: Qualitative or Quantitative	Data Collection: How will you collect the data needed to answer this question?	Data Analysis: What method(s) will you use to analyze the data for this question?	Data Presentation: How will you present this data in Chapter 4?
Research Question #1:				
Research Question #2:				
Research Question #3:				
Research Question #4:				