

WKU Educational Leadership Doctoral Program Dissertation-in-Practice

Chapter 3 Quality Rubric: The First Intervention

-Version: October 2, 2024-

This tool is designed to help WKU EdD students, course instructors, and chairs/committee members understand the features of a high-quality Chapter 3 as it appears in WKU improvement science dissertations in practice. Chapter 3 describes the first intervention cycle the student deployed to address the problem of practice that provided the basis of the improvement science study. This tool should be used in conjunction with the dissertation-in-practice framework found in Appendix A of the *WKU EdD Student Handbook*, the *WKU EdD Writing Rubric*, and relevant improvement science sources like Chapters 5-6 of Perry et al. (2020) and Chapters 6-8 of Hinnant-Crawford (2020).

Chapter element	Proficient	Developing	Unacceptable
<p>Introduction</p> <p><i>-overview-</i></p> <p><i>-linkage between this intervention and the root cause analysis-</i></p>	<p>Briefly but accurately describes the purpose of the first intervention phase in improvement science, citing appropriate sources, and previews the structure of this chapter.</p> <p>Briefly and accurately summarizes the intervention deployed in this chapter and why it was appropriate based on the findings of the root cause analysis described in Chapter 2.</p>	<p>Intro may need to be strengthened in terms of more thoroughly or accurately describing the intervention process, citing appropriate sources, and/or previewing the structure of the chapter.</p> <p>Intervention description needs to be strengthened and/or more clearly connected to the root causes identified in Chapter 2.</p>	<p>No introduction; or the introduction fails to accurately describe the intervention process; or the described intervention is not connected to the root cause analysis findings.</p>
<p>Setting/Context</p>	<p>Briefly and accurately recaps the setting of this study as described in Chapters 1 and 2 and the problem of practice under investigation.</p>	<p>Recap of the setting and problem of practice needs clarity or further description.</p>	<p>No effort to remind the reader of the setting or problem of practice.</p>
<p>Intervention Design</p>	<p>Accurately describes scholarly and practitioner literature</p>	<p>Informed readers can tell that search terms may need more</p>	<p>Literature review presents a haphazard set of literature that</p>

<p><i>-intervention literature review-</i></p> <p><i>-case for this intervention over others-</i></p> <p><i>-theory of action-</i></p> <p><i>-PDSA-</i></p>	<p>related to various interventions that have shown promise for impacting the overarching problem of practice.</p> <p>Based on this literature review, describes which interventions were considered for this improvement science study, and makes a compelling case for why the intervention described in this chapter was selected over others, connecting the planned intervention to relevant contextual factors and root causes of the local problem identified in Chapter 2.</p> <p>Describes a theory of action that clearly articulates why the planned intervention is expected to impact the problem of practice, citing relevant literature, and presented with a graphic tool such as a driver diagram, logic model, or other visual representation.</p> <p>Presents a Plan-Do-Study-Act graphic clearly and accurately illustrating the intervention design.</p>	<p>refinement or that there is relevant literature not included in the chapter.</p> <p>The case for why this intervention was chosen over others based on the literature and root cause analysis findings needs to be strengthened.</p> <p>Theory of action and related tools do not fully or clearly explain why the identified intervention is expected to impact the problem of practice.</p> <p>Plan-Do-Study-Act graphic does not accurately or completely illustrate the intervention design.</p>	<p>may not clearly relate to relevant interventions or the problem of practice.</p> <p>The chosen intervention is disconnected from the findings of root cause analysis.</p> <p>No theory of action presented, or the theory of action fails to convey an understanding of how the proposed intervention should impact the problem of practice.</p> <p>No PDSA graphic included or the PDSA graphic fails to present a coherent intervention design.</p>
---	---	---	--

<p>Research Design</p> <p><i>-research question and the intervention-</i></p> <p><i>-goals/purpose of the intervention-</i></p> <p><i>-participants-</i></p> <p><i>-instruments and data sources description-</i></p>	<p>Restates the improvement science research question and briefly and accurately describes how the proposed intervention addressed the RQ.</p> <p>Briefly, clearly, and accurately summarizes the goals and purpose of the intervention.</p> <p>Describes the participants for the first intervention. Participants should be purposively chosen to represent the relevant “users” of the problem. Describes how the researcher obtained access to these participants and secured their voluntary involvement. Describes IRB approval process for obtaining informed consent.</p> <p>Describes the instruments and/or data sources used to measure the impact of the intervention. Instruments should reflect both quantitative and qualitative methods appropriate to the context, problem of practice, and intervention. Describes the design of each instrument, supported by relevant literature.</p>	<p>More linkage between the RQ and the proposed intervention is needed.</p> <p>Description of the goals and purpose of the intervention needs more explication.</p> <p>More explanation of why participants were chosen, and/or how access to participants was ethically obtained, is needed.</p> <p>Needs a stronger rationale for instruments and data sources chosen, or how each instrument assesses the efficacy of the intervention. May need more balance between quantitative and qualitative methods. Some forms of improvement science measurement that should be considered (outcome, driver,</p>	<p>No restatement of the RQ.</p> <p>Description of goals and purpose of the intervention is unclear.</p> <p>There is no coherent explanation for why participants were chosen or how access was ethically obtained.</p> <p>No rationale provided for instruments or data sources chosen; or instruments and data sources are not appropriate for the intervention.</p>
--	---	--	--

<p><i>-data analysis techniques-</i></p> <p><i>-IRB process-</i></p>	<p>Narrative describes how each instrument or item(s) of the instrument address the various measures appropriate for improvement science (outcome, driver, process, and balancing measures). For pre-existing instruments, describes relevant research literature that previously utilized the instrument and reliability and/or validity of the instrument, if appropriate.</p> <p>Describes intended method of analyzing the results of each instrument or data source, supported by relevant literature. Analysis methods are appropriate for the instrument.</p> <p>Describes IRB approval process for all instruments.</p>	<p>process, or balancing metrics) are neglected.</p> <p>Needs more justification for the analysis methods chosen and their appropriateness for the instrument.</p> <p>Needs a more thorough description of the IRB approval process.</p>	<p>No analysis plan offered, or analysis plan is inaccurate for the instrument/method.</p> <p>IRB approval process not addressed.</p>
<p>Results</p> <p><i>-summary of quantitative methods and findings-</i></p>	<p>Describes results from quantitative instruments. Summarizes the quantitative findings, clearly and accurately describes specific quantitative findings that describe the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the intervention.</p>	<p>Description of the quantitative results needs more explication to accurately describe findings or connect findings more clearly to the efficacy of the intervention.</p>	<p>Description of quantitative results is inaccurate and/or incomplete. Results do not illuminate the efficacy of the intervention.</p>

<p>-summary of qualitative methods and findings-</p> <p>-synthesis of qualitative and quantitative results-</p>	<p>Describes results from qualitative methods. Summarizes the qualitative data analysis process and accurately describes themes and findings from each qualitative protocol that clearly and accurately describe the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the intervention. Addresses how triangulation was achieved and how trustworthiness of the findings was ensured.</p> <p>Synthesizes the combination of quantitative and qualitative results to thoroughly and accurately explain the results of the intervention.</p>	<p>Description of the qualitative results needs more explication to accurately describe the data analysis process and/or themes and findings and to connect findings more clearly to the efficacy of the intervention. Narrative may not fully or accurately describe triangulation and trustworthiness.</p> <p>Results need more synthesis and/or stronger connection to intervention design.</p>	<p>Description of qualitative results is inaccurate and/or incomplete. Results do not clearly convey the efficacy of the intervention. Triangulation and trustworthiness are not addressed.</p> <p>Results are not synthesized and/or do not clearly or accurately convey the efficacy of the intervention.</p>
<p>Limitations of the Intervention</p>	<p>Accurately describes limitations to the intervention design or results.</p>	<p>Limitations require more explication.</p>	<p>Limitations have not been identified or are inaccurately presented and/or obvious limitations are omitted.</p>
<p>Recommendations for Next Intervention Cycle</p>	<p>Accurately draws conclusions from the intervention in terms of implications for the next cycle of intervention, connecting to appropriate literature when relevant.</p>	<p>Stronger linkages between the findings and implications for future intervention cycles are required.</p>	<p>There are no clear linkages between the intervention's results and future intervention efforts.</p>

Hinnant-Crawford, B. (2020). *Improvement science in education: A primer*. Myers Education Press.

Perry, J. A., Zambo, D., & Crow, R. (2020). *The improvement science dissertation in practice: A guide for faculty, committee members, and their students*. Myers Education Press.