

WKU Educational Leadership Doctoral Program Dissertation-in-Practice

Chapter 4 Quality Rubric: The Second Intervention

-Version: October, 2024-

This tool is designed to help WKU EdD students, course instructors, and chairs/committee members understand the features of a high-quality Chapter 4 as it appears in WKU improvement science dissertations in practice. Chapter 4 describes the second 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 second 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 first intervention described in Chapter 3.</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 first intervention described in Chapter 3.</p>	<p>No introduction; or the introduction fails to accurately describe the intervention process; or the described intervention is not connected to the first intervention findings.</p>
<p>Setting/Context: OPTIONAL SECTION (include only if the setting or context has changed for the second intervention)</p>	<p>Briefly and accurately describes any changes to the setting or context between the first and second intervention.</p>	<p>Description of setting and context change needs clarity or further description.</p>	<p>No effort to acknowledge changes in setting or problem of practice.</p>

Intervention Design			
<i>-intervention literature review-</i>	Accurately describes scholarly and practitioner literature related to various interventions that have shown promise for impacting the overarching problem of practice considering the findings of the first intervention.	Informed readers can tell that search terms may need more refinement or that there is relevant literature not included in the chapter. More discussion of how the second literature review was narrowed based on findings of the first intervention is needed.	Literature review presents a haphazard set of literature that may not clearly relate to the first interventions or the problem of practice.
<i>-case for this intervention over others-</i>	Based on this literature review, describes which interventions were considered for the second improvement science cycle, and makes a compelling case for why the intervention described in this chapter was selected over others, connecting the second intervention to relevant findings from Chapter 3.	The case for why this intervention was chosen over others based on the literature and first intervention findings needs to be strengthened.	The chosen intervention is disconnected from the findings of first intervention.
<i>-theory of action-</i>	Describes a theory of action that clearly articulates why the second 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.	Theory of action and related tools do not fully or clearly explain why the identified intervention is expected to impact the problem of practice.	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.
<i>-PDSA-</i>	Presents a Plan-Do-Study-Act graphic clearly and accurately	Plan-Do-Study-Act graphic does not accurately or	No PDSA graphic included or the PDSA graphic fails to

	illustrating the second intervention design.	completely illustrate the intervention design.	present a coherent intervention design.
<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 second intervention and why and how it is different from the first intervention.</p> <p>Describes the participants for second intervention. If the same or different from the first intervention, accurately and clearly describes why. 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</p>	<p>More linkage between the RQ and the proposed intervention is needed.</p> <p>Description of the goals and purpose of the intervention and/or connection to the first intervention cycle needs more explication.</p> <p>More explanation of why participants were chosen, how and why they were the same or different than the first intervention, 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</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</p>

	<p>intervention. Instruments should reflect both quantitative and qualitative methods appropriate to the context, problem of practice, and intervention. If new instruments are utilized since the first intervention, describes the design of each instrument, supported by relevant literature. 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 new pre-existing instruments, describes relevant research literature that previously utilized the instrument and reliability and/or validity of the instrument, if appropriate.</p>	<p>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, process, or balancing metrics) are neglected.</p>	<p>data sources are not appropriate for the intervention.</p>
-data analysis techniques-	<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>Needs more justification for the analysis methods chosen and their appropriateness for the instrument.</p>	<p>No analysis plan offered, or analysis plan is inaccurate for the instrument/method.</p>
-IRB process-	<p>Describes IRB approval process for all instruments.</p>	<p>Needs a more thorough description of the IRB approval process.</p>	<p>IRB approval process note addressed.</p>

<p>Results</p> <p><i>-summary of quantitative methods and findings-</i></p> <p><i>-summary of qualitative methods and findings-</i></p> <p><i>-synthesis of qualitative and quantitative results-</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>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 second 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 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 quantitative results is inaccurate and/or incomplete. Results do not illuminate the efficacy of the intervention.</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>

Recommendations for Next Intervention Cycle	Accurately draws conclusions about the efficacy of the second intervention cycle, connecting to appropriate literature when relevant.	Conclusions about the efficacy of the second intervention are somewhat unclear.	There are no clear conclusions about the efficacy of the second intervention.
--	---	---	---

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.