

## WKU Educational Leadership Doctoral Program Dissertation-in-Practice

### Chapter 5 Quality Rubric: Conclusions and Recommendations

-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 5 as it appears in WKU improvement science dissertations in practice. Chapter 5 concludes the improvement science study by summarizing the results of both interventions, relating the findings to previous literature, and making recommendations for future research, practitioners, and further cycles of intervention. 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 7-8 of Perry et al. (2020).

Chapter element	Proficient	Developing	Unacceptable
<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p><i>-how this study exemplified improvement science-</i></p>	Clearly and accurately summarizes the improvement science process, citing relevant sources, and outlines how each step was addressed in the current study.	Discussion of the improvement science process needs more citations or elaboration. Some lack of clarity on how this study addressed each step of improvement science.	No or unclear connections between this study and the protocols of improvement science.
<p><b>Discussion of Intervention 1 results</b></p> <p><i>-the effectiveness of the intervention-</i></p> <p><i>-supporting conclusions with evidence from the study-</i></p> <p><i>-connecting findings to previous literature-</i></p>	<p>Summarizes the findings from the first intervention, drawing conclusions about the effectiveness of the intervention in addressing the problem of practice.</p> <p>Draws on evidence from the study to support conclusions.</p> <p>Accurately relates findings to previous literature.</p>	<p>Conclusions about the effectiveness of the intervention are unclear or need further elaboration.</p> <p>More evidence from the study is needed to support conclusions.</p> <p>More connections are needed to the previous literature to bolster the trustworthiness of conclusions.</p>	<p>It is unclear to the reader whether the intervention affected the problem of practice.</p> <p>Conclusions are drawn without supporting evidence from the findings of the study.</p> <p>Conclusions are drawn without reference to previous literature.</p>

<p><i>-why the intervention worked, or why it didn't-</i></p>	<p>Offers literature-based perspectives on why the intervention was successful or unsuccessful.</p>	<p>A stronger case for why the intervention was successful or unsuccessful is needed.</p>	<p>Reasons for the interventions success or lack of success are not discussed.</p>
<p><b>Discussion of Intervention 1 results</b></p> <p><i>-the effectiveness of the intervention-</i></p> <p><i>-how the second intervention revealed new knowledge-</i></p> <p><i>-supporting conclusions with evidence from the study-</i></p> <p><i>-connecting findings to previous literature-</i></p> <p><i>-why the intervention worked, or why it didn't-</i></p>	<p>Summarizes the findings from the second intervention, drawing conclusions about the effectiveness of the intervention in addressing the problem of practice.</p> <p>Describes how the findings from the second intervention combine with the findings of the first intervention to inform a more comprehensive assessment of the entire study's effectiveness.</p> <p>Draws on evidence from the study to support conclusions.</p> <p>Accurately relates findings to previous literature.</p> <p>Offers literature-based perspectives on why the second intervention was successful or unsuccessful.</p>	<p>Conclusions about the effectiveness of the second intervention are unclear or need further elaboration.</p> <p>Linkages between the findings of the first and second intervention require more elaboration.</p> <p>More evidence from the study is needed to support conclusions.</p> <p>More connections are needed to the previous literature to bolster the trustworthiness of conclusions.</p> <p>A stronger case for why the intervention was successful or unsuccessful is needed. It is unclear to the reader whether the intervention affected the problem of practice.</p>	<p>It is unclear to the reader whether the intervention affected the problem of practice.</p> <p>No linkages are made between the first and second interventions.</p> <p>Conclusions are drawn without supporting evidence from the findings of the study.</p> <p>Conclusions are drawn without reference to previous literature.</p> <p>Reasons for the intervention's success or lack of success are not discussed.</p>

<b>How Theory Drove Improvement</b>	Accurately and clearly relates the findings of the improvement science study to the leadership and other theoretical frameworks that informed the study's design.	Linkages between findings and the leadership and other theoretical frameworks informing the study's design require further elaboration.	No attempt is made to relate the findings to leadership and other theoretical frameworks.
<b>Implications for future interventions</b>	Clearly and comprehensively discusses what the next cycle of intervention for the organization might be to address the problem of practice based on the findings of the improvement science study.	Conclusions about the next improvement cycle need further explication or connection to the study's findings.	Recommendations for the next intervention cycle appear to have no connection to the study's findings.
<b>Optional (Equity Implications)</b>	When equity elements were present in the study or in the findings, clearly describes those equity elements and implications for future interventions, drawing on previous research and theory.	When equity elements were present in the study or findings, more elaboration is needed to clearly describe those elements and their implications, and/or more research and theory is needed to support these recommendations.	Where equity elements were present in the study, these were undiscussed or ignored.
<b>Limitations</b>	Accurately and thoroughly discusses the limitations of the study, including in its design, delivery, or findings.	Limitations discussion may be partially incomplete or require further elaboration.	No limitations are noted, or limitations are inaccurate to the actual study design or findings.
<b>Recommendations</b>	Provides a clear and comprehensive set of recommendations for practitioners, education leaders, and researchers interested in further examining the problem of practice, based on the findings of the study.	More discussion of how the study's findings support recommendations for practitioners, leaders, or researchers is needed. Important recommendations may be overlooked.	Fails to make future recommendations or neglects recommendations for key groups including practitioners, researcher, or leaders. Recommendations are inaccurate relative to the findings of the study.

<b>Final Conclusions</b>	Briefly recaps the study's design and findings and clearly and accurately describes the significance of the study for researchers and practitioners.	Recap of the study and its significance needs more elaboration.	Fails to clearly or accurately describe the significance of the study's findings.
--------------------------	--	---	---

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.