Doctoral Programs
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION & HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO **DENVER**

EdD Proposal Score Report

Candidate Name: ID Number:

Date of Defense: Concentration:

Faculty Chair:

Committee Members:

Summative Assessment:

☐ Pass [minor revisions to proposal and research plan, reported to advisor and/or other committee members]

☐ Pass with conditions [Significant revisions are needed. The committee specifies required revisions and a due date (must be completed to the satisfaction of the examination committee within 4 months). The committee may defer responsibility for review to the primary advisor or ask to see revisions.]

☐ Fail [Substantial revisions are required and is subject to dismissal. The committee specifies required revisions and a new defense will be set (within 12 months) when the student and primary advisor agree that the document is ready.]

Formative Assessment: *Rubric on page 2*

Component	Score	Notes
Research problem, question(s) and significance		
Review of relevant research		
Conceptual / theoretical framework		
Methodology		
Writing mechanics		
Oral presentation and response to questions		
Revision requirements		
Additional comments		

Signature of Faculty Chair:

EdD Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Component	SLO	3 – Fully Met (pass)	2 – Partially met (pass with conditions)	1 – Not Met (Fail)
Research problem, question(s) and significance	2	Fully describes the problem of practice, research question(s), and significance of the study, enactment in the practice/partner site, and potential to impact equity/social justice.	Partially describes the problem of practice, research question(s), and significance of the study, enactment in the practice/partner site, and potential to impact equity/social justice, but one or more of these elements needs elaboration.	Does not describe one or more of the following: problem of practice, research question(s), significance of the study, enactment in the practice/partner site, or potential to impact equity/social justice.
Review of relevant research	1	Provides a synthesis of literature relevant to the research question(s) from related fields. Places the current study appropriately within the larger context.	Summarizes literature related to the research question(s) from related fields, but is missing important work to frame the study within the larger context.	Provides little or no review of relevant literature, neglects important work, or includes work of limited or no relevance
Conceptual / theoretical framework	1	Clearly identifies or develops a conceptual framework that specifies key constructs and their purported relationships.	Begins to identify or develop a conceptual framework specifies key constructs and their purported relationships. Framework is incomplete or does relate to research problem of questions.	The conceptual framework is omitted, poorly developed, or needs to be more thoroughly elaborated.
Methodology	4	Identifies methodologies and research techniques appropriate to research questions and purposes. Provides coherent rationale for design and identifies limitations. Project is feasible.	Partially identifies methodologies and research techniques appropriate to research questions and purposes; one or more elements of method are missing or require further development to establish the feasibility of the study.	Critical elements of method are omitted or insufficiently explained to establish the feasibility of the study.
Writing mechanics	5	Document is grammatically correct and free from errors. Manuscript complies with APA style and formatting requirements. Reference list matches citations.	Document requires updating to correct frequent grammatical errors and failure to comply with APA style and formatting requirements. Reference list requires more than incidental updating/correction.	Document requires substantial updating to correct frequent grammatical errors and failure to comply with APA style and formatting. Reference list requires significant updating/correction.
Oral presentation and response to questions	5	Presentation provides a clear overview of the proposed study. Candidate is open to critique, seeks to understand queries and addresses questions.	Presentation provides an overview of the proposed study, but lacks detail for committee to fully understand aspects of the study. Candidate responds to critique but has difficulty understanding queries or adequately address questions.	Insufficient detail is provided for committee to understand the proposed study, or candidate does not respond to queries and fails to adequately address questions.