

Decision Making Dissertation Proposal Rubric

Indicator	Performance			
General Requirements:				
1. The cover contains:	Yes	No		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The title “Decision-Analysis Dissertation” • Problem, Issue, or Program Name • Full name of the entity under examination (e.g., District, School, Department, College) • Semester and year prepared • Candidate’s name (e.g., “Prepared by ...”) • Committee Members Names (with Sponsor’s Name Noted) 				
2. The Document is divided into major sections:	Yes	No		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Summary • Institutional Context • Problem Statement • Rationale • Stakeholders • Institutional Approval • Ethical Principles in Research Program Approval • Literature Review • Methods • Objectives • Decision Maker • Alternatives • Predicted Effects • Predicted Costs • Recommendation • Limitations • Final Comments • References • Attachments/Appendices 				
3. The pages of the dissertation are numbered consecutively from page 1 to X (excluding the title page).	Yes	No		
4. The Table of Contents, List of Figures, List of Appendices, and List of Tables precedes the Executive Summary and identifies all major sections.	Yes	No		
5. The text of the report is doubled spaced, 12 point, Times Roman Font, with 1 inch margins.	Yes	No		
6. Citations and References are formatted in APA style.	Yes	No		
7. The writing is stylistically sophisticated, using language that is precise and engaging, with an awareness of the audience (i.e., University Faculty and Senior District/College Administration) and purpose.	I	E	BP	OP
8. The writing exhibits conventional spelling, punctuation,	I	E	BP	OP

<p>paragraphing, capitalization, grammar, usage, and documentation.</p>	
<p>Executive Summary: The <u>two-page</u>, single-spaced Executive Summary presents a comprehensive summary of the following sections and can be separated from the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem Statement • Rationale • Stakeholders • Objectives • Alternatives • Effects • Costs • Recommendation • Limitations 	<p>I E BP OP</p>
<p>Institutional Context: Background: A brief overview of the entity under examination that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institution’s name (e.g., district, school, department, and university name) • Basic description of institution (e.g., elementary school, and location) • Basic Institutional Demographics (e.g., institutional size, and student characteristics) • Other information required to set the stage for the decision (e.g., community characteristics) <p>(The Institutional Context Section is typically 4-6 pages)</p>	<p>I E BP OP</p>
<p>Problem Statement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A coherent statement of the problem/issue that you are trying to address (i.e., the decision that you are trying to make). The problem statement should be <u>objective</u> and written in clear, simple terms. (The problem statement is typically a single sentence.) 	<p>I E BP OP</p>
<p>Rationale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A coherent discussion of the reason(s) or rationale for analyzing the problem/issue. Specifically, you must make a case for why making <i>this</i> decision is important to the stakeholders (i.e., why does your district/college want to solve this problem or address this issue). You should also address why educators in general might want to solve this problem or address this issue. The rationale is not an argument for why making “good” decisions in general is important, but why you should address the problem/issue. (The Rational section is typically 3-5 pages) 	<p>I E BP OP</p>
<p>Stakeholders</p>	<p>I E BP OP</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A listing of the key stakeholders in your decision. The stakeholders should be appropriately ranked/scaled in order of importance. You should also provide a brief explanation regarding why each of these individual(s) is a stakeholder in your decision and so ranked. 	
<p>Institutional Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present evidence of district or university approval for conducting the analysis (e.g., a letter from the superintendent authorizing you to conduct the study in the district). 	<p>Yes No</p>
<p>Ethical Principles in Research Program Approval (EPRP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present evidence that you have completed the University of Rochester’s “Ethical Principles in Research Program.” See the following website: http://www.urmc.rochester.edu/rsrb/belmont.htm 	<p>Yes No</p>
<p>Literature Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A critical review of the research literature relevant to your decision problem. The review should answer the question: What do we know about this issue? A well-done review will provide a coherent, organized synthesis, not simply a laundry list of studies conducted on the topic. The review should be sufficiently comprehensive and objective so that it can be used as evidence in the effects section. 	<p>I E BP OP</p>
<p>Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a coherent discussion of the methodology that you use in the decision making analysis, making sure to address each of the following items: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Outline the decision making model that you employ (e.g., mixed scanning), specifying what is required at the various stages. Indicate the advantages and disadvantages associated with this model when compared to other models (e.g., political). Provide an list of the steps that you will employ to carryout the model. 	<p>I E BP OP</p>
<p>Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A coherent list of objectives – specified and ranked/scaled accordingly. You should present the objectives in an objective table. For each objective you should provide an explanation as to why you specified the objective, and why you ranked the objective accordingly. (An explanation for a given objective is typically a paragraph or two.) 	<p>I E BP OP</p>
<p>Decision Maker</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specify who will make the final decision whether or which alternative will be selected and adopted by the district or university (e.g., board, superintendent, or 	<p>I E BP OP</p>

No

N

director).					
<p>Alternatives</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alternatives: The document should list and provide a coherent description of each alternative. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each description should allow the reader to understand fully how the alternative will function (e.g., will training be required, how many staff are needed, how many hours will it take, and so on). • You should also <u>strongly</u> consider presenting an ingredients table. That is, a cost table without the costs figures included. • You should not predict whether the alternative will meet a given objective in this section. You will discuss effects in the effects section. • You should not provide cost figures for the alternative. You will present cost figures in the cost section. 2. Alternatives could be formulated through consultation with a focus group (i.e., informed decision) - (if you use a focus group to formulate alternatives, attach the focus group protocol as appendix) 	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>I</td> <td>E</td> <td>BP</td> <td>OP</td> </tr> </table>	I	E	BP	OP
I	E	BP	OP		

1. Insufficient (I) – i.e., Warner graduates are not able to meet this standard.
2. Emergent (E) – i.e., Warner graduates are somewhat able to meet this standard.
3. Basic proficiency (BP) – i.e., Warner graduates are able to meet this standard.
4. Outstanding performance (OP) – i.e., Warner graduates are more than able to meet this standard.