

Middle Tennessee State University
Department of Health and Human Performance

DISSERTATION PROPOSAL APPROVAL FORM

Dissertation/Thesis Title (print): _____

SUBMITTED BY: _____

Candidate's Printed Name

Candidate's Signature

Date

Names of Committee Members who approve this proposal:

Chair: _____
Printed Name Signature Date

Member: _____
(Department) Printed Name Signature Date

Member: _____
(External) Printed Name Signature Date

Member: _____
(Additional) Printed Name Signature Date

Member: _____
(Additional) Printed Name Signature Date

Proposal Rubric Scores: Intro _____ Review of Literature _____ Research Methods _____

Institutional Review Board Committee Approval Letter Received At Time of Proposal
Yes _____ No _____ (for committee information only; not a requirement)

Expected date of defense: _____

Committee Recommended Changes and Comments:

(Use reverse side)

Dissertation Proposal Rubric

TERM _____

STUDENT NAME _____

	1	2	3	4	Score
1 Introduction	A weak rationale for the project was presented. The purpose of the study was unfocused and unclear.	The rationale for the project was clear, although a stronger justification for the project could have been provided.	A clear and convincing rationale for the project was provided within the context of existing research literature.	Justification for the project was conveyed in a clear and convincing manner. The purpose of the study was clear and focused.	
2 Review of Literature	The review was poorly organized and failed to provide an adequate review of literature relevant to the study. A weak rationale for the choice of theoretical perspectives or empirical studies was evident and there was little synthesis, critique or rationale of existing studies. The description of research samples, methodologies, and findings was insufficient.	A review of literature relevant to the study and a theoretical perspective supported by empirical studies were provided. The description of research samples, methodologies, and findings was sufficient.	The review of the literature was organized and comprehensive. A rationale for including or excluding various theoretical perspectives and empirical studies was apparent. The description of research samples, methodologies, and findings was clear.	A comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study was provided. The review was well-organized, with a nuanced critique regarding the relatedness of the research and scholarship reviewed and the inclusion or exclusion of various theoretical perspectives and empirical studies. The review clearly described research samples, methodologies, and findings.	
3 Methods / Approach	Description of the subject population, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses was inadequate, unclear, or lacking.	Description of the subject population, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses was adequate for the research question being addressed.	Description of the subject population, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses was clear and appropriate to the research question(s) being addressed.	Description of the subject population, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses was clear, well-organized, and appropriate to the research question(s) being addressed. A convincing case for the methods chosen was presented which demonstrated an appreciation for possible alternative or competing methods of data collection and analysis.	