

Rubric Detail

A rubric lists grading criteria that instructors use to evaluate student work. Your instructor linked a rubric to this item and made it available to you. Select **Grid View** or **List View** to change the rubric's layout.

Name: **Partial Prospectus**

[Exit](#)

Grid View

[List View](#)

	Limited	Emerging	Strong
Introduction	0 (0.00%) - 2 (2.00%) The PoP is unclear and/or readers may be unable to identify the author's practice.	3 (3.00%) - 6 (6.00%) The introduction is sufficient but could be clearer or more engaging/specific.	7 (7.00%) - 10 (10.00%) The introduction is vivid, engaging, clear, and specific. Ample contextual detail enables readers to identify the author's problem and practice.
Problem Statement	0 (0.00%) - 2 (2.00%) The problem statement is missing or unclear and the author incorporates few, if any, citations.	3 (3.00%) - 6 (6.00%) The problem statement is sufficient, and the author has made some effort to situate the PoP within a broader conversation, but the quantity and/or quality of the sources is lacking, the author uses too much summary, and/or the	7 (7.00%) - 10 (10.00%) The actual problem statement is clear and concise, expressing the need for change in the practitioner's context. The author clearly situates the PoP by citing and synthesizing multiple (3+) high-quality sources.

		alignment with the PoP is unclear.	
Purpose Statement	<p>0 (0.00%) - 2 (2.00%)</p> <p>The purpose statement is missing or unclear.</p>	<p>3 (3.00%) - 6 (6.00%)</p> <p>The purpose statement sounds more like the aim of “traditional” research or the purpose is sufficient but could exhibit stronger alignment with the PoP, e.g., by going beyond the wording of the RQs to communicate the author’s overall aim.</p>	<p>7 (7.00%) - 10 (10.00%)</p> <p>A clear and succinct purpose statement aligns with the principles of action research by coming across as an aim to resolve the PoP.</p>
Research Questions	<p>0 (0.00%) - 2 (2.00%)</p> <p>The draft contains only one RQ (without sufficient justification) or none at all.</p>	<p>3 (3.00%) - 6 (6.00%)</p> <p>The draft contains multiple RQs, but they do not pass the “litmus test” (e.g., yes/no format). Alignment with the PoP and/or purpose is unclear.</p>	<p>7 (7.00%) - 10 (10.00%)</p> <p>The draft contains multiple high-quality RQs, along with an explanation/justification of their alignment with the purpose and the PoP.</p>
Positionality	<p>0 (0.00%) - 2 (2.00%)</p> <p>The author does not define or discuss positionality.</p>	<p>3 (3.00%) - 6 (6.00%)</p> <p>The author’s definition exhibits a basic understanding of positionality, and/or the</p>	<p>7 (7.00%) - 10 (10.00%)</p> <p>The author effectively defines and explains positionality, ably reflecting on the role it might play in the prospective study.</p>

		and/or the author could say more about the role it might play in the study.	
Rationale/Significance	<p>0 (0.00%) - 2 (2.00%)</p> <p>The author does not identify the potential study as an action research study and/or fails to explain why and how action research differs from "traditional" research.</p>	<p>3 (3.00%) - 6 (6.00%)</p> <p>The author has a basic understanding of the differences between "traditional" research and action research, but could say more about why the latter approach is most appropriate for this PoP. The author identifies overly broad audiences for the study rather than narrowing the scope.</p>	<p>7 (7.00%) - 10 (10.00%)</p> <p>The author demonstrates a firm grasp of the difference between action research and "traditional" research and uses this section to explain what resolving the PoP would mean and to whom. Primarily focused on creating local change, the author also identifies specific audiences who might be interested in the outcomes of the prospective study.</p>
Grammar/Style	<p>0 (0.00%) - 2 (2.00%)</p> <p>Errors are frequent enough that they severely jeopardize readability.</p>	<p>3 (3.00%) - 6 (6.00%)</p> <p>Some errors impede readability, but the draft reads well overall.</p>	<p>7 (7.00%) - 10 (10.00%)</p> <p>The draft contains few, if any, grammatical or mechanical errors and demonstrates effective diction and sentence structure, as well as appropriate tone and tense.</p>
APA Format/Organization	<p>0 (0.00%) - 2 (2.00%)</p> <p>APA errors are frequent or APA format may not be evident at all. A</p>	<p>3 (3.00%) - 6 (6.00%)</p> <p>A concerted attempt at APA format is evident, despite some mistakes.</p>	<p>7 (7.00%) - 10 (10.00%)</p> <p>Correct APA format (including headings, in-text citations, and references) is evident throughout. Logical organization and strong</p>

	lack of headings and/or transitions impedes flow.	Transitions could be stronger and/or organization could be clearer.	transitions enhance readability.
Reflection	<p>0 (0.00%) - 2 (2.00%)</p> <p>The draft does not include a reflection: automatic 0/10.</p>	<p>3 (3.00%) - 6 (6.00%)</p> <p>The author includes a general reflection but could be more specific and/or does not set any goals for next steps.</p>	<p>7 (7.00%) - 10 (10.00%)</p> <p>The author acknowledges the draft's partial status and offers some tentative ideas related to a theoretical framework and study design, establishing clear goals for next steps.</p>
Submission Time	<p>0 (0.00%) - 0 (0.00%)</p> <p>The draft has not been submitted by the end of the term. Without prior communication regarding extenuating circumstances, this can result in a 0 for the entire assignment, not just this category.</p>	<p>0 (0.00%) - 0 (0.00%)</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>7 (7.00%) - 10 (10.00%)</p> <p>The draft is on-time or early. Otherwise, the standard deduction (-1/day) applies until the end of the term.</p>

Name: **Partial Prospectus**

Exit