



DOCTOR of MARRIAGE and FAMILY THERAPY
School of Education & Behavioral Science
at CHAMINADE UNIVERSITY of Honolulu

Course Syllabus

Course Number: DMFT 8013

Course Title: Qualitative Methods & Analyses

Term: Spring 2024

Credits: Hybrid, 3 credits

Instructor Name: Blendine Hawkins, Ph.D., LMFT

Email: blendine.hawkins@chaminade.edu

Phone: 808 739-7495

Virtual Office Hours: By appointment

Class meeting dates and time:

WEEK 1	WEEK 2	WEEK 3	WEEK 4	WEEK 5	WEEK 6	WEEK 7	WEEK 8	WEEK 9	WEEK 10
Wednesday 4/8 6am-8am HST		Wednesday 4/22 6am-8am HST		Wednesday 5/6 6am-8am HST				Wednesday 6/3 6am-8am HST	

University Course Catalog Description

This course identifies various strategies for utilizing qualitative research methodology in family studies, including differences in research design, sampling, and data collection. Prepares doctoral students to conduct qualitative research study or program evaluation relevant to family processes and/or clinical practice. Introduces qualitative research foundations and practical experience with qualitative research methods. Addresses philosophical foundations of research design, analysis, and interpretation, and evaluation and presentation of qualitative data and findings.

Mission Statement for Doctorate of Marriage and Family Therapy

The program's mission is based on Marianist values and focused on developing strong leaders within the burgeoning field of Marriage and Family Therapy, who value diversity, promote justice and peace, and embody adaptation and change. Drawing on the Marianist Educational Values of formation in faith; quality education; family spirit; service, justice and peace; and adaptation and change, the program promotes continuous self-reflection and personal growth for the clinical student in their development as Clinical Practitioners in their roles as scholars, therapists, supervisors, and leaders.

Marianist Values

1. Educate for formation in faith
2. Provide an integral quality education
3. Educate in family spirit
4. Educate for service, justice and peace
5. Educate for adaptation and change

Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)

Upon completion of the Doctorate degree in Marriage and Family Therapy, students will be able to:
PLO1: develop a doctoral-level professional identity as marriage and family therapists and a specialized clinical area that is grounded in research and is at an advanced level of intervention and understanding (Addresses ACA 2 COAMFTE)

PLO2: synthesize contemporary family and couple therapy models and be responsive to the societal, cultural and spiritual contexts of practice

(Addresses ACA 3 COAMFTE)

PLO3: synthesize the ethics and competency in peace, health, and justice approaches to MFT research, supervision, and practice, demonstrating attention to multiple domains of diversity

(Addresses ACA 2&3 COAMFTE)

PLO4: use and evaluate quantitative and qualitative MFT clinical measures to improve clinical process and outcomes

(Addresses ACA 1 COAMFTE)

PLO5: cultivate a coherent and competent program of MFT supervision

(Addresses ACA 4 COAMFTE)

PLO6: utilize systemic leadership, demonstrating sophistication in program building, leadership, and/or consultation

(Addresses ACA 4 COAMFTE)

Competency Area	Program Learning Outcome
Advanced Relational/Systemic Clinical Theory	PLO1: Students will develop a doctoral-level professional identity as marriage and family therapists and a specialized clinical area that is grounded in research and is at an advanced level of intervention and understanding (Addresses ACA 2 COAMFTE)
Advanced Relational/Systemic Applications to Contemporary Challenges	PLO2: Students will synthesize contemporary family and couple therapy models and be responsive to the societal, cultural and spiritual contexts of practice (Addresses ACA 3 COAMFTE)
Diversity, Service, Justice, Wellness, and Peace	PLO3: Students will synthesize the ethics and competency in peace, health, and justice approaches to MFT research, supervision, and practice, demonstrating attention to multiple domains of diversity (Addresses ACA 2&3 COAMFTE)
Introductory Research Methods Quantitative and Qualitative	PLO4: Students will use and evaluate quantitative and qualitative MFT clinical to improve clinical process and outcomes (Addresses ACA 1 COAMFTE)
Couple and Family Therapy Supervision	PLO5: Students will cultivate a coherent and competent program of MFT supervision (Addresses ACA 4 COAMFTE)
Leadership/Consultation in Marriage/Couple and Family Therapy	PLO6: Students will utilize systemic leadership, demonstrating sophistication in program building, leadership, and/or consultation (Addresses ACA 4 COAMFTE)

Course Learning Outcomes (CLO)

At the completion of this course, MFT Doctoral students will be able to:

1. Utilize qualitative research techniques, methods, tools, and procedures for investigating research questions (PLO1; PLO4)
2. Recognize and assess quality and rigor in evaluating qualitative research studies (PLO4)
3. Describe a variety of research methods, including survey research, interviewing, participant observation, case studies, comparative analysis, and the use of documentary/primary sources (PLO4)
4. Give examples of several ethical issues that arise in qualitative research approaches (PLO3; PLO4)

Learning Materials

Required Readings

Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2018). Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road map from beginning to end.

Recommended readings

**Other readings (chapters or articles) will be posted on the course learning site, Canvas.*

- Beitin, B. K. (2008). Qualitative research in marriage and family therapy: Who is in the interview?. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 30, 48-58.
- Birks, M., Chapman, Y., & Francis, K. (2008). Memoing in qualitative research: Probing data and processes. *Journal of research in nursing*, 13(1), 68-75.
- Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. *Educational Researcher*, 34(6), 3-15.
- Bowen, G. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27—40.
- Brayboy, B. M., & Dehyle, D. (2000). Insider-outsider: Researchers in American Indian communities. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(3), 163—169.
- Burck, C. (2005). Comparing qualitative research methodologies for systemic research: The use of grounded theory, discourse analysis and narrative analysis. *Journal of family therapy*, 27(3), 237-262.
- Chenail, R. J. (1997). Interviewing exercises: Lessons from family therapy. *The qualitative report*, 3(2), 1-8.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage publications.
- Damianakis, T., & Woodford, M. R. (2012). Qualitative research with small connected communities: Generating new knowledge while upholding research ethics. *Qualitative health research*, 22(5), 708-718.
- Haene, L. D. (2010). Beyond division: Convergences between postmodern qualitative research and family therapy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 36(1), 1-12.
- Helm, S., Lee, W., Hanakahi, V., Gleason, K., McCarthy, K., & Haumana. (2015). Using Photovoice with Youth to Develop a Drug Prevention Program in a Rural Hawaiian Community. *American Indian & Alaska Native Mental Health Research: The Journal of the National Center*, 22(1), 1–26.
<https://doi.org/10.5820/aian.2201.2015.1>
- Jacob, S. A., & Furgerson, S. P. (2012). Writing interview protocols and conducting interviews: tips for students new to the field of qualitative research. *Qualitative Report*, 17, 6.
- Lei, S. A. (2009). Strategies for finding and selecting an ideal thesis or dissertation topic: A review of literature. *College Student Journal*, 43(4), 1324—1332.
- Kara, H., & Pickering, L. (2017) New directions in qualitative research ethics, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 20:3, 239-241, DOI: 10.1080/13645579.2017.1287869
- Liamputtong, P. (2009). Qualitative data analysis: conceptual and practical considerations. *Health promotion journal of Australia*, 20(2), 133-139.
- McLellan, E., MacQueen, K. M., & Neidig, J. L. (2003). Beyond the qualitative interview: Data preparation and transcription. *Field methods*, 15(1), 63-84.
- Milner, H. R. (2007). Race, culture, and researcher positionality: Working through dangers seen, unseen, and unforeseen. *Educational Researcher*, 36(7), 388—400.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc. American Psychological Association (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Shaw, I. F. (2003). Ethics in qualitative research and evaluation. *Journal of social work*, 3(1), 9-29.

- Srivastava, P., & Hopwood, N. (2009). A practical iterative framework for qualitative data analysis. *International journal of qualitative methods*, 8(1), 76-84.
- St. Pierre, E. A., & Jackson, A. Y. (2014). Qualitative data analysis after coding. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6) 715–719
- Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2017). *An introduction to qualitative research* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Taylor, K. H. (2008). Hawaiian history revisited: illuminating silenced perspectives and Hawaiian resistance in the writings of American missionaries. *Svensk Missionstidskrift*, 96(2), 105–126.
- Thomas, D. R. (2003). A general inductive approach for qualitative data analysis. School of Population Health, University of Auckland, August 2003
<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.462.5445&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Yeong, M. L., Ismail, R., Ismail, N. H., & Hamzah, M. I. (2018). Interview protocol refinement: Fine-tuning qualitative research interview questions for multi-racial populations in Malaysia. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(11), 2700-2713.

Assessment

Course Learning Outcomes (CLO)	Assessment & Description	Contribution (%) to Final Grade
CLO 1: Utilize qualitative research techniques, methods, tools, and procedures for investigating research questions (PLO1; PLO4)	<p>Interview Paper This paper has a few steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construct interview script and questions (Submit) 2. Interview someone and record the interview 3. Construct reflective memos (Submit) <p>Analysis Paper You will be provided with a transcribed interview to engage in initial analyses of the data. You will use coding methods and write a short reflection of your process. (2-3 pages)</p>	25%
CLO2: Recognize and assess quality and rigor in evaluating qualitative research studies (PLO4)	<p>Evaluating a Qualitative Study <i>You will be provided with a qualitative study and you will conduct an evaluation of the qualitative methods for integrity, bias, trustworthiness, transferability, and rigor (using a provided table). You will submit your evaluation of the methods for rigor and effectiveness.</i></p>	15%
CLO3: Describe a variety of research methods, including survey research, interviewing, participant observation, case studies, comparative analysis, and the use of documentary/ primary sources (PLO4)	<p>Research proposal <i>For this assessment, you will construct a brief research proposal, using the standard IRB Form III application template. The form will be provided, and you will have to select an epistemology and methodology that is congruent with your methods of inquiry, along with a brief & relevant review of the literature, recruitment, study risks and benefits, and other specifics of your study. (4-6 pages)</i></p>	25%
CLO4: Give examples of several ethical issues that arise in qualitative research approaches (PLO3; PLO4)	<p>Discussions and Reflections <i>For the discussion you will elaborate about the populations you most want to serve and the cultural and diversity considerations for qualitative research with this population. You will also offer perspectives and respond to a colleague's post.</i></p>	15%

Points Breakdown

Assignments	Max Points
Research IRB Proposal	25
Interview Script and Reflection (2 submissions)	25
Analysis Paper	20
Qualitative Study Evaluation Table	15
Discussions and Reflections (2 discussion forums)	15
Total	100

Please submit assignments on time. If something comes up, give me notice in writing (email or text).

Grading scale

100-90%	A
89-80%	B
79-70%	C- Fail, retake

DMFT Doctoral Courses Student Engagement Credit Hour Policy

The unit of semester credit is defined as university-level credit that is awarded for the completion of coursework. One credit hour reflects the amount of work represented in the intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement for those learning outcomes. Each credit hour earned at Chaminade University should result in a minimum of 45 hours of engagement, regardless of varying credits, duration, modality, or degree level. This equates to one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester. Terms that have alternative lengths, such as 10-week terms, should have an equivalent amount of faculty instruction and out-of-class student work to meet each credit hour. Direct instructor engagement and out-of-class work result in a total student engagement time of 45 hours for one credit. The number of engagement hours may be higher, as needed to meet specific learning outcomes.

Doctoral students are expected to perform work of higher quality and quantity, however typically a minimum of forty-five hours of student engagement for each student credit hour is required, although instructors may require roughly a third more work than this minimum undergraduate credit hour requirement. Therefore, a 3-credit doctoral course would typically require engagement of approximately 135 hours for the average student for whom the course is designed. The minimum 45 hours of engagement per credit hour can be satisfied in fully online, internship, or other specialized courses through several means, including (a) regular online instruction or interaction with the faculty member and fellow students and (b) academic engagement through extensive reading, research, online discussion, online quizzes or exams; instruction, collaborative group work, internships, laboratory work, practica, studio work, and preparation of papers, presentations, or other forms of assessment. This policy is in accordance with federal regulations and regional accrediting agencies.

Number of hours per class activity:

Educational activity	Expected hours of Student Engagement:	Details (if any):
Course attendance/Lecture	10	Synchronous class meetings
Assigned readings	80	There will be assigned readings posted online including a primary text

Key assessments/Writing assignments	25	Research IRB Proposal, Interview Script and Reflection, Analysis Paper, Qualitative Study Evaluation Table
Online Discussions	10	
Presentation and preparation	10	
Total hours:	135	

Technical Assistance for Canvas Users:

- Search for help on specific topics or get tips in [Canvas Students](#)
- [Live chat with Canvas Support for students](#)
- Canvas Support Hotline for students: +1-833-209-6111
- Watch this [video to get you started](#)
- [Online tutorials](#): click on “Students” role to access tutorials
- Contact the Chaminade IT Helpdesk for technical issues: helpdesk@chaminade.edu or call (808) 735-4855

Tutoring and Writing Services

Chaminade is proud to offer free, one-on-one tutoring and writing assistance to all students. Tutoring and writing help is available on campus at Kōkua ‘Ike: Center for Student Learning in a variety of subjects (including, but are not limited to: biology, chemistry, math, nursing, English, etc.) from trained Peer and Professional Tutors. Please check [Kōkua ‘Ike’s website](#) for the latest times, list of drop-in hours, and information on scheduling an appointment. Free online tutoring is also available via TutorMe. Tutor Me can be accessed 24/7 from your Canvas account. Simply click Account – Notifications – TutorMe. For more information, please contact Kōkua ‘Ike at tutoring@chaminade.edu or 808-739-8305.

Writing Standards

All work submitted by Chaminade University students within the DMFT program must meet the following writing standards. Written assignments should:

1. Use correct grammar, spelling, punctuation, and sentence structure of Standard Written English.
2. Develop ideas, themes, and main points coherently and with clarity.
3. Adopt modes and styles appropriate to their purpose and audience (i.e. academic style, research style, and clinical style).
4. Utilize APA style formatting for all papers unless specified otherwise*. APA format includes 12-pt serif font (Times New Roman preferred), one-inch margins, double spaces, in-text citation, correct level heading, title page (abstract not always necessary).
5. Carefully analyze and synthesize material and ideas borrowed from sources. In addition, the sources must be correctly cited both in the body of the paper and the Reference page to avoid plagiarism (see Plagiarism).
6. In addition, for this section:
 - a) First and second level APA headings MUST be used to structure the paper. The final sentence(s) of the introductory paragraph should outline the first-level headings for the paper (sample will be provided).
 - b) All papers must have introductory and closing paragraphs.
 - c) Papers must be in a neutral, formal academic voice (third person).
 - d) No personal opinion is allowed in the literature review. The paper should serve to accurately summarize the academic literature without personal commentary. For the literature review paper, students may cite published critiques and opinion from peer-reviewed articles and professional books.

**The Final Paper for this course is an IRB proposal and should be constructed using the template provided and thus not in APA format.*

Assignments

All assignments need to be submitted online on Canvas by the due date (before 11:59pm on the day it is due). No assignments will be accepted late unless you have contacted the instructor 48 hours prior to the due date and have been granted an extension.

Academic Honesty

Violations of the Honor Code are serious. They harm other students, your professor, and the integrity of the University. Alleged violations will be referred to the Office of Judicial Affairs. If found guilty of plagiarism, a student might receive a range of penalties, including failure of an assignment, failure of an assignment and withholding of the final course grade until a paper is turned in on the topic of plagiarism, failure of the course, or suspension from the University.

Violations of Academic Integrity: Violations of the principle include, but are not limited to:

- Cheating: Intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, notes, study aids, or other devices in any academic exercise.
- Fabrication and Falsification: Intentional and unauthorized alteration or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise. Falsification is a matter of inventing or counterfeiting information for use in any academic exercise.
- Multiple Submissions: The submission of substantial portions of the same academic work for credit (including oral reports) more than once without authorization.
- Plagiarism: Intentionally or knowingly presenting the work of another as one's own (i.e., without proper acknowledgment of the source).
- Abuse of Academic Materials: Intentionally or knowingly destroying, stealing, or making inaccessible library or other academic resource materials.
- Complicity in Academic Dishonesty: Intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another to commit an act of academic dishonesty.

Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to:

- Copying or borrowing liberally from someone else's work without his/her knowledge or permission; or with his/her knowledge or permission and turning it in as your own work.
- Copying of someone else's exam or paper.
- Allowing someone to turn in your work as his or her own.
- Not providing adequate references for cited work.
- Copying and pasting large quotes or passages without properly citing them.

Artificial intelligence (AI) language models, such as ChatGPT, and online assignment help tools, such as Chegg®, are examples of online learning support platforms: they **can not** be used for course assignments except as explicitly authorized by the instructor. **The following actions are prohibited in this course:**

- Incorporating any part of an AI generated response in an assignment or online discussion
- Using AI to brainstorm, formulate arguments, or template ideas for assignments
- Using AI to summarize or contextualize source materials
- Submitting your own work for this class to an online learning support platform for iteration or improvement
- Using AI programs to input quiz/exam questions to retrieve answers to be submitted

If you are in doubt as to whether you are using an online learning support platform appropriately in this course, I encourage you to discuss your situation with me.

Any assignment content composed by any resource other than you, regardless of whether that resource is human or digital, must be attributed to the source through proper citation. Unattributed use of

online learning support platforms and unauthorized sharing of instructional property are forms of scholastic dishonesty and will be treated as such.

Title IX Compliance

Chaminade University of Honolulu recognizes the inherent dignity of all individuals and promotes respect for all people. Sexual misconduct, physical and/or psychological abuse will NOT be tolerated at CUH. If you have been the victim of sexual misconduct, physical and/or psychological abuse, we encourage you to report this matter promptly. As a faculty member, I am interested in promoting a safe and healthy environment, and should I learn of any sexual misconduct, physical and/or psychological abuse, I must report the matter to the Title IX Coordinator. Should you want to speak to a confidential source you may contact the following:

- Chaminade Counseling Center| 808-735-4845.
- Any priest serving as a sacramental confessor or any ordained religious leader serving in the sacred confidence role.

Disability Access

The University is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for all persons with disabilities. This syllabus is available in alternate formats upon request. Students who need accommodations must be registered with Student Disability Services. Students with special needs who meet criteria for the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provisions must provide written documentation of the need for accommodations from the Counseling Center by the end of week three of the class, in order for the instructor to plan accordingly. Failure to provide written documentation will prevent your instructor from making the necessary accommodations. Please refer any questions to the Dean of Students.

Schedule

Week	Topic	Readings & Tasks	Assignments Due
Week 1 4/8/2024 Sync Class Meeting	Finding a research topic Overview of qualitative research	Bloomberg (2023) Ch. 1 Boote & Beile (2005) Lei (2009) Haene (2008) Optional: Roy–Chowdhury (2003)	
Week 2	Philosophical Assumptions Designing a Qualitative Study	Bloomberg (2023) Ch. 2 Cresswell & Poth (2016) Ch. 2-3 Rossman & Rallis (2017) Ch. 5 Jacob & Furgerson (2012). Moustakas (1994). Ch 1 & 3	Submit Interview idea: Who and What DUE Friday 4/19
Week 3 4/22/2024 Sync Class Meeting	Qualitative Approaches	Burck (2005) Cresswell & Poth (2016) Ch. 4-6 Chenail (1997)	Submit Interview Script & Questions DUE Sunday 4/28
Week 4	Data collection: Interviewing Qualitative Research Ethics	Cresswell & Poth (2016) Ch. 7-8 Rossman & Rallis (2017) Ch. 2 (ignore chapter 3 for now) Brinkmann & Kvale (2018) Ch 4,6,7 <u>Optional:</u>	Discussion 1 (Initial Post Thursday Response(s) to Colleague Sunday 5/5

		Shaw (2003) Taylor (2008) Helm et al. (2015) Nelson et al. (2001)	
Week 5 5/6/2024 Sync Class Meeting	Observations and analysis	Bloomberg (2023) Ch. 3 & 4 Rossman & Rallis (2017) Ch. 7 Beitin (2008)	Interview Reflective Memos DUE 5/12
Week 6	Maintaining Rigor in Qualitative Research	Bloomberg (2023) Ch. 5 Rossman & Rallis (2017) Ch. 3 McLellan, MacQueen & Neidig (2003) Birks et al., (2008)	Evaluation of Qualitative Dissertation study DUE 5/19
Week 7	Data analysis I	Bloomberg (2023) Ch. 6 Rossman & Rallis (2017) Ch. 10 Liamputtong (2009) pg 133-137 Thomas (2003) Bowen (2009)	Analysis Paper DUE Sunday 5/26
Week 8	Data analysis II Start working on Final Research Proposal/IRB application (use presentation rubric)	Bloomberg (2023) Ch. 7-9 Srivastava & Hopwood (2009). St. Pierre & Jackson (2014).	
Week 9 6/3/2024 Sync Class Meeting	Positionality and role of the researcher Instructions on how to complete the IRB application	Bloomberg (2023) Ch. 11 Yeong, et al. (2018) Damianakis & Woodford (2012) Milner (2007) Brayboy & Dehyle (2000)	Presentations (Slides due 6/2; Presentations In-class 6/3)
Week 10	Closing reflections & course evaluations		Research Proposal/IRB Application DUE Friday 6/14

Instructor reserves the right to modify the course schedule based on class needs and dynamics of current events.

**DMFT 8013 Qualitative Methods & Analyses
Presentations of Research Proposal RUBRIC**

Topic Content	Poor	Less Effective/Introductory	Effective/Developing	Advanced/Mastery
	1	3	5	7
Topic & Context (Total Possible = 7 Points)	Presentation focuses immediately on the literature review, or no context for the topic is provided.	More clarity in the opening may be needed or the Presentation may begin with a definition of the topic but provide very little context for the idea (e.g., may begin immediately with review of previous research). Definitions not provided.	Presentation starts somewhat broadly, and provides some theoretical or real world context for the main concept in the study. Definitions and an explanation of the key concept or question is provided, but it could be clearer.	Presentation (i.e., first one to two slides) begins in a broad manner and clearly explains the problem to be investigated and defines important constructs.
Literature Review (Total Possible = 7 Points)	All studies are described in an unclear manner; connection of studies to topic/focus is unclear.	At least 3 studies are described clearly and in enough detail for the audience to understand OR 3 studies are described in an unclear manner. Connection of 3 studies to topic/focus may be slightly unclear.	At least 4 studies are described clearly. Connection of a study to the topic/focus may be slightly unclear.	At least 5 studies are described clearly and in enough detail for the audience to understand.
Literature Advancement (Total Possible = 7 Points)	A brief summary of the literature is not provided. The description of what is missing from this literature or what researchers do not yet know is absent or very unclear. There is no discussion of why the proposed study idea will be important to this literature, or no study is proposed at this point.	A brief summary of the literature is not provided. The description of what is missing from this literature or what researchers do not yet know is unclear. There is little justification for why the proposed study idea will be important to this literature, or the author makes a vague call for more research without any specificity.	A brief summary of the literature is provided, but the description of what is missing from this literature or what researchers do not yet know could be stated more clearly. An explanation of how the proposed study idea will answer this question or fill this research gap is included, but it could be more specific; or, the author makes a vague call for more research without specifying variables, populations, or methods.	A brief summary of the literature is provided, and there is a specific, clear description of what is missing from this literature or what researchers do not yet know. A clear explanation of how the proposed study idea will answer this question or fill this research gap is included. Specific issues, variables, populations, or methods are mentioned.
Research Question (Total Possible = 7 Points)	A semblance of a research question is provided.	The research question is unclear and inconsistent with qualitative research, or the research question is unsupported by the literature review.	The research question is somewhat unclear and may be inconsistent with qualitative research, or the research question loosely follows a logical conclusion from the literature review.	One research question is clearly stated. The research question is consistent with qualitative research, demonstrating an understanding of the purpose and objectives of qualitative design, and is a culmination of the literature review.
Proposed Study (Total Possible = 7 Points)	One suggestion for study is provided. Design is not appropriate for the hypothesis; variables are not operationalized or not valid.	One suggestion for study is provided. Design is not complete or the operationalization of the variables is not clear. Measured variables may be simplistic or not appropriate).	One suggestion for study is provided. Design is complete and appropriate but not clearly described. Variables are appropriately operationalized but may be simplistic.	One suggestion for study is provided. The design is clear, complete, and appropriate to test the hypothesis. Variables are appropriate and operationalized properly.
Method: Participants, Materials, Procedure (Total Possible = 7 Points)	Discussion misses two or more of the following: participants, materials, or procedures. The method cannot answer the research question and/or does not match study design.	Discussion misses one of the following: participants, materials, or procedures. It is unclear whether the method provides a good path to answering the research question.	Participants, materials, and procedure are discussed. One of these components may be unclear. Participants, materials, and procedure provide a good path to answering the research question.	Participants, materials, and procedure are briefly and clearly discussed. Participants, materials, and procedure clearly provide a way to answer the research question and show methodological congruence.
Framework (Total Possible = 7 Points)	No framework was identified.	One interpretive framework was identified however the tenets were not described or did not align with the research question, and the study methods.	One interpretive framework was identified and described with brief exploration of how the tenets align with the research question, and the study methods.	One or more interpretive frameworks were identified (if more than one there was integration), succinct & substantive exploration of the methodological alignment for the entire study, i.e. RQs & study methods.
Rigor (Total Possible = 7 Points)	Did not attend to any concept or strategy increase rigor.	Did not mention one of the concepts related to study rigor, i.e. credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability or did not identify one step that will be taken to increase rigor in this study	Mentioned one of the concepts related to study rigor, i.e. credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability and identified one step that will be taken to increase rigor in this study.	Discussed one of the concepts related to study rigor, i.e. credibility, transferability, dependability, & confirmability and described a strategy that will be taken to increase rigor in this study that is consistent with the methods.
Consultation Questions (Total Possible = 7 Points)	Does not identify any questions related to the study.	Poses one vague query about research but not related to own study.	Poses 2 consultation questions loosely related to the constructing or conducting of the study, is able to discuss the questions.	Poses 2+ consultation questions related to the study to the team that initiates discussion related to the constructing or conducting of the study, has prior ideas of how to address these questions about own study.
Clarity and Organization (Total Possible = 7 Points)	Audience cannot understand presentation because there is no sequence of information. Students were unprepared and did not rehearse their presentation.	Audience has difficulty following presentation because students jump around 50% of the time. Students were 50% prepared.	Students present information in logical sequence which audience can follow 75% of the time. Students were 75% prepared.	Students present information in logical, interesting sequence which audience can follow 100% of the time. Students were 100% prepared and have obviously rehearsed.
PowerPoint Slides (Total Possible = 7 Points)	More than 50% of the slides contain too much text and little to no visual images. The slides are hard for the audience to understand.	50% of the slides display text in a way that is easy for audience to understand. The slides contain too much text and information that is overwhelming to the audience or too many distracting, unrelated images.	75% of the slides display text in a way that is easy for audience to understand. Slides contain text that should be replaced by a visual image, such as a chart or figure or unrelated to the topic.	Each slide displays text in a way that is easy for audience to understand. This may be an outline, photo, table, chart, figure, etc. Visuals are creative or clean, and help the audience remember the presentation.
Time Limit (Total Possible = 7 Points)	Presentation is less than 6 OR more than 12 minutes	Presentation is 6 minutes OR 12 minutes.	Presentation is 7 OR 11 minutes.	Presentation was between 8-10 minutes.
Academic Integrity	Quotations AND citations included on slides when citing someone's exact words (including your own). Citations included on slides when citing someone's ideas, theories, etc. References included at end of presentation. Self-plagiarism and plagiarism of other sources not present. If presence of plagiarism, a reduction of final paper grade up to 100% may be applied based on severity, and a report of academic integrity violation will be submitted to the DMFT program and Chaminate University.			
Total Possible Points = 84	Points Earned = /84			