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The Prospectus

The Doctor of Healthcare Administration (DHA) / Doctor of Public Health (DrPH) Doctoral Study Prospectus Guide is a brief document that provides preliminary information about your doctoral study research and is used in two ways:

- It serves as an agreed-upon plan for developing the proposal and is evaluated to ensure doctoral-level work.
- Although your premise document will be used to assign your supervisory committee, the prospectus may serve as a step to finalize the structure of your doctoral study supervisory committee, who will work with you on completing the doctoral study.

Completing the Prospectus

The Doctoral Study Prospectus consists of several small sections, which are detailed in the annotated outline. Your goal for the prospectus is to create a plan for developing your doctoral study proposal. Therefore, you need to have more information for the prospectus than you did for the Doctoral Study Premise, but you do not need to know all the specific details of the study that you will ultimately conduct. For example, you may identify low birth weight as a covariate in a quantitative study, but at this point you do not yet need to identify the instrument that you plan to use to measure the covariate.

Also, because every doctoral study is unique and because this outline is general, you may be asked to include additional information in your prospectus to help assure your supervisory committee that you are headed in the right direction. For example, feasibility will be one criterion for evaluating your prospectus, and if you are considering a unique sample group, your committee may ask that you explore that aspect in more detail before moving forward.

The Doctoral Study Prospectus should follow Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (sixth edition) guidelines and be formatted as either a .doc, .docx, or .rtf file. As you work on the document, you may also want to review the Litmus Test for a Doctoral-Level Research Problem from the Doctoral Study Premise guide and materials provided from your academic residency experience, as well as the quality indicators found in the Doctoral Study Prospectus Rubric, which is included in this guide (see “Quality Indicators”).

One prospectus quality indicator that is not included as a separate section in the prospectus document, but rather is holistically assessed throughout the prospectus, is research design alignment. The rubric item reads: “Aligned? Do the various components of the research plan align overall?” Alignment is critically important to the quality of research. Research design alignment means that all pieces of the study design match and/or complement one another. For example, the identified doctoral-level problem must drive the purpose of the study and the research questions. The framework must support the research approach overall. There should be common language throughout, with concepts and theories corresponding with the problem and purpose—meaning that language should be repeated from earlier sections into later sections. As
you write, be sure to connect the dots among each section of the prospectus, ensuring alignment throughout. The visual below represents this idea.

Conceptualizing the research plan and the various components of the research design is sometimes challenging. One way to assist with this, and to ensure research design alignment, is to use a visual to help you see how the various parts of a research design should fit together and therefore must align with one another. For example, as presented in the graphic below, the Problem Statement, Purpose, and Framework in the prospectus must align with all other pieces of the research design. This example has three research questions. If one research question does not appear to fit with the study purpose, it does not belong in the study design. The method and design make up the section in the prospectus called “Nature of the Study.” Each section must coordinate with the others.

As a self-check, you should ask yourself these questions about your research design:
1. Is there a logical progression from the research problem to the purpose of the study?
2. Does the identified framework ground the investigation in the stated problem?
3. Do the problem, purpose, and framework align with the RQ(s) and nature of the study?
4. Does each RQ address the problem and align with the purpose of the study?
5. Will the instrument, data source, and analysis address the RQ?

**Submitting the Prospectus**

Students work with their chair in a companion research forum course (PUBH/HLTH 8900 – Research Forum) that supports prospectus development. Students work with their chair in the PUBH/HLTH 8900 course to complete the prospectus before moving into the PUBH/HLTH 9100 Research Forum course.

Prospectus development is an iterative process, as you will receive feedback on working drafts from your supervisory committee. When the prospectus is completed, please follow the submission guidelines for your program. Generally, you should submit a final prospectus to your doctoral study supervisory committee for review in PUBH/HLTH 8900 after completion of your research sequence but before enrolling in the PUBH/HLTH 9100, and

- *as required in your doctoral study course*, if you are currently enrolled in this course;
- *toward the end of your time in a companion course*, following the guidance of your chair;
- or
- *prior* to beginning your doctoral study proposal in PUBH/HLTH 9100, following the guidance of your chair.

**My Doctoral Research (MyDR)**

If you have not done so already, you should familiarize yourself with the [My Doctoral Research (MyDR)](https://www.example.com) system and other resources on the [Center for Research Quality](https://www.example.com) website. The MyDR system was designed to assist you and your committee in navigating your doctoral research journey, from the very beginning through the final approval. The various landing pages in MyDR will track your progress and will serve as a central location for resources to support that progress. The Taskstream element of the MyDR system is used to establish a process flow tool in which you exchange and store faculty evaluations of and feedback on your work as you progress along that journey.

Students are entered into the MyDR system when *both* the chair and second member nominee are approved by the academic program. At that point, you will be able to access MyDR from the home page of your doctoral study completion course in Blackboard. When your supervisory committee believes your *Doctoral Study Prospectus* is ready to finalize, it will be the first document that you submit to MyDR. Your supervisory committee will evaluate your document (using the rubric that is discussed herein), and, assuming they agree that it meets the quality indicators, your academic program director or designee will give final approval of the prospectus. This may be an iterative process, and more details of this process are located in the MyDR Student Process form. You will begin working on your proposal upon approval from the program director or designee.
An Annotated Outline

The Prospectus document includes a title page (page 1) followed by pages containing the required elements in the prospectus. Follow the format in the appropriate Prospectus template (DHA or DrPH) on the Writing Center website.

Title Page

The recommended title length is 12 words, to include the topic, the variables and relationship between them, and the critical keywords. Double-space the title if it’s over one line of type and center it under the word “Prospectus.” Please note that your doctoral study title will likely change as the project evolves.

Include your name, your program of study (and specialization if applicable), and Student ID number—double-spaced and centered under the title.

Title

Start with “Prospectus” and a colon, and then include the title as it appears on the title page. Double-space if over one line of type and center it at the top of the page.

Problem Statement

Note:
A social problem involves an issue that affects a specific population/discipline. It is the issue that students see “on the ground” so to speak. The social problem is often what prompts students to think about a topic of interest that drives their dissertation topic. Usually such a topic is one that students identify with, sometimes having personally experienced some aspect of the problem as it exists in the world. All too often, students want to solve a specific social, organizational, clinical, or practical problem rather than explore a research problem.

A research problem is a focused topic of concern, a condition to be improved upon, or troubling question that is supported in scholarly literature or theory that you study to understand in more detail, and that can lead to recommendations for resolutions. It is the research problem that drives the rest of the dissertation: the purpose, the research questions, and the methodology. It is the research problem that is identified in the Problem Statement of the prospectus.

Provide a one- to two-paragraph statement that is the result of a review of research findings and current practice and that contains the following information:

1. A logical argument for the need to address an identified gap in practice as supported in the research literature that has relevance to the discipline and area of practice. Keep in mind that a gap in the research is not, in and of itself, a reason to conduct research. Make sure to clarify the problem that caused you to look at that research area in the first place.

2. Preliminary evidence that provides justification that this problem is meaningful to the discipline or professional field. Provide three to five key citations that highlight the relevance and currency of the problem. These references need not all be from peer-
reviewed journals but should be from reputable sources, such as national agency databases or scholarly books.

3. Assure that the problem is framed within and primarily focused on the discipline (program of study).

**Purpose of the Study**

Provide a one- to two-paragraph statement that discusses the overall purpose or intention of the study. In quantitative studies, state what needs be studied by describing two or more factors (variables) and a conjectured relationship among them related to the identified gap or problem.

*Note:* All DHA and DrPH capstones must be quantitative and use secondary data.

**Significance**

Provide one or two paragraphs, informed by the topic in the problem statement, that describe the following:

1. How this study will contribute to filling the gap identified in the problem statement: What *contribution to the discipline or practice* will this study make? This is an elaboration of what the problem addresses.

2. How this research will support professional practice or allow practical application: Answer the *So what?* question.

3. How the claim aligns with the problem statement to reflect the potential relevance of this study to society: How might the potential findings lead to *positive social change*?

**Background**

Provide (a) the keywords or phrases that you searched and the databases used; and (b) a representative list of scholarship (or an annotated bibliography) and findings that *support and clarify the main assertions* in the problem statement, highlighting their relationship to the topic (e.g., “This variable was studied with a similar sample by Smith [2013] and Johnson [2014]” or “Jones’s [2012] examination of industry leaders showed similar trends in the same key segments”). Some of these resources may have already been mentioned above in the first two sections of the prospectus. Provide 5 to 10 peer-reviewed articles, most of which should have been published within the last 5 years and/or represent current information on the topic.

**Framework**

In one paragraph, describe the theoretical framework that demonstrates an understanding of the theories and concepts relevant to your topic. Align the framework with the problem, purpose, research questions, and background of your study. This framework is the basis for understanding, designing, and analyzing ways to investigate your research problem (data collection and analysis). Provide the original scholarly literature on the theory or concepts, even if it is more than 5 years old. Please do not cite secondary sources.
Research Question(s) and Hypotheses

List the question or a series of related questions that are informed by the study purpose, which will lead to the development of what needs to be done in this study and how it will be accomplished.

A research question informs the research design by providing a foundation for the generation of hypotheses in quantitative studies. Include the null and research hypotheses for each research question.

Nature of the Study

Provide a concise paragraph that discusses the quantitative approach that will be used to address the research question(s) and how this approach aligns with the problem statement and purpose.

Secondary Data Types and Sources of Information

Secondary data include public or existing data that are collected by others. Identify the data source, how the data will be accessed, and the data points that will be used to address the research questions. Provide a list of possible types and sources of information or data for this study, such as employee surveys, historical documents from state records, de-identified medical records, or statistics from a federal database. Possible secondary data sources, by program, are available on the Center for Research Quality website.

Limitations, Challenges, and/or Barriers

Provide information on limitations, challenges, and/or barriers that may need to be addressed when conducting this study. These may include access to data, data storage requirements, data access fees, etc.

References

Include references formatted in the correct style (Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, sixth edition, modeled at the end of this guide) for all citations within the Doctoral Study Prospectus.
Quality Indicators

Nine key indicators have been identified to assure the overall quality of the doctoral study project at this point in its development. Supervisory committee members will use these indicators to give ongoing feedback and to document their final approval of the Doctoral Study Prospectus. Students should use these indicators to guide development of their prospectus.

A Doctoral Study Prospectus shows the potential of leading to a high-quality doctoral study only if the answer to all of the following standards is “Met.”

1. **Complete?**
   *Does the prospectus contain all the required elements?* Refer to the annotated outline to see the required parts of the Doctoral Study Prospectus document.

2. **Meaningful?**
   *Has a meaningful problem or gap in practice as supported in the research literature been identified?* In other words, is addressing this problem the logical next step, given the previous exploratory and confirmatory research (or lack thereof) on this topic? It is not acceptable to simply replicate previous research for a doctoral degree.

3. **Justified?**
   *Is evidence presented that this problem is significant to the discipline and/or professional field?* The prospectus should provide relevant statistics and evidence, documentable discrepancies, and other scholarly facts that point to the significance and urgency of the problem.

4. **Grounded?**
   *Is the problem framed to enable the researcher to either build upon or counter the previously published findings on the topic?* For most fields, grounding involves articulating the problem within the context of a theoretical base or conceptual framework. Although many approaches can ground a study in the scientific literature, the essential requirement is that the problem is framed such that the new findings will have implications for the previous findings.

5. **Original/Relevance to Area of Practice?**
   *Does this project have potential to make an original contribution that has relevance to the discipline and/or area of practice?* The problem must be an authentic “puzzle” that needs solving, not merely a topic that the researcher finds interesting. Addressing the problem should result in an original contribution to the field or discipline.
6. Impact?

Does this project have the potential to affect positive social change? As described in the Significance section (see annotated outline), the anticipated findings should have the potential to support Walden University’s mission to promote positive social change.

7. Feasible?

Can a systematic method of inquiry be used to address the problem, and does the approach have the potential to address the problem while considering potential risks and burdens placed on research participants? The tentative methodology demonstrates that the researcher has considered the options for inquiry and has selected an approach that has the potential to address the problem while considering participant risks.

8. Aligned?

Do the various aspects of the prospectus align overall? The nature of the study should align with the problem, research questions, and tentative approaches to inquiry.

9. Objective?

Is the topic approached in an objective manner? The framing of the problem should not reveal bias or present a foregone conclusion. Even if the researcher has a strong opinion on the expected findings, the researcher must maximize scholarly objectivity by framing the problem in the context of a systematic inquiry that permits multiple possible conclusions.

Self-Check Item on Partner Site Masking

Walden capstones typically mask the identity of the partner organization. The methodological and ethical reasons for this practice, as well as criteria for exceptions, are outlined in Guidance on Masking Partner Organizations in Walden Capstones.

If you perceive that your partner organization’s identity would be impossible to mask or if there is a strong rationale for naming the organization in your capstone, the program director must review your request for an exception. If granted, that exception will need to be confirmed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) during the ethics review process. The IRB will also ensure that your consent form(s) and/or site agreement(s) permit naming the organization.
Sample Prospectus
Prospectus

Differences in the Quality of Problem Statements Written Throughout the Capstone Process

Alpha B. Gamma

Doctor of Public Health

or

Doctor of Healthcare Administration

Walden University

A00000000
Prospectus: Differences in the Quality of Problem Statements Written Throughout the Capstone Process

**Problem Statement**

Conducting a supervised, independent research project is a unique feature of completing a doctoral degree (Lovitts, 2008; Luse, Mennecke, & Townsend, 2012). Contrary to the common wisdom of a 50% all-but-doctoral study rate, only approximately 20% of doctoral students are unable to complete the study after finishing their coursework (Lovitts, 2008; Wendler et al., 2010). The challenge of the doctoral study is not a new phenomenon in higher education, but what is new is the growing number of students who complete their academic programs online (Allen & Seaman, 2007; Kumar, Johnson, & Hardemon, 2013). Although many students are ultimately successful in defining the central argument for a doctoral capstone, less research has been conducted on that process in a distributed environment.

In their book on doctoral education, Walker, Golde, Jones, Conklin Bueschel, and Hutchings (2008) highlight the need to develop more “pedagogies of research” (p. 151) for teaching graduate students to be scholars. Although a modest body of scholarship exists on research training in traditional programs, emerging research suggests that the online environment offers some unique challenges and opportunities for doctoral students (Baltes, Hoffman-Kipp, Lynn, & Weltzer-Ward, 2010; Kumar et al., 2013; Lim, Dannels, & Watkins, 2008). Of the many aspects of a research project, development of the problem statement is arguably a key step because it provides the rationale for the entire doctoral study (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2013; Luse et al., 2012). Hence, this study will fill a gap in the research by focusing specifically on the development of problem statements by students in online doctoral programs.
**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine differences in the quality of problem statements written by doctoral students in online programs during the various stages of their doctoral studies. Secondary data that include objective ratings of problem statements by doctoral faculty over the course of the capstone process will be examined for differences. This project is unique because it addresses an underresearched area of higher education (Gardner & Barnes, 2014) with a group of learners that has expanded over the past decade (Bell, 2011).

**Significance**

The results of this study will provide much-needed insights into the processes by which increasing numbers of new scholars work through the beginning phase of their research. Insights from this study should aid doctoral committees in helping students to succeed in their final projects, thus supporting eventual degree attainment. Education has long been a force for social change by addressing inequities in society. Because a broad range of students attends online institutions, supporting their successful attainment of a terminal degree allows for increased diversity among individuals in key academic and scholarly leadership positions.

**Background**

Selected articles relating to doctoral education and the process of learning to be a researcher are described here. The keywords searched were *ABD, online doctoral program completion, doctoral capstone completion, online research training,* and *online learning* in the databases Education Source, ERIC, and SAGE Journals, as well as in a Thoreau multidatabase search.
1. Baltes et al. (2010) and Bieschke (2006) provided information on research self-efficacy, which has been shown as a key predictor of the future research of doctoral students.

2. Gelso (2006); Holmes, Seay, and Wilson (2009); Hilliard (2013); and Kim and Karau (2009) provided different views of strategies to support the development of scholar-practitioners during the capstone experience.

3. Ivankova and Stick (2007) and Kumar et al. (2013) offered models that align well with the possible methodologies used in this study and that involve online students.

4. Lim et al. (2008) addressed the role of research courses in an online environment.

5. Lovitts (2008), Gardner and Barnes (2014), and Werner and Rogers (2013) gave different views of the transition from student to researcher.

6. Ismail, Majid, and Ismail (2013); Spaulding and Rockinson-Szapkiw (2012); and Stubb, Pyhältö, and Lonka (2014) focused on the student experience of learning to conduct research.

**Framework**

The theoretical framework for this study will be Perry’s (1970) theory of epistemological development. Because this theory addresses ways of knowing in adults, Perry’s theoretical work has been used extensively in all aspects of higher education, albeit more frequently with undergraduates than doctoral students. The approach provides details on cognitive-structural changes that emerge as a result of development and learning. Further, subsequent research and application of Perry’s theory offer guidance on ways to facilitate academic development, thus allowing for insight into the pedagogical challenge of the doctoral study (Gardner, 2009).
Research Question(s) and Hypotheses

RQ—Quantitative: Based on objective ratings by doctoral faculty, what are the differences in the overall quality of problem statements as students progress through the doctoral study process?

$H_{01}$—Based on objective ratings by doctoral faculty, there are no statistically significant differences in the overall quality of problem statements as students progress through the doctoral study process.

$H_{1}$—Based on objective ratings by doctoral faculty, there are statistically significant differences in the overall quality of problem statements as students progress through the doctoral study process.

Nature of the Study

The nature of this study will be quantitative research with a repeated-measure design consistent with understanding how students approach the work of creating a successful doctoral study problem statement, which is the primary focus of this doctoral study. To elucidate how a viable research problem emerges, objective ratings of student work products will be examined across time. This quantitative analysis should help pinpoint the amount of growth from the beginning to the end of the project.

Secondary Data Types and Sources of Information

Secondary data will be accessed from an online doctoral program. The program collects and rates doctoral problem statements written at four key points in a doctoral student’s career: the premise, the prospectus, the proposal, and the doctoral study writing stage. The data will be de-identified and contain the scores by stage of program for 300 online doctoral students.
Limitations, Challenges, and/or Barriers

Potential barriers to data access include the partner site agreement and possible fees for data access.
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Ten Tips for Writing a Quality Prospectus

Prospectuses tend to be as unique as the students writing them, so specific strategies are hard to offer. Based on a recent institutional analysis of prospectuses, the following general tips are provided to support successful approval. Students should ask themselves the following questions:

1. **Is it complete?**
   One of the most common reasons that a prospectus is sent back is one of the simplest to fix: Some pieces are missing. You should ask yourself, “Did I effectively respond to every item on the annotated outline?”

2. **Is it well written?**
   Your prospectus is the first time that your scholarly writing style is on full display for your committee. The prospectus needs to be a preview of what they can expect when they agree to work with you. Certainly, if your writing is unclear, your supervisory committee will have a difficult time ascertaining whether you have met the quality indicators. If you need added support with your writing, now is the time to find it. The [Walden Writing Center](https://www.walden.edu/academics/writing-center) offers webinars and multimedia resources to help students improve their academic writing, and the [Academic Skills Center](https://www.walden.edu/academics/academic-skills-center) offers courses to help students improve their writing skills. If you need refreshers and support with key research concepts, the [Center for Research Quality](https://www.walden.edu/academics/center-for-research-quality) site has additional resources.

3. **Are the parts and sections aligned?**
   Of all the quality indicators, alignment tends to be one of the more challenging because it transcends the content in the prospectus. Some examples of misalignment include reviewing research on children when the study is concerned with adults, the intended sample group does not seem appropriate to provide information to answer the research question, and the study is labeled as qualitative even though the intention is to draw inferences from a statistical test of group differences. Importantly, all the parts—not just some—need to align.

4. **Is the topic relevant to my discipline and program of study?**
   Doctoral students are encouraged to explore scholarship from a variety of disciplines as they formulate their questions. When choosing their actual research topic, however, they need to be especially careful to not go beyond their own disciplinary program of study area.

5. **Did I answer the “So what?” question?**
   Too often what is obvious to the student is not always captured in what is written in the prospectus. Ironically, one area that seems to get neglected is the social change statement because the writer assumes that the reader understands the full impact of the situation and how this research will have potential for a positive impact. Make sure you are clear on
why so many people, including your committee and your participants, need to invest their time in this project.

6. **Is the prospectus presented in an objective manner?**
   Students are encouraged to develop a deep understanding of the problem and the people affected by it. When coupled with experiences gained through one’s work as a practitioner, however, it is tempting to lose sight of researcher objectivity. You should not offer solutions before the study has been completed (“I know what needs to happen here”) or suggest an answer before you have started the study (“I want to prove this point”). Research has a way of humbling us and showing us the error in jumping to conclusions.

7. **Did I do my “homework”?**
   Although the prospectus sets the stage for a more in-depth examination of a research topic, students are still expected to conduct a preliminary literature review. Be careful not to equate “Here’s a gap in the research” with “I haven’t looked at the research.” Students are sometimes shocked at how much research has already been done on a topic after they start digging into it, even if more research is eventually needed.

8. **Have I identified a research question?**
   A common mistake that new researchers make is to confuse the broader social problem with the research question that will be the focus of the doctoral study, because the two are related. Although much is often known about the scope and nature of the social problem (e.g., incident rates, outcomes), less information is available on how to address the social problem; otherwise, it would not be a problem. What is often lacking in the situation is some piece of information or understanding that can be used to address the social problem. That question or gap is what your research will answer.

9. **Is my topic too broad?**
   Most doctoral students have overly ambitious research goals at the beginning, and we rarely have to ask someone to “do more.” Usually, the struggle is to identify a focused, doable question that fits within the expectations of a doctoral study. Exploring the research literature is one way to see how other researchers have shaped their questions. Keep in mind that a tightly conceived, well-executed study of one robust research question is better than a doctoral study that tries to answer a bunch of tangentially related questions with a variety of methods.

10. **Have you considered the feasibility of the study?**
    The prospectus is a plan to develop the proposal, and the proposal is where many key research decisions are finalized. Still, it is never too early to start thinking about feasibility, which is why it is one of the quality indicators. Like all the indicators, feasibility is a quality that you will revisit as the project evolves. At the prospectus stage, you need to show your supervisory committee that you are considering your choices in light of previous scholarship and what you have learned about the research process in your courses.
Sample Prospectus in the HAT

The Historical Alignment Tool (HAT) is a tool that is introduced in Residency 2 to help students see the alignment in their prospectus and to track the changes they have made along the way. What follows is a HAT that might have been developed for the Sample Prospectus that appears in this guide.

Problem Statement
There is a lack of information on how online doctoral students develop their research problem and whether the quality of the problem statement varies over time.

Purpose
The purpose of this study is to examine differences in the quality of problem statements written by doctoral students in online programs during the various stages of their doctoral studies.

Potential Significance
Results may help ensure the success of online doctoral students.

Research Questions
RQ–Quantitative: Based on objective ratings by doctoral faculty, what are the differences in the overall quality of problem statements as students progress through the doctoral study process?

$H_0$:—Based on objective ratings by doctoral faculty, there are no statistically significant differences in the overall quality of problem statements as students progress through the doctoral study process.

$H_1$:—Based on objective ratings by doctoral faculty, there are statistically significant differences in the overall quality of problem statements as students progress through the doctoral study process.

Theories or Conceptual Frameworks
Perry’s theory of epistemological development

Method on Inquiry
Quantitative

Data Collection
Ratings by faculty members

Data Analysis Method
To be determined

Implications for Positive Social Change
Online education has expanded the reach of higher education to a more diverse group of learners, many of whom serve in key leadership roles. These results may support their success and eventual advancement.