

Rubric for First Year Project

Candidate: _____ Student ID: _____

Reviewer Name: _____

Project Title: _____

Purpose: The purpose of this rubric is to give CPP students a clear understanding of the criteria that will be used to guide the assessment of the quality of their scholarship and to apply the rubric in completing the final assessment of their first year project.

Application: This rubric is intended to be shared with students early in the process. Students can use this rubric as a coherent set of criteria that include descriptions of expected levels of performance for the first year project milestone. It is expected that a first year project that is approved by the reviewers would be evaluated as being **at least in the “good performance” category and at or above a “3” level in all areas.**

Instructions for Reviewers:

- 1) Please fill out the complete form. *Do not leave blanks.*
- 2) Using the 5-point scale below, only circle one number for each rubric section to indicate your assessment of the candidate’s scholarship. Please rate the student’s performance in the domains listed below, taking into account their developmental level/ year in the program and the amount of time and scope of experiences they have completed thus far in the program.
 - 1 = Inadequate Performance (Consistently below expectations)
 - 2 = Marginal Performance (Meets minimum expectations at times, but not consistently)
 - 3 = Good Performance (Consistently meets minimum expectations for a student of their level)
 - 4 = Very Good Performance (Exceeds expectations at times)
 - 5 = Outstanding Performance (Exceeds expectations consistently)
 - NA= Not applicable, no basis for rating
- 3) Once complete, please return the completed form to the Program Director.

ABSTRACT

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to the problem or findings missing • Statement of the problem, findings, methodology very limited or absent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to the problem or findings not developed in a clear way • Findings, methodology, and/or significance not well organized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abstract has an introduction to the finding • Statement of the problem, findings, methodology, and/or significance may need some more further organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organized well • States the research problem, findings, methodology, and significance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and concise; smoothly draws the reader in • States the problem, findings, methodology, and significance well

RESEARCH QUESTION OR THESIS THEME

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance

<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research question is weak, insignificant, uninteresting or unimportant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research question is not strongly supported or developed • The question needs more development to enhance its originality • The case is not well developed that question is significant, interesting or important 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research question is developed, but not as thoroughly • The question may be original but could be improved • Significance to the field is somewhat supported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research question is well developed • The question is original and innovative • Significance is clear, well-situated to advance existing knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research question very well developed • The question is exceptionally original and innovative • Significant in its potential contribution, calls forth new knowledge, obvious potential to address critical issues within the field

LITERATURE REVIEW

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature review is absent or unrelated to overall research project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete, omissions or unsubstantiated interpretations, may only provide a list of previous findings without being in dialogue with the literature • Little evidence the candidate understands the canonical and current literature within their field, relevance to the research question unclear • May not address the gap in the literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides an analysis of previous findings; adequate coverage but limited as to viewpoints presented • Reference to and discussion of canonical and current relevant literature but weak connection with their question or thesis • May develop some connection but not a strong connection to the gap in the literature their project addresses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An insightful review that draws connections and integrates literature in a new way • Includes canonical and current relevant literature and uses the literature to discuss scholarly trends and to develop hypotheses • Draws a clear relationship to the gap in literature their project will address 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mastery of original and critical engagement with relevant literature in the field • Hypotheses derived from both canonical and current literature review with analysis and summary contributing to the body of research in their field • Demonstrates the gap in the literature relevant to their study and makes a compelling argument to addressing the gap

FRAMEWORKS AND MODELS

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no theoretical framework or model guiding the research project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical framework is unclear, or misunderstood • Theories not connected to the literature review or research question clearly; little or no discussion of the impact of theory on their research; may reject theory as important or pertinent to their study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current theories are connected to but provide only a minimal framework for the research • The research connects back to theoretical bases in some way; little or no discussion of the impact on existing theories their research implies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current theories are connected to and provide a clear framework for the research; well-versed in theory • Clear connection between theory and research questions, gaps identified in existing theories; discusses the impact on existing theories their research implies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilizes multiple demonstrably relevant theories or models; looks at the complementarity and tensions of competing theories • Uses theory to generate questions, answers, and considers their implications; addresses how their project will contribute to, support, or change established theory

METHODS AND APPROACHES

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology is not appropriate for the main question, data analysis plan or population 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a methodology and/or population that does not lend itself well to the study of the question • Is unaware of, or has not identified, the biases and/or limitations within the study design • A clear connection between the methodology and the data analysis either not discussed or not clearly made • The analysis plan may be incomplete 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows basic competence in understanding methodology and study design • Study biases and/or limitations within the study design discussed but may not be well developed • Choice of methodology, approach and study design acceptable; connection discussed but may not be clearly developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some quality or innovative methodology and study design • Study biases and/or limitations within the study clearly understood and discussed • Discussion of connection between methodology and data analysis clear and concise • Analysis plan is thorough, complete and well-connected to the research question and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality, innovative study design; design of study manifests a deep understanding of the field • Discusses the limitations of the methodology, study design, and potential biases inherent in study • Clear explanation of methodological choices, and integration of approaches; iteratively explores questions raised by the data or

	and/or poorly organized and/or implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The analysis plan connects back to theory but may not establish a clear connection; aspects of the data are adequately considered but a more thorough analysis should be considered 	theoretical framework	<p>theoretical analysis; discussion of connection between methodology and data analysis clear and concise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis plan is rigorous, nuanced, and transparent
--	--	---	-----------------------	---

THEORETICAL ANALYSIS, DISCUSSION and INTERPRETATION

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any part of the theoretical analysis, discussion and interpretation is missing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The analysis may be incomplete and/or poorly organized and/or implemented The findings may not be supported by the analysis; the discussion of the findings may not be well organized and/or not address all of the findings clearly and/or be missing portions such as a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the research Validity of the findings may not be addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The analysis connects back to theory but may not establish a clear connection Aspects of the data are adequately considered but a more thorough analysis should be considered Validity of the findings are addressed but may lack a thorough approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis is thorough, complete and well-connected to the research question and theoretical framework Validity of the findings are addressed rigorously 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis is rigorous, nuanced, and transparent; findings are tied to the research question and theoretical foundations A rigorous discussion of the validity of the findings are engaged in and compared to previous research in the field

CONCLUSIONS

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusions are absent or incorrect based upon presented data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not include a summary of results or summary may not be clear and organized; the connection between the findings and data may not be established in a convincing way • Little or no interpretation is provided or the interpretation may not fully fit the findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarizes the results and provides a general discussion in reference to the literature; the results are situated as to their significance • Little or no discussion of the ‘gap’ in the literature their study addresses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusions are well-presented and insightful; they return to the larger context to identify future directions and/or discuss how the field needs to change • Accentuates the ‘gap’ in the literature and presents a compelling argument as to how their study fulfills this area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a focused discussion of conclusions, situating them in the literature to draw connections or point to differences with previous research; advances the field(s) of knowledge and raises questions for the future • Makes a compelling and interesting argument as to the importance of their findings and how those findings address the ‘gap’ in the literature originally identified
---	---	--	--	--

WRITING AND SCHOLARLY VOICE (CPP SLO Communication and Interpersonal Skills)

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing and scholarly voice in not sufficiently professional with excessive spelling, punctuation or formatting errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More development of academic speech and writing skills necessary; Tone is not professional • Syntax or vocabulary may not be well developed; writing may be difficult to read or understand; errors of spelling, punctuation or formatting • Overreliance on jargon or the candidate may not have a command of the field’s lexicon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing and speech are somewhat developed and professional • Spelling, punctuation, grammar, in general, meet program and institutional standards; formatting is adequate • The lexicon of the respective field is understood and used properly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The tone of writing and speech is professional; scholarly style • Speech and writing are grammatically correct, fluid, precise, and clear; vocabulary and syntax are mature; formatting is accurate • Lexicon of the field is clearly explained and defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidate’s written ‘voice’ is heard and yields a definitive, clear presence. Speech is professional and commanding • Speech and writing are fluid, precise, and clear; vocabulary and syntax are mature; scholarly style and format are accurately used • Lexicon of the field is clearly explained and defined

DIVERSITY and APPLICATION

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both fails to consider diversity factors and makes inappropriate claims about generalization of findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to address questions of diversity where such considerations are clearly relevant to the current research Makes claims that are inappropriately universalizing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discusses relevant issues of diversity but could provide greater depth or nuance Recognizes the existence of multiple frameworks and epistemologies but does not address these sufficiently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides analysis of some of the diversity considerations and debates that are relevant to the topic, methodology, and conclusions Recognizes the existence of multiple frameworks and epistemologies and avoids inappropriately universalizing results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a sophisticated, critical, and nuanced analysis of key considerations and debates where relevant to the topic, methodology, and conclusions Recognizes the existence of multiple frameworks and epistemologies and avoids inappropriately universalizing results

APA Domain Specific Knowledge:

Category 4: *Research Methods, Statistical Analysis, and Psychometrics*

Research Methods, including topics such as strengths, limitations, interpretation, and technical aspects of rigorous case study; correlational, experimental, and other quantitative research designs; measurement techniques; sampling; replication; theory testing; qualitative methods; mixed methods; meta-analysis; and quasi-experimentation.

<i>N/A Does not Apply</i>	Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

Statistical Analysis, including topics such as quantitative, mathematical modeling and analysis of psychological data, statistical description and inference, univariate and multivariate analysis, null-hypothesis testing and its alternatives, power, and estimation.

<i>N/A Does not Apply</i>	Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

Psychometrics, including topics such as theory and techniques of psychological measurement, scale and inventory construction, reliability, validity, evaluation of measurement quality, classical and contemporary measurement theory, and standardization.

<i>N/A Does not Apply</i>	Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
---------------------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

<i>APA Profession Wide Competency (i) Research</i>	<u>Global rating 1-5</u>
Element #1: Demonstrate the substantially independent ability to formulate research or other scholarly activities (e.g., critical literature reviews, dissertation, efficacy studies, clinical case studies, theoretical papers, program evaluation projects, program development projects) that are of sufficient quality and rigor to have the potential to contribute to the scientific, psychological, or professional knowledge base.	
Element #2: Conduct research or other scholarly activities.	

Final Determination of First Year Project Milestone:

 Approve (Complete next section)/ meets CPP SLO Research standard and APA Profession Wide Competency in Research: MLA of 3's in all ratings of elements and domains have been achieved

 Modification required; MLA of 3's not obtained across all domains above

Suggested date for revision to be completed (Optional)

1. Would the reviewer recommend subsequent submission for publication?

 Yes

 Yes, with modifications/revisions (detail out below)

 No (detail out below)

Reviewer Name: _____

Reviewer Signature: _____ Date: _____

Individual Committee Member comments for student concerning performance: Divide by comments pertaining to (1) APA standards and (2) publication

Confidential Comments to Program Director: