

Rubric for Qualifying Exam (QE)

Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_ Student ID: \_\_\_\_\_ Defense Date \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer 1 Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer 2 Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer 3 Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Additional Reviewer Names (if applicable):  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**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 QE. 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 while developing their scholarship during their program. *It is expected that a qualifying exam grant that is approved by the QEC would be evaluated as being at least in the “good performance” category and at or above a “3” level in all areas.*

**Instructions for QEC:** Please fill out the complete form. *Do not leave blanks.*

- 1) Each reviewer should complete a separate rubric with their initial thoughts and bring this with them to the defense.
- 2) After the oral defense, the *QEC will deliberate together and make final decisions on each rating and the overall evaluation* based upon the written product, oral presentation and oral defense. One complete form and set of ratings will be agreed upon by the QEC and submitted to the program.
- 3) Using the 5-point scale below, only circle one number for each rubric section to indicate evaluation 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

- 4) Once complete, the final grades and determinations will be shared with the student to conclude their oral defense. The QEC will return this completed form to the Program Director or designee, who will share it with the student.

## RESEARCH QUESTION, INNOVATION AND SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

## USE AND INTEGRATION OF 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"> <li>• Theoretical framework is unclear, or misunderstood.</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current theories are connected to but provide only a minimal framework for the research.</li> <li>• The research connects back to theoretical bases in some way; little or no discussion of the impact on existing theories their research implies</li> </ul>	<p>Current theories are connected to and provide a clear framework for the research; well-versed in theory.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear connection between theory and research questions, gaps identified in existing theories; discusses the impact on existing theories their research implies</li> </ul>	<p>Current theories are connected to and provide a very clear framework for the research; research very well-versed in theory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very clear connection between theory and research questions, gaps identified in existing theories; discusses how project will fit with or impact existing theories</li> </ul>	<p>Utilizes multiple demonstrably relevant theories or models; looks at the complementarity and tensions of competing theories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses theory to generate questions, answers, and considers their implications; addresses how their project will contribute to, support, or change established theory</li> </ul>

**COMMUNICATION, WRITING & 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"> <li>• More development of academic speech and writing skills necessary; Tone is not professional</li> <li>• Syntax or vocabulary may not be well developed; writing may be difficult to read or understand; errors of spelling, punctuation or formatting</li> <li>• Overreliance on jargon or the candidate may not have a command of the field's lexicon</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writing and speech are somewhat developed and professional</li> <li>• Spelling, punctuation, grammar, in general, meet program and institutional standards; formatting is adequate</li> <li>• The lexicon of the respective field is understood and largely used properly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The tone of writing and speech is professional; scholarly style</li> <li>• Speech and writing are grammatically correct, fluid, and clear; vocabulary and syntax are accurate; formatting is accurate</li> <li>• Lexicon of the field is clearly explained and defined</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate's written 'voice' is professional and clear. Speech is professional and very strong</li> <li>• Speech and writing are fluid, precise, and clear; vocabulary and syntax are mature; scholarly style and format are accurately used</li> <li>• Words are well chosen; and express the intended meaning precisely. Presentation is appropriately formal and information is delivered with fluency. Demonstrates a thorough grasp of professional language and concepts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate's written 'voice' is heard and yields a definitive, clear presence. Speech is professional and commanding</li> <li>• Speech and writing are fluid, precise, and clear; vocabulary and syntax are mature; scholarly style and format are accurately used</li> <li>• Lexicon of the field is expertly explained and defined</li> <li>• Presentation is clear, logical, and organized. Listener can follow line of reasoning. Listeners gain insights.</li> </ul>

**RESEARCH STRATEGY, METHODS AND APPROACHES** (APA Domain Specific Knowledge Category)

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

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

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/ADoesnot 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/ADoesnot 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/ADoesnot 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>
<b>Element #1:</b> 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.	
<b>Element #2:</b> Conduct research or other scholarly activities.	

Qualifying Exam Committee comments for student concerning performance:

**Written Product:**

**Oral Presentation:**

**Defense:**

<b>Final Determination of Qualifying Exam (written grant proposal, oral presentation &amp; oral defense)</b>
--

\_\_\_\_ **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 timeline and deliverables:** \_\_\_\_\_

If needed, modification may be suggested for all parts or just for certain parts of the qualifying exam:

**IF APPROVED ABOVE: Complete the next section.**

**2. Would the reviewer recommend subsequent submission to granting agency?**

\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_ Yes, with modifications/revisions (detail out below)

\_\_\_\_ No (detail out below)

**Reviewer's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Confidential Comments to Program Director:**

Director or Acting Director Signature of Approval and Date: \_\_\_\_\_