Rubric for Dissertation

Candidate: _____ Student ID: _____ Defense Date_____
Project Title:_____

DAC Chair:_____
Mentor _____ _____
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 dissertation.

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 dissertation and oral exam milestone. It is expected that a dissertation 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 OEC:

1) Please fill out the complete form. *Do not leave blanks.*

2) Each reviewer should complete a separate rubric with their initial thoughts from their review of the written dissertation document and bring this with them to the defense.

3) After the oral defense, the OEC *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 OEC and submitted to the program for competency tracking.

4) 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 determinations will be shared verbally with the student to conclude their oral defense. The OEC will return this completed form to the Program Director or designee, who will share it with the student.

ABSTRACT

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
• Introduction to the problem or findings not developed in a clear way • Findings, methodology, and/or significance not well organized	• The abstract has an introduction to the finding • Statement of the problem, findings, methodology, and/or significance may need some additional organization	• Organized well • States the research problem, findings, methodology, and significance well	• Clear and concise • States the problem, findings, methodology, and significance very well	• Clear and concise; smoothly draws the reader in • States the problem, findings, methodology, and significance extremely well

RESEARCH QUESTION OR THESIS THEME

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
• 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	• Research question is developed, but not as thoroughly • The question may be original but could be improved • Significance to the field is somewhat supported	• Research question is well developed • The question is original and innovative • Significance is clear, well-situated to advance existing knowledge	• Research question very well developed • The question is clear, original and innovative • Significant in its potential contribution, potential to address critical issues within the field	• Research question extremely well developed • The question is exceptionally original and innovative • Very 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
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*

• 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	• 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	• A clear review that draws connections and integrates literature well • 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	An insightful review that draws connections and integrates literature in a new way • Includes strong canonical and current relevant literature and uses the literature to discuss scholarly trends and to develop clear hypotheses • Draws a very clear relationship to the gap in literature their project will address	• 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
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
• 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	• 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	• 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	• Current theories are connected to and provide a very clear framework for the research; research very well-versed in theory • Very clear connection between theory and research questions, gaps identified in existing theories; discusses how project will fit with or impact existing theories	• 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

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

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
• 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	• 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 largely used properly	• The tone of writing and speech is professional; scholarly style • Speech and writing are grammatically correct, fluid, and clear; vocabulary and syntax are accurate; formatting is accurate • Lexicon of the field is clearly explained and defined	• The candidate's written 'voice' is professional and clear. Speech is professional and very strong • Speech and writing are fluid, precise, and clear; vocabulary and syntax are mature; scholarly style and format are accurately used • 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.	• 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 expertly explained and defined • Presentation is clear, logical, and organized. Listener can follow line of reasoning. Listeners gain insights.

RESEARCH STRATEGY, METHODS AND APPROACHES:

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
●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	●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	●Shows adequate methodology and study design ● Study biases and/or limitations within the study are adequately understood and discussed	●High quality or innovative methodology and study design ● Study biases and/or limitations within the study are clearly understood and discussed	●Very high quality, innovative study design; design of study manifests a deep understanding of the field ● Broad discussion of the limitations of the methodology, study design, and potential biases inherent in study

limitations within the study design ● A clear connection between the methodology and the data analysis either not discussed or not clearly made.	● Choice of methodology, approach and study design minimally acceptable; connection discussed but may not be clearly developed. ●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	●Discussion of connection between methodology and data analysis is adequate. ●Analysis plan is complete and connects to the research question and theoretical framework	●Discussion of connection between methodology and data analysis clear and concise. ●Analysis plan is thorough, complete and well-connected to the research question and theoretical framework	● 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. ●Analysis plan is rigorous, nuanced, and transparent.

THEORETICAL ANALYSIS, DISCUSSION and INTERPRETATION

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
•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	•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.	•The analysis connects back to theory in a clear connection. •The data are adequately considered and validity of the findings are addressed adequately.	•Analysis is thorough, complete and well-connected to the research question and theoretical framework •Validity of the findings are addressed rigorously.	•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.

•Validity of the findings may not be addressed.				

CONCLUSIONS

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
•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 fit the findings.	•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.	•Summarizes the results and situates findings in reference to the literature and their significance •Some discussion of the 'gap' in the literature their study addresses.	•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 the study addresses and presents a compelling argument as to how their study fulfills this area.	•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.

DIVERSITY and APPLICATION

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
• Fails to address questions of diversity where such considerations are clearly relevant to the current research • Makes claims that are inappropriately universalizing	• Discusses relevant issues of diversity but could provide greater depth or nuance • Recognizes the existence of multiple frameworks and epistemologies but	• Provides analysis of some of the diversity considerations and debates that are relevant to the topic, methodology, and conclusions • Recognizes the existence of multiple	• Provides strong analysis of the diversity considerations and debates that are relevant to the topic, methodology, and conclusions • Recognizes the existence of multiple	• 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
does not address these sufficiently	frameworks and epistemologies and avoids inappropriately universalizing results	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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

APA Profession Wide Competency (i) Research	**Global rating 1-5**
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.	

DAC comments for student concerning performance:

Written Product:

Oral Presentation:

Defense:

Final Determination of Dissertation (written dissertation, oral presentation & oral defense)

____**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 dissertation.

3. Would the reviewers recommend subsequent submission for publication?
___Yes
___Yes, with modifications/revisions (detail out below)
___No (detail out below)

Chair Name:

Chair Signature and Date:

Reviewer Name:

Reviewer Signature and Date:

Reviewer Name:

Reviewer Signature and Date:

Reviewer Name:

Reviewer Signature and Date:

Reviewer Name:

Reviewer Signature and Date:

Confidential Comments to Program Director: