

**PhD Assessment Rubric**  
**Please give student score based on the following criterion**

Student's name: \_\_\_\_\_

Examiner: \_\_\_\_\_

Criterion	Missing or Unacceptable (Score=4)	Developing (Score=6)	Accomplished (Score=8)	Exemplary (Score=10)	Score
<b>1. Title and Abstract</b>	Title or abstract were omitted or inappropriate given the problem, research questions, and method.	Title or abstract lacks relevance or fails to offer appropriate details about the educational issue, variables, context, or methods of the proposed study.	Title and abstract are relevant, offering details about the proposed research study.	Title and abstract are informative, succinct, and offer sufficiently specific details about the educational issue, variables, context, and proposed methods of the study.	
<b>2. Introduction: Motivation, Problem, Research Significance, &amp; Purpose of the Study</b>	Statement of the problem, significance, purpose, questions/ hypotheses, or definitions of constructs and variables were omitted or inappropriate.	Although a research issue is identified, the statement is too broad or the description fails to establish the importance of the problem area. Connections to the literature are unclear, debatable, or insignificant.	Identifies a relevant research issue. Connections established with the literature.	Articulates a specific, significant problem by connecting that problem to the literature. Statements of purpose flows logically from the introduction. The research problem and the statement of significance clearly	
<b>3. Introduction: Research Questions, Definitions, Assumptions, Limitations</b>	Research questions, definitions, assumptions and limitations were omitted or inappropriate given the context, purpose, or methods of the study.	Elements are poorly formed, ambiguous, or not logically connected to the description of the problem, purpose, or research methods	Research questions are stated, connected to the research issue, and supported by the literature. Constructs have been identified and variables have been operationally defined. Assumptions and limitations are present.	Articulates clear, reasonable, and succinct research questions and definitions given the purpose, design, and methods of the proposed study. A thorough, reasonable discussion of assumptions and limitations is provided. All elements are mutually supportive.	
<b>4. Literature Review: General</b>	The review of literature was missing or consisted of nonresearch based articles. Propositions were irrelevant, inaccurate, or inappropriate.	A key construct or variable was not connected to the research literature. Selected literature was from unreliable sources. Literary supports were vague or ambiguous.	Key constructs and variables were connected to relevant, reliable theoretical and research literature.	Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature. Attention is given to different perspectives, conditionalities, threats to validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	
<b>5. Literature Review: Organization</b>	The structure of the literature review is incomprehensible, irrelevant, or confusing.	The structure of the literature review is weak; it does not identify important ideas, constructs or variables related to the research purpose, questions, or context.	A workable structure has been presented for presenting relevant literature related to the constructs and variables of the proposed study.	Structure is intuitive and sufficiently grounded to each of the key constructs and variables of the proposed study.	
<b>6. Methodology: Research Design</b>	The research design is inappropriate or has not been identified and or described using standard terminology. Limitations and assumptions are omitted.	The research design is confusing or incomplete given the research questions and sampling strategy. Important limitations and assumptions have not been identified.	The research design has been identified and described in sufficiently detailed terms. Some limitations and assumptions have been identified.	The purpose, questions, and design are mutually supportive and coherent. Attention has been given to eliminating alternative explanations and controlling extraneous variables. Appropriate and important limitations and assumptions	

				have been clearly stated.	
<b>7. Methodology: Context, Population, and Sampling/ Software Development Methodology (SDM)</b>	The context, population, or sample was not identified or described. The sampling/SDM strategy was inappropriate for the research questions.	The description of the context, population, or sampling strategy/SDM was confusing, lacked relevance to the purpose, was incomplete, or failed to identify specific quantitative or qualitative details.	The context, population, sampling strategy/SDM was adequately identified and described. The size of the population, sample, and comparison groups was identified.	The description of the context/SDM population was meaningful, including both quantitative and qualitative description. The sampling process was reasonable to recruit a representative sample of the population. Attention was given to controlling for extraneous factors and sampling error.	
<b>8. Methods: Instruments/ Procedures</b>	Instruments and observation protocols for gathering data were not identified by name or described in a meaningful way. Validity and reliability information was omitted. Procedures for treatments and gathering data were omitted.	Description of the instruments (purpose, form, and elements) or observation protocols were confusing, incomplete, or lacked relevance to the research questions and variables. Procedures (permissions, treatments, and data gathering) were confusing, incomplete, or lacked relevance to purpose, research questions, or sampling strategy.	Instruments and observation protocols were identified by name and described. Procedures for implementing the study (permissions, treatments, and data gathering) were identified and described in a chronological fashion.	Descriptions of instruments and observation protocols included purpose statements, type and number of items, and type of scores. Reasonable evidence of validity and reliability was presented. Procedures were thorough, manageable, coherent, and powerful for generating valid and reliable data. Procedures were chronological and replicable, with clear distinctions between researcher and participant actions. Clear and reasonable strategies were presented for seeking permissions and for the ethical treatment of human subjects.	
<b>9: Methods: Data Analysis/ Initial Findings/Pilot Study</b>	Analytical methods (descriptive, inferential test, and significance level) were missing or inappropriately aligned with data and research design.	Descriptive or inferential methods were confusing, incomplete or lacked relevance to the research questions, data, or research design.	Both descriptive and inferential methods were identified. Level of significance was stated.	Analytical methods were sufficiently specific, clear, and appropriate given the research questions, research design, and scale of measurement, and type of distribution.	
<b>10. Manuscript/ Proposal: English, Composition, References, Timelines</b>	Failure to apply standard rules for manuscript presentation, English composition, and timeliness.	Weak, incomplete, ambiguous, or inconsistent application of APA (2001), manuscript organization, rules of English composition. Delivery was delinquent.	Manuscript conformed to most standards of English composition and APA (2001) guidelines. Timeliness of delivery was nacceptable.	Consistently applied assignment, English composition, and APA (2001) guidelines, especially in regards to citations, references, headings, table of contents, page numbers, and running headers.	
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>					

Assessment Result <i>(for office use only)</i>	
---	--