

Table 5. Final Dissertation Document Evaluation Rubric and Ratings

INSTRUCTIONS: Please use this form during Dissertation Committee deliberations and rate each student's performance in each of the five categories in the columns below. The feedback should be provided to the student and the form submitted with the Final Orals Results Form (Appendix D) to the Program Administrator.

Scoring Level	Introduction and Review of the Literature (including Lit Table or Text Appendices)	Methods, Analysis, and Results	Discussion	APA Format	Writing
4 Exemplary	In addition to meeting the requirements of "3," the review of the literature demonstrates an integrated and high-level mastery of relevant scholarly work and provides a strong and specific foundation for the research conducted; review has the potential to be a stand-alone document	In addition to meeting the requirements of "3," the sophistication and rigor of the methods and analysis are of publishable quality with few revisions necessary; presentation of the results reflect a strong mastery of the findings of the study	In addition to meeting the requirements of "3," the Discussion demonstrates highly impressive critical thinking skills and presents analysis with great depth and detail; Substantial integration of existing literature.	In addition to meeting the requirements of "3," the document demonstrates mastery of and highly detailed attention to APA format and style.	In addition to meeting the requirements of "3," the document demonstrates outstanding, publication-quality, academic writing skills; the document is an excellent model of the language and conventions expected of scholarly writing.
3 Strong	The review is very well-organized, comprehensive and demonstrates a strong understanding of the conceptual and empirical foundations for the study; Relevant and current literature is reviewed with solid conceptual and methodological critique included	Strong execution of the methodology as proposed. Analysis conducted comprehensively with excellent attention to accuracy and detail; Results are presented clearly, accurately, and in a well-organized, understandable manner.	Comprehensive analysis of the results of the research conducted (strengths- contributions and weaknesses-limitations); Clearly conveys how current work connects to and builds upon existing research and practice; Strong critical thinking demonstrated through presentation of implications, future directions, recommendations, etc.	Rare errors in format and citations; the document demonstrates strong competence in the use of 6 th edition APA format.	Demonstrates clarity, coherence, logic, and flow in the presentation of content. Strong transitional segues are used to structure the document. Minimal to no errors in syntax, punctuation, and spelling. Negligible number of typographical errors.
2 Acceptable	The review includes most of the relevant and current research; minimal to no use of secondary citations; organized, follows a logical progression. Could benefit from more critique, greater depth and/or detail, and/or more extensive references.	Good execution of methodology and competent analysis conducted; provides solid rationale for any necessary deviations; Results are mostly clear and accurate in their presentation.	Includes attention to strengths and limitations of the study; Demonstrates good critical thinking skills; Connects results to existing literature	Mostly follows 6 th edition APA style. Most citations are correct. Reference list and in-text citations generally match. Tables and charts follow APA format.	The proposal mostly demonstrates coherence, logic, and flow in the presentation of content. Minimal number of syntax, punctuation, and spelling errors. Minimal number of typographical errors.
1 Weak	The review is missing key pieces of relevant research or includes unrelated literature; minimal critique. The citations are dated and/or numerous secondary citations are used. The review is disorganized.	Methodology not executed as proposed or deviations not explained; Superficial or incomplete analysis; Presentation of results is confusing and/or incomplete.	The Discussion is superficial and primarily restates the results; lacks analysis and critical thinking about the strengths and limitations of the study; clear connections to existing theory and scholarship are missing; few citations included	6 th edition APA style is not consistently followed; Citations are incorrect or missing; References list does not follow APA style.	The proposal lacks coherence, logic, and flow in the presentation of content. Numerous errors of syntax, punctuation, and spelling. Excessive typographical errors; Excessive reliance on quotations.
0 Unacceptable					
Rating Please check the numerical rating for each category	Introduction and Review of the Literature (including Lit Table or Text Appendices)	Methods, Analysis, and Results	Discussion	APA Format	Writing
	0 1 2 3 4 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	0 1 2 3 4 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	0 1 2 3 4 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	0 1 2 3 4 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	0 1 2 3 4 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>