

SDSU Ed.D. Written Dissertation Rubric

	1	2	3	4	5	Score
1 Introduction	Failed to convey project in context of literature. No rationale. Purpose was unfocused and unclear.	Vaguely conveyed project in context of literature. Weak rationale. Purpose was poorly focused and not sufficiently clear.	Project moderately conveyed in context of literature. Moderately clear rationale. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear.	Conveyed project within context of literature. Moderately-strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.	Clearly conveyed project within context of literature. Strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.	
2 Review of Literature	Failed to review literature relevant to the study. No synthesis, critique or rationale. Lacks description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.	Inadequate review of literature relevant to the study. Poorly organized. Weak rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Insufficient description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.	Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Moderately well organized. Some mention of the relatedness of scholarship. Moderately clear rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Somewhat focused description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.	Review of the literature is fairly well organized, acknowledging the relatedness of the research and scholarship. The rationale for including/excluding various theoretical perspectives/empirical studies are apparent. Includes description of research samples and methodologies.	Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Well organized, with nuanced critique regarding the relatedness of the research and scholarship reviewed. Includes specific criteria for inclusion/exclusion of various theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Clearly describes research samples, methodologies, & findings.	
3 Methods / Approach	Little or no description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Inadequate description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Moderate or excessive description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Most detail included/slightly excessive detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Appropriate detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	
4 Results / Outcomes	Absence of pertinent results. Table/figures are absent or inappropriate, not labeled, and no legend.	Few pertinent results. Table/figures are inappropriate or incomplete, poorly labeled, and inadequate legend.	Some pertinent results not reported; results presented in clear and concise manner. Table/figures generally labeled appropriately and included legend.	Most pertinent results reported and in fairly clear and concise manner. Table/figures labeled appropriately and included legend.	All pertinent results reported and in clear and concise manner. Table/figures are labeled appropriately and included legend.	
5 Discussion and Summary	Little or no discussion of project findings/outcomes. Displayed poor grasp of understanding. Conclusion/summary not supported by findings/outcomes.	Major topics or concepts inaccurately described. Considerable relevant discussion missing. Conclusions/summary not entirely supported by findings/outcomes.	Discussion is too brief/excessive, needs to be more concise of major findings/outcomes. Several inaccuracies and omissions. Conclusions/summary generally based on findings/outcomes.	Discussion sufficient and with few errors, though not particularly engaging or thought-provoking. Greater foundation needed from past work in area. Conclusions/summary based on outcomes and appropriate, but included no recommendations.	Brief and concise discussion of major findings/outcomes. Was superior, accurate, engaging, and thought-provoking. Conclusions/summaries and recommendations appropriate and clearly based on outcomes.	
6 Writing Quality	The dissertation lacks clarity and precision. Sentences are poorly constructed and confusing. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling reflects poor grasp of basic writing conventions. Narrative absent. Incorrect use of 5th edition APA.	The dissertation is unclear throughout. Frequent errors in word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The narrative discussion lacks focus and coherence. Frequent errors in use of 5th edition APA conventions.	The dissertation is moderately clear. Several errors in word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The narrative lacks focus. Uneven application of 5th edition APA conventions.	The dissertation is written with clarity and precision. Writing is understandable. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling are adequate. The narrative is logical and coherent. Mostly correct use of 5th edition APA.	The dissertation is written with great clarity and precision. Each sentence is understandable. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling are excellent. The narrative is logical and coherent. Correct use of 5th edition APA.	

Comments : [This rubric was adapted from the San Diego State University Student Research Symposium rubric.]

Student's Name: _____

Reviewer's Name: _____

Date: _____