ABSTRACT

The traditional "black box" approach to evaluation of assignments in educational research courses has at least two effects: (1) products that fail to meet the expectations of the instructor; and (2) frustration on the part of students who do not know exactly what is expected, and who are consequently confused about or disappointed in the grades they receive. Solutions to these problems include developing checklists and rubrics that break complex tasks, such as writing research proposals and master's theses, into component parts, using the checklists and rubrics to guide students' work, and then grading the students on how well they complete each component. Included in the appendix are sample checklists for scoring content, quality of writing, and adherence to American Psychological Association (APA) style in research proposals, as well as rubrics for master's theses and group research project presentations. (Author/SLD)
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Abstract

The traditional "black box" approach to evaluation of assignments in educational research courses has at least two effects: 1) products that fail to meet the expectations of the instructor and 2) frustration on the part of students who do not know exactly what is expected and who are consequently confused about or disappointed in the grades they receive. Solutions to this problem include developing checklists and rubrics which break complex tasks, such as writing research proposals and masters' theses, into component parts, using the checklists and rubrics to guide students' work, and then grading the students on how well they complete each component.

Included in the appendix are sample checklists for scoring content, quality of writing, and adherence to APA style in research proposals, as well as rubrics for masters' theses and group research project presentations.
IMPROVING ACHIEVEMENT AND STUDENT SATISFACTION THROUGH CRITERIA-BASED EVALUATION: CHECKLISTS AND RUBRICS IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH CLASSROOMS

The traditional “black box” approach to evaluation of assignments in educational research courses has at least two effects: 1) products that fail to meet the expectations of the instructor and 2) frustration on the part of students who do not know exactly what is expected of them and who are consequently confused about or disappointed in the grades they receive. Instructors can use scoring guides to share their expectations and to guide students in the processes of research, writing, and developing presentations; the guides can be used by students to direct their own work, assess their own achievement, and improve the quality of their work before the project is graded by the instructor. The “black box” is removed, revealing a not-too-mysterious collection of component parts, each well described and responsible for a portion of the total grade.

A scoring guide, as presented here, can take two forms: a structured checklist in which positive achievement of each of the components of the project is described, and a five-point scale is provided to rate agreement from strongly disagree to strongly agree; and a rubric, in which components of the project are listed, and standards of performance from low to high for each of the components are described. Included in the appendix are sample checklists for scoring content, quality of writing, and adherence to APA style in research proposals, as well as rubrics for masters’ theses and group research project presentations.

According to Mabry (1999), scoring guides “are translations of visions of desirable performance into specifications of exactly what is desirable.” They “specify
both *what* students should know and *how well* they should perform" (p. 674). They can be analytical or holistic (Luft, 1997; Tuttle, 1996). An analytical rubric “breaks the project into its many important parts and rates each part on a scale,” whereas a holistic rubric “rates a few skills without doing a microscopic analysis” (Tuttle, 1996, p. 31). The scoring guides included in the appendix are analytical.

Constructing a scoring guide involves enumerating the elements of the project that need to be assessed and determining and describing the elements of performance (Luft, 1997; Schack, 1994). Enumerating the elements of the project requires teachers to analyze their teaching/learning objectives in great detail. Shaffner (1997) states, “With each rubric I prepared, I came to learn more intimately exactly what I was teaching and what I expected my students to accomplish (p. 262). Scoring guides should be seen as always “in progress.” As instructors evaluate projects against established guides, they will inevitably adjust the criteria to enable students to produce even better products in the future.

Some instructors involve students in the development of scoring guides. According to Lundberg (1997), “students are more comfortable and realize their opinion is valued....They are more successful because they know what is expected, and most are willing to work to meet those expectations” (p. 53). Students, as well as instructors, are more aware of the essential elements of the required assignments.

Schack (1994) advocates providing models, or “benchmarks,” for various levels of performances. Such models should be used for instruction as well as for justification of grades.
Use of scoring guides involves extended interaction between teacher and student. According to Tuttle (1996), “the purpose of having a rubric is to be sure that both the student and the teacher understand and agree upon how the project will be evaluated” (p. 30). Jensen (1995) goes further in stating that with a rubric students not only know the outcome of the assessment, they also can “set goals toward the completion of the task” (p. 35). The assessment plan should help students “guide their work along the way” (Schack, 1994, p. 39), assisting in the process of completion of the project, not only in its scoring. Falk and Ort (1998) state that working with students in projects that have scoring guides helps teachers “understand the strategies and approaches students bring to their learning” (p. 62). The use of scoring guides thus focuses discussion between teacher and students, giving them a common purpose and a commonly-understood goal. Students are required to be self-directed, reflective learners, using the scoring guides to assess and improve their work.

A criticism of the use of scoring guides is that they can “set the boundaries of creative expression” (Mabry, 1999, p. 678). However, the projects assigned in educational research classrooms generally follow established formulas, and papers and presentations are often scored on specified criteria. Points can be allocated to emphasize some components of the project, such as integrity of research design, while de-emphasizing others, such as mechanics. Care can be taken as well to encourage students to see the scoring guides, especially rubrics, as setting the floor but not defining the ceiling.

In summary, scoring guides such as structured checklists and rubrics can be used in educational research classrooms to improve instruction and reduce student frustration.
They force instructors, and sometimes students, to delineate the important elements of each research assignment, and to describe the ideal. With the goal in mind, students can more comfortably determine the path they choose, and instructors can more successfully guide them along that path. In our experience, the use of scoring guides has resulted in quantum leaps in the quality of student output. And as the structure and use of our guides continues to improve, so do our students' work and their satisfaction with it—and us.
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SCORING CHECKLIST FOR CONTENT IN RESEARCH ARTICLE PROPOSALS

Tony Onwuegbuzie – RSCH 7100

Name(s) :
Semester: Date:

DIRECTIONS:

For each of the following statements, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree to the corresponding ratings of students, according to the scale below. (Note: Any statements which are not applicable will automatically receive a strongly agree rating.)

1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = neutral 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree

CONTENT

Title:

1. The title makes clear the population of interest. 1 2 3 4 5
2. The title makes clear the primary independent variable(s). 1 2 3 4 5
3. The title makes clear the dependent variable(s). 1 2 3 4 5
4. The title indicates the specific relationship between the major variables. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Vague, ambiguous, and emotional-laden terms have been avoided. 1 2 3 4 5

Summary

6. The rationale of the study is presented clearly. 1 2 3 4 5
7. The purpose of study is provided adequately. 1 2 3 4 5
8. The research questions and/or hypotheses are presented adequately. 1 2 3 4 5
9. The educational significance is delineated explicitly and clearly. 1 2 3 4 5
10. The sample size and/or group sizes are specified. 1 2 3 4 5
11. The major characteristics of the sample are delineated adequately. 1 2 3 4 5
12. The instrument(s) used are specified and/or described adequately. 1 2 3 4 5
13. The research design used is identified. 1 2 3 4 5
14. Procedures are described adequately. 1 2 3 4 5
15. The method of data analysis is described clearly. 1 2 3 4 5
16. It is specified clearly how and to whom the findings of the study will be delineated. 1 2 3 4 5
## Introduction/Literature Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. There is an explicit statement of the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The statement of the problem is stated in the opening paragraph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Adequate background information is given on the problem presented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Every statement of fact is supported by one or more citations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. All findings from previous research are supported by one or more citations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The literature review is comprehensive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. All references cited are relevant to the problem under investigation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Most of the sources are primary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Most of the references are current.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The review explicitly relates previous studies to the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. At least some of the references have been critically analyzed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The references have been compared and contrasted adequately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The review logically flows in such a way that the references least related to the problem are discussed first and the most related references are discussed last.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Clear connections are made between the present study and the previous research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. All theoretical terms and concepts are directly/operationally defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. A clear theoretical framework is presented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The review concludes with a brief summary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. A clear rationale for the study is provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. There is an explicit purpose statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The purpose statement flows logically from the rationale.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The purpose statement makes clear the population of interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The purpose statement makes clear the primary independent variable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The purpose statement makes clear the primary dependent variable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. The purpose statement indicates the specific relationship between the major variables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The purpose statement is consistent with the title.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The research problem is researchable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. One or more explicit research questions are presented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. The research questions follow the purpose statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Each research question makes clear the population of interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Each research question makes clear the primary independent variable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Each research question makes clear the primary dependent variable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Each hypothesis is stated clearly and concisely.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Each hypothesis states the expected relationship or difference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Each hypothesis makes clear the population of interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Each hypothesis makes clear the primary independent variable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Each hypothesis makes clear the primary dependent variable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Each hypothesis logically flows from the literature review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Each hypothesis logically flows from the theoretical framework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Each hypothesis is testable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. The educational significance is stated explicitly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method

Subjects

57. The (approximate) population size is provided. 1 2 3 4 5
58. The major characteristics of the population are described adequately. 1 2 3 4 5
59. The selection-eligibility criteria are described adequately. 1 2 3 4 5
60. If a sample will be selected, the sampling scheme is described clearly. 1 2 3 4 5
61. The use of volunteers was avoided. 1 2 3 4 5
62. The sample size is provided. 1 2 3 4 5
63. The sample size is adequate for the research design. 1 2 3 4 5
64. The major characteristics of the sample are described adequately. 1 2 3 4 5
65. Evidence of ethical considerations is provided adequately. 1 2 3 4 5

Instruments

66. An adequate rationale is given for the selection of each instrument. 1 2 3 4 5
67. Each instrument is described adequately in terms of purpose and content. 1 2 3 4 5
68. The developers of all instruments are specified clearly. 1 2 3 4 5
69. The format of the items is specified clearly and accurately. 1 2 3 4 5
70. The administration, scoring or tabulating, and interpretation procedures are fully described. 1 2 3 4 5
71. Citations are presented for any information provided pertaining to the development of all instruments (e.g., standardization/norming techniques). 1 2 3 4 5
72. Citations are provided for all statements of facts and research findings pertaining to the characteristics of the instruments. 1 2 3 4 5
73. Each instrument appears to be appropriate for measuring the intended variables. 1 2 3 4 5
74. Evidence is given that each instrument is appropriate for the sample. 1 2 3 4 5
75. Each instrument appears to be appropriate for the sample under study. 1 2 3 4 5
76. Information is provided which indicates that administrators, observers, or interviewers are/will be well trained. 1 2 3 4 5
77. Adequate information is provided which indicates that there is no administrator, observer, or interviewer effect. 1 2 3 4 5
78. Instrument reliability is described adequately in terms of type of coefficients 1 2 3 4 5
79. Instrument reliability is described adequately in terms of size of coefficients. 1 2 3 4 5
80. If appropriate, subtest reliabilities are provided adequately. 1 2 3 4 5
81. All instruments used appear to be sufficiently reliable. 1 2 3 4 5
82. Instrument validity is discussed and coefficients given if appropriate. 1 2 3 4 5
83. Citations are provided for all reliability and validity coefficients presented. 1 2 3 4 5
84. Each instrument is described in terms of content-related validity. 1 2 3 4 5
85. Each instrument is described in terms of criterion-related validity. 1 2 3 4 5
86. Each instrument is described in terms of construct-related validity. 1 2 3 4 5
87. All instruments used appear to be sufficiently valid for the study. 1 2 3 4 5
88. If an instrument was/will be designed specifically for the study, the
procedures involved in its development are described.

89. If an instrument was/will be designed specifically for the study, the
procedures involved in its validation are described.

90. If an instrument was/will be designed specifically for the study, the
administration, scoring or tabulating, and interpretation procedures
are fully described.

Procedure

91. All data collecting procedures are clearly described.

92. The study will be conducted for an appropriate length of time
for the predicted outcomes to be observed.

93. The training of data collectors is clearly described and adequate.

94. It appears that the data collection procedure will be conducted in
a consistent manner.

95. The ethical nature of data collection method is discussed adequately.

96. Procedures are described in sufficient detail to permit replication.

97. Citations are provided for any procedural information delineated which
are directly or indirectly based on previous research.

98. If a pilot study will be conducted, its execution and results are
described as well as its impact on the subsequent study.

99. The procedures provide sufficient control for internal validity.

100. The procedures provide sufficient control for external validity.

101. The research paradigm used is clear.

102. The research design is stated clearly.

103. Adequate justification is provided for the research design used.

104. The design appears to be appropriate for answering the research study or
testing the hypothesis.

105. If groups will be compared, it is clear whether subjects will be randomly
assigned to groups.

106. If groups will be compared, the number of subjects in each group
is stated.

107. If groups will be compared, the number of subjects per group used
appears to be adequate, or else an appropriate rationale is provided as to
why the group sizes are smaller than recommended.

108. If groups will be compared, it is clear whether subjects will be blinded
as to what treatment group they will be assigned.

109. If groups will be compared, it is clear whether the individual measuring the
outcome variable(s) will be blinded to the treatment group which the
subject will be assigned.

110. If groups will be compared and subjects will be aware of their group
assignment, it is clear that this knowledge will not affect their responses.

111. If groups will be compared and the individual measuring the outcome
variable will not be blinded, it is clear that the measurements
will not be biased by this.

112. If groups will be compared, the conditions of all experimental groups are described clearly and completely.

113. If groups will be compared, the conditions of all control groups are described clearly and completely.

114. If groups will be compared, subjects in all groups will receive the exact same experimental procedures and measurements, except for the treatment intervention.

115. If groups will be compared, it is clear that there will be strict adherence to the protocol in all groups.

116. If groups will be compared, any subject attrition is described clearly.

117. It is specified clearly how and to whom the findings will be delineated.

Limitations

118. At least two possible threats to internal validity are discussed adequately.

119. At least two possible threats to external validity are discussed adequately.

120. Each threat to internal validity discussed is labeled appropriately.

121. Each threat to external validity discussed is labeled appropriately.

122. Citations are provided when referring to threats to validity.

123. Discussion as to how to minimize each threat to internal validity is adequate.

124. Discussion as to how to minimize each threat to external validity is adequate.

125. All important threats to internal validity are discussed.

126. All important threats to external validity are discussed.

Analysis

127. An adequate description is provided as to the analysis intended to address the research question(s) and/or test the hypotheses.

128. The method of analysis is appropriate for testing the research hypothesis.

129. The significance level of the statistical tests is delineated.

Appendix

130. The appendix section contains samples of any researcher-made instruments.

131. All researcher-made instruments appear to be appropriate for the study.

132. The appendix section contains a timetable.

133. The timetable is clearly presented.

134. The timetable is consistent with information given in the procedure section.

135. The appendix section contains a budget.

136. The budget contains all important elements.
137. The budget is itemized appropriately.
138. The budget does not contain any inappropriate items.
139. The budget appears appropriate for the study proposed.
140. The appendix section contains an appropriate number of informed consent forms.
141. Each informed consent form is written appropriately for the intended reader.
142. Each informed consent form contains all important information.
143. The information provided in each informed consent form is consistent with the information provided in the methods section.
144. The appendix contains biographical information of all authors.
145. The biographical information provided is appropriate.

Number of Occurrences:

Number of points assigned

TOTAL SCORE FOR RESEARCH PROPOSAL OUT OF 725: 

PERCENTAGE SCORE FOR RESEARCH PROPOSAL: 

RUBRIC EQUIVALENT SCORE OUT OF 60: 
Research Proposal Scoring Checklist for Quality of Writing and Adherence to APA Style

Tony Onwuegbuzie -- RSCH 7100

Name(s):

Semester: Date:

DIRECTIONS:

For each of the following statements, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree, according to the scale below. (Note: Any statements which are not applicable will automatically receive a "strongly agree" rating).

1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=neutral 4=agree 5=strongly agree

Title Page

1. The title page contains all essential components. 1 2 3 4 5
2. The page header adheres strictly to APA guidelines. 1 2 3 4 5
3. The page header text is of high quality (e.g., grammar, punctuation). 1 2 3 4 5
4. The running head adheres strictly to APA guidelines. 1 2 3 4 5
5. The running head text is of high quality (e.g., grammar, punctuation). 1 2 3 4 5
6. The title adheres strictly to APA guidelines (including margins). 1 2 3 4 5
7. The title text is of high quality (e.g., grammar, punctuation). 1 2 3 4 5
8. The names of all authors adhere strictly to APA guidelines. 1 2 3 4 5
9. The names of all authors are spelled correctly. 1 2 3 4 5
10. The affiliations adhere strictly to APA guidelines. 1 2 3 4 5

Biographical Information

1. The biographies contain all the salient information. 1 2 3 4 5
2. All information presented in the biographies is appropriate. 1 2 3 4 5
3. All biographies are informative. 1 2 3 4 5
4. All biographies are comprehensive. 1 2 3 4 5
5. All biographies are written in strict adherence to APA guidelines (including margins). 1 2 3 4 5
6. All biographies are clearly written throughout. 1 2 3 4 5
7. The writing in the biography section is of high quality (e.g., grammar, punctuation). 1 2 3 4 5
### Abstract/Summary

1. The summary contains all the salient information.  
2. No inappropriate information is presented in the summary  
   (including repetitive information).  
3. The summary is informative.  
4. The summary is an accurate reflection of the research proposal.  
5. The summary is comprehensive.  
6. The summary is written in strict adherence to APA guidelines  
   (including margins).  
7. The summary is clearly written throughout.  
8. The writing in the summary is of high quality (e.g., grammar, punctuation).

### Introduction/Literature Review

1. This section of the proposal contains all the salient information.  
2. No inappropriate information is presented in this section of the proposal  
   (including repetitive information).  
3. This section of the proposal is informative.  
4. This section of the proposal is entirely accurate.  
5. This section of the proposal is comprehensive.  
6. This section of the proposal is written in strict adherence to APA guidelines.  
   (including margins)  
7. This section of the proposal is clearly written throughout.  
8. The writing in this section of the proposal is of high quality  
   (e.g., grammar, punctuation).

### Method

**Subjects**

1. This section of the proposal contains all the salient information.  
2. No inappropriate information is presented in this section of the proposal  
   (including repetitive information).  
3. This section of the proposal is informative.  
4. This section of the proposal is entirely accurate.  
5. This section of the proposal is comprehensive.  
6. This section of the proposal is written in strict adherence to APA guidelines.  
   (including margins)  
7. This section of the proposal is clearly written throughout.  
8. The writing in this section of the proposal is of high quality  
   (e.g., grammar, punctuation).

**Instruments:**

1. This section of the proposal contains all the salient information.  
2. No inappropriate information is presented in this section of the proposal  
   (including repetitive information).  
3. This section of the proposal is informative.
4. This section of the proposal is entirely accurate.

5. This section of the proposal is comprehensive.

6. This section of the proposal is written in strict adherence to APA guidelines.
   (including margins)

7. This section of the proposal is clearly written throughout.

8. The writing in this section of the proposal is of high quality
   (e.g., grammar, punctuation).

Procedure:
1. This section of the proposal contains all the salient information.

2. No inappropriate information is presented in this section of the proposal
   (including repetitive information).

3. This section of the proposal is informative.

4. This section of the proposal is entirely accurate.

5. This section of the proposal is comprehensive.

6. This section of the proposal is written in strict adherence to APA guidelines.
   (including margins)

7. This section of the proposal is clearly written throughout.

8. The writing in this section of the proposal is of high quality
   (e.g., grammar, punctuation).

Limitations:
1. This section of the proposal contains all the salient information.

2. No inappropriate information is presented in this section of the proposal
   (including repetitive information).

3. This section of the proposal is informative.

4. This section of the proposal is entirely accurate.

5. This section of the proposal is comprehensive.

6. This section of the proposal is written in strict adherence to APA guidelines.
   (including margins)

7. This section of the proposal is clearly written throughout.

8. The writing in this section of the proposal is of high quality
   (e.g., grammar, punctuation).

Analysis:
1. This section of the proposal contains all the salient information.

2. No inappropriate information is presented in this section of the proposal
   (including repetitive information).

3. This section of the proposal is informative.

4. This section of the proposal is entirely accurate.

5. This section of the proposal is comprehensive.

6. This section of the proposal is written in strict adherence to APA guidelines.
   (including margins)

7. This section of the proposal is clearly written throughout.
8. The writing in this section of the proposal is of high quality (e.g., grammar, punctuation).

Reference List

1. All citations provided in the text are contained in the reference list. 1 2 3 4 5
2. All citations provided in the reference list are contained in the text. 1 2 3 4 5
3. The names of all authors provided in the text are consistent with the names presented in the reference list. 1 2 3 4 5
4. All authors are presented in strict adherence to APA guidelines. 1 2 3 4 5
5. All titles are written accurately and in strict adherence to APA guidelines. 1 2 3 4 5
6. All publication dates in the reference list are consistent with those in the text and are written in strict adherence to APA guidelines. (including margins) 1 2 3 4 5
7. All sources are written accurately and in strict adherence to APA guidelines. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Every aspect of the reference list strictly adheres to APA guidelines. (including margins) 1 2 3 4 5

Appendix

1. This section of the proposal contains all the salient information. 1 2 3 4 5
2. All information presented in this section of the proposal is appropriate. 1 2 3 4 5
3. This section of the proposal is informative. 1 2 3 4 5
4. This section of the proposal is entirely accurate. 1 2 3 4 5
5. This section of the proposal is comprehensive. 1 2 3 4 5
6. This section of the proposal is written in strict adherence to APA guidelines. (including margins) 1 2 3 4 5
7. This section of the proposal is clearly written throughout. 1 2 3 4 5
8. The writing in this section of the proposal is of high quality (e.g., grammar, punctuation). 1 2 3 4 5

Number of Occurrences:

Number of points assigned

Total Score out of 445:

Percentage Score:

Rubric Equivalent Score out of 40:
EVALUATION FORM FOR PRESENTATIONS
OF RESEARCH PROPOSALS
RSCH 7100

Names:

Scoring Key: Strongly Disagree = SD; Disagree = D; Not Observed = N; Agree = A; and, Strongly Agree = SA.

Content (3.5 points)

The introduction provided a substantial link from the audience's current knowledge to the presentation content.

The importance of the topic was made clear.

Links to the audience's knowledge were made throughout the body of the presentation.

The presenters covered important concepts, research findings, researchers, and methodological issues in the field.

The critique provided of current research reflected the expected level of research sophistication for students at this level.

Clear citations of major articles were provided for the audience.

Questions by the audience were handled appropriately, professionally, and reflected knowledge and understanding of the area.

Comments:

Organization (2.5 points)

The purpose of the presentation was stated clearly.

The introduction clearly laid out an outline of the organization to follow.

The important points were presented lucidly.

Transitions between points made sense and aided the audience in following the arguments presented.

A concise conclusion occurred, providing a sense of closure.

Comments:
Evaluation Form EDR701 (cont.)

**Scoring Key:** Strongly Disagree = SD; Disagree = D; Not Observed = N; Agree = A; and, Strongly Agree = SA.

### Planning and Style (4 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The presentation in its entirety fit the allocated time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual aids (chalkboard, transparencies, handouts, PowerPoint, computer, video) were effective in their communication of information to the audience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual aids used were appropriate for the presentation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual aids used could be easily seen by all members of the audience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The body language (eye contact, use of gestures, posture, etc.) of presenters facilitated communication.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The verbal presentation communicated excitement and confidence.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presenters used examples, understandable to the audience, to illustrate concepts, especially ones that might be unfamiliar.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The demeanor of the presenters was appropriate for the setting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

---

**Points for Content**

**Points for Organization**

**Points for Planning and Style**

---

**Total Points (Out of 100 possible)**
Muskingum College  
EDUC 700/701  
Research Project Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Less than 20 pages</td>
<td>20 to 30 pages</td>
<td>More than 30 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
<td>Mismatch between problem and research questions/hypotheses</td>
<td>Some relationship between problem and research questions/hypotheses</td>
<td>Clear relationship between problem and research questions/hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superficial treatment of problem</td>
<td>Adequate treatment of problem; no obvious omissions</td>
<td>Demonstrates clear understanding of problem through inclusion of multiple perspectives and placement of problem in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topic not a substantive one in the field</td>
<td>Topic of documented educational importance</td>
<td>Topic of documented educational importance, well justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing one or more of the following components: Introduction, rationale for the study, statement of the problem, general hypotheses and/or research questions, definition of terms</td>
<td>All components included</td>
<td>All components included and clearly described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>Fewer than 15 sources</td>
<td>15-20 sources</td>
<td>More than 20 sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes only opinion and application articles</td>
<td>Includes primarily research and synthesis articles</td>
<td>Includes a variety of high quality sources, including articles from juried publications, interviews, correspondence, etc.; emphasis on research and synthesis articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No clear organization</td>
<td>Well organized</td>
<td>Organization pattern demonstrates understanding of prior research on the topic (historical, general to specific, segments of the topics, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 3</th>
<th>Mismatch between research methods and questions/hypotheses</th>
<th>Uses accepted standards of research methodology</th>
<th>Shows thorough understanding of research methodology used, including assumptions of statistical tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No limitations noted</td>
<td>Limitations noted</td>
<td>Thoughtful explanation of limitations and their justification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 4</th>
<th>Inaccurate or incomplete analysis</th>
<th>Adequate analysis</th>
<th>Insightful analysis and interpretation of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lacks adequate narrative description of findings</td>
<td>Includes adequate narrative description of findings</td>
<td>Clear and complete narrative description of findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks appropriate charts and/or tables</td>
<td>Tables and charts adequately support written research findings</td>
<td>Tables and charts enhance written research findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td>Lacks summary</td>
<td>Summary adequately covers all components of project</td>
<td>Clear, concise, and thorough summary; publication-quality abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks conclusion or conclusion not supported by the data</td>
<td>Conclusions supported by the data</td>
<td>Insightful conclusions, well supported by the data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks implications, or implications inconsistent with findings</td>
<td>Includes relevant implications for educators</td>
<td>Includes a variety of implications for relevant audiences: educators, students, parents, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations not addressed</td>
<td>Superficial treatment of limitations</td>
<td>Insightful treatment of limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results not tied to literature review</td>
<td>Results tied to literature review</td>
<td>Results compared and contrasted with findings of prior researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks recommendations for future research, or recommendations are inconsistent with findings</td>
<td>Recommendations for future research are consistent with research findings</td>
<td>Thorough exploration of ideas for future research based on the research project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style/Organization</th>
<th>Contains spelling and grammatical errors</th>
<th>Contains no spelling or grammatical errors</th>
<th>Contains no spelling or grammatical errors, demonstrates creative use of language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not follow APA style</td>
<td>Follows APA style</td>
<td>Conscientiously follows APA style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks or uses quotations and/or citations ineffectively</td>
<td>Uses quotations and citations appropriately</td>
<td>Uses quotations and citations to enhance written narrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes sketchy descriptions</td>
<td>Includes adequate descriptions</td>
<td>Uses &quot;thick description&quot; where appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization plan inconsistent</td>
<td>Organizational plan obvious throughout</td>
<td>Organization plan enhances project presentation, promotes ease in reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not maintain focus on research problem</td>
<td>Well written with smooth transitions</td>
<td>Well written with smooth transitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td>Less than 20 pages</td>
<td>20 to 30 pages</td>
<td>More than 30 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
<td>Mismatch between problem and research questions/ hypotheses</td>
<td>Some relationship between problem and research questions/ hypotheses</td>
<td>Clear relationship between problem and research questions/ hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superficial treatment of problem</td>
<td>Adequate treatment of problem; no obvious omissions</td>
<td>Demonstrates clear understanding of problem through inclusion of multiple perspectives and placement of problem in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topic not a substantive one in the field</td>
<td>Topic of documented educational importance</td>
<td>Topic of documented educational importance, well justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing one or more of the following components: Introduction, rationale for the study, statement of the problem, general hypotheses and/or research questions, definition of terms</td>
<td>All components included</td>
<td>All components included and clearly described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>Fewer than 15 sources</td>
<td>15-20 sources</td>
<td>More than 20 sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Includes only opinion and application articles</td>
<td>Includes primarily research and synthesis articles</td>
<td>Includes a variety of high quality sources, including articles from juried publications, interviews, correspondence, etc.; emphasis on research and synthesis articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No clear organization</td>
<td>Well organized</td>
<td>Organization pattern demonstrates understanding of prior research on the topic (historical, general to specific, segments of the topics, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 3</th>
<th>Mismatch between research methods and questions/ hypotheses</th>
<th>Uses accepted standards of research methodology</th>
<th>Shows thorough understanding of research methodology used, including assumptions of statistical tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No limitations noted</td>
<td>Limitations noted</td>
<td>Thoughtful explanation of limitations and their justification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 4</th>
<th>Inaccurate or incomplete analysis</th>
<th>Adequate analysis</th>
<th>Insightful analysis and interpretation of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacks adequate narrative description of findings</td>
<td>Includes adequate narrative description of findings</td>
<td>Clear and complete narrative description of findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacks appropriate charts and/or tables</td>
<td>Tables and charts adequately support written research findings</td>
<td>Tables and charts enhance written research findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td>Lacks summary</td>
<td>Summary adequately covers all components of project</td>
<td>Clear, concise, and thorough summary; publication-quality abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacks conclusion or conclusion not supported by the data</td>
<td>Conclusions supported by the data</td>
<td>Insightful conclusions, well supported by the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacks implications, or implications inconsistent with findings</td>
<td>Includes relevant implications for educators</td>
<td>Includes a variety of implications for relevant audiences: educators, students, parents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations not addressed</td>
<td>Superficial treatment of limitations</td>
<td>Insightful treatment of limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Results not tied to literature review</td>
<td>Results tied to literature review</td>
<td>Results compared and contrasted with findings of prior researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacks recommendations for future research, or recommendations are inconsistent with findings</td>
<td>Recommendations for future research are consistent with research findings</td>
<td>Thorough exploration of ideas for future research based on the research project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style/Organization</th>
<th>Contains spelling and grammatical errors</th>
<th>Contains no spelling or grammatical errors</th>
<th>Contains no spelling or grammatical errors, demonstrates creative use of language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not follow APA style</td>
<td>Follows APA style</td>
<td>Conscientiously follows APA style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacks or uses quotations and/or citations ineffectively</td>
<td>Uses quotations and citations appropriately</td>
<td>Uses quotations and citations to enhance written narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Includes sketchy descriptions</td>
<td>Includes adequate descriptions</td>
<td>Uses &quot;thick description&quot; where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization plan inconsistent</td>
<td>Organizational plan obvious throughout</td>
<td>Organization plan enhances project presentation, promotes ease in reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not maintain focus on research problem</td>
<td></td>
<td>Well written with smooth transitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Group Presentation Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 points</th>
<th>10 points</th>
<th>20 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length (x .5)</strong></td>
<td>&lt; 5 minutes</td>
<td>5 to 15 minutes</td>
<td>About 20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation (x .5)</strong></td>
<td>One person speaks, others stand around</td>
<td>Two persons actively involved</td>
<td>All members actively involved; speakers acknowledge contributions of group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of the Study</strong></td>
<td>Not stated; worthless</td>
<td>Stated but unclear or vague</td>
<td>Clearly stated; important, timely, interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Review</strong></td>
<td>Non-existent</td>
<td>Another study mentioned</td>
<td>Contributions from other studies (ideas, questions, instruments) stated and acknowledged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td>Not linked to purpose; inappropriate</td>
<td>Weakly linked to purpose</td>
<td>Effective attempt to answer research question; may be primarily qualitative, quantitative, or mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Ignored; unrelated to purpose or methodology</td>
<td>Not clearly or thoroughly reported</td>
<td>Clear and thorough reporting of findings; objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion (x 1.5)</strong></td>
<td>Non-existent</td>
<td>Not well related to results; analysis not thorough</td>
<td>Conclusions and implications well supported by the data; implications useful for educators; suggestions for further research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience Appeal</strong></td>
<td>Audience asleep at conclusion</td>
<td>Most audience members able to pay attention throughout</td>
<td>Audience members exhilarated by scintillating facts, stories, metaphor; outstanding audiovisuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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