

DPELFS Written Dissertation Rubric

Final Defense

	1	2	3	4	5	Score
Introduction	Failed to convey project in context of literature. No rationale. Purpose was unfocused and unclear. Was not comprehensive.	Vaguely conveyed project in context of literature. Weak rationale. Purpose was poorly focused and not sufficiently clear. Was not comprehensive.	Project moderately conveyed in context of literature. Moderately clear rationale. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear. Was not comprehensive.	Conveyed project within context of literature. Moderately-strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused. Was somewhat comprehensive.	Clearly conveyed project within context of literature. Strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused. Was comprehensive.	
Review of Literature	Failed to review literature relevant to the study. No synthesis, critique or rationale. Lacks description of research samples, methodologies, & findings. Was not comprehensive.	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. Was not comprehensive.	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. Was not comprehensive.	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. Was somewhat comprehensive.	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. Was comprehensive.	
Methods / Approach	Little or no description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Was not comprehensive.	Inadequate description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Was not comprehensive.	Moderate or excessive description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Was not comprehensive.	Most detail included/slightly excessive detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/ approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Was somewhat comprehensive.	Appropriate detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Was comprehensive.	
Results / Outcomes	Absence of pertinent results. Table/figures are absent or inappropriate, not labeled, and no legend. Was not comprehensive.	Few pertinent results. Table/figures are inappropriate or incomplete, poorly labeled, and inadequate legend. Was not comprehensive.	Some pertinent results not reported; results presented in clear and concise manner. Table/figures generally labeled appropriately and included legend. Was not comprehensive.	Most pertinent results reported and in fairly clear and concise manner. Table/figures labeled appropriately and included legend. Was somewhat comprehensive.	All pertinent results reported and in clear and concise manner. Table/figures are labeled appropriately and included legend. Was comprehensive.	
Discussion/ Summary/ Conclusions	Little or no discussion of project findings/outcomes. Displayed poor grasp of understanding. Conclusion/summary not supported by findings/outcomes. Was not comprehensive.	Major topics or concepts inaccurately described. Considerable relevant discussion missing. Conclusions/summary not entirely supported by findings/outcomes. Was not comprehensive.	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. Was not comprehensive.	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. Was somewhat comprehensive.	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. Was comprehensive.	
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 6th edition APA. Was not comprehensive.	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 6th edition APA conventions. Was not comprehensive.	The dissertation is moderately clear. Several errors in word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The narrative lacks focus. Uneven application of 6th edition APA conventions. Was not comprehensive.	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 6th edition APA. Was somewhat comprehensive.	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 6th edition APA. Was comprehensive.	

ment:

Students Name: _____ Reviewer's Name _____ Date: _____

DPELFS Oral Dissertation Rubric

	1	2	3	4	5	Score
Organization	Lacked sequence in presentation or missing information. Presented too little/much material for allotted time.	Poor sequence or illogical presentation of information. Some relevant information not presented. Presentation not well timed.	Some information presented out of sequence. Had some pacing and timing problems.	Information presented nearly complete and relevant and presented in logical sequence. Pace and timing appropriate.	Information presented was complete and in logical order. Easy to follow. Very well-timed and well-paced.	
Originality	Problem/purpose lacked creativity or not new. Duplication of previous work. Design/approach inappropriate and/or ignored previous well-established work in area.	Problem/purpose limited in originality and creativity. Design/approach only marginally appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose moderately original or creative. Design/approach moderately appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose fairly original or creative. Design/approach appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose very creative or original with new and innovative ideas. Explored original topic and discovered new outcomes. Design/approach introduced new or expanded on established ideas.	
Significance/ Authenticity	Project has no significance/authenticity to field and will make no contribution.	Project has little relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make little contribution.	Project only moderate relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make a nominal contribution.	Project has fair relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make good contribution.	Project extremely relevant or has significant importance/authenticity to field and will make an important contribution.	
Discussion/ Summary/ Conclusions	Little or no discussion of project findings/outcomes. Displayed poor grasp of material. 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.	Few inaccuracies and omissions. Conclusions/summary generally supported by findings/outcomes.	Discussion sufficient and with few errors. Greater foundation needed from past work in area. Conclusions/summary based on outcomes and appropriate, included no recommendations.	Discussion was superior, accurate, engaging, and thought-provoking. Conclusions/summaries and recommendations appropriate and clearly based on outcomes.	
Delivery	Presenter unsettled, uninterested, and unenthused. Presentation was read. Inappropriate voice mannerisms, body language, and poor communication skills. Poor quality of slides/presentation materials; did not enhance presentation/performance.	Presenter unenthused, monotonous and relied extensively on notes. Voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills sometimes inappropriate. Poor quality of slides/presentation material; poor enhancement of presentation/performance.	Displayed interest and enthusiasm. Read small parts of material. Occasionally struggled to find words. Generally appropriate voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Moderate quality of slides/presentation materials.	Relied little on notes. Displayed interest and enthusiasm. Good voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Good quality of slides/presentation materials; enhanced presentation/performance.	Relied little on notes. Expressed ideas fluently in own words. Genuinely interested and enthusiastic. Exceptional voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Exceptional slides/presentation quality materials; greatly enhanced presentation/performance.	

Comments :

Student's Name: _____

Reviewer's Name: _____

Date: _____