

## Master's Thesis/Research Rubric

Advanced Candidate \_\_\_\_\_ Chair of Committee: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Committee Members: \_\_\_\_\_

Reader: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Elements	Unacceptable (0-3)	Acceptable (4-7)	Target (8-10)
<b>APA - Alignment with Reference List</b>	Consistent citing mistakes were made within body of the proposal including references in text but not on reference list and/or items on reference list and not cited in document (at least three). Electronic sources were incorrectly cited in the text and/or on the reference list. Et. al. was used incorrectly or inconsistently throughout the body of the document. Consistently reviewer had difficulty finding cited in text references on the reference list.	While there may have been minor errors, conventions for APA style and format were used consistently throughout the document. Less than two references in the document were not on the reference list or vice versa. The majority of electronic sources were cited correctly and could be found on the reference list. Et. al was consistently used appropriately with less than three errors in the proposal. Reviewer found minor inconsistencies between citing in the text and on the reference list.	The proposal consistently models the APA language and conventions used in the scholarly/professional literature appropriate for publication. Electronic sources were identified correctly within the document and on the reference list. Original sources were clearly identified and correctly cited in both the body of the text and the reference section. Et. al. was consistently used appropriately with no errors in the document. Reviewer found all cited sources on the reference list.
<b>Reference List</b>	There were at least ten citing mistakes on the reference list and a general failure to follow APA convention. This included references out of alphabetical order, incomplete reference information, incorrect identification of sources, incorrect sequence within individual references, and various mistakes in convention.	There were minor mistakes on the reference list (less than five) and generally APA conventions were followed. Reference list was in alphabetical order, complete reference information was provided, and only minor mistakes in convention such as a misplaced period.	There were less than two mistakes on the reference list and all APA conventions were followed.
<b>Mechanics</b>	Grammatical conventions were generally used, but inconsistency and/or errors in their use resulted in weak, but still apparent, connections between topics in the formulation of the argument. There were poor uses of transitions, which failed to allow the to identify the sequence within the subheading. The review of literature section consisted of a string of summaries of the various studies with no attempt to integrate similar studies.	While there may have been minor errors, the proposal followed normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout. Errors did not significantly interfere with topic comprehensibility. Transitions were effectively used which help the reviewer move from one point to another. Some attempt was made to integrate similar studies and to compare and contrast findings.	The proposal was essentially error free in terms of mechanics. Writing flowed smoothly from one idea to another and led the reviewer through an orderly discussion of the topic. Transitions effectively established a sound scholarly argument and aided the reviewer in following the writer's logic. Similar studies were integrated and findings were compared and contrasted.
<b>Required Format</b>	Consistent mistakes were made in the required format. These may have included margins, spacing, page numbering, typeface, and headings that failed to comply with APA conventions. Format mistakes were found on the Title page and in the Table of Contents.	There were minor mistakes in the required format that did not interfere with the readability of the proposal. Margins, typeface, spacing, and page numbering were correct. There were minor mistakes with headings, Title page, and/or Table of Contents.	There were less than two mistakes in the required format. Margins, typeface, spacing, page numbering, and headings followed the required format. There were minor mistakes with the Title page and/or Table of Contents.

<b>Content Knowledge</b>	Ideas presented closely follow conventional concepts with little expansion and development of new directions. Ideas and concepts were generally and satisfactorily presented although lapses in logic are apparent. Theory was minimally applied to the context of the question. The research design did not align with the research question.	Response was organized, carefully focused and clearly outlined the major points related to the question. Ideas were logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument. Depth of understanding related to physical education, sport or physical activity was evident. Theory was accurately applied contextually to the question. Research design aligned with the research question.	The thesis/project excelled in the organization and representation of ideas related to the question. Depth of understanding was apparent and clearly related to the field of physical education, sport or physical activity. The response synthesized theoretical concepts and coherently applied them to the question's specific context. The research design aligned with the research question and provided more than one method of analyzes.
<b>Literature Review</b>	Related literature was summarized. The gaps in current knowledge and approaches that fill these gaps were not identified. The literature review was minimally connected to the study's methodology and measures. The research design and method of analysis were not appropriate for the research problem. Related research was not synthesized or integrated. Sub-headings were not used or used incorrectly. Literature review was incomplete and failed to explore the depth and scope of the available literature.	Related literature was credibly summarized. The gaps in current knowledge were identified, and directions and approaches that fill these gaps were identified. The literature review was connected to the study's methodology and measures. The research design and method of analysis were appropriate for the research problem. Sub-headings were effectively used to categorize related research. Literature review was comprehensive in both depth and scope.	Important issues or ideas were raised, which may not have been represented in the literature cited. The gaps in current knowledge were clearly identified, and significant directions and approaches that fill these gaps were identified. The literature review was clearly connected to the study's methodology and measures. The research design and method of analysis reflected a sophisticated understanding of the research problem. Subheadings were used effectively and transitions were provided between subheadings. Literature reveiw was comprehensive and extensive.
<b>Results</b>	The study's results section was not supported by the literature review and only partially related to the research question(s) or hypothesis(es). There a was no sequence to the reporting of the results and data tables lack clarity.	The study's results section referenced the review of literature. The results were directly related to the research question(s) or hypothesis(es) . The reporting of results followed a logical sequence. Data tables were clearly labeled and accurately reported the findings. For each analysis the name of the statistic used was reported along with p values, SD, etc. as appropriate for the statistical procedure used in the study.	The study's results were thoroughly and logically explained and directly related to the review of literature. The results were directly related to the research question(s) or hypothesis(es) and were reported in logical segments. Data tables were clearly labeled, accurate, and well designed for easy of understanding. For each analysis the name of the statistic used was reported along with p values, SD, etc as appropriate for the statistical procedures used in the study. The results section had maximum clarity.
<b>Discussion</b>	The discussion is minimally supported by related literature. Findings are summarized, but not interpreted (candidate simply repeats the findings in the results section). The discussion fails to place the findings in context or include implications for future studies.	The discussion is supported by related literature and findings are compared and contrasted to other studies included in the review section. Findings are interpreted using some statistical jargon. Results are placed in context and implications for future research are identified.	The discussion is supported by related literature, findings are compared and contrasted, and theoretical connections are made to your research results. Findings are interpreted using a minimal amount of statistical jargon. Implications and future directions are identified.
<b>Supervision</b>	The finish project/thesis required numerous drafts(10-15) on the part of the advanced candidate. Candidate would make limited corrections on each draft and depended on the advisory to provide specific input. Draft would be returned with just the edited corrections. Candidate failed to demonstrate independent problem solving skills or to think critically about the project/thesis. Candidate relied on the advisor for the development of the main research question/hypothesis.	The finish project required several drafts (5-9), but the candidate made more than specific edits. Candidate demonstrated the ability to accept feedback from the advisory and make the necessary changes. Candidate did demonstrate independent problem solving and critical thinking skills throughout the project/thesis. The candidate did develop an appropriate main research question/hypothesis with guidance from the advisory.	The finish project required minimal drafts (5 or under) and candidate demonstrated the ability to use feedback to make improvements beyond the editorial comments. Candidate demonstrated critical thinking, problem solving, and analytical skills throughout the project/thesis. Candidate independently developed an appropriate main research question/hypothesis.

*Adapted from California State University, Fresno, Department of Biology*