

## Master's Thesis/Research Proposal Written Rubric

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

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 reader had difficulty finding cited in text references on the reference list.	While there were 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 modeled the APA language and conventions used in the scholarly/professional literature appropriate to physical education. 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 were made.	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 to keep the reviewer on track within the topic. The review of literature section consisted of a string of summaries of the various studies with no attempt to integrate similar studies.	While there were 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 helped the reader 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 reader 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 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 followed conventional concepts with little expansion and development of new directions. Ideas and concepts were generally and satisfactorily presented although lapses in logic were 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 was comprehensive and extensive.
<b>Results &amp; Discussion</b>	The study's results section was not supported by the literature review. The results were partially related to the hypothesis. The discussion was minimally supported by related literature.	The study's results section referenced the review of literature and was supported by the review. The results were directly related to the hypothesis. The discussion was supported by related literature.	The study's results were thoroughly and logically explained and directly related to the review of literature. The results were directly related to the hypothesis and reported in logical segments.. The discussion was strongly supported and aligned with the related literature.

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

Requirement to pass PHED 681: pass the written component and the oral examination for the research proposal.