

CONTENT	Exemplary = 3	Competent = 2	Marginal = 1	Score
Purpose and rationale	Purpose is clear; the problem is clearly significant and worthy of study. The need for the study is strongly evident.	Purpose, significance and arguments for the study are stated.	Purpose, significance are weak. Insufficient rationale for the study is apparent.	
Conceptual or theoretical framework	Conceptual, theoretical framework or theories are clearly articulated and justified.	Conceptual, theoretical framework or theories are articulated and justification is attempted.	Conceptual, theoretical framework or theories are not well articulated or justified.	
Literature Review-viewpoints	Literature review regards different points of view but clearly demonstrates the value of the selected perspective.	Literature review is substantial and regards different viewpoints. The selection of the viewpoint used is evident, although not strongly so.	Literature review is evident but does not offer different viewpoints and does not demonstrate the value of the selected perspective.	
Literature Review- major themes and argument	Integrated, organized synthesis of major themes or ideas. A coherent argument is made resulting in the research question(s).	An integrated, organized review of the literature is offered. A coherent argument is attempted or marginally apparent.	Little integration and organization of a literature review is evident. Little evidence of a coherent argument has been made.	
Literature Review- sources	Drawn from acceptable and current sources. Uses seminal, historic, and current sources appropriately.	Drawn from acceptable sources. Sources are varied.	Sources are not always acceptable or drawn from varied sources.	
The Research Design	Derives logically from the purpose of the study. Research design clearly matches the research question.	Derives logically from the purpose of the study. Some attempt to match design to question is evident.	Does not always derive logically from the purpose of the study. Design does not match research question.	
The methods and sources.	Data generation/sources is clearly articulated, a strong rationale for these methods is made and is relevant to the research question(s).	Data generation/sources is articulated, a rationale is attempted and methods are relevant to the research question(s).	Data generation/sources is not well articulated and a rationale is not consistently made for these methods. Methods do not always match the research question.	
Data analysis	The how, when, and why of data analysis are clearly articulated. Qualitative-The interpretive approach is multi-faceted and sophisticated offering novel insights into the data. Quantitative-Statistical measures are correctly used. Multiple measures are used to expand knowledge.	The how, when, and why of data analysis are evident. The interpretive approach is standard, offering good descriptive representations of the data	The how, when, and why of data analysis are not always evident. The interpretive approach yields minimal insights or statistical measures are not always generated correctly.	
Statement of Findings	Findings are clearly stated. Clear connections between the findings and the research questions is consistently apparent.	Findings adequately address the research questions.	Findings do not always clearly address the research questions.	
Findings and Data	Discussion of the findings offers a full circle that connects purpose, theoretical framework to the findings.	Discussion of the findings are supported by the data.	Discussion of the findings are not consistently substantiated by the data.	
Conclusions and implications	Conclusions are creative and generate new theory or confirm existing theories in a clear manner. Implications and significance reveal the importance of the work to the field.	Conclusions, implications and significance are well stated and strong implications and significance are emerging.	Findings are reiterated but do not offer new insights.	

THOUGHT & EXPRESSION	Exemplary = 3	Competent = 2	Marginal = 1	Score
Breadth and Depth.	Evidence of breadth and depth; excellent insight and analysis of complex ideas.	Evidence of breadth and depth and insight is emerging.	Breadth and depth are lacking. Insights are not evident.	
Organization and reasoning	Well-focused, well-organized, and well-reasoned.	Focus, organization and reason are evident.	Focus, organization and reason are not consistently evident.	
Main Arguments	Main arguments are thoroughly developed and strongly convincing.	Main arguments are developed and supported.	Main arguments are not well developed and/or supported by research and theory.	
Original and Creative Thought	Scholarly, creative and original thought is integrated and evident.	Displays original and creative thought.	Some attempt at original and creative thought is attempted.	
Integration	Vital issues, arguments and points of view are integrated with existing knowledge and contributes to scholarship.	Vital issues, arguments and points of view are integrated.	Vital issues, arguments, and points of view are not integrated.	
TECHNICAL QUALITY	Exemplary = 3	Competent = 2	Marginal = 1	Score
Clarity	Clarity: careful word choice, skillful sentence construction. Quality is indicative of level expected for publication.	Clarity: careful word choice, skillful sentence construction are evident	Unclear, vague wording and inconsistent sentence construction evident at times	
Transitions, summaries, and conclusions.	Paper flows well. Transitions, summaries and conclusions are seamless.	Transitions, summaries, and conclusions exist when appropriate.	Transitions, summaries and conclusions are sometimes missing.	
References Citations	References are cited properly. APA is error-free.	References are cited properly with few errors.	References are cited but multiple error are evident.	
Headings	Headings adhere to APA and well organized for clarity.	Headings adhere to APA.	Headings do not always adhere to APA. Headings are confusing.	
Grammar, Punctuation, and Spelling.	Written with correct grammar, punctuation, and spelling. Writing is flawless with no errors.	Written with correct grammar, punctuation, and spelling. Errors are minimal.	Errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling exist.	

Student Name _____

Dissertation Rubric

DEFENSE	Exemplary = 3	Competent = 2	Marginal = 1	Score
Content areas (purpose, framework, lit review, design, methods, analysis, findings, conclusions and implications).	Clear and thorough explanation of all required content areas. Explanation is succinct, and sequential.	Inclusion of all required content areas is indicated and sequential. Explanation is adequate.	Content areas are not always clearly identified. Explanations are fragmented and/or not thought-out.	
Delivery (professionalism)	Confidence in presentation of study is strongly evident.	Confidence in presentation is evident.	Presentation not delivered with expected level of professionalism.	
Responses (questions and feedback)	Questions are answered in clear, concise and reflect strong understanding of the research.	Questions answered adequately and reflect knowledge of one's study.	Responses to questions and feedback demonstrates some inconsistencies.	
Timing	Presentation is no longer than 20-30 minutes with the remaining time used for questions and feedback.	Presentation slightly exceeds time limits but still offers time for feedback and questions.	Presentation is too lengthy or too short to discern content.	
Total Overall Score				
Student Name		Banner ID		
Dissertation Chair		Date of Defense		
Title of Dissertation				