

April 2017

**Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership
Grading Rubric for Qualifying Examination**

Question #2 Student Name _____

Criteria	Excellent = 3	Acceptable = 2	Unacceptable = 1	Score
1. Responsiveness to the QE question(s) posed				Score
Clear understanding of the theoretical and conceptual issues	Conceptual understanding is clearly expressed throughout the work.	Conceptual understanding is inferred but is not clearly expressed in some parts of the	Treats the issues superficially; lacks focus and depth.	
Comprehensive coverage of all components of the QE question(s)	All aspects of the QE framework are addressed and components are integrated.	Minor aspects of the issues/question(s) are missed, but the exclusion does not detract from the quality of the response.	Fails to express or develop relevant aspects of the issues/question(s); lack of integration among QE components.	
Comments:				
2. Thoughtfulness of response				Score
Fresh and original thinking about the issues/questions	Demonstrates original thinking about the issues/question(s) and applies knowledge in a novel manner.	Demonstrates some ability to think in new ways about the issues/question(s).	Offers normative thinking about the issues/question(s).	
Effective synthesis of research and literature	Synthesizes theoretical knowledge and empirical research. Demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge in context.	Some important and relevant literature and/or research are missing, or are poorly integrated into the overall discussion.	Offers personal experience rather than theoretical or empirical evidence; misrepresents principles of research or theoretical knowledge; list or reports evidence in a shallow manner; uses outdated sources.	
Comments:				
3. Effectiveness of argument				Score
Evidence adequately supports the argument and is balanced	Conclusions are clearly substantiated by theoretical frameworks as well as empirical evidence; contradictory evidence or perspectives are presented in a balanced fashion.	Conclusions are substantiated but the focus may be on the literature or empirical evidence that supports the student's argument without presenting contradictory evidence or	Conclusions are weakly substantiated, grounded in opinion rather than scholarship, and are biased. Failure to critically analyze and engage with alternative evidence or perspectives.	
Argument is defensible	Demonstrates the ability to integrate theory and empirical research in a logical and sequential manner; clearly developed logic leads to credible conclusions.	Logic is somewhat flawed; an attempt is made to sequentially and logically develop ideas but gaps exist or conclusion(s) may not be entire credible or	Logic is seriously flawed or is not present; lacks focus on important aspects of the issues/question(s); the work is incoherent.	
Comments:				
4. Clarity of communication				Score
Organization is clear and effective	Content is thoughtfully organized around key arguments/ideas; consistent signposting and smooth transitions between topics.	Content is adequately organized, with attention to signposting and some transitions to guide reader; only occasional gaps.	Disorganized content; lack of overarching structure; lack of explicit connection among topics and sections; failure to guide the	
Grammar, spelling, syntax is appropriate	Technical aspects of the writing are strong and consistent.	Minor errors are present but are easily corrected; errors do not distract the reader.	Writing is non-standard and/or contains technical errors that distract the reader.	
Correct attribution in APA style	Present and consistent with careful attention to APA guidelines.	Some minor errors are present but are easily corrected.	APA guidelines incorrectly used or ignored.	
Comments:				

Total Score _____