**Dissertation Evaluation Rubric**

Mennonite College of Nursing, Illinois State University

|  |
| --- |
| Student |
| Committee Member |
| Date |
| Abstract | Acceptable | Not Acceptable | Not Applicable |
| Abstract contains a concise description of the study, a brief statement of the problem, exposition of methods and procedures, and a summary of findings and implications. |  |  |  |

Comments:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Acceptable | Not Acceptable | Not Applicable |
| **Introduction** | Demonstrates that the focus of the study is on an important clinical problem that is worthy of study  |  |  |  |
| Describes the purpose of the study in a logical, explicit manner.  |  |  |  |
| The nature of the study, specific research question, hypotheses, or research objectives are briefly and clearly described. |  |  |  |
| The significance of the study is described in terms of knowledge generation and professional application |  |  |  |

Comments:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Acceptable | Not Acceptable | Not Applicable |
| **Literature Review** | The review of related research and literature is clearly related to the problem statement as expressed in:a. Research questions and hypothesis, orb. Study questions and objectives |  |  |  |
| The review of related research and literature includes: Comparisons/contrasts of different points of view or different research outcomes and the relationship of the study to previous research |  |  |  |
| The content of the review is drawn from acceptable peer‐reviewed journals or sound academic journals or there is justification for using other sources. |  |  |  |
| The review is an integrated, critical essay on the most relevant and current published knowledge on the topic. Historically important sources are included if relevant. The review is organized around major ideas or themes. |  |  |  |
| The theory and/or theoretical framework is appropriate; the relationship between the framework and problem is well established by literature support; concepts from the framework guide the development of the study. |  |  |  |

Comments:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Acceptable | Not Acceptable | Not Applicable |
| **Methods** | The introduction describes how the research design derives logically from the research problem, hypotheses and/or questions and theoretical framework (if appropriate). |  |  |  |
| The process by which the data were generated, gathered, recorded and managed is clearly described |  |  |  |
| How the data were analyzed is articulated |  |  |  |

Comments:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Acceptable | Not Acceptable | Not Applicable |
| **Results** | Builds logically from the problem and the research design, and presented in a manner that addresses the research questions. |  |  |  |
| Patterns, relationships, and themes described as findings are supported by the data. All salient data are accounted for in the findings. |  |  |  |
| The tables and figures are clear, effective and informative. |  |  |  |

Comments:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Acceptable | Not Acceptable | Not Applicable |
| **Discussion** | Provides a brief summary of the research findings that can be drawn from the study |  |  |  |
| Contains implications of the study, relates the findings to the review of literature and articulates the needs for future research |  |  |  |

Comments:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Acceptable | Not Acceptable | Not Applicable |
| **Writing** | Follows a standard form and has a professional scholarly appearance |  |  |  |
| Is written with correct grammar, punctuation and spelling, using active voice |  |  |  |
| Citations are presented consistently and professionally throughout the text and in the reference list. |  |  |  |
| Writing is clear, precise, concise and accurate, avoiding jargon |  |  |  |
| Logically organized |  |  |  |

Comments:

*Adapted from Texas Tech Health Sciences Center rubric Moore \dissertation rubric 10‐1‐08 and the Duke Thesis Assessment Protocol, Duke University 2007*

Dissertation Review Rubric

Description of the Rating Scale

**Acceptable**

* Is original and important
* Is well written and organized
* Has a point of view and exhibits mature, independent thinking
* Asks new questions or addresses an important question or problem
* Displays a deep understanding of the literature
* Shows a deep understanding of theory
* Is the next step in a research program
* Has a research design that is connected to the questions/hypotheses
* Analysis is comprehensive, complete, and convincing
* Results are important
* Conclusion ties the whole thing together
* Is publishable

**Not Acceptable**

* Is not very original or important
* Is poorly written
* Has spelling and grammatical errors
* Has a sloppy presentation
* Contains errors or mistakes
* Has a weak structure and organization
* Plagiarizes or deliberately misreads or misuses sources
* Displays a narrow understanding of the field
* Knows the literature but is not critical of it or does not discuss what is important
* Does not understand or misses relevant literature
* Demonstrates understanding of theory at a simple level, and theory is minimally applied to the problem
* Relies on inappropriate or incorrect methods
* Has data that are flawed, wrong, false, fudged, or misinterpreted
* Analysis—does not explore all possibilities and misses connections
* Includes results that are obvious, already known, unexplained, or misinterpreted
* Has unsupported or exaggerated interpretation

*Adapted from “How to Grade a Dissertation” Barbara E. Lovitts Academe Nov-Dec 2005*