

Rubric for Research (Reported in the Traditional Format)
Wesley College Department of Education

This evaluative rubric should be used throughout the teacher candidate's program of study for evaluating formal knowledge production products that require a traditional research reporting format: action research, literary research, scientific research, social science research, historical research. The Reflection Rubric can and should be used to evaluate candidates' thinking processes and the Research Rubric can be used in tandem to evaluate the content, structure, and format of the product.

Name _____ Course _____ Date _____

Evaluator _____ Product _____

Scoring Guide

- 1= no evidence of indicator being met, not passing
- 2= some evidence of indicator being met, passing, but needs improvement
- 3= acceptable evidence of indicator being met for course purposes . Meets novice research criteria
- 4= consistent evidence of indicator being met. Meets professionally ready novice researcher criteria.
- 5= exemplary evidence of indicator being met, meritorious researcher skills.

The Introduction (includes literature review)

Uses sufficient and appropriate primary resources to describe/explain theoretical assumptions that contextualize the research question

1 2 3 4 5

Uses sufficient and appropriate primary resources to develop background or context for research question

1 2 3 4 5

Culminates with a clearly stated purpose/ research question

1 2 3 4 5

The Methods

Clearly describes the selection methods, parameters, subjects And setting, or context of the study based on accepted research practice

1 2 3 4 5

Clearly describe data gathering methodology based on Accepted research practice

1 2 3 4 5

Clearly describe data analysis methodologies Based on accepted research practice

1 2 3 4 5

The Findings (Results)

Have tables, graphs, figures, descriptions that clearly convey how data were organized for analysis and interpretation

1 2 3 4 5

Have clearly written interpretations of the data that pose

answers to the original research question(s)	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

The Discussion

Extends findings to a broader context	1	2	3	4	5
---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

Describes implications and limitations	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

Poses further questions	1	2	3	4	5
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

The Paper:

Has an authentic voice with minimal use of quotes	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

Is appropriately cited	1	2	3	4	5
------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

APA format is followed	1	2	3	4	5
------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

Free of major spelling, grammatical, Punctuation errors	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

Is well written	1	2	3	4	5
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---

Research Paper Scoring Guide

	1	2	3	4	5
Introduction	Does not meet criteria. No introduction or contextual information for research question; insufficient primary resources; there is no clearly stated research question; question does not have appropriate scope or focus	Meets minimal criteria. Two or more references are cited appropriately but is not clearly tied to the research question, though question may have sufficient scope or focus.	Meets criteria for novice researcher Cites two or more primary sources to set up theoretical assumptions and develop background for research question; research question is stated with clear and sufficient scope and focus	Meets criteria for professionally ready novice researcher. More than two primary sources set up the theoretical assumptions, which are used to develop background for research question, clearly stated and has appropriate scope and focus.	Exceeds criteria. Theoretical background and contextual information flow seamlessly into a well stated research question that has potential to add to the professional knowledge base and is of publishable quality.
Methods	Does not meet criteria. No discernable methodology; or method is inappropriate for the scope, focus and type of research question	Meets minimal criteria. Some sections of methodology are described, with minimal detail , demonstrating minimal knowledge of accepted research practice.	Meets criteria for novice researcher. The methodology is appropriate for the question, is described in some detail and meets accepted research standards.	Meets criteria for professionally ready novice. Methodology is thorough with all terms operationalized and described in depth and detail using accepted research standards.	Exceeds criteria. All sections of the methodology flow clearly and logically form the question. Methods are described with sufficient detail as to be replicable; and validly link data collection and analyses to the findings. Is of publishable quality.
Findings	Does not meet criteria. Findings are not connected to data analysis. Insufficient data representation, organization and analysis to generate meaningful statements. Findings are	Meets minimal criteria. Data might be sufficient, but analyses are weak, leading to vague generalizations that are not well supported by or tied to the data.	.Meets criteria for novice researcher. Data representations, analyses and interpretations support the findings and are confined to the scope of the question.	Meets criteria for professionally ready novice researcher. Data representation and analyses are clear and logically flow from the	Exceeds criteria. Data representations, analyses and interpretations support the findings , which are confined to the scope of the question and have the potential to contribute to

	not confined to the scope of the data				the professional knowledge base and be published
Discussion	Does not meet criteria. Statements are personal rather than focused on knowledge extension from the question.	Meets minimal criteria. Minimal attempt to extend the knowledge in the findings and does not address extensions or limitations, nor does it pose further logical questions.	Meets novice researcher criteria. Creditable attempt to extend the knowledge in the findings; addresses extensions, limitations, or posing of further questions that appear to grow logically from findings.	Meets criteria for the professionally ready novice. There is depth of thinking apparent about the findings and their contribution to the existing knowledge base, and some further questions that connect to the findings.	Exceeds criteria. Evidence of deep thought about the findings and their implications, extensions, limitations; questions posed flow meaningfully from findings. Is of publishable quality.
The Paper	Does not meet criteria. Paper is quote-heavy with no authentic voice; Structure and order of sentences and paragraphs hinder clarity and understanding; numerous mechanical errors and APA guidelines are not followed.	Meets minimal criteria. Paper lacks an authentic voice; mechanical errors impede the flow of the meaning. APA guidelines are followed, but text is structurally weak with little flow.	Meets novice researcher criteria.. Paper has an emerging authentic voice but still possibly quote heavy. Few mechanical errors that impede understanding; follows APA guidelines. Structure and order of sentences and paragraphs are acceptable, but need further revision.	Meets criteria for the professionally ready novice. Generally free of mechanical errors. The authentic voice is present with appropriate or little use of direct quotes. APA guidelines are followed and structure of sentences and paragraphs need little or no revision.	Exceeds criteria. Well written. Authentic voice. Well-structured paragraphs and sentences that need minimal revision. APA guidelines are followed in formatting and citations; free of mechanical errors. Is of publishable quality