

2016-2017 RUBRIC— PH.D. SECOND YEAR RESEARCH PAPER

UC Irvine School of Education

Directions: With guidance from the indicators, please provide feedback on each standard. On the basis of the feedback provided, form an overall holistic assessment about whether the paper merits a REVISE AND RESUBMIT for the first round or if the paper is judged to be passable at the time, the reviewer can recommend to the Ph.D. Steering Committee that the paper be given a PROVISIONAL PASS. For the second and third rounds, in reviewing the revised paper consider primarily whether the candidate has demonstrated a skill level that indicates likely success in conducting and completing a dissertation.

Please enter your suggested revisions on this form electronically, and return within two weeks to sksingh@uci.edu.

Theoretical framework
<i>Indicators:</i>
<p>Acceptable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>A strong case is made for the significance of the topic/issue within a theoretical or policy framework.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Background theory is presented fairly with no obvious gaps or misrepresentations.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>The research problem/question is articulated in terms (concepts or variables) of the theoretical framework.</i> <p>Revise and Resubmit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>The topic/issue is not presented within an appropriate theoretical framework.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>The theory cited is misrepresented, has serious gaps, or is thin or superficially presented.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>The research problem/question is presented in terms that have no clear reference to theory.</i>
Reviewer Recommendations:

Problem formulation*Indicators:***Acceptable:**

- A clear statement of the purpose and scope of the study is provided, including the research question, problem, or issue the study addresses, situated in context, with a description of the approach taken to addressing it and explanation of why it is important to address.*
- A clear description of how the study is a contribution to knowledge is provided.*
 - If the study is a contribution to an established line of theory and empirical research, the author clarifies what the contributions are and how the study contributes to testing, elaborating, or enriching that theoretical perspective.*
 - If the study is intended to establish a new line of theory, the author clarifies what that new theory is, how it relates to existing theories and evidence, why the new theory is needed, and the intended scope of its application.*

- If the study is motivated by practical concerns, the author clarifies what those concerns are, why they are important, and how this investigation can address those concerns.*
- If the study is motivated by lack of information about a problem or issue, the author should make clear what information is lacking, why it is important, and how this investigation will address the need for information.*
- A review of the relevant scholarship that bears directly on the topic of the study is provided.*
- The criteria used to identify and select the relevant scholarship in which the study is grounded are clear.*

Revise and Resubmit:

- The purpose and scope of the study is unclear.*
- The study is not situated in a broader social, historical, or research context.*
- The description of why the question or problem is important is unclear or missing.*
- The review of scholarship is incomplete or not entirely relevant.*

Reviewer Recommendations:

Data Sources and Evidence*Indicators:***Acceptable:**

- The relevance of evidence to the research problem, topic, or question is clear.*
- The units of study (sites, groups, participants, events, or other units) and the means through which they were selected are adequately described.*
 - Relevant characteristics of the site, group, participants, events, or other units of study that bear directly on reporting and interpreting outcomes are clearly identified.*
- The intervention or treatment is described in sufficient detail so that its key features can be identified and used to account for results, and be compared with related interventions or treatments.*
- Features of control or comparison groups are described so that they can be understood and examined in relation to interventions or treatments.*

Revise and Resubmit:

- The relationship between data/evidence and the research problem, topic, or question is unclear.*
- The units of study (sites, groups, participants, events, or other units) and the means through which they were selected are not adequately described.*
- The intervention or treatment is not described in sufficient detail. Key features are unclear.*
- Features of control or comparison groups are not clearly described.*

Reviewer Recommendations:

Methods**Indicators: Qualitative****Acceptable:**

- Development/selection of quantitative measurements and/or qualitative classifications (coding) is described completely enough so that someone could replicate all procedures.
- Classification scheme is clearly described with concrete examples that represent the range of phenomena classified.

Information on the backgrounds and training of the coders; inter-coder reliability or outcomes of reviews by other analysts is provided.

Revise and Resubmit:

- The description of the classification scheme is ambiguous.
- Concrete examples of the classification scheme are not provided.
- Information on the backgrounds and training of the coders; inter-coder reliability or outcomes of reviews by other analysts is unclear, missing, or irrelevant.

Indicators: Quantitative**Acceptable**

- Data elements and organization used for measurement are described clearly and succinctly.
- Paper includes a clear description of sample design and external validity. Data are well selected to provide sufficient statistical power and generalizability to answer research questions, the paper sufficiently accounts for sample design, using weights or clustering as appropriate. A detailed accounting of differences between the total sample and the sample used in the analysis is provided.
- The variables utilized in the paper are valid and well-documented measures of key concepts. The paper thoroughly describes variable measurement and construction, provides relevant information on measurement reliability, and relevant descriptive statistics (such as means and standard deviations for continuous variables, frequencies for discrete variables with few categories, and correlation matrices.)
- The paper's analytic method is appropriate to addressing the research question, clearly articulated, and effectively implemented. The rationale for the development or selection of quantitative measurements and/or qualitative classifications (coding) is unclear or missing.

Revise and Resubmit:

- Data elements and organization used for measurement are unclear.
- More information needed on sample design and generalizability.
- Paper lacks a sufficient discussion of measurement and variable construction. Relevant descriptive statistics are unclear, incomplete, or missing. More information on the reliability of measures is needed.
- The paper's analytic method is not adequately explained, not well matched with research question, or inappropriately implemented.

Reviewer Recommendations:

Analysis and Interpretation*Indicators***Acceptable:**

- The procedures used for analysis are precisely and transparently described from the beginning of the study through presentation of the outcomes.*
- Reporting makes clear how the analysis procedures address the research question or problem and lead to the outcomes described.*
- Analytic techniques are described in sufficient detail to permit understanding of how the data were analyzed and of the processes and assumptions underlying specific techniques (e.g., techniques used to undertake content analysis, discourse or text analysis, deliberation analysis, time use analysis, network analysis).*
- Analysis and presentation of the outcomes make clear how they support claims or conclusions drawn in the research.*
- Information about any intended or unintended circumstances that may have significant implications for interpretation of the outcomes, limit their applicability, or compromise their validity is provided (e.g., key actors leaving the site, changes in membership of the group, or withdrawal of access to any part of the study or to people in the study).*
- The presentation of conclusions (a) provides a statement of how claims and interpretations address the research problem, question, or issue underlying the research; (b) shows how the conclusions connect to support, elaborate, or challenge conclusions in earlier scholarship; and (c) emphasizes the theoretical, practical, or methodological implications of the study.*

Revise and Resubmit:

- The relationship among the analysis procedures, outcomes, and research procedures is unclear.*
- Analytic techniques are not described in sufficient detail. The processes and specific techniques used are unclear.*
- It is unclear how analysis and outcomes support claims or conclusions drawn in the research.*
- The presentation of conclusions (a) does not clarify how claims and interpretations address the research problem, question, or issue underlying the research; (b) does not demonstrate how the conclusions connect to support, elaborate, or challenge conclusions in earlier scholarship; or (c) explain the theoretical, practical, or methodological implications of the study.*

Reviewer Recommendations:

Presentation of Ideas*Indicators:***Acceptable:**

- The student's independent thinking is clearly evident throughout the study.*
- The study contributes to our knowledge of education, learning, or development in a significant way.*

Revise and Resubmit:

- The sequence of ideas is scattered and hard to follow.*
- Ideas, concepts, and claims are vague.*
- It's hard to find the "big picture."*
- The student shows little or no evidence of independent critical appraisal or thinking.*
- Claims are made with little or no backing or concrete examples from the data or relevant literature.*

The broader significance of the study in relation to education, learning, or development is unclear.

Reviewer Recommendations:

STUDENT NUMBER: _____

- The student's independent thinking is clearly evident throughout the study.*
- The study contributes to our knowledge of education, learning, or development in a significant way.*

Revise and Resubmit:

- The sequence of ideas is scattered and hard to follow.*
- Ideas, concepts, and claims are vague.*
- It's hard to find the "big picture."*
- The student shows little or no evidence of independent critical appraisal or thinking.*
- Claims are made with little or no backing or concrete examples from the data or relevant literature.*
- The broader significance of the study in relation to education, learning, or development is unclear.*

Reviewer Recommendations:

Writing Quality

Indicators:

Acceptable:

- Language is used skillfully to communicate complex ideas clearly.*
- Writing quality is polished.*
- Transitions/connections in the paper are logical and smooth.*
- Writing is well edited and follows grammar and spelling conventions.*
- The writing impedes clarity.*

Revise and Resubmit:

- The writing quality feels unfinished and reads like an early draft.*
- Transitions between sentences, paragraphs, and sentences are poor or confusing*
- The referents of pronouns are sometimes hard to determine.*
- There are recurrent errors of syntax, style, spelling, or punctuation*

Reviewer Recommendations:

Scholarly Style

Indicators:

Acceptable:

- Current APA style guidelines are followed consistently both in the body of the paper and in the reference list.*
- The organization of the paper is clear and effectively organized by headings and subheadings.*
- The ideas of other scholars are consistently credited by appropriate citations.*
- A scholarly voice is projected.*

Revise and Resubmit:

- APA style guidelines are ignored or are used inconsistently.*
- The paper is not satisfactorily organized by headings and subheadings.*
- The ideas of other scholars are not appropriately credited by use of citations, or are misrepresented.*
- The writing is not scholarly in tone.*

Reviewer Recommendations:

STUDENT NUMBER: _____

OVERALL RATING	SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR STUDENT
<p data-bbox="180 272 512 342">REVISE & RESUBMIT (round 1)</p> <p data-bbox="163 423 411 509">PROVISIONAL PASS (round 1)</p>	

STUDENT NUMBER: _____

OVERALL RATING	SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR PH.D. PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE
<p data-bbox="184 313 512 378">REVISE & RESUBMIT (round 2 or 3)</p> <p data-bbox="170 461 443 493">PASS (round 2 or 3)</p> <p data-bbox="170 534 243 566">FAIL</p>	