**Mary Kay Sommers Award Rubric**

**Candidate’s Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**NOTE:** Scoring should be done primarily based on the dissertation **summary** and **nomination form**.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Element** | **Outstanding**  **3** | **Good**  **2** | **Average**  **1** | **Insufficient**  **0** | **Score – (18 total)** |
| **Contribution to the Field** | Groundbreaking research in terms of theory, practice, **or** both.   1. The study should **contribute to theoretical, defensible knowledge** in education. 2. The study should have **clear, practical applications to the resolution of a problem** or problems in education. | Study moves the body of knowledge forward. | An incremental extension of previous work lacking clear justification for replication of the study. | No evidence present or contribution to the field is unclear |  |
| **Writing Quality** | **Clear and concise**. **Terms defined, avoids unnecessary jargon.**  **Well organized**, with good use of **figures and tables** where appropriate. | Minor flaws in 1 to 2 areas of writing quality. | Flaws that hinder under- standing. | Writing is incoherent or has major grammatical errors. |  |
| **Alignment** | There is continuity across the **literature reviewed**, **research purpose/question(s)/hypotheses, rationale, method, and results**. Aligns well **with methods and results**. | Some minor lapses in continuity or unclear connections. | Continuity is not consistent across all parts of the dissertation. | Continuity is not present. |  |
| **Methods** | The **methods and research design are appropriate to the research purpose/question/hypotheses**.  **The sources of data and analysis are appropriate to the given method (e.g., reliable, valid, trustworthy, shows triangulation, explains role of researcher and potential subjectivity conflicts or benefits** of data sources). | Minor flaws in the methods. | Flaws in methods. | Methods are inappropriate for research design. |  |
| **Results/ Findings** | Results are **thorough and well communicated,** in order to **reveal patterns** across the data. | Results are derived appropriately from the analysis. | Results appear to be biased towards the researcher’s opinion, without justification or evidence derived from the data. | It is unclear how the results were derived from the analysis. |  |
| **Interpretation of Findings** | The interpretations provide **insights into the pattern of the data, notes contribution(s) to the field**, **and don’t overstate the findings.**  **Limitations are noted** or addressed with **suggested future studies.** | Minor flaws (e.g., slight over-or under-interpretation of data).  Limitations noted partially address the nature of the study.  Areas for future research expand upon with the findings and/or address limitations. | Interpretations do not correspond to the results or connection is unclear.  Limitations are not appropriately identified or addressed. | No interpretation of results present. |  |

\* This scoring rubric uses or adapts many of the elements of the APA Division 15 Paul R. Pintrich Outstanding Dissertation Award scoring rubric.
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