

Student Name: _____ Reviewer Name: _____

Date of Review: _____ Evaluation Results: Pass Fail

Evaluation Rubric for Master's Examination Paper

The review of the Master's examination paper will use the following holistic rubrics to evaluate it. A score of zero on any rating will result in a failure.

A. Mechanics: The paper is expected to conform with the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed., 2001).

I. Proper Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling	Score:
2- Accomplished: The paper is essentially error free in grammar, punctuation and spelling.	
1- Satisfactory: While there may be minor errors, the paper follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout. Errors do not significantly interfere with topic comprehensibility.	
0- Unsatisfactory: Major errors in spelling, grammar, sentence structures that make reading difficult and interfere with comprehensibility.	
Comments:	

II. Writing Style	Score:
<i>The writing style helps the reader to follow and comprehend the paper. It includes an orderly presentation of ideas, smoothness of expression, precision and clarity. The paper is expected to conform with Chapter 2 (Expressing Ideas and Reducing Bias in Language) of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (5th ed., 2001). Specifically, the paper will display an: Orderly presentation of ideas; Smoothness and Economy of expression; Precision and Clarity.</i>	
2- Accomplished: The manuscript is ready for submission for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. While there may be minor errors, conventions for style and format are used consistently throughout the paper. Writing flows smoothly from one idea to another. Transitions effectively establish a sound scholarly argument and aid the reader in following the writer's logic. Organizationally, smooth and effective transitions between topics lead the reader through an orderly discussion of the topic being addressed.	
1- Satisfactory: While there may be minor errors, conventions for style and format are used consistently throughout the paper. Transitions and organizational structures such as subheadings are effectively used to help the reader move from one point to another.	
0- Unsatisfactory: Major stylist problems and inconsistencies are apparent. The inappropriate style makes reading and comprehension difficult. Weak transitions and apparent logic gaps occur between topics being addressed. The style detracts from the comprehensibility of the manuscript.	
Comments:	

III. APA Editorial Style (Chapter 3 to 6 of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association)	Score:
2- Accomplished: The manuscript is organized and prepared in APA format, e.g., appropriate citations, headings, subordination, references and tables.	
1- Satisfactory: The manuscript is generally and prepared in APA format. Some minor omissions occur.	
0- Unsatisfactory. APA Editorial Style is almost neglected or misinterpreted on a large scale	
Comments:	

B. Content and Organization:

IV. The Topic	Score:
2- Accomplished: The topic of the paper is clearly presented and the significance of the topic is explicitly stated. The topic is carefully focused. Historical, conceptual or theoretical grounding of the topic is present.	
1- Satisfactory: While the topic is clearly presented, the reader must infer its importance. Weaknesses are evidence in the historical, conceptual, theoretical, or importance of the topic	
0- Unsatisfactory: The topic is not clearly stated or it is difficult for the reader to determine why the topic is important.	
Comments:	

V. Comprehensiveness	Score:
2- Accomplished: All relevant published empirical and theoretical research is included. Opinion pieces maybe omitted. Essential findings of the studies are accurately and concisely paraphrased. The search strategy and databases searched are clearly described.	
1- Satisfactory: All major relevant published empirical research is included. Minor studies are omitted. Theoretical positions are briefly summarized. Essential findings are accurately described. The search strategy and databases seared are clearly described.	
0- Unsatisfactory: Major studies or theories are omitted and/or irrelevant studies are included.	
Comments:	

VI. Organization	Score:
<p>2- Accomplished: The organization of the review is apparent and facilitates the reading of the text. The organization may be historical, presenting the studies in a chronological order and describing the contribution of successive studies. The organization may be problem focused, presenting studies as steps in solving a problem. Other organizations are possible.</p> <p>1- Satisfactory: An organization is present but occasionally it is not followed or unclear to the reader. The reader, however, can understand of how each study relates to the paper's topic.</p> <p>0- Unsatisfactory: An organization is generally lacking. The studies are just described, with little or no linkage between them. The reader is left with little understanding of how the studies relate to the paper's topic.</p>	
Comments:	

VII. Critical Analysis	Score:
<p>2- Accomplished: Studies are not simply described, they are criticized. Relevant methodological problems, faults in interpretation and theoretical foundations are noted. Limitations of the results are also noted. Minor problems that do not distract from the article's conclusions are omitted.</p> <p>1- Satisfactory: Problems in the design, interpretation and generalizability of studies are sometimes noted and sometimes not. Important criticisms are present.</p> <p>0- Unsatisfactory – Studies are accepted at face value and rarely criticized.</p>	
Comments:	

VIII. Integration and Synthesis:	Score:
<p>2- Accomplished: Various, and possibly conflicting, opinions are presented in a balanced manner and integrated to address the focus of the study. Essential findings of multiple sources are accurately and concisely analyzed, and integrated. Essential differences between studies are clearly identified and evaluated. Gaps in current knowledge are clearly identified and significant directions and approaches that fill these gaps are identified.</p> <p>1- Satisfactory: There are inconsistencies in the integration and synthesis of the material, the overall consistency, thoroughness, and analysis result in a well-crafted document.</p> <p>0- Satisfactory: Topics and related concepts are awkwardly presented and linkages among topics may be unclear. Incorrect or poorly developed synthesis of results are present. At best, analysis is limited to categorizing and summarizing scientific topics.</p>	
Comments:	

<p>IX. Conclusions</p> <p>2- Accomplished: The strengths and weaknesses of the literature reviews are clearly summarized. Gaps in current knowledge are clearly identified and significant directions and approaches that fill these gaps are identified.</p> <p>1- Satisfactory: The strengths and weaknesses of the literature reviews are clearly summarized. Gaps in current knowledge are clearly identified and approaches that fill these gaps are identified. Solutions tend to be mundane</p> <p>0- Unsatisfactory: No clear conclusions are evident. At most only a summary is presented.</p>	
<p>Comments:</p>	