

Rubric for the Preliminary Exam Project (This rubric was established for the traditional quantitative research. Efforts were made to include other research formats. Both faculty and students in other areas may exercise a certain level of flexibility for other research formats.)

Introduction & Literature Review	Target – Outstanding 4-5	Acceptable 3	Unacceptable 1-2
Topic Relevancy	Rationale convinces the reader why the topic is timely and relevant.	Rationale makes a case for importance of the topic.	Rationale for topic relevancy is weak. No rationale is provided for topic choice.
Theories & Background	The topic is contextualized by providing theory, research, and historical perspectives. Popular and alternative views are considered. Clear definitions and descriptions of the topic and terms are provided. The relevant literature is fully reviewed and cited.	Theory, research, or historical perspectives are presented, but not fully explained or described. Definitions and descriptions are weak.	Only some background information is presented with weak definitions or descriptions of the topic. The topic is not contextualized within a larger context.
Critical Analysis of Primary Studies	Both content and methodology of at least 10 primary studies are considered in the review. It is apparent that the analysis originates from the reviewer instead of being a summary of limitations noted by the authors of the primary literature being reviewed. Adequate detail is provided and the most relevant features are highlighted. The conclusions proposed by the reviewer are supported with details from the primary studies.	Both content and methodology are considered with a moderate amount of detail. The conclusions drawn are sometimes supported with details from the primary studies.	Only one area (i.e., content or methodology) or less is addressed adequately. Few details are provided to support conclusions.
Coherence and Relevance to Proposed Study	Rationale for the proposed study is apparent. “Gaps” in the literature relevant to the proposed study are emphasized. It is clear what is most important across this body of work - at least in relation to the proposed study. Instead of being a list of facts or a summary report of each reviewed study, the reviewer provides a cohesive story and justification that integrates information across studies.	A rationale for the proposed study is somewhat clear to the reader. Some of the “gaps” in the literature related to the proposed study are highlighted. Some of the paper reads as a list of facts or summary report.	Little discussion is focused on the “gaps” in the research. Most of the paper reads as a list of facts or summary of the articles with little attention to integrating information or considering elements across studies. No attempt is made to provide detailed information about each study reviewed.

Study Purpose	The purpose is explicitly and clearly articulated through the use of a purpose statement or set of research questions. The reader does not have to deduce the purpose and the unique contribution of the study to the literature.	The purpose of the paper is outlined, but the purpose statement or research questions lack details.	The purpose for the study is partially outlined but unclear or the purpose of the study is not considered explicitly.
Method			
Design and Sampling Procedures	Design is clearly articulated and a rationale is provided. The sampling procedure is justified and clearly outlined. The plan is based on sound sampling procedures for the purposes of the study (e.g., experimental intervention studies establishing equivalence of groups). The limitations of the proposed design are adequately discussed.	The design is stated and a rationale is provided. Sampling procedure is unclear or stated without a rationale.	The design is vaguely articulated with few details describing it.
Participants or units of analysis	Participants or units of analysis are described in detail. The number of participants or units of analysis are reported. Characteristics important to the study are discussed. Inclusion and exclusion criteria are established. It is clear from the description who (or what) is eligible for the study and who (or what) is not.	Participants or units of analysis are described with some detail. One or more characteristics relevant to the proposed study are not discussed. Inclusion criteria are provided with some details.	Participants or units of analysis are described with little to no detail, but important characteristics relevant to the proposed study are not mentioned.
Procedures	The factors involved in the procedures are fully described and justified with good research design principles and/or previous studies. Procedures for training, implementation, and fidelity are outlined if applicable. The description of the procedures makes this study easy to replicate. If conducting an experimental study, the independent variable is identified and fully described.	The procedures involved are described but lack some details. Some of the procedures for training, implementation, and fidelity are described.	The procedures are not addressed, or the factors studied are named. Little descriptive information is provided about the procedures, factors or the provided information is unclear.
Measurement	The outcome factors directly link to the study purpose or study questions. The construct for each outcome factor is discussed and a rationale provided. Each measure is fully described including whether the measure is an existing measure or a custom measure. Reliability and validity of each existing measure is included if available. For custom measures, a statement about	Only some of the outcome factors link directly with the study's purpose or questions. The outcome factors are adequately described including the type of measure and reliability and validity if applicable.	Little to no information is given about the outcome factors.

	how reliability and validity will be determined is included. A plan for training and fidelity is discussed if appropriate.		
Results			
Descriptive Statistics or Outcome Factors	Means and Standard Deviations (M & SD) are computed and reported along with clear explanations of any special trends and anomalies. If it is a psychometric validation project, both reliability and validity indices are reported and explained when available. For qualitative research, outcome factors are clearly described.	Means and Standard Deviations (M & SD) are computed and reported along with marginal explanations of trends and anomalies. If it is a psychometric validation project, both reliability and validity indices are reported and explained when available. For qualitative research, outcome factors are described.	Explanations on Means and Standard Deviations (M & SD) are unclear. Reliability and validity indices are not reported. For qualitative research, outcome factors are not described.
Inferential Statistics (for quantitative research only)	Statistical methods applied are appropriate for the project. All necessary statistical indices are computed, reported, and clearly interpreted.	Statistical methods applied are appropriate for the project. Major indices are computed, reported, and interpreted.	Statistical methods applied are inappropriate for the project. Not all necessary indices are computed, reported, and interpreted.
Discussion			
Highlight Main Contributions	Clearly and insightfully highlighted the findings of the project in conjunction with previous findings and controversies. Described both similarities and dissimilarities between the current and previous findings. Speculated possible reasons for differences with caution.	Described the findings of the project in conjunction with previous findings and controversies. Tried to explain both similarities and dissimilarities between the current and previous findings.	No clear highlights of the project in conjunction with previous findings and controversies. No explanations on both similarities and dissimilarities between the current and previous findings.
Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research	Acknowledged a couple of major and reasonable limitations of the project and make practical and feasible suggestions for future research.	Listed limitations of the project are less reasonable and future suggestions are less practical.	Failed to list reasonable limitations of the project and future suggestions.

General Elements Across the Manuscript			
Coherence	Links between introduction, research questions, and proposed methods are apparent. There is a tight fit between study purpose or questions and the methods.	Links between the introduction, research questions, and methods are outlined, but some methods don't match to the study questions or statement.	Few to no links are made between the introduction, research questions, and methods.
Writing	Writing is concise and clear. The ideas are presented clearly and logically to support the author's purpose. Ideas are effectively linked, so the reader can follow the line of reasoning easily. Transitions and headings are used to guide the reader through the text.	Most of the writing is concise and clear. Most ideas are presented clearly and logically. A line of reasoning is apparent. Transitions and headings are used appropriately throughout most of the paper.	Writing is unclear, disorganized, or wordy.
APA format	APA guidelines are followed throughout the paper. The paper includes a title page, abstract, body, references, and at least one table with appropriate formatting. Citations are used generously throughout the paper to support any assertions made or to give credit to others' ideas.	APA guidelines are followed consistently throughout the paper with only a few errors. Citations are used throughout most of the paper.	APA guidelines are followed sporadically or are not apparent.

Preliminary Examination Evaluation Form for Manuscript

Literacy Studies Ph.D. Program

Student Name: _____ (M#): _____ Date: _____

Evaluator Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

Directions: Please use the following rating scale for each category of the manuscript.

1 = very poor 2 = poor 3 = satisfactory 4 = good 5 = excellent

1. In order to pass the exam, student should receive at least a score of 3 for each category and the total score should be 20 or above.
2. Student may revise and resubmit only once upon the feedback. If fails for the second time, the student will be not be allowed to continue in the Program.
3. Attach or write comments on this form to provide an explanation of your ratings and score. It is required if your score does not pass the student.
4. The evaluator will make the decision within two weeks after receiving the manuscript.
5. **This evaluation form was established for the traditional quantitative research. Efforts were made to include other research formats. The evaluator may exercise a certain level of flexibility for other research formats.**

1. Introduction and Literature Review:	1	2	3	4	5
a. The topic is relevant for the project.					
b. The topic is contextualized by providing theory, research, or historical perspectives.					
c. Popular and alternative views are considered.					
d. At least 10 primary studies are reviewed.					
e. The purpose is explicitly articulated and justified.					
2. Method:	1	2	3	4	5
a. Design is clearly explained, and sampling procedure is well outlined.					
b. Participants are described in detail (# of participants, characteristics, inclusion criteria).					
c. Each measurement is fully described including reliability and validity indices if applicable.					
d. Procedure is well described enough to replicate the study (e.g., treatment implementation, training, and fidelity).					
3. Results:	1	2	3	4	5
a. Means and SDs are reported with explanations of trends and anomalies.					
b. Reliability and validity indices are reported if necessary.					
c. Inferential statistics (along with effect size) are appropriate for the project.					
d. Necessary Tables and Figures are reported with clear explanations.					
e. For qualitative research, outcome factors are clearly described.					
4. Discussion:	1	2	3	4	5
a. Main contributions of the study are highlighted with proper references.					
b. Limitations and suggestions for future studies are provided with reason and practicalities.					
c. Insightful speculations and practical application are provided.					
5. General Elements:	1	2	3	4	5
a. Coherence between introduction, research questions, and proposed methods is provided.					
b. Writing is concise and logical.					
c. APA guidelines are well followed throughout the paper.					
d. Proper citations are made with appropriate formatting.					

• Total Points () Decision: Fail () Return for revision () Pass ()