### Graduate Learner Outcomes Dissertation Rubric Evaluating the Dissertation Fall 2011

**School:** Education  
**Department:** Special Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Outcome Quality Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outstanding - 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Statement of the Problem    | • Well-articulated and relevant question  
• Makes a persuasive convincing case | • Articulates an interesting question | • Provides a general discussion of question or issues but has limited specificity in the statement of the problem | • Shows a fundamental lack of understanding of the problem  
• Poorly written, incomplete, lacks structure |
| Grounding in the Literature| • Demonstrates mastery of the relevant literature and critical insight  
• Critical synthesis of relevant literature | • Shows mastery of relevant literature | • Adequate literature review but review is uncritical  
• Displays limited understanding of the field | • Misreads or misuses sources  
• Missing relevant sources  
• Plagiarizes |
| Mastery of Research Methods | • Uses sophisticated design and methods  
• Demonstrates technical competence with regards to design and methods  
• Well-executed research including data collection and analyses | • Demonstrates technical competence with regards to design and methods  
• Well-executed research including data collection and analyses | • Demonstrates ability to do research  
• Uses standard methods and analyses | • Inappropriate or incorrect design or methods  
• Wrong, inappropriate, incoherent, confused, uninformative analyses  
• Data are flawed, falsified, misinterpreted, irrelevant, or confusing |
| Written Communication Skills| Well written and organized  
• Adequately written and organized | • Writing does not flow  
• Writing lacks originality or creativity | • Poorly written  
• Spelling and grammatical errors  
• Poorly organized |
| Analysis and Interpretation | • Compelling and coherent  
• Demonstrates mature, independent thinking  
• Focused and logical  
• Coherent and logical  
• Insightful | • Lacks synthesis  
• Lacks insight  
• Narrow of scope | • Weak, inconsistent or invalid  
• Conclusions are unsupported, exaggerated or invalid |
| Significance and Impact     | • Original and significant  
• Interdisciplinary  
• Will make an important contribution to the field  
• Will advance the field  
• Of interest to the broader scientific community  
• Pushes new boundaries, opens up new lines of inquiry  
• Some original ideas, insights and observations  
• Programmatic extension of prior research  
• Makes important contribution to the field | • Question or problem is highly derivative of prior work  
• Results are predictable | • Trivial, weak, unoriginal  
• Results are obvious, unexplained, or misinterpreted  
• Will not make a contribution to the field |