

## Literature Review Rubric (June 08)

<b>Topic, Score, &amp; Alignment</b> S = SED L = LEAD K = K-12 H = HEA	<b>5</b>  <b>Exceptional</b>	<b>4</b>  <b>Proficient</b>	<b>3</b>  <b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>2</b>  <b>Emerging (subject to revision)</b>	<b>1</b>  <b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>Synthesis</b>  40%    S-V L-4a K-9 H-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The research focus is clearly situated in broader scholarly literature and in a historical context</li> <li>• Develops a new direction of research based on what has been done and what needs to be done</li> <li>• Clarifies and resolves ambiguities and contradictions in the literature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The research focus is situated in broader scholarly literature or in a historical context</li> <li>• Effective examination leads to statement of new direction for research</li> <li>• Ambiguities are acknowledged but only partially resolved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some historical context</li> <li>• Emerging new direction in the literature is evident</li> <li>• Sufficient critical analysis and adequate review of key terms and ambiguities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited historical context</li> <li>• Limited critical analysis and partial review of key terms and ambiguities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No historical context given</li> <li>• Poor analysis of topic and field</li> <li>• Key ambiguities and definitions missing</li> </ul>
<b>Methodology</b>  10%    S-V L-4a K-9 H-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critiques appropriateness and practical significance of research methods</li> <li>• Introduces new research methods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies research methods and connects them to proposed research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research methods reviewed but limited link made to proposed research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research methods discussed but taken at face value</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research methods not discussed</li> </ul>
<b>Significance</b>  10%    S-V L-4a K-9 H-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both the practical and scholarly significance of prior research are clearly reviewed and critiqued</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both the practical and scholarly significance of prior research are reviewed and critiqued</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the practical and scholarly significance of prior research are reviewed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Either practical or scholarly significance are reviewed, but not both</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments made about the practical or scholarly significance of prior research</li> </ul>

<p><b>Search &amp; Selection</b></p> <p>10% S-IVb, V L-4a K-9 H-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a comprehensive and systematic search and selection of material</li> <li>Wide use of databases, experts, handbooks, and web resources</li> <li>Use of high quality sources, like peer-reviewed articles and empirical studies (quantitative and qualitative)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a broad search and selection of material</li> <li>Consistent use of databases, experts, handbooks, and web resources</li> <li>Selection of high quality material, like peer-reviewed articles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a basic search of some databases and resources</li> <li>Some use of databases, experts, handbooks, and web resources</li> <li>Some use of high-quality materials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a limited search</li> <li>Limited use of databases, experts, handbooks, and web resources</li> <li>A few well selected materials, but mostly non-scholarly resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence of systematic or sufficient search</li> <li>No use of databases, experts, handbooks, and web resources</li> <li>Poor selection of material</li> </ul>
<p><b>Breadth &amp; Scope</b></p> <p>10% S-V L-4a K-9 H-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistently explains why specific topics and material are used</li> <li>Gives criteria for inclusion and exclusion of sources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explains why specific topics and material are used</li> <li>Gives some criteria for inclusion and exclusion of sources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discusses some of the reasons for included and excluded literature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minor discussion of the reasons for included and excluded literature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not discuss the criteria for inclusion or exclusion</li> </ul>
<p><b>Style &amp; Format</b> (APA and AU Standards)</p> <p>10% S-IVa L-2a K-? H-2a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Models language, style, and format of scholarly literature</li> <li>Publishable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Style and format standards consistently applied</li> <li>Accurately documented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few errors of style and format</li> <li>Most sources documented correctly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inconsistent style and format</li> <li>Lacks precision in use of quotations and citation of sources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Style and format standards not applied</li> <li>Sources plagiarized</li> <li>Clarity compromised by errors</li> </ul>
<p><b>Mechanics</b> (spelling, grammar, punctuation, sentence structure)</p> <p>10% S-IVa L-2a K-? H-2a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Free of mechanical errors</li> <li>Smooth flow and effective transitions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few mechanical errors</li> <li>Good flow and strong transitions increase comprehensibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally follows mechanical conventions, but with some minor errors</li> <li>Appropriate transitions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Frequent mechanical errors</li> <li>Ineffective transitions and flow from point to point</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Numerous mechanical errors, making comprehension almost impossible</li> </ul>

Many aspects of this rubric are adapted from Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. *Educational Researcher*, 34(6), 3-15.