

APPENDIX E: SCIENCE EDUCATION MA FINAL PROJECT RUBRIC

**Master of Arts in Science Education
Cumulative Scholarly Work Rubric**

Student Name _____

Student number: _____

Scholarly Work: Select one

Advisor: Select one

Evaluator: Select one

Scoring Rubric				
Aspects	Score = 1	Score = 2	Score = 3	Score = 4
Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus of the work is overbroad, ambiguous, confusing, and/or misinformed and the details are minimal.	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus of the work is sensible, specific, and safe. It provides a positive base for the work but may not include convincing details or insight.	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus of the work is thoughtful and targeted, including relevant details, providing a strong, informed base for the work.	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus of the work is insightful and rich. Substantive details are interwoven to provide an effective significant base for the work.
Connection to existing Literature or standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Literature review is sketchy and vague or limited in significance to the focus of the scholarly work.	<input type="checkbox"/> Literature review provides a minimal examination of the prior research OR although the literature review is adequate the connection and impact on the study is unclear or loosely related.	<input type="checkbox"/> Literature review provides a strong theoretical framework outlining prior research related to the focus of the scholarly work.	<input type="checkbox"/> Literature review provides an in depth, well-defined examination of the variety and significance of prior research and demonstrates how this research informs the focus of the scholarly work.
Impact of Master's Program on Scholarly Work	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact of the Master's Program on the scholarly work is unclear.	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact of the Master's Program can be intuitively understood in the scholarly work but is not defined.	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact of the Master's Program on the scholarly work is clearly defined although not as well described as a four.	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact of the Master's Program on the scholarly work is demonstrated through the multiple aspects of the work and is significant.
Quality of Work	<input type="checkbox"/> There is little evidence of analysis or synthesis in the scholarly work. The final product is simplistic.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is evidence of accurate analytical ability and synthesis in certain sections of the scholarly work, but overall the conclusions drawn, the curriculum developed and/or the questions answered are routine.	<input type="checkbox"/> Throughout the work the conclusions drawn, the curriculum developed or the questions answered demonstrate logical analysis and thoughtful synthesis.	<input type="checkbox"/> Throughout the work there are multiple examples of reflective analysis, and insightful synthesis. The conclusions, curriculum developed and/or questions answered provide creative solutions to a challenging focus.
Implications on Classroom Practice	<input type="checkbox"/> There is little evidence of any implications of the scholarly work on classroom practice.	<input type="checkbox"/> Implications of the scholarly work on classroom practice are general and/or lack a connection to future use.	<input type="checkbox"/> Implications of the scholarly work on classroom practice are convincingly defined and are related to future use.	<input type="checkbox"/> Implications of the scholarly work on classroom practice are effective and rich in detail and tightly connected to future use.
Professional Significance of Work	<input type="checkbox"/> There is little evidence of the impact of the scholarly work on a wider professional community.	<input type="checkbox"/> Significance of the scholarly work to the wider community is general and/or is ill defined or weakly explained.	<input type="checkbox"/> Scholarly work carries significance to the wider professional community and this is fully delineated.	<input type="checkbox"/> Scholarly work will inform the wider community and engage them in challenging ways producing significant impact of this community.
Communication Competency	<input type="checkbox"/> Sentence structure varies little, organization is confusing or grammatical errors distract from the scholarly work	<input type="checkbox"/> Sentences are varied in length or structure but may not show as much variety as a level 3. Communication may have less organization or may have problems with grammar.	<input type="checkbox"/> Sentences are varied in length and structure. They are creative and well connected. Communication flows and contains few if any grammatical errors.	<input type="checkbox"/> Language is precise, powerful and engaging. Sentences are varied in length and structure demonstrating creativity, clarity, and organization.
Product Format/ APA Style	<input type="checkbox"/> Product format does not conform at all to APA or accepted formatting guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/> Product illustrates rare or occasional, but not consistent use of APA or accepted formatting guidelines.	<input type="checkbox"/> Product mostly illustrates use of APA or accepted formatting guidelines, but is still somewhat inconsistent.	<input type="checkbox"/> Product format completely follows all APA and accepted formatting guidelines

This Rubric is meant to be formative as well as summative. A min score of "3" in each aspect is required for successful completion, and consequently is unlikely on thesis proposals or first drafts of products.

PLEASE NOTE: We are continually working to improve the quality of our program through the quality of products our students produce. As such, this version of rubric is currently under revision and may be updated in the course of your graduate career. You will be informed of any changes as they are approved.