

**622 Inquiry Project Rubric for final paper  
(Revised 4/20/09)**

The following criteria will be used to assess the quality of your work.

Dimension	Exceptional (3) 90-100 A	Satisfactory (2) 80-89 B	Poor, but minimally acceptable (1) 70-79 C	Unacceptable (0) 69 and below
<p><b>Introduction and Background</b></p> <p>5%</p>	<p>Focused clearly the question(s); stated a question that is appropriate for qualitative research and the context of 632/622</p> <p>Provided a clear and concise explanation of the issue(s) and/or problem(s) that offered insight and thoughtful reflection</p> <p>Described the significance/importance of the inquiry project as it related to his/her development as a teacher</p> <p>Made links to personal experiences and context using examples to illustrate the need for studying the issue</p>	<p>Stated the question in such a way that its appropriateness is implied</p> <p>Provided explanations of the issue(s) and/or problem(s) that are easy and obvious</p> <p>Explicitly described the significance/importance of the inquiry, but doesn't richly develop the ideas</p> <p>Made links to personal experiences and context, yet provides no examples to illustrate the need of the study</p>	<p>Implied a question and/or the question exceeds the realm of a qualitative inquiry project in 632/622</p> <p>Provided a vague or ambiguous discussion of the issue(s) or problem(s)</p> <p>Implied a significance/importance of the inquiry, but the reader must ferret meaning out</p> <p>Vaguely connected personal experiences and context to the need for a study</p>	<p>No question is stated or implied</p> <p>Explained irrelevant issue(s) or problem(s) or never attempts to explain</p> <p>Lacked any mention of the significance/importance of the inquiry</p> <p>Made irrelevant or no connections to personal experiences or contexts</p>
<p><b>Literature Review</b></p> <p>15 %</p>	<p>Conducted a timely and comprehensive search of previous research that painted a full picture of the topic</p> <p>Gathered information from a variety of relevant sources</p> <p>Included information from those critical readings that provided a foundation to support the inquiry question(s)</p> <p>If research question(s) changed from original proposal or findings necessitated, additional relevant literature was reviewed.</p>	<p>Conducted a review that provided a solid foundation for the inquiry question, yet could be more comprehensive</p>	<p>Conducted a cursory review and/or includes an occasional irrelevant source</p>	<p>Cited irrelevant sources and/or uses unreliable or invalid sources</p> <p>Failed to include additional literature if research question(s) changed or findings indicated additional literature was needed.</p>

<p><b>Methods</b></p> <p>15%</p>	<p>Drew upon theory and experts in the field to ground the decisions that are made in choosing methods of data collection and methods of data analysis</p> <p>Designed a logical and realistic plan of action for implementing the inquiry project</p> <p>Described in "thick description" the activities/actions, and the relationship of those activities/action to the inquiry's purpose</p> <p>Planned to triangulate the data on all questions</p>	<p>Drew upon theory and experts in the field to ground the decisions that are made in choosing methods of data collection and methods of data analysis</p> <p>Designed a logical and realistic plan of action for implementing the inquiry project</p> <p>Described in general terms the activities/actions and the relationships of those activities/action enough so the reader concludes the design is complete</p> <p>Planned to triangulate the data</p>	<p>Implied the legitimacy of the methods chosen for data collection and data analysis</p> <p>Designed a plan of action that causes the reader to suggest ways to improve the implementation of the project</p> <p>Gave a cursory discussion of the activities/actions and relationships of those activities/actions that causes the reader to conclude the project has not been completely thought through</p> <p>Made minor attempts to triangulate the data</p>	<p>Wrote in a very ambiguous fashion so the reader is unsure of what will be done on this project</p>
<p><b>Findings</b></p> <p>25%</p>	<p>Conducted thorough analysis of data according to the methods discussed in the methodology section</p> <p>Provided a clear guide to each of the findings in the paper</p> <p>Patterns or themes were identified and fully supported by data</p>	<p>Conducted thorough analysis of data</p> <p>Provided a rough guide to each of the findings in the paper</p> <p>Patterns and themes were identified with data</p> <p>Partially related findings with referenced literature</p>	<p>Findings were not organized in a coherent way</p> <p>Patterns were identified but partially supported by data</p>	<p>Findings were reported in vague ways without much support by data</p>
<p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>30%</p>	<p>Speculated on the findings in relation to the research questions asked in the initial stage and referenced literature</p> <p>Provided insights and implications for future practice</p>	<p>Speculated on findings but did not fully relate them to research questions and referenced literature</p> <p>Provided some implications for future practice</p>	<p>Repeated the findings or was limited to a brief summary of findings</p> <p>Mentioned implications for future practice</p>	<p>Limited to summary of findings or did not provide any implications for future practice</p>

<p><b>Organization</b></p> <p>5%</p>	<p>Presented materials and explanations in a clear, coherent, and logical fashion so the reader has no difficulty understanding the message</p> <p>If multiple authors, wrote such that one voice carried throughout the proposal</p> <p>Developed transitions between ideas and concepts that caused the reader to moves smoothly from one idea to another</p> <p>Concluded the work in a fashion that drew the piece together and closed the conversation without an abrupt ending</p>	<p>Presented materials and explanations such that the reader has no difficulty understanding the message</p> <p>If multiple authors, wrote such that one voice carried throughout the proposal</p> <p>Used transitions occasionally to signal changes of ideas and concepts</p> <p>Ended the work by summarizing the purpose of the project</p>	<p>Wrote such that the reader occasionally needs to reread sections or passages to maintain a train of thought in the writing</p> <p>Attempted to write with one voice, if multiple authors</p> <p>Rarely used transitions</p> <p>Used the end of a section as the end of the paper</p>	<p>Organized and wrote such that the reader finds it nearly impossible to read the paper</p>
<p><b>Mechanics</b></p> <p>5%</p>	<p>Wrote a paper that matches the high expectations of professional publishing in the field of education</p> <p>Followed the conventions of Standard English and few, if any, errors are made in syntax, grammar, punctuation, and/or spelling</p> <p>Chose words that are precise for their message and contribute to the reader's understanding</p> <p>Varied sentence structure to enhance the readability of the paper.</p>	<p>Wrote a paper such that with a few minor revisions could be published in the field of education</p> <p>Followed the conventions of Standard English and few, if any, errors are made in syntax, grammar, punctuation, and/or spelling</p> <p>Chose words that are precise, but are often used repeatedly</p> <p>Varied sentence structure</p>	<p>Wrote a paper such that major revisions would be needed for publication</p> <p>Made numerous errors in Standard English which at times detract from understanding the message</p> <p>Chose words that reflect a simple, nonprofessional vocabulary</p> <p>Used simple sentence structure throughout which creates a monotone</p>	<p>Wrote with so many errors in mechanics that the paper is unreadable</p>