**Milestone Research Paper Evaluation and Rating Sheet**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Rating Scale

0= Far Below Expectation (significant omissions, poorly communicated content)

1= Below Expectations (not ready for submission as a manuscript because it lacks qualities such as those specified in each category below)

2= Minor Revisions Required in order to Meet Expectations (as specified below)

3= Meets Expectations (sufficient attention and quality in all components)

4= Meets Expectations (strong in all component areas)

5= Exceeds Expectations (excellent with respect to qualities such as those listed in each category below)

*(Must meet expectations in each area prior to final acceptance of project)*

\_\_\_\_\_ Rationale (sufficient justification, relevant literature cited, theoretically grounded)

\_\_\_\_\_ Methods (each required section present, sufficient detail, accurate)

\_\_\_\_\_ Analyses (appropriate, clearly presented, accurate)

\_\_\_\_\_ Results (organized, follow from hypotheses, accurate)

\_\_\_\_\_ Discussion (relevant literature cited, limitations acknowledged, implications for practice, research, policy discussed as appropriate)

\_\_\_\_\_ Writing quality (well-structured sentences & paragraphs, no errors of grammar or typos, clear and precise language, organized, structured, headings)

\_\_\_\_\_ APA 7th edition format

\_\_\_\_\_ Attention to diversity (e.g. indicates sample composition in lit review, addresses limitations of measurement and external validity with diverse populations)

\_\_\_\_\_ Attention to ecological and social justice factors bearing upon topic (levels of ecology evident in conceptualization, relevant issues of marginalization or reproduction of status quo addressed)

This requirement is \_\_\_\_\_ Accepted \_\_\_\_\_ Not accepted

Overall Rating: (0-5) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (see next page for rubric)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Advisor Signature Date

The number circled indicates the level the student achieved in this competency area.

5 This requirement goes beyond the expected level for a typical doctoral student at this stage of training. A thorough, accurate, and comprehensive understanding of specialty area/research topic is demonstrated along with a strong rationale for the study. Every element of the task is presented with clarity, depth of thought, and focused and coherent organization. Analyses well suited to questions, presented very well. Evidence base included. The content is expressed with superior precision and literacy.

4 This requirement includes all elements of a publishable research project, well justified, research addresses the relevant elements and demonstrates a solid understanding of the area. It shows clear and sophisticated thinking and good organization and structure. Presentation of material is skillful and thorough. Well-cited. Evidence base included.

3 This requirement includes all elements of a publishable research project. The content, while sound, may also be slightly under-elaborated or at a minimally acceptable level. Like the 4 – level response, it shows clarity of thought but may lack tight, cohesive organization (some digressions may be evident). Content is adequate to demonstrate competency, but more would be needed to gain higher levels of expertise in the area.

2 This requirement neglects one or more components (rationale, results) such that it provides only a superficial or underdeveloped treatment of the area. Evidence base may be insufficient. It may show some clarity of thought while being overly simplistic. Problems in organization may be evident. The writing frequently impedes communication of the writer’s ideas. Content is presented at the minimal level, and is not unacceptable for a doctoral student at this stage of development. Room for improvement is evident.

1 This requirement seriously neglects or distorts one or more of the relevant elements or offers less than minimal treatment of the area. Evidence base not presented. Alternatively, it may demonstrate substantial problems with analysis, organization, and understanding of the topic. Presentation is unorganized, poor reflection of knowledge.

0 This requirement entirely fails to address the topic or relevant tasks. Alternatively, it demonstrates marked problems with organization and mechanics that makes the presentation extremely difficult to follow.
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