

Assessment of Counseling Psychology Theses

The Counseling Psychology program has adopted the following rubric for assessing theses. Thesis advisors will utilize this rubric to provide specific feedback regarding the final draft of the thesis which, if approved by the thesis advisor, is submitted by the student to the Internal APA Proofreader and Research Coordinator.

Student Name: _____

Title of Thesis: _____

Track: _____

Overall Quality of Thought and Expression

Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/>	Poor <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Lucid, coherent, and evocative writing that immediately engages readers and sustains their excitement throughout.</p> <p>Language that reflects both intellectual sophistication and depth of feeling in elegantly constructed sentences, paragraphs, and whole chapters.</p> <p>Clear evidence of a developing scholarly voice that is inquiring rather than ideological or polemical.</p> <p>Clearly substantiates any conclusions.</p> <p>Critiques other works, authors, or theories in a knowledgeable, fair, and respectful manner.</p> <p>Well organized and complete with no gaps in content; easy for reader to follow.</p> <p>Adheres to Pacifica/APA style guidelines.</p>	<p>Clear and complete writing, organized in a logical manner that sustains the reader's interest.</p> <p>Competent use of language.</p> <p>Clear evidence of a beginning scholarly voice that is inquiring, not ideological.</p> <p>Declarative statements or claims are substantiated with clear citation and referencing.</p> <p>Demonstrates fair and respectful approach to other works.</p> <p>Good organization that leads reader through the research in a fairly smooth manner.</p> <p>Adheres to Pacifica/APA style guidelines with very few exceptions.</p>	<p>Poor or limited flow of ideas, problematic use of language and vocabulary, and incomplete thoughts. Work is not interesting, notable, or compelling in any way.</p> <p>Noticeable presence of errors in grammar, paragraph construction, and transitions between paragraphs.</p> <p>Writing is narcissistic, self-interested, and/or narrow-minded.</p> <p>Vague generalizations that are unsubstantiated in a scholarly manner.</p> <p>Chaotic and erratic organization and/or significant gaps in content; subheadings do not reflect material in the section.</p> <p>Shows little or no awareness of Pacifica/APA style guidelines.</p>

Significance of Topic

Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/>	Poor <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Explicit evidence that the research is relevant to the student's development as a therapist.</p>	<p>Clear attention to the issue's significance in the student's development as a therapist.</p>	<p>Little or no thought given to the significance. Inadequate evidence that the issue is relevant to the student's development as a therapist.</p>

Introduction to Topic

Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/>	Poor <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Immediately draws the reader in and presents the topic in an engaging manner.</p> <p>Provides a succinct overview and context, sets up the research question smoothly, and shows why it is important.</p> <p>Exhibits breadth and depth of thought and sensitivity to diverse perspectives.</p> <p>Discussion of the limitations of the research; marked lack of intellectual hubris.</p>	<p>A competent overview of the topic that is adequately organized and presented.</p> <p>Coherent flow of ideas with no gaps in logic.</p> <p>Discusses the limitations of the research.</p>	<p>Poorly written, incomplete, lacks coherent organization and logical structure. Little thought given to guiding the reader into the topic or beginning to establish the need for the research.</p> <p>Contains sweeping knowledge claims that are unsubstantiated and appear to be unexamined.</p>

Research Question

Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/>	Poor <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Clear, compelling, and thought-provoking question for other therapists as well as the student researcher.</p>	<p>Clear and researchable question that is relevant and/or grounded in a discipline.</p>	<p>Question too complex, not clear, or too broad.</p> <p>Too many questions that reflect scattered and incoherent thinking.</p>

Literature Review

Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/>	Poor <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Comprehensive discussion that demonstrates good critical thinking and the ability to relate existing literature to the research.</p> <p>Well-organized literature categories that relate organically to the research question and are introduced in a concise way.</p> <p>Well-integrated discussion that relates the literature reviewed to the research question.</p> <p>Polished presentation of multiple perspectives that deepens an understanding of the literature reviewed and the research question.</p> <p>Clear attribution of sources engaged with the student's voice.</p>	<p>Adequate coverage of the literature with basic critical analysis and synthesis with the research question.</p> <p>Well-organized with some thought to how each text is related to the research question.</p> <p>Integrates quotes from the literature to explore the research question.</p> <p>Clear attribution of sources.</p> <p>Discusses multiple perspectives.</p>	<p>Incomplete. Misses or omits important studies relevant to the topic.</p> <p>Does not use adequate original sources or only uses secondary sources.</p> <p>Relevance of the literature to the research question is unclear.</p> <p>Uses quotes without integrating their relevance to the research question and topic.</p> <p>Unclear attribution of sources.</p> <p>Tone of criticism is strident or polemical.</p>

Methodology, Ethics, and Research Design

Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/>	Poor <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Thoughtful research design that reflects careful planning.</p> <p>Sophisticated critical thinking and self-awareness: researcher is able to question mindfully his or her own assumptions and biases.</p> <p>Detailed ethics section, including a thorough discussion of ethical issues, reflecting careful consideration for the adequate protection of human participants.</p> <p>Demonstrates multicultural competence integrated into the research.</p> <p>Incorporates the role of the unconscious and/or unconscious processes into the methodology.</p>	<p>Research design is clear and relevant to the question.</p> <p>Some critical thinking and self-awareness of assumptions and biases.</p> <p>Sufficient thought given to protection of human participants.</p> <p>Addresses ethical issues in a general way.</p> <p>Some discussion of cultural and community awareness.</p> <p>Some discussion of the unconscious and/or unconscious processes related to the methodology.</p>	<p>No clear relationship between research question and chosen methodology.</p> <p>Researcher demonstrates little or no self awareness of assumptions and biases.</p> <p>Obvious potential problems with the ethics protocol that may lead to harm.</p> <p>Demonstrates no awareness of cultural diversity issues.</p> <p>No discussion or awareness of unconscious processes.</p>

Analysis and Conclusions

Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/>	Poor <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Complete discussion that integrates all parts of the work in a thorough, balanced presentation.</p> <p>Discussion is well-informed and explores unanticipated results.</p> <p>Clinical application is clear and insightful.</p> <p>Stimulating discussion of implications for future research.</p>	<p>Summarizes the results and provides interesting and meaningful interpretations related to the research question.</p> <p>Discussion is knowledgeable and integrated.</p> <p>Discussion includes clinical application.</p> <p>Contextualizes research in an adequate manner.</p>	<p>Shows inadequate understanding of the research and little thought to the meaning and implications of the results.</p> <p>Interpretation of data is either too superficial or too broad, unsupported by the actual results.</p> <p>Tone is strident or polemical; researcher has failed to examine his or her own biases and assumptions.</p>

Formatting

Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/>	Poor <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Abstract succinctly summarizes the research question and findings and contains a statement of methodology.</p> <p>References thoroughly address and deepen the topic.</p>	<p>Abstract generally describes the research question and findings and contains a statement of methodology within the 150 word limit.</p> <p>Pacifica/APA formatting is followed as indicated in the current Counseling Psychology Program's <i>Thesis Handbook</i>.</p> <p>Images adhere to copyright law and</p>	<p>Abstract does not adhere to acceptable guidelines.</p> <p>Errors or omissions in Pacifica/APA formatting.</p> <p>Use of images violates copyright law.</p> <p>Text is too long or not of adequate length.</p>

	<p>Pacifica/APA citation and referencing format.</p> <p>Text is of length specified in the current handbook.</p> <p><i>A minimum of 25 References. All references are cited in the text; all text citations are in the References.</i></p>	<p>Inadequate number of references; references not matched in the text; text citations not listed in the References.</p>
--	--	--

Approved: _____

Not Approved: _____

Thesis Advisor's Signature: _____