



CENTER for FACULTY  
EXCELLENCE

# Scholarship Review

## Quantitative Research Rubric

Name of Author:

Title of the abstract/presentation/manuscript, or scholarly project:

Name and title of Reviewer:

Date reviewed and returned to CFE:

**Approved**

**Not Approved**

**Recommend further revision and subsequent review**

**Note:** To ensure that the work follows appropriate ethical guidelines, verify that approval has been received from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Research and/or the IRB respectively when appropriate.

CRITERIA		POOR (1 point)	SATISFACTORY (2 points)	EXCELLENT (3 points)	TOTAL Points	COMMENTS
TITLE		Title is irrelevant or fails to offer appropriate information of the study.	Title is relevant, informative but not 12 words or less	Title is relevant, informative and 12 words or less		
ABSTRACT		Does not clearly state the research question, context, methodology, and analysis Information provided is inaccurate or irrelevant to the study.	Generally states the research question, context, methodology, and analysis but includes vague or confusing information.	Clearly and concisely states the research question, context, methodology, data analysis.		
INTRODUCTION	Problem Background	A research problem is identified but the description fails to establish a link to the literature and research questions.	A research problem is identified with a few examples of evidence from the literature but loosely	Articulates a specific, significant problem or issue(s) with supporting evidence from literature. Fits well to the research questions.		



CENTER for FACULTY  
EXCELLENCE

## Scholarship Review

CRITERIA		POOR (1 point)	SATISFACTORY (2 points)	EXCELLENT (3 points)	TOTAL Points	COMMENTS
			connected to the research questions.			
	Problem Statement	Incomplete and/or unfocused	States the purpose in a single paragraph with sufficient literature, but is vague or not well-worded.	Clearly states the purpose in a single paragraph with relevant literature.		
	Research Objectives/Questions	Does not clearly state the research purpose or rationale. The research questions posed were written poorly and/or out of focus of the intent of the research.	States the purpose of the research but lacks a clear rationale. The research questions were written in accordance with the intent of the research.	Clearly states the purpose of the research with rationale. Research questions were clearly posed and all fit well with the issue(s) under study.		
	Framework (Theoretical/Conceptual)	Illustrations and descriptions of the theoretical and conceptual frameworks are not appropriate with the research questions and research design. There is little supporting literature.	Theoretical and conceptual frameworks are illustrated and briefly described in accordance with research questions and the research design. Brief descriptions of the frameworks with relevant literature.	Theoretical and conceptual frameworks are appropriately illustrated and described in accordance with the research questions and the research design. Clearly describes frameworks with relevant literature.		
	Definitions, Rationale, Significance, and Limitations	Articulates clear definitions given the purpose, design and methods of the study. A thorough, reasonable discussion of assumptions, significance of the study and limitations is provided.	Constructs have been identified and operationally defined. Assumptions, significance of the study and limitations are described briefly.	Definitions, assumptions, significance of the study and limitations were omitted or inappropriate given the context, purpose, or methods of the study.		
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE		The structure of the literature review is weak; it does not identify important ideas, constructs or issue(s) related to the research purpose, questions, or context.	A workable structure has been delineated for presenting relevant literature related to the issue(s) of the study. Citations used	Structure is intuitive and sufficiently grounded to each of the key constructs and issue(s) of the study. Citations used		



CENTER for FACULTY  
EXCELLENCE

## Scholarship Review

CRITERIA		POOR (1 point)	SATISFACTORY (2 points)	EXCELLENT (3 points)	TOTAL Points	COMMENTS
		Citations used are more than 5 years since publication.	include peer-reviewed journal articles published within the last 5 years.	include peer-reviewed journal articles published within the last 5 years.		
RESEARCH DESIGN		The research design is confusing or inaccurate to answer the research questions and sampling strategy.	The research design has been identified and described in sufficient and detailed terms. The research design is relevant to address the research questions.	The research design is appropriate to answer the research questions. The purpose, questions, and design are mutually supportive and coherent.		
METHODOLOGY	SAMPLING	The description of the context where the sample was situated and sampling strategy was vague and lacked relevance to the purpose of the study. Number of research participants was insufficient.	The sample of the study was identified appropriately to the context of the study. Description of the sampling procedure was sufficient with the research design, but lack of justification. Number of research participants was sufficient related to the power analysis and interpretation of data.	The description of the sample is based on the context of the study. The sampling procedure was appropriate with the research design. Justification is provided. Number of research participants was sufficient related to the power analysis and interpretation of data.		
METHODOLOGY continued	DATA COLLECTION	Data collection procedures were confusing, incomplete, or lacked relevance to purpose, research questions, or sampling strategy. The relevant descriptions of research protocol and ethics were not included. Descriptions to assure dependability, reliability, and credibility of data through data collection procedures were insufficient.	Data collection procedures for generating data were identified and described in a systematic way. Descriptions of procedures involved in data collection included protocol and ethical considerations. Evidence of dependability, reliability, and credibility of data through data collection procedures was sufficient.	Data collection procedures were thorough, manageable, coherent, and powerful for generating rich and in-depth data. Descriptions of procedures involved in data collection include protocol and ethical considerations are clear and structured. Reasonable evidence of dependability, reliability, and credibility of data through data		



CENTER for FACULTY  
EXCELLENCE

## Scholarship Review

CRITERIA		POOR (1 point)	SATISFACTORY (2 points)	EXCELLENT (3 points)	TOTAL Points	COMMENTS
				collection procedures was presented and clearly stated.		
METHODOLOGY continued	DATA ANALYSIS	Analytical method was confusing, incomplete or lacked relevance to the research questions, data, or research design.	Data analysis procedures and its specific features were appropriately described with little relevance to the research questions and research design.	Data analysis procedures and its specific features were well-described and appropriate with given research questions and research design.		
FINDINGS		Findings are missing or unclear.	Findings are present but do not adequately capture the interpretation of the data collection and analysis.	Findings are effectively summarized with good use of excerpts and supporting arguments. The findings of the research study adequately capture the interpretation of the data collection and analysis. The findings are directly linked to the philosophical basis of the study.		
IMPLICATIONS		Implications of the study are missing or unclear.	Implications of the study are present but need to be expanded upon further.	Implications of the study related to healthcare practice, education, and/or further research are thoroughly discussed.		