

Students Name:

Student's Graduate Program:

## Rubric for Evaluating PhD Dissertation and Defense (Final Oral Exam)

Committee Members, Readers and Students are responsible for being aware of the evaluation rubric in advance of the defense.

*(This page will be completed by Graduate Committee and a copy of the rubric will be distributed to the committee, readers and student just prior to the defense)*

Major Advisor Name:

Date of Dissertation Defense:

Dissertation Title:

Graduate Committee Members

At the conclusion of the defense, **each committee member must complete the attached response sheets.**

For each attribute that a committee member feels is somewhat or very deficient, a short explanation should be provided. **Confidential Comment** sections at the bottom of the rubric are provided for explanations of the reasoning behind the overall evaluation of the examinee's performance if desired.

Completed forms are to be treated as **confidential** and are to be **turned in to the graduate program coordinator**, not to the student.

All examination documents (rubrics and written comments) must be completed regardless of the outcome of the Dissertation Defense.

A summary of written comments and overall evaluation from the committee members **will be provided** to the student, Major Advisor, and Graduate Studies chair.

Students Name:

Student's Graduate Program:

Dissertation and ORAL DEFENCE Rubric – Completed by:

Date:

(To be completed by each committee member. Please check each evaluation criteria that you feel are appropriate within each attribute category)

Attribute for ORAL	Does Not Meet Expectations <i>Provide a short explanation for each attribute that you select in this category.</i>	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
<b>Overall quality of presentation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Poor presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Poor communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts difficult to read	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Clear presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Good communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts clear	<input type="checkbox"/> Well organized Professional presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts outstanding
<b>Overall breadth of knowledge</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals critical weaknesses in depth of knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation does not reflect well developed critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is narrow in scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals some depth of knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals above average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the ability to draw from knowledge in several disciplines	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation superior <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals exceptional depth of subject knowledge <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals well developed critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple disciplines
<b>Quality of response to questions</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are incomplete or require prompting <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are poorly presented <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits lack of knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses do not meet level expected of degree program of graduate (MS or PhD)	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are complete <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are well organized <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses meet level expected of degree program of graduate (MS or PhD)	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are eloquent <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are skillfully presented <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses exceed level expected of degree program of graduate (MS or PhD)
<b>Overall Assessment</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations

**Confidential Comments:**

Students Name:

Student's Graduate Program:

WRITTEN Thesis/Dissertation Rubric – Completed by:

Date:

(To be completed by each committee member and reader. Please check each evaluation criteria that you feel are appropriate within each attribute category)

Attribute for WRITTEN	Does Not Meet Expectations <i>Provide a short explanation for each attribute that you select in this category.</i>	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
<b>Overall quality of science</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are incorrect, incoherent, or flawed <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are poorly defined <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited originality <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are coherent and clear <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are clear <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates originality <input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are superior <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are well defined <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality <input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight
<b>Contribution to discipline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Limited expansion upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Limited theoretical or applied significance	<input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Builds upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable theoretical or applied significance	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Greatly extends previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional theoretical or applied significance
<b>Quality of writing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is weak <input type="checkbox"/> Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is poor <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is logical <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is publication quality <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is excellent
<b>Overall Assessment</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations

Confidential Comments: