

**PhD Dissertation and Defense Evaluation Rubric**

**Major Advisor Name**: Click here to enter text.

**Date of Dissertation Defense**: Click here to enter text.

**Dissertation Title**: Click here to enter text.

|  |
| --- |
| **Advisory Committee Members** |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

At the conclusion of the defense, **each committee member must complete the attached response sheets**. The front page will be completed by the Office of the PhD Program Director.

For each attribute that a committee members feels is somewhat or very deficient, a short explanation should be provided. Confidential comment sections are provided at the bottom of the rubric for explanations of the overall evaluation of the examinee’s performance if desired. Completed forms are to be treated as **confidential** and are to be turned into the PhD Program Director and Associate Dean for Academic Programs, not the student.

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

A summary of comments will be provided to the student and major advisor by the Office of the PhD Program Director/ Associate Dean for Academic Programs.

**Dissertation ORAL DEFENSE Rubric Completed by:**  Click here to enter text. **Date**: Click here to enter a date.

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attribute for ORAL** | **Does Not Meet Expectations***Provide a short explanation for each attribute that you select in this category.* | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Overall quality of presentation** | [ ]  Poorly organized[ ]  Poor presentation[ ]  Poor communication skills[ ]  Slides and handouts are difficult to read | [ ]  Clearly organized[ ]  Clear presentation[ ]  Solid communication skills[ ]  Slides and handouts are clear | [ ]  Well organized[ ]  Professional presentation[ ]  Excellent communication skills[ ]  Slides and handouts are outstanding |
| **Overall breadth of knowledge** | [ ]  Presentation unacceptable[ ]  Presentation reveals critical weaknesses in depth of knowledge in subject matter[ ]  Presentation does not reflect well developed critical thinking skills[ ]  Presentation is narrow in scope | [ ]  Presentation acceptable[ ]  Presentation reveals some depth of knowledge in subject matter[ ]  Presentation reveals above average critical thinking skills[ ]  Presentation reveals the ability to draw from knowledge in several disciplines | [ ]  Presentation superior[ ]  Presentation reveals exceptional depth of subject knowledge[ ]  Presentation reveals well developed critical thinking skills[ ]  Presentation reveals the ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple disciplines |
| **Quality of response to questions** | [ ]  Responses are incomplete or require prompting[ ]  Arguments are poorly presented[ ]  Respondent exhibits lack of knowledge in subject area[ ]  Responses do not meet level expected of degree program of graduate | [ ]  Responses are complete[ ]  Arguments are well organized[ ]  Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area[ ]  Responses meet level expected of degree program of graduate | [ ]  Responses are eloquent[ ]  Arguments are skillfully presented[ ]  Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area[ ]  Responses exceed level expected of degree program of graduate |
| **Overall assessment** | [ ]  Does not meet expectations | [ ]  Meets expectations | [ ]  Exceeds expectations |
| **Confidential Comments:** Click here to enter text. |

**WRITTEN Dissertation Rubric Completed by:**  Click here to enter text. **Date**: Click here to enter a date.

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attribute for WRITTEN** | **Does Not Meet Expectations***Provide a short explanation for each attribute that you select in this category.* | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Overall quality of science** | [ ]  Arguments are incorrect, incoherent, or flawed[ ]  Objectives are poorly defined[ ]  Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills[ ]  Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature[ ]  Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts[ ]  Demonstrates limited originality[ ]  Displays limited creativity and insight | [ ]  Arguments are coherent and clear[ ]  Objectives are clear[ ]  Demonstrates average critical thinking skills[ ]  Reflects average understanding of subject matter and associated literature[ ]  Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts[ ]  Demonstrates originality[ ]  Displays creativity and insight | [ ]  Arguments are superior[ ]  Objectives are well defined[ ]  Exhibits mature critical thinking skills[ ]  Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature[ ]  Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts[ ]  Demonstrates exceptional originality[ ]  Displays exceptional creativity and insight |
| **Contribution to discipline** | [ ]  Limited evidence of discovery[ ]  Limited expansion upon previous research[ ]  Limited theoretical or applied significance[ ]  Limited publication impact | [ ]  Some evidence of discovery[ ]  Builds upon previous research[ ]  Reasonable theoretical or applied significance[ ]  Reasonable publication impact | [ ]  Exceptional evidence of discovery[ ]  Greatly extends previous research[ ]  Exceptional theoretical or applied significance[ ]  Exceptional publication impact |
| **Quality of writing** | [ ]  Writing is weak[ ]  Numerous grammatical and spelling errors[ ]  Organization is poor[ ]  Documentation is poor | [ ]  Writing is adequate[ ]  Some grammatical and spelling errors[ ]  Organization is logical[ ]  Documentation is adequate | [ ]  Writing is publication quality[ ]  No grammatical and spelling errors[ ]  Organization is excellent[ ]  Documentation is excellent |
| **Overall assessment** | [ ]  Does not meet expectations | [ ]  Meets expectations | [ ]  Exceeds expectations |
| **Confidential Comments:** Click here to enter text. |
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