

**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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