

Academic Affairs Office Cooper Hall, Suite 1100 701 Highland Avenue Madison, Wisconsin 53705 Front Desk 608/263-5202 Fax 608/263-5296

## Rubric for Evaluating PhD Dissertation Proposal and Dissertation Defense

Page 1 should be completed by the student or committee chairman prior to distribution to committee

Student Name:		Advisor / Chair of Evaluation Committee:		
Date				
Circle One:	Dissertation Proposal Defense	Final Dissertation Defense		
Dissertation 7	Гitle:			
Committee M	Iembers (include department):			

At the conclusion of the presentation/defense, each committee member should fill out the response sheet. For each attribute which a committee member feels is somewhat or very deficient, a short explanation should be provided. Completed forms are to be treated as confidential and are to be collected and reviewed by the Examination Committee Chair, and copies turned in to the Graduate Program Student Services Coordinator within 7 days of the defense.

The Committee Chair will provide the students with a written summary of the committee members' comments and verbal summary of their overall evaluation of the student's performance within 7 days of the defense.

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

To be completed by each committee member. Please check boxes for all evaluation criteria within each attribute category.

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality presentation	☐ Poorly organized	☐ Clearly organized	☐ Well organized
	☐ Poor presentation	☐ Clear presentation	☐ Professional presentation
	☐ Poor communication	☐ Good communication skills	☐ Excellent communication skills
	☐ Proposal / Dissertation thesis or manuscripts difficult to read	☐ Proposal / Dissertation thesis or manuscripts clear	☐ Proposal / Dissertation thesis or manuscripts outstanding
Overall breadth of knowledge	☐ Unacceptable	☐ Acceptable	☐ Superior
	☐ Critical weaknesses in depth of existing knowledge in subject matter	☐ Some depth of knowledge in subject matter	☐ Exceptional depth of subject knowledge
	☐ Does not reflect knowledge in other disciplines	☐ Ability to draw from knowledge in several disciplines	☐ Ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple disciplines
Quality of response to questions	☐ Responses are incomplete	☐ Responses are complete	☐ Responses are eloquent
	☐ Arguments are poorly presented	☐ Arguments are well organized	☐ Arguments are skillfully presented
	☐ Relies on faculty advisor for substantive help in answering	☐ Relies on faculty advisor for minimal help in answering	☐ Does not rely on faculty advisor for help in answering questions
	questions  ☐ Responses do not meet level expected of a PhD student/graduate	questions  ☐ Responses meet level expected of a PhD student/graduate	☐ Responses exceed level expected of a PhD student/graduate
Overall quality of theory / science	☐ Arguments are 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 reasonable □ Objectives are clear □ Demonstrates average critical thinking skills □ Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature □ Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts □ Demonstrates originality □ Displays creativity and insight	<ul> <li>□ Arguments are clear and convincing</li> <li>□ Objectives are well defined</li> <li>□ Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills</li> <li>□ Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature.</li> <li>□ Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts</li> <li>□ Demonstrates exceptional originality</li> <li>□ Displays exceptional creativity and insight</li> </ul>

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Contribution to nursing and	☐ Limited evidence of discovery	☐ Some evidence of discovery	☐ Exceptional evidence of discovery
other disciplines	☐ Limited expansion upon previous research findings	☐ Builds upon previous research findings	☐ Greatly extends previous research findings
	☐ Limited theoretical or applied significance	☐ Reasonable theoretical or applied significance	☐ Exceptional theoretical or applied significance
	☐ Limited publication potential	☐ Reasonable publication potential	☐ Exceptional publication potential
Quality of writing	☐ Writing is weak	☐ Writing is adequate	☐ Writing is publication quality
	☐ Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent	☐ Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent	☐ No grammatical or spelling errors apparent
	☐ Organization is poor	☐ Organization is logical	☐ Organization is excellent
	☐ Documentation is poor	☐ Documentation is adequate	☐ Documentation is excellent
Overall Assessment	☐ Does not meet expectations	☐ Meets Expectations	☐ Exceeds Expectations
Comments:			
Completed by:		Date:	

Summary of written comments from <u>ALL</u> committee members for student concerning performance or	proposal presentation / defense:
Chair of Examining Committee Signature	Data
Luair of Examining Committee Signature	_ Date: