



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 _____

Check One: Dissertation Proposal Defense Final Dissertation Defense

Dissertation Title: _____

Committee Members (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 Advising Manager 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Poor presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Poor communication <input type="checkbox"/> Proposal / Dissertation thesis or manuscripts difficult to read | <input type="checkbox"/> Clearly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Clear presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Good communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Proposal / Dissertation thesis or manuscripts clear | <input type="checkbox"/> Well organized <input type="checkbox"/> Professional presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Proposal / Dissertation thesis or manuscripts outstanding |
| Overall breadth of knowledge | <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Critical weaknesses in depth of existing knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Does not reflect knowledge in other disciplines | <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Some depth of knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Ability to draw from knowledge in several disciplines | <input type="checkbox"/> Superior <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional depth of subject knowledge <input type="checkbox"/> Ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple disciplines |
| Quality of response to questions | <input type="checkbox"/> Responses are incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are poorly presented <input type="checkbox"/> Relies on faculty advisor for substantive help in answering questions <input type="checkbox"/> Responses do not meet level expected of a PhD student/graduate | <input type="checkbox"/> Responses are complete <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are well organized <input type="checkbox"/> Relies on faculty advisor for minimal help in answering questions <input type="checkbox"/> Responses meet level expected of a PhD student/graduate | <input type="checkbox"/> Responses are eloquent <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are skillfully presented <input type="checkbox"/> Does not rely on faculty advisor for help in answering questions <input type="checkbox"/> Responses exceed level expected of a PhD student/graduate |
| Overall quality of theory / science | <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are 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 reasonable <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 clear and convincing <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 |

Summary of written comments from ALL committee members for student concerning performance on proposal presentation / defense:

Chair of Examining Committee Signature _____ **Date:** _____