Student's Graduate & Degree Program:

Rubric for Evaluating MS Thesis or PhD Dissertation and Defense (Final Oral Exam)

Committee Members, Readers and Students are responsible for being aware of this evaluation rubric in advance of the defense. (This page will be completed by CGS 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

Advisory Committee Members			
Thesis/Dissertation Readers			

At the conclusion of the defense, each committee member and reader 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 Dean (or Dean's designee)**, not to the student.

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

A copy of the completed forms (both rubrics and written comments) must be submitted to the College of Graduate Studies Dean (or Dean's designee), at the conclusion 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 Program Director.

Student's Name:

Student's Graduate & Degree Program:

Thesis/Dissertation ORAL <u>DEFENSE</u> Rubric – Completed by:

Date (use M/D/YYYY format):

(To be completed by each committee member & reader. Please check each evaluation criteria that you feel are 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 difficult to read	Clearly organized Clear presentation Good communication skills Slides and handouts clear	Well organized Professional presentation Excellent communication skills Slides and handouts 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 (MS or PhD)	Responses are complete Arguments are well organized Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area Responses meet level expected of degree program of graduate (MS or PhD)	Responses are eloquent Arguments are skillfully presented Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area Responses exceed level expected of degree program of graduate (MS or PhD)
Overall Assessment Confidential Com	Does not meet expectations nments:	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations

Student's Name:

Student's Graduate & Degree Program:

<u>WRITTEN</u> Thesis/Dissertation Rubric – Completed by:

Date (use M/D/YYYY format):

(To be completed by each committee member & reader. Please check each evaluation criteria that you feel are 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 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 Overall	Writing is weak Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent Organization is poor Documentation is poor	Writing is adequate Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent Organization is logical Documentation is adequate	Writing is publication quality No grammatical or spelling errors apparent Organization is excellent Documentation is excellent
Assessment Confidential Con	Does not meet expectations nments:	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations