

# Dissertation Evaluation Rubric

Rev. date: 2/6/15

The Doctor of Philosophy degree program is designed to lead graduates to meet the following goals:

- Mastery of a body of knowledge related to a chosen field of study
- Excellence in designing, implementing, and reporting research
- Proficiency in imparting the knowledge of the chosen field through teaching and other communication skills

Assessment Evaluation (0 = Inadequate, 1 = Basic, 2 = Competent, 3 = Good, 4 = Excellent)

Domain	Level	0	1	2	3	4
<b>UNDERSTANDING</b> The student understood	Relevant principles of research					
	The field of study					
	The place of the project in the field					
<b>APPLICATION</b> The student applied the principles by	Forming an acceptable research question					
	Creating an appropriate research design					
	Implementing necessary research					
	Interpreting results					
<b>COMMUNICATION</b> The student communicated results of research	In a cogent manner					
	Using appropriate style					
	By adequately defending the results orally					

Domains	0 Inadequate	1 Basic	2 Competent	3 Good	4 Excellent
<b>UNDERSTANDING: The student understood</b>					
Relevant principles of research	Shows no evidence of principles of research	Limited evidence of principles of research	Evidence of competence in research principles	Reflects strong understanding of research principles	Shows mastery of research principles
The field of study	Does not reflect understanding of subject matter or associated literature	Reflects limited understanding of subject matter or associated literature	Competent understanding of subject matter and associated literature	Reflects strong understanding of subject matter or associated literature	Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature
The place of the project in the field	No contribution to field	Limited contribution to the field	Adequate contribution to field	Strong contribution to field, though originality limited	Strong, original contribution to field
<b>APPLICATION: The student applied the principles of research by</b>					
Forming an acceptable research question	Statement of research question is missing or lacks originality; not feasible	Vague statement of research question; originality and creativity minimal; too broad	Clear statement of research question; feasible	Strong statement of research question; may lack some creativity and originality	High level of sophistication in presenting question; original and creative; feasible
Creating an appropriate research design	Discussion of research design and analytical tools lacks clarity and/or is inappropriate	Research design and analytical tools are not clearly tied to research question	Research design and analytical tools are appropriate; design appears to answer research question	Research design is strong, though clarity and/or appropriateness are not well documented	Clearly describes appropriate research design and analytical tools; design clearly answers research question
Implementing necessary research	Lacks evidence of discovery or expansion of current research; poor potential for publication	Limited evidence of discovery or expansion of current research; weak potential for publication	Adequate evidence of discovery; builds on previous research; reasonable potential for publication	Strong evidence of discovery; interacts with previous research; strong potential for publication	Exceptional evidence of discovery and greatly extends current research; excellent potential for publication
Interpreting results	Conclusion missing	Incomplete, unclear, illogical, irrelevant argument and conclusion	Adequate argument and conclusion	Strong argument and conclusion supported by some evidence	Excellent, relevant argument, conclusion, and supporting evidence
<b>COMMUNICATION: The student communicated results of research</b>					
In a cogent manner	Arguments are unclear, illogical, and unconvincing with no evidence of critical thinking	Arguments are poor, with logical flaws, and limited evidence of critical thinking	Arguments are clear and logical with adequate evidence of critical thinking	Arguments are above average, with strong evidence of critical thinking, and are convincing	Arguments are superior, show excellent evidence of critical thinking, and are compelling
Using appropriate style and form	Writing is weak with numerous errors, poor organization, and improper documentation	Writing is basic, frequent errors, basic organization & documentation fall short of PhD level	Writing is adequate with some errors, logical organization, and adequate documentation	Writing is good with limited errors, strong organization and good documentation	Writing is publication quality with no errors and excellent organization & documentation
By adequately defending the results orally	Responses to questions were incomplete, showing lack of knowledge of field, not meeting level of PhD graduate	Responses were unclear, showing limited knowledge of the field, not meeting level of PhD graduate	Responses were complete, with adequate knowledge of the field, meeting minimal level expected of PhD graduate	Responses were strong, with good knowledge of the field, meeting level expected of PhD graduate	Responses were eloquent, showing superior knowledge of field, exceeding level expected of PhD graduate