## **PhD Dissertation Examination Rubric**



Committee Chair: \_\_\_\_\_\_
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

This form is for use by committee members and should be provided to them as part of the evaluation process. The form should be completed by the chair following the oral to indicate how the student faired in each category according to the committee's judgment. The completed form should be dated and sent to the PhD Director (for institutional assessment purposes). It should not include the student's name.

## **Dissertation Rubric**

	Exceptional	Well Done	Not Passing	Not Passing	Rating (use rubric evaluation term)
1. Originality of research and contribution to the field	exceptionally creative/original and/or makes an important contribution to the field	somewhat original and/or makes a modest contribution to the field	not very creative/original and/or makes almost no contribution to the field	not creative/original and merely duplicates or summarizes the work of others	
2. Suitability of research methods and skill in using them	exceptionally well suited to research question and/or carried out with remarkable skill	generally well-suited to research question and carried out skillfully	only somewhat suitable to research question and/or carried with limited skill	not well suited to research question and/or carried out poorly	
3. Ability to collect and analyze data	exceptionally comprehensive collection and/or remarkably perceptive analysis	good collection and/or perceptive analysis	incomplete collection and/or somewhat weak analysis	poor collection and/or very weak analysis	
4. Facility in using primary sources	exceptionally adept in use of primary sources	good use of primary sources	somewhat weak use of primary sources	poor use of primary sources	
5. Ability to draw reasoned conclusions from a body of knowledge or evidence	exceptionally-sharp reasoning from the relevant body of knowledge or evidence	good reasoning from the relevant body of knowledge or evidence	somewhat weak reasoning from the relevant body of knowledge or evidence	very weak reasoning from the relevant body of knowledge or evidence	
6. Cogency of responses during the oral defense	exceptionally cogent responses during oral defense	generally cogent responses during oral defense	only somewhat cogent responses during oral defense	unclear or contradictory responses during oral defense	