Thesis and Dissertation Proposal Evaluation Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Component  | Fully met (3) | Met (2) | Partially Met (1) | Not met (0) | Score |
| Proposal overview | Effectively and insightfully develops a set of testable, supportable and impactful study hypotheses. | Develops a set of testable and supportable hypotheses. | Develops hypotheses.  | Hypotheses are not testable or justifiable.  |  |
| Justification for hypotheses | The introduction section provides a cogent overview of conceptual and theoretical issues related to the study hypotheses. Demonstrates outstanding critical thinking.  | The introduction section provides a logical overview of conceptual and theoretical issues related to the study hypotheses. Demonstrates competent critical thinking. | The proposal provides weak support for study hypotheses. Provides some evidence of sound critical thinking. | Very little support for the conceptual and theoretical relevant to the study hypotheses was provided. Provides little evidence of sound critical thinking.  |  |
| Supporting evidence | Provides clearly appropriate evidence to support position | Provides adequate evidence to support position | Provides inappropriate or insufficient evidence to support position | Provides little or no evidence to support position |  |
| Review of relevant research | Sophisticated integration, synthesis, and critique of literature from related fields. Places work within larger context.  | Provides a meaningful summary of the literature. Shows understanding of relevant literature | Fails to cite important or relevant scholarship. Misinterprets research findings.  | Provides little or no relevant scholarship.  |  |
| Maintains purpose/focus | The proposal is well organized and has a tight and cohesive focus that is integrated throughout the document  | The proposal has an organizational structure and the focus is clear throughout.  | The proposal is somewhat focused or has minor drifts in the focus.  | The document lacks focus or contains major drifts in focus |  |
| Methodology* Sample
* Procedures
* Measures
* Data analytic plan
 | Identifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques (e.g., justifies the sample, procedures, and measures). Data analytic plan is suitable to test study hypotheses. Provides appropriate justification for controls. Project is feasible | Identifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques but some details are missing or vague.  | Identifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques but many details are missing or vague. The methodology is largely incomplete.  | The methodologies described are either not suited or poorly suited to test hypotheses. The methodology is under-developed and/or is not feasible.  |  |
| Grammar, clarity, and organization | The manuscript is well written and ideas are well developed and explained. Sentences and paragraphs are grammatically correct. Uses subheadings appropriately. | The manuscript effectively communicates ideas. The writing is grammatically correct, but some sections lack clarity.  | The manuscript communicates ideas adequately. The manuscript contains some grammatical errors. Many sections lack clarity.  | The manuscript is poorly written and confusing. Ideas are not communicated effectively.  |  |
| References and citations | Properly and explicitly cited. Reference list matches citations | Properly cited. May have a few instances in which proper citations are missing.  | The manuscript has several instances of improper use of citations. Contains several statements without appropriately citing.  | The manuscript lacks proper citations or includes no citations.  |  |
| General recommendations for the thesis /dissertation defense: |

Thesis and Dissertation Defense Evaluation Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Component  | Fully met (3) | Met (2) | Partially Met (1) | Not met (0) | Score |
| Thesis/dissertation overview | Effectively and insightfully develops a set of testable, supportable and impactful study hypotheses. In general the document is well organized and maintains a tightly integrated focus throughout the manuscript.  | Develops a set of testable and supportable hypotheses. The manuscript is nicely organized and the focus of the manuscript is generally maintained throughout the document. | Develops hypotheses. The manuscript lacks a clear organizational structure and cohesive focus; some sections are clearly organized and focused and others are not.  | Hypotheses are not testable or justifiable. Focus of the manuscript is hard to follow; lacks organizational structure.  |  |
| Justification for hypotheses | The introduction section provides a cogent overview of conceptual and theoretical issues related to the study hypotheses. Demonstrates outstanding critical thinking.  | The introduction section provides a logical overview of conceptual and theoretical issues related to the study hypotheses. Demonstrates competent critical thinking. | The proposal provides weak support for study hypotheses. Provides some evidence of sound critical thinking. | Very little support for the conceptual and theoretical relevant to the study hypotheses was provided. Provides little evidence of sound critical thinking.  |  |
| Supporting evidence | Provides clearly appropriate evidence to support position | Provides adequate evidence to support position | Provides inappropriate or insufficient evidence to support position | Provides little or no evidence to support position |  |
| Review of relevant research | Sophisticated integration, synthesis, and critique of literature from related fields. Places work within larger context.  | Provides a meaningful summary of the literature. Shows understanding of relevant literature | Fails to cite important or relevant scholarship. Misinterprets research findings.  | Provides little or no relevant scholarship.  |  |
| Maintains purpose/focus | The proposal is well organized and has a tight and cohesive focus that is integrated throughout the document  | The proposal has an organizational structure and the focus is clear throughout.  | The proposal is somewhat focused or has minor drifts in the focus.  | The document lacks focus or contains major drifts in focus |  |
| Methodology* Sample
* Procedures
* Measures
* Data analytic plan
 | Identifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques (e.g., justifies the sample, procedures, and measures). Data analytic plan is suitable to test study hypotheses. Provides appropriate justification for controls. Project is feasible | Identifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques but some details are missing or vague.  | Identifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques but many details are missing or vague. The methodology is largely incomplete.  | The methodologies described are either not suited or poorly suited to test hypotheses. The methodology is under-developed and/or is not feasible.  |  |
| Results section | The results clearly align with study hypotheses and the data analytic plan. Tables are well integrated and discussed in the section. Controls and preliminary analyses are well explained and justified. The statistical results are discussed in a sophisticated and accurate way.  | The results discussed are consistent with hypotheses and the data analytic plan. Tables are somewhat integrated and discussed in the section. Adequate justification of preliminary analyses and statistical controls. The statistical results are discussed adequately.  | The results section is under developed. Results section is incomplete in that tables are somewhat integrated, or preliminary analyses and statistical controls are not justified. Results are not always described accurately. | The statistics used are inappropriate to test study hypotheses. Or, results are discussed incorrectly or inappropriately. There is not a good correspondence between the tables and the written document.  |  |
| Discussion section | Provides a sophisticated integration of the findings within the extant literature. Clarifies how the findings and research hypotheses advance the field. Addresses strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the current study accurately and insightfully.  | Adequately integrates the findings within the extant literature. Addresses how the findings and research hypotheses advance the field. Attends to issues of strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the current study. | The integration of the findings within the extant literature is superficial or incomplete. Poorly justifies the strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the current study. | No integration of the findings within the extant literature. Fails to attend to issues of generalizability or design strengths and weaknesses.  |  |
| Grammar, clarity, and organization | The manuscript is well written and ideas are well developed and explained. Sentences and paragraphs are grammatically correct. Uses subheadings appropriately. | The manuscript effectively communicates ideas. The writing is grammatically correct, but some sections lack clarity.  | The manuscript communicates ideas adequately. The manuscript contains some grammatical errors. Many sections lack clarity.  | The manuscript is poorly written and confusing. Ideas are not communicated effectively.  |  |
| References and citations | Properly and explicitly cited. Reference list matches citations | Properly cited. May have a few instances in which proper citations are missing.  | The manuscript has several instances of improper use of citations. Contains several statements without appropriately citing.  | The manuscript lacks proper citations or includes no citations.  |  |
| Responsive to prior feedback | Highly responsive to previous feedback from faculty. Feedback is well integrated into the current document. | Largely responsive to previous feedback from faculty. Feedback is somewhat integrated into the current document. | Somewhat responsive to previous feedback from faculty. | Highly **un**responsive to previous feedback from faculty.  |  |
| General recommendations for the thesis /dissertation defense: |

Qualifying Exam Rubric: Pre-oral exam evaluation of the written document

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Component  | Fully met (3) | Met (2) | Partially Met (1) | Not met (0) | Score |
| Biological bases of psychology | Effectively and insightfully answers the exam question. Provides scientific evidence to support conclusions and provides a thoughtful, rich, astute answer that is consistent with and or extends existing empirical and theoretical work.  | Provides a solid answer to the question. Presents good scientific evidence to support conclusions, although may have missed a few relevant citations. The answer is clearly represents the empirical and theoretical work. | Answers the question, but the answer lacks depth and a clear integration of existing research and theory. Some sections are clearly organized and focused and others are not.  | Question is not answered. The answer is superficial and lacks any clear demonstration of an understanding of the conceptual issues the question addressed.  |  |
| Social bases of psychology | Effectively and insightfully answers the exam question. Provides scientific evidence to support conclusions and provides a thoughtful, rich, astute answer that is consistent with and or extends existing empirical and theoretical work.  | Provides a solid answer to the question. Presents good scientific evidence to support conclusions, although may have missed a few relevant citations. The answer is clearly represents the empirical and theoretical work. | Answers the question, but the answer lacks depth and a clear integration of existing research and theory. Some sections are clearly organized and focused and others are not.  | Question is not answered. The answer is superficial and lacks any clear demonstration of an understanding of the conceptual issues the question addressed.  |  |
| Cognitive-affective bases of psychology | Effectively and insightfully answers the exam question. Provides scientific evidence to support conclusions and provides a thoughtful, rich, astute answer that is consistent with and or extends existing empirical and theoretical work.  | Provides a solid answer to the question. Presents good scientific evidence to support conclusions, although may have missed a few relevant citations. The answer is clearly represents the empirical and theoretical work. | Answers the question, but the answer lacks depth and a clear integration of existing research and theory. Some sections are clearly organized and focused and others are not.  | Question is not answered. The answer is superficial and lacks any clear demonstration of an understanding of the conceptual issues the question addressed.  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Component  | Fully met (3) | Met (2) | Partially Met (1) | Not met (0) | Score |
| Individual differences | Effectively and insightfully answers the exam question. Provides scientific evidence to support conclusions and provides a thoughtful, rich, astute answer that is consistent with and or extends existing empirical and theoretical work.  | Provides a solid answer to the question. Presents good scientific evidence to support conclusions, although may have missed a few relevant citations. The answer is clearly represents the empirical and theoretical work. | Answers the question, but the answer lacks depth and a clear integration of existing research and theory. Some sections are clearly organized and focused and others are not.  | Question is not answered. The answer is superficial and lacks any clear demonstration of an understanding of the conceptual issues the question addressed.  |  |
| Grammar, clarity, and organization | The manuscript is well written and ideas are well developed and explained. Sentences and paragraphs are grammatically correct. Uses subheadings appropriately. | The manuscript effectively communicates ideas. The writing is grammatically correct, but some sections lack clarity.  | The manuscript communicates ideas adequately. The manuscript contains some grammatical errors. Many sections lack clarity.  | The manuscript is poorly written and confusing. Ideas are not communicated effectively.  |  |
| References and citations | Properly and explicitly cited. Reference list matches citations | Properly cited. May have a few instances in which proper citations are missing.  | The manuscript has several instances of improper use of citations. Contains several statements without appropriately citing.  | The manuscript lacks proper citations or includes no citations.  |  |
| Notes: |

Oral defense Checklist

Content

*Does the student appropriately and effectively exhibit or use the following:*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Components | Yes (2) | Sometimes (1) | No (0) | Total  |
| Accurately answer questions |  |  |  |  |
| Clarifies concerns in written document (if NA answer yes)  |  |  |  |  |
| Recovers from anxiety |  |  |  |  |
| Demonstrates knowledge of the content area |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| total |  |

Presentation and delivery: Oral components

*Does the student appropriately and effectively exhibit or use the following:*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Components | Yes (2) | Sometimes (1) | No (0) | Total  |
| Eye contact |  |  |  |  |
| Facial expressions |  |  |  |  |
| Gestures/movement |  |  |  |  |
| Appropriate word choice |  |  |  |  |
| Proper pronunciation |  |  |  |  |
| Vocal variety |  |  |  |  |
| Self-confidence |  |  |  |  |
| Professionalism |  |  |  |  |
| Enthusiasm |  |  |  |  |
| Timing/pace |  |  |  |  |
| total |  |

Presentation and delivery: Visual components

*Are the visual aids (Power point slides, handouts..)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Components | Yes (2) | Sometimes (1) | No (0) | Total  |
| Well organized |  |  |  |  |
| Clear and readable |  |  |  |  |
| Free of mechanical and grammatical errors |  |  |  |  |
| Relevant and meaningful |  |  |  |  |
| Appropriately cited |  |  |  |  |
| Enhance overall presentation |  |  |  |  |
| total |  |

*Overall total:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*