

## Dissertation/Thesis Defense Evaluation Rubric

Candidate's Name:

Department:

Degree:

Committee Chair:

Completed by: ☐ Chair ☐ Member ☐ 4<sup>th</sup> Reader ☐ External ☐ Grad Rep

Title of Dissertation:

<b>Section A: Evaluating the Oral Defense</b>					
<b>Competency</b>	<b>Extent to which these were articulated during the oral defense</b>	<i>Does Not Meet Expectations (Unacceptable)</i>	<i>Marginally Meets Expectation (Acceptable)</i>	<i>Meets Expectations (Acceptable)</i>	<i>Exceeds Expectation (Outstanding)</i>
<b>Knowledge &amp; Skills</b>					
Problem Definition	Stated the research problem clearly and provided the motivation for undertaking the research				
Literature Review	Demonstrated sound knowledge of literature in the general subject area and on the specific research problem				
Potential Impact of the Study	Demonstrated the potential value of proposed solution to the research problem in advancing knowledge within the area of study				
Research Questions	Generated viable research question(s) that can be addressed within the scope of the research				
Research Methodology	Applied sound state-of-the-field research methods/tools/analysis to solve the defined problem and has described the methods/tools/analysis effectively				
	Articulated why the methodology was appropriate				
<b>Communication</b>					
Oral Explanations	Oral explanations are scholarly, clear, and succinct				
<b>Critical Thinking</b>					
Making the Case	Presented a chain of logic that was easy to follow				
	Showed that the dissertation was grounded in a well-articulated conceptual framework				
	Critiqued the process and findings and defended them in response to probing questions				
	Argued beyond what is written in dissertation to include other possible scenarios, "what if's", rationales, etc.				
Interpretation of Results	Articulated appropriate interpretation of results; and results were justified/supported by the literature				
Conclusions	Demonstrated awareness of broader implications of the conclusions on theological, educational, social, economic, technical, and ethical viewpoints				
<b>Section B: Evaluating the Written Document</b>					
<b>Communication</b>					
Writing	Dissertation was well written and has an obvious chain of logic				
<b>Ethical Research</b>					
Data Analysis	Where applicable, strict ethics governed the analysis and reporting of data				
Evidence of Original Work	Evidence from the literature review indicate that the research was original				
Citations	Evidence of appropriate citations; no plagiarism				
<b>Publication</b>					
	Dissertation quality indicates likelihood of publication in scholarly journals				

## Dissertation/Thesis Defense Evaluation Rubric

**Overall assessment of the oral defense based on the evidence from Section A**

CRITERIA	PERFORMANCE RATINGS			
	Does Not Pass Dissertation Defense Examination	Passes Dissertation Defense Examination		
My Overall Rating of the Dissertation Defense Examination:	Does Not Meet Expectations	Marginally Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations

**Overall assessment of the written document based on the evidence from Section B**

CRITERIA	PERFORMANCE RATINGS			
	Document is Not Acceptable	Document is Acceptable		
My Overall Rating of the Written Document:	Does Not Meet Expectations	Major Revisions Required (paragraphs and chapter re-write)	Minor Revisions Required (editing/rearranging sentences and/or paragraphs)	No Revisions Required (typos and other minor edits)