**Rubric for Evaluating PhD Candidacy Examination**

Committee Members and Students are responsible for being aware of the evaluation rubric in advance of the examination.

# Date of Exam:

**Student Name: Student Number:**

**PhD Candidacy examination committee members:**

Examination Procedure

* Candidate presents a brief (~20 minute) summery of the work
* Examining committee asks at least two rounds of questions. The set of question should address the attributes in this rubric. In particular, questions must assess the candidate’s
	+ Understanding of the subject matter and associate literature.
	+ Breath of knowledge in the relevant areas.
	+ Understanding of the fundamental concepts and methodology.
* When questioning is completed, the candidate is asked to leave the room
* Each committee member must complete the attached response sheets **separately and prior to the post-oral discussion**.
* 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.
* The committee conducts post-oral discussion *in camera*. The discussion and decision of the examining committee should be based on the completed rubrics.
* The committee choose an outcome.

Completed forms are to be treated as **confidential** and are to be **turned in to the graduate program director, not to the student.**

A summary of written comments and overall evaluation from the committee members **will be provided** to the student and advisor/s.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attribute for Written | Does Not Meet Expectations | Meets Expectations | Exceeds Expectations |
| Quality of writing | * 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 acceptable
* Documentation is adequate
 | * Writing is high quality
* No grammatical and spelling errors apparent
* Organization is excellent
* Documentation is excellent
 |
| Quality of formatting | * Formatting is inconsistent
* Equations are not clear or not coherent
* Figures are difficult to read or not relevant
* Captions/legends are not clear
 | * Formatting is consistent
* Equations are clear and logical
* Figures clear to read and relevant
* Captions/legends are clear
 | * Formatting is excellent
* Equations are excellent
* Figures are excellent
* Captions/legends are excellent
 |
| Overall assessment | * Does not meet expectation
 | * Meets expectation
 | * Exceeds expectation
 |

Confidential Comments:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attribute for Oral | Does Not Meet Expectations | Meets Expectations | Exceeds Expectations |
| Quality of presentation | * Poorly organized
* Poor presentation
* Poor communication skills
 | * Clearly organized
* Clear presentation
* Good communication skills
 | * Well organized
* Professional presentation
* Excellent communication skills
 |
| Overall breadth of knowledge | * Presentation reveals critical weaknesses in depth of knowledge
* Presentation does not reflect well developed critical thinking
* Presentation is narrow in scope
 | * Presentation reveals some depth of knowledge
* Presentation reveals adequate critical thinking skill
* Presentation reveals the ability to draw from broad knowledge
 | * Presentation reveals excellent depth of knowledge
* Presentation reveals well developed critical thinking skill
* 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
* Responses do not meet level of expectation
 | * Responses are complete
* Arguments are well presented
* Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge
* Responses meet level of expectation
 | * Responses are eloquent
* Arguments are skillfully presented
* Respondent exhibits excellent knowledge
* Responses exceed level of expectation
 |
| Overall assessment | * Does not meet expectation
 | * Meets expectation
 | * Exceeds expectation
 |

Confidential Comments:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attribute for Research | Does Not Meet Expectations | Meets Expectations | Exceeds Expectations |
| Overall Quality of Science | * Arguments are incorrect, incoherent or flawed
* Objectives are poorly defined
* Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking
* Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature
* Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts
* Displays limited creativity and insight
 | * Arguments are coherent and clear
* Objectives are clear
* Demonstrates adequate critical thinking skills
* Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature
* Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts
* Displays creativity and insight
 | * Arguments are superior
* Objectives are well defined
* Demonstrates mature critical thinking skills
* Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature
* Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts
* Displays exceptional creativity and insight
 |
| Contribution to discipline | * Limited evidence of potential discovery
* Limited expansion upon previous research
* Limited potential of theoretical or applied significance
 | * Some evidence of potential discovery
* Builds upon previous research
* Reasonable potential of theoretical or applied significance
 | * Exceptional evidence of potential discovery
* Greatly extends previous research
* Exceptional potential of theoretical or applied significance
 |
| Overall assessment | * Does not meet expectation
 | * Meets expectation
 | * Exceeds expectation
 |

Confidential Comments: