**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: