|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dissertation & Thesis Analytic Rubric** | | | |
| **Attribute** | **Does Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Oral Defense** | | | |
| **Overall Quality of Presentation** | Poorly organized;  Poor presentation;  Poor communication skills;  Slides and handouts are difficult to read. | Clearly organized;  Clear presentation;  Good communication skills;  Slides and handouts are clear. | Well organized;  Professional presentation;  Excellent communication skills;  Slides and handouts are outstanding. |
| **Overall Breadth of Knowledge** | Presentation is unacceptable;  Presentation reveals critical weaknesses in depth of knowledge in subject matter;  Presentation does not reflect well developed critical thinking skills;  Presentation is narrow in scope. | Presentation is acceptable;  Presentation reveals some depth of knowledge in subject matter;  Presentation reveals above average critical thinking skills;  Presentation reveals the ability to draw from knowledge in several disciplines. | Presentation is superior;  Presentation reveals exceptional depth of subject knowledge;  Presentation reveals well developed critical thinking skills;  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 a lack of knowledge in subject area;  Responses do not meet the level expected of the graduate degree program. | Responses are complete;  Arguments are well organized;  Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area;  Responses meet level expected of the graduate degree program. | Responses are eloquent;  Arguments are skillfully presented;  Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area;  Responses exceed level expected of the graduate degree program. |
| **Overall Assessment** | Does not meet expectations. | Meets expectations. | Exceeds expectations. |
| **Written Thesis** | | | |
| **Overall Quality of Argument** | Arguments are incorrect, incoherent, or flawed;  Objectives are poorly defined;  Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills;  Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature;  Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts;  Demonstrates limited originality;  Displays limited creativity and insight. | Arguments are coherent and clear;  Objectives are clear;  Demonstrates average critical thinking skills;  Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature;  Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts;  Demonstrates originality;  Displays creativity and insight. | Arguments are superior;  Objectives are well-defined;  Exhibits mature critical thinking skills;  Exhibits mastery of theoretical concepts;  Demonstrates exceptional originality;  Displays exceptional creativity and insight. |
| **Contribution to Discipline** | Limited evidence of discovery;  Limited expansion upon previous research;  Limited theoretical or applied significance. | Some evidence of discovery;  Builds upon previous research;  Reasonable theoretical or applied significance. | Writing is adequate;  Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent;  Organization is logical;  Documentation is adequate. |
| **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 logical;  Documentation is adequate. | Writing is publication quality;  No grammatical or spelling errors apparent;  Organization is excellent;  Documentation is excellent. |
| **Overall Assessment** | Does not meet expectations. | Meets expectations. | Exceeds expectations. |
| (Adapted from Ohio State University: <https://pharmacy.osu.edu/sites/default/files/Rubric%20for%20Evaluating%20PhD%20Dissertation%20and%20Defense.pdf>) | | | |