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| **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>) |