# Grading Rubric for Dissertations and Oral Defenses

Each committee member will independently rate the written component of the dissertation and the oral defense. In order to pass the dissertation defense, the overall average score from each committee member must be at least 2. The student will be rated on items using the following using the following scale:

3 = Satisfactory (student has met competency in area)

2 = Satisfactory with reservations (modifications are required to components)

1 = Unsatisfactory

Completed by:

Date:

## Written Dissertation

| **Item** | **Rating** | **Comment(s)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Student justified the research study.** |  |  |
| 1. Provided specific and accurate information about practical significance (e.g., rates or consequences of problem) |  |  |
| 1. Clearly and accurately explained how the study advances knowledge theoretically or methodologically. |  |  |
| **Student successfully reviewed extant literature and demonstrated informed conclusions.** |  |  |
| 1. Detailed and organized literature review that clearly supports purpose of study. |  |  |
| 1. Explicitly identified strengths and limitations of literature. |  |  |
| 1. Explicitly identified future directions for the literature. |  |  |
| **Student clearly described theoretical rationale and purpose of study.** |  |  |
| 1. Articulated masterful understanding of the most relevant theory or theories. |  |  |
| 1. Provided a clear and convincing rationale for study and hypotheses using theory and existing research. |  |  |
| 1. Provided specific and appropriate hypotheses for analyses (or explained hypotheses were not appropriate). |  |  |
| **Student used innovative methodology.** |  |  |
| 1. Student used a sample from a population that was appropriate given research question and availability of data sources. |  |  |
| 1. Richly described sample demographics, participation, retention rates (where applicable), and sampling procedure. |  |  |
| 1. If *quantitative*, student used measures that were well-selected given research questions. Measures were richly described, example items were provided, and reliability or validity addressed.   If *qualitative*, data collection efforts (e.g., semi-structured interview) was well-justified given the research question. Means of data collection were richly described, examples were provided, and issues of internal consistency addressed. |  |  |
| 1. Adequately described a plan of analysis that is well-suited to the research questions with rationale for chosen analysis. |  |  |
| 1. Analysis took nature of the sample and variables into account, including missing data and data structure when appropriate. |  |  |
| 1. At least one aspect of the methodology is innovative in nature for the field of study. |  |  |
| **Student interpreted findings accurately and completely.** |  |  |
| 1. Findings were interpreted with high fidelity to the data and all results are fully and clearly explained. |  |  |
| 1. Supplementary materials (graphs, tables, figures) enhance understanding of results and include all necessary information. |  |  |
| **Student discussed conceptual contributions and strengths and limitations appropriately.** |  |  |
| 1. Appropriately contextualized the results within the relevant literature. |  |  |
| 1. Accurately identified the conceptual or theoretical contributions of the study. |  |  |
| 1. Clearly and accurately described the key strengths and limitations of the study. |  |  |
| **Student discussed future directions and implications appropriately.** |  |  |
| 1. Clearly and accurately presented specific and important directions for future research to advance the current study. |  |  |
| 1. Clearly articulated implications or applications (e.g., intervention, policy) with the appropriate level of caution. Clearly articulated clinical or research relevancy to the field of CFT. |  |  |
| Overall averaged rating |  |  |

## Oral Defense

| **Item** | **Rating** | **Comment(s)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Adequately justified the research study using conclusions from extant literature and theoretical framework. |  |  |
| 1. Clearly and accurately explained the purpose of study and appropriate hypotheses. |  |  |
| 1. Accurately described methodology, rationale for chosen method, and important details of the research process |  |  |
| 1. Accurately described the results using correct terminology and interpretations. |  |  |
| 1. Accurately described the overall findings with high fidelity to the data. |  |  |
| 1. Clearly described the importance and implications of the findings. |  |  |
| 1. Demonstrated knowledge of study strengths and weaknesses. |  |  |
| 1. Clear articulation of and thoughtful answers to committee questions. |  |  |
| Overall averaged rating |  |  |