

Rubric for Evaluating PhD Dissertation

(This page should be filled out by the student or Committee Chairman/advisor prior to distribution to Committee)
(Version October 9, 2007)

Student _____ Date of Defense _____

Advisor _____

Dissertation Title _____

Committee Members and Department

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

- At the conclusion of the defense, **each committee member should fill out the response sheet**. For each attribute which a committee member feels is somewhat or very deficient, a short explanation should be provided. Since completed forms are to be treated as **confidential**, they are to be **turned in to the Committee Chair (advisor)**, not the student.
- This document should be completed, even if the committee feels that the dissertation is unacceptable.
- A copy of the dissertation abstract and conclusions, as well as copies of all journal publications or referred conference proceedings that have already resulted from the dissertation work, must accompany this evaluation form. All materials must be sent to Dr. David Vorp, Chair of the Bioengineering Graduate Committee, 200 Bridgeside Point.
- Student has accepted a position at _____ or will continue on for a PhD at _____ (if student has yet to accept a position, please leave blank). Indicate whether student has or intends to apply (yes no) and/or has been accepted (yes no) to a PhD program or medical school.

Ph.D. Dissertation Response Sheet

(one for each committee member – circle response and return directly and confidentially to the student's advisor or the Chair of the Bioengineering Graduate Committee)

Attribute	Very Deficient	Somewhat Deficient	Acceptable	Very Good	Outstanding
Completed in a timely manner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed more than two years after preliminaries; Defense more than three years after passing preliminaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed 13 to 24 months after passing preliminaries. Defense within three years after preliminaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed within a year after passing preliminaries; Defense within 2.5 years after preliminaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminaries passed within one year. Defense within 2 years of passing preliminaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminaries passed within one year. Defense within 18 months of passing preliminaries;
Quality of dissertation	Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of dissertations.	Acceptable, but disappointing (75 th to 90 th percentile of dissertations.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable (25th to 75th percentile of dissertations.) Extensions possible, but may require more work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Among 10th to 25th percentile of dissertations Provides opportunities for additional, fruitful research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Among top 10% of dissertations. Student will be able to further extend; Solid basis for funded projects
Contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires committee to stretch to find contribution. Closer to MS than outstanding PhD dissertation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extends prior knowledge to some degree; In total is a contribution, but contains no single major contribution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates originality Makes some contributions Introduces new methodology or techniques to field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very original work; At least one important contribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original and creative. Several important contributions.
Publications and potential publications.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At best a conference proceeding. Nothing has been submitted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential exists for a publication in a second tier journal. Presented work at least one conference. No papers submitted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one paper has been submitted to a recognized journal Should be able to publish one or two papers from dissertation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one paper has been accepted by a recognized journal. Three or more good publications should result. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one paper has been fully accepted or published in a leading journal More than three significant publications will

Attribute	Very Deficient	Somewhat Deficient	Acceptable	Very Good	result
Quality of writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires a professional editor Sentence structure, language and style deficient. Major revisions required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing is weak A number of typos, grammatical and spelling errors. A number of changes required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable (25th to 75th percentile). Limited number of typos (grammatical errors and spelling). Some normal changes necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very well written; Easy to read and understand Very few changes or additions required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reads like an outstanding publication. No typos, grammatical or spelling errors. No revisions or changes; acceptable as is.
Defense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very poorly organized. Disjointed presentation. Unable to answer a number of questions. Slides and handouts of very poor quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not well organized; Rambled; dwelt too long on less important aspects Had difficulty with questions. Some slides and handouts difficult to read Typos and other errors in slides. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable – slides and handouts clear Good presentation skills Able to answer most questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well thought out slides and handouts. Professional presentation Almost all questions addressed in a professional manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well organized, very professional, All questions addressed in a knowledgeable and respectable manner. Slides and handouts outstanding.
Other – explain					

Comments and reasons for any deficiencies:
(10/09/2007)

DISSERTATION RUBRIC

Content Criteria 40%	Well Developed	Acceptable	Sketchy or non-existent
Topic selected has significance for Leadership Studies			
Rationale for the Study (Chapter 1)			
Literature Review (Chapter 2)			
Research Methods (Chapter 3)			
Results of the Study (Chapter 4)			
Conclusions (Chapter 5)			
Thought and Expression Criteria 40%	Excellent: Superior to generally thoughtful analysis of complex ideas; minor errors in expression that do not interfere with meaning	Acceptable: Competent analysis of complex ideas; errors in expression affect clarity	Needs LOTS of work: Serious weaknesses in analysis of complex ideas; errors in expression obscure meaning or result in incoherence
Raises vital questions or issues, formulating them clearly and precisely			
Evidence of breadth and depth: Insightful, in-depth analysis of complex ideas			
Main points are developed and supported with relevant information and references that are appropriately incorporated			
Organization and Logic: Well focused and well organized, well reasoned conclusions. Writing flows; I didn't get lost or have to work to determine what you were saying			
Thinks open-mindedly within alternative systems of thought, recognizing and assessing, as appropriate, their assumptions, implications, and/or practical consequences.			
Technical Criteria 20%	Excellent: Very few mistakes	Acceptable but needs some work	Needs LOTS of work
Clarity: demonstrates high level of vocabulary through careful word choice, sentences are constructed			

skillfully and purposefully			
Transitions, summaries and conclusions exist as appropriate			
Grammar, Punctuation, Spelling			
APA style: references are cited properly within the text and a complete reference list is provided; appropriate use of headings			
Scholarly tone: Dissertation is written at the level expected for publication			