

Oral Comprehensive Examination: Written document (dissertation proposal, written preliminary examinations, etc.)

	OUTSTANDING	VERY GOOD	ACCEPTABLE	UNSATISFACTORY
Mastery of Field	<input type="checkbox"/> Interdisciplinary and/or novel synthesis of relevant literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of the relevant literature and critical insight	<input type="checkbox"/> Shows some mastery of relevant literature <input type="checkbox"/> Offers some critical synthesis of relevant literature	<input type="checkbox"/> Adequate literature review but review is uncritical <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited understanding of the field	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarizes or misreads or misuses sources
Mastery of Research Methods	<input type="checkbox"/> Develops new techniques, tools, methods, or analyses <input type="checkbox"/> Methodologically sophisticated	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates strong technical competence with regards to design and methods	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates technical competence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates ability to do research <input type="checkbox"/> Uses standard methods and analyses	<input type="checkbox"/> Inappropriate or incorrect design or methods
Presentation/Communication Skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Well written and organized <input type="checkbox"/> Compelling and coherent argument	<input type="checkbox"/> Generally well written and organized	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is pedestrian and plodding <input type="checkbox"/> Writing lacks originality or creativity	<input type="checkbox"/> Poorly written <input type="checkbox"/> Spelling and grammatical errors <input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized
Analysis and Interpretation	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mature, independent thinking <input type="checkbox"/> Argument is focused and logical <input type="checkbox"/> Imaginative or insightful argument	<input type="checkbox"/> Generally coherent, logical argument	<input type="checkbox"/> Sustained argument but lacks synthesis and innovation <input type="checkbox"/> Argument lacks imagination or insight <input type="checkbox"/> Argument is narrow in scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Weak, inconsistent, or invalid theoretical argument <input type="checkbox"/> Wrong, inappropriate, incoherent, confused, uninformative analyses
Significance and Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Original and significant <input type="checkbox"/> Importantly advances knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> Some original ideas, insights, and observations <input type="checkbox"/> Programmatic extension of prior research	<input type="checkbox"/> Question or problem is highly derivative of prior work	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited or no impact

Oral Comprehensive Examination: Oral examination

	OUTSTANDING	VERY GOOD	ACCEPTABLE	UNSATISFACTORY
Mastery of Field	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of the relevant literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates ability to critique and synthesize the relevant literature	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates familiarity with the relevant literature	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited mastery of the relevant literature <input type="checkbox"/> Narrow understanding of the field	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates weak or incomplete mastery of the relevant literature <input type="checkbox"/> Reveals lack of adequate preparation
Mastery of Research Methods	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates thorough understanding of relevant research designs, data analytic methods, and quantitative methods	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of relevant research designs, data analytic methods, and quantitative methods	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates technical competence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates ability to conduct research <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates basic competencies for research design, data analytic methods, and quantitative methods	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited understanding of key methodological issues <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited understanding of key quantitative analyses
Presentation/ Communication Skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Confident, mature, and articulate <input type="checkbox"/> Can rebut criticisms	<input type="checkbox"/> Communicates effectively <input type="checkbox"/> Can respond to criticisms	<input type="checkbox"/> Defense is nervous or hesitant <input type="checkbox"/> Weak or incomplete response to criticisms	<input type="checkbox"/> Defense is confused or unresponsive <input type="checkbox"/> Cannot respond to criticisms <input type="checkbox"/> The presentation is sloppy, disorganized or incomplete
Analysis and Interpretation	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear, concise, and logical <input type="checkbox"/> Develops a thorough, logical argument	<input type="checkbox"/> Generally develops a logical argument <input type="checkbox"/> Can respond to criticisms but counter-arguments are incomplete or unconvincing	<input type="checkbox"/> Knows the literature but unable to critique or synthesize it <input type="checkbox"/> Misses connections and implications	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates failure to understand key theoretical arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are illogical <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are not supported with relevant citations and data
Significance and Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Insightful and original <input type="checkbox"/> Proposes novel research questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Proposes programmatic line of research	<input type="checkbox"/> Generally solid contribution	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited or no impact