



PhD Final Dissertation Score Report

Candidate Name:

ID Number:

Date of Defense:

Concentration:

Faculty Chair:

Committee Members:

Summative Assessment:

- ☐ 3 = Pass [minor revisions that will be screened by the primary advisor; other members of the committee are willing to sign off as a pass]
- ☐ 2 = Pass with conditions [Significant revisions are needed. The committee specifies required revisions and a due date (must be completed to the satisfaction of the examination committee within 60 days). The committee may defer responsibility for review to the primary advisor or ask to see revisions.]
- ☐ 1 = Fail [Substantial revisions are required and is subject to dismissal. The committee specifies required revisions and a new defense date/time will be set when the student and primary advisor agree that the document is ready.]

Formative Assessment: *Continued on page 2; Rubric on page 3-6*

Component	Score	Notes
Dissertation Overview		
Conceptual/Theoretical Framework		
Review of relevant research		
Methodology		
Result section		

PhD Final Dissertation Score Report

Component	Score	Notes
Discussion Section		
Clarity, Organization, Grammar, and References		
Oral presentation and response to questions		
Revision requirements		
Additional comments		

Signature of Faculty Chair:

PhD Final Dissertation Defense Rubric

Component	SLO	3 – Fully Met (pass)	2 – Partially met (pass with conditions)	1 – Not Met (Fail)
Dissertation Overview	2	Effectively develops a set of researchable, supportable and potentially impactful study questions / hypotheses. The document is well organized and maintains a tightly integrated focus throughout the manuscript.	Manuscript includes a set of researchable and supportable questions / hypotheses. The manuscript is largely organized and the focus of the manuscript is generally maintained.	Manuscript develops a set of questions / hypotheses, but lacks a clear organizational structure and cohesive focus; some sections are clearly organized and focused and others are not.
Conceptual/Theoretical Framework	4	Clearly identifies or develops a conceptual model that defines constructs studied and their purported relationships. Framework is used to ground the study within what is already known and helps establish what the present study will contribute to the knowledge base and/or practice.	Begins to identify or develop a conceptual model that defines constructs studied and their purported relationships. Framework could usefully ground the study within what is already known and help establish the significance of the study, but these connections require elaboration.	The conceptual framework is evident but needs to be further grounded in the relevant knowledge base.
Review of Relevant Research	3	Provides a substantial synthesis of literature from related fields. Places work within larger context.	Provides a meaningful summary of the literature. Shows understanding of relevant literature	Fails to cite important or relevant scholarship. Misinterprets research findings.
Methodology	6	Identifies and justifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques and describes fully how and why the method enacted differed from the method proposed. Research plan enacted was suitable to study purposes. Limitations of the method are clear.	Identifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques to answer research question(s) but arguments for justification and suitability are not adequately present. Description of how and why the method enacted was adjusted from the method proposed requires elaboration or clarification. Limitation are presented but require elaboration.	Many details of method and/or justification are missing or vague, as are descriptions of adjustments to the research plan since proposal and/or description of limitations.
Results Section	6	The results clearly align with study questions and the research conducted. Evidence provided fully addresses the research question(s), is well integrated and discussed. Results are discussed thoroughly and accurately.	The results discussed are consistent with questions and the data analytic plan. Evidence is presented but relationships between evidence and questions is sometimes unclear or evidence is insufficient to address all research question(s).	The results section is under-developed or incomplete. Results are not always described accurately or certain analyses that were expected were not done or presented.

Discussion Section	4	Provides an integration of the findings within the extant literature. Clarifies how the findings and research questions / hypotheses advance the field. Accurately addresses strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the current study and implications for future research	Adequately integrates the findings within the extant literature. Addresses how the findings and research questions / hypotheses advance the field. Attends to issues of strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the current study.	The integration of the findings within the extant literature is superficial or incomplete. Poorly justifies the strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the current study.
Clarity, Organization, Grammar, and References	7	The manuscript is well structured with clear transitions and flow of thought. Sentences and paragraphs are grammatically correct. Uses subheadings appropriately. Manuscript complies with formatting requirements of the Graduate School and properly cites references. Reference list matches citations	The manuscript is well structured but requires revision to provide clearer transitions and flow of thought. The writing is grammatically correct with only occasional errors, but some sections lack clarity. Manuscript complies with formatting requirements of the Graduate School and properly cites references. Reference list matches citations with few omissions.	The manuscript requires substantial revision to provide effective structure, transitions and flow of thought. The manuscript contains frequent grammatical errors and/or many sections lack clarity. Manuscript needs some updating to comply with formatting requirements of the Graduate School. Citations and/or reference list need editing.
Oral presentation and response to questions	7	Presentation provides a thorough and clear overview of the proposed study. Candidate listens carefully, is open to critique, seeks to understand queries and responds fully to questions.	Presentation describes the study but clarifying questions are necessary to fully understand the study. Candidate is responsive to questions, but is at times closed to critique or fails to seek understanding.	Presentation provides an overview of the proposed study but lacks detail on important aspects. Candidate is unresponsive to some questions or fails to seek understanding on suggestions for improvement.

PhD Program Goal:

To prepare candidates to serve as scholars and researchers who will in turn prepare researchers and future scholars for institutions of higher education (IHEs) or organizations focused on research.

Student Learning Objectives:

Graduates of the PhD in Education and Human Development program will be able to:

1. Apply theories of learning and development to understand fundamental questions involving education, communities, and/or families.
2. Identify and analyze an issue related to equity.
3. Apply a critical lens to interrogate existing research and theoretical perspectives.
4. Critically apply theories, methods, and knowledge to address questions in their primary field.
5. Demonstrate skills and knowledge at a level required for college and university teaching.
6. Plan and conduct research of significance.
7. Demonstrate skills in oral and written communication sufficient to publish and present work in their field or prepare grant proposal.