***Graduate Outcome Assessment: Comprehensive Exam***

***Student\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Rater \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_***

***Assessment completed approximately at the end of year 3 or beginning of year 4. This assessment is based on the comprehensive examination. Note that it is common for comprehensive exams to include questions about research design and statistical methods. These categories should be skipped if not part of the comprehensive exam or oral defense and if there is no other basis for making the assessment.***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *N/A* | *Failed to Meet Expectations* | *Met Expectations* | *Exceeded Expectations* |
|  |  | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8* | *9* |
| *Research Design/ Methodological Skills* |  | *Unable or has a difficult time generating an appropriate experimental design to address a hypothetical research question.**Does not have good understanding of common methodologies used within field (e.g., survey methods, interview methods, behavioral methods, physiological techniques, neuroimaging techniques, etc)* | *Understands common threats to validity and able to design a study to handle threats to validity**Able to design an experiment in fashion consistent with stated research design.*  | *Creatively (but appropriately) employs research methodology to address questions of interest* *Able to independently think through and propose solutions to any critical threats to validity of study**Study (or studies) designed to rule out most of the meaningful threats to validity.* *Develops computational or quantitative models to describe behavior.* |
| *Justification (required for ratings 1 – 3)* |  |
|  |  | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8* | *9* |
| *Knowledge of statistical methods*  |  | *Struggles to independently perform and/or correctly interpret common statistical analyses.**Struggles to understand when a particular analyses analysis is appropriate/inappropriate* | *Can articulate which statistical methods are appropriate across a variety of circumstances.**Has understanding of basic assumptions of common statistical methods.* | *Has understanding of sophisticated statistical methods**Understands non-standard methods such as bootstrapping, jackknife, Bayesian methods.* |
| *Justification (required for ratings 1 – 3)* |  |
|  |  | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8* | *9* |
| *Breadth and depth of Knowledge across Discipline*  |  | *Is able to reference research covered in class but not literature not covered in course work**Has surface knowledge of concepts in field* *Frequently cannot provide source (authors) of major findings/research* | *Knowledgeable of common research findings in content area and major publications.**Possesses depth of knowledge within a particular content area.**Can provide source (authorship) of major findings/research when referencing work.* | *Knowledgeable of papers in content area published in journals.**Possesses depth of knowledge within a particular content area**Knowledgeable of research in related fields that are relevant to research topic of interest.**Can have a rigorous debate about concepts in field**Can provide source (authorship) of major findings/research when referencing work* |
| *Justification (required for ratings 1 – 3)* |  |
|  |  | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8* | *9* |
| *Written Communication Skills* |  | *Writing is weak**Numerous grammatical and spelling errors**Organization is poor**Poorly Documented* | *Writing is adequate**Some grammatical and spelling errors**Organization is logical**Adequate Documentation* | *Writing is publication quality**No grammatical or spelling errors apparent**Organization is excellent**Excellent Documentation* |
| *Justification (required for ratings 1 – 3)* |  |
|  |  | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8* | *9* |
| *Oral Communication/ Presentation Skills* |  | *Lack of logical progression**Monotone voice**Sometimes audible or inaudible**Consistently too fast or too slow**Gap fillers (ums/uh) interfere with expression**Makes little or no eye contact with audience* | *Adequate logical progression**Vocal delivery exhibits some energy and enthusiasm**Pace of presentation was mostly effective**Presentation has few gap fillers (ums/huhs).* *Makes eye contact with limited group within audience* | *Strong logical progression* *Clear and consistently understandable* *Pace of presentation was consistently effective**Minimal number of gap fillers**Consistently makes eye contact with all members of audience* |
| *Justification (required for ratings 1 – 3)* |  |
|  |  | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8* | *9* |
| *Practitioner Skills**(Clinical and Counseling areas only)* |  | *Struggles when working with clients to behave in a fashion consistent with psychological theories despite supervision**Struggles when working with clients to follow accepted practice despite supervision.* *Behavior could be questions in terms of conformity with ethical principles* *Struggles with establishing rapport and maintaining healthy relationship with client* | *Appropriately applies psychological theories when working with clients with minimal supervision**Appropriately applies psychological practices with clients with minimal supervision**Follows ethical practices with clients**Establishes rapport and maintains healthy relationship with client* | *Could be expected to appropriately apply psychological theories when working with clients even if not directly supervised.* *Could be expected to appropriately apply psychological practices with clients even if not directly supervised.**Empathetic and connection with clients exceeds expectations for new Ph.D.**Expected to follow ethical practices*  |
| *Justification (required for ratings 1 – 3)* |  |
|  |  | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8* | *9* |
| *Critical Thinking and Creativity*  |  | *Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions**Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view**Fails to identify strong, relevant counter-arguments**Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions* | *Draws warranted, non-fallacious conclusions**Justifies some results or procedures, explains reasons**Identifies relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con**Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions* | *Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major alternative points of view**Draws warranted, judicious, non-fallacious conclusions**Justifies key results and procedures, explains assumptions and reasons**Identifies unique and relevant counter-arguments**Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions* |
| *Justification (required for ratings 1 – 3)* |  |

*Overall evaluation (mean):*

*Recommended Course of Action, if needed:*