***Graduate Outcome Assessment: Dissertation Defense***

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

***This assessment will take place following the dissertation defense meeting and will be based on the written dissertation proposal and oral defense.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *N/A* | *Failed to Meet Expectations* | | | *Met Expectations* | | | *Exceeded Expectations* | | |
|  |  | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8* | *9* |
| *Research Design/ Methodological Skills* |  | *Struggles to develop research proposal that is sound and will address question of interest*  *Uses commonly employed research design in field even when it doesn’t address research question*  *Failed to conduct critical aspects of claimed research design when conducting study.* | | | *Appropriately applies research design commonly employed in field*  *Designs study to handle obvious threats to validity*  *Conducts study 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.* | | |
| *Justification (required for ratings 1 – 3)* |  | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8* | *9* |
| *Applied Statistical Analysis and Advanced Statistical Methodology* |  | *Struggles to independently perform and/or correctly interpret common statistical analyses.*  *Struggles to understand when a particular analyses analysis is appropriate/inappropriate* | | | *Able to independently analyze data without assistance using appropriate statistical methodology*  *Appropriately interprets statistical analyses.* | | | *Able to independently analyze data without assistance using appropriate statistical methodology AND uses novel or more advanced statistical methodology*  *Appropriately performs, interprets, and applies sophisticated statistical analyses*  *Independently learns new statistical analyses* | | |
| *Justification (required for ratings 1 – 3)* |  | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8* | *9* |
| *Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Knowledge* |  | *Dissertation literature review fails to demonstrate breadth or depth of understanding of content area.*  *Student has difficulty discussing common theories associated with dissertation topic.* | | | *Dissertation literature adequately reviews the relevant literature and possesses both possesses breadth and depth.*  *Student can discuss major theories associated with topic area.*  *Student can articulate major theoretical disagreements in the literature* | | | *Dissertation literature review is exemplary.*  *Student is able to draw connections with literature outside of disciplinary boundaries.*  *Student illustrates knowledge of theories and empirical findings outside of content area.* | | |
| *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:*