***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:*