Rubric for Evaluating Dissertation Oral Defense(Ph D Course)

Department

Year in graduate school

Name

	A. very good	B. good	C. inadequate	score
Background and objectives	Research objectives are clearly stated with very good understanding of the background.	Research objectives are clearly stated with good understanding of the background but with some shortcomings.	Research objectives are not clearly stated; understanding of the background is insufficient.	
Methodology	Methodology is appropriate and adequate to achieve the research objectives.	Methodology is mostly appropriate to achieve the research objectives but with some shortcomings.	Methodology is not appropriate or adequate to achieve the research objectives.	
Results	Qualitatively and quantitatively sufficient results are obtained.	Necessary results are obtained but with some shortcomings.	Qualitatively and quantitatively sufficient results are not obtained.	
Statistical analysis	Statistical analyses are performed appropriately and adquately.	Statistical analyses are performed appropriately but with some shortcomings.	Statistical analyses are not performed appropriately and adequately.	
Interpretation of results	Interpretation of the results is well-grounded and rational; relevance to and consistency with previous findings and the limitations of the study are sufficietnly discussed.	Interpretation and discussion of the results are mostly good with some shortcomings.	Interpretation of the results is not sound, and its discussion is limited.	
Originality and contribution to discipline	Research is original/innovative, and its potential contribution to the field is clearly presented and argued.	Research demonstrates some originality/innovativeness; the presentation of and arguments for its contribution to the field have some shortcomings.	Research is limited in origianlity/innovativeness, and its contribution to the field is not clearly presented and argued.	
Research ethics	Research ethics is well-understood.	Research ethics is understood adequately.	Resarch ethics is not understood adequately.	
Organization and clarity of presentation	The presentation is logically clear. Important points in the main components (background, aim, methods, results, interpretation) are appropriately stressed and easy to understand.	The presentation ontains some points that are difficult to understand due to, e.g., insufficient explanation.	The presentation is logically unclear and difficult to understand.	
Comprehensibility of presentation to the general audience	Those who are not in this field would be able to grasp the important points of the presentation sufficiently.	The presentation contains some information (e.g., methodolog and interpretation) that would be understood only by those who are in this field.	Very little attention is given to make the presentation comprehensible to those who are not in this field.	
Response to questions	Responses are pertinent and complete.	Responses contain some impertinence.	Responses are impertinent and incomplete.	
Presenter's contributions to the study	Presenter clearly demonstrates self-motivated and substantial contribution to the study.	Presenter's contribution is somewhat unclear.	Presenter's contribution is not clear and/or limited.	
Comments to presenter				

Date of evaluation

Evaluater