

Date:

Doctoral Research Proposal

Oral Communication Rubric

Student:

Reviewer:

<i>Student Outcome</i>	<i>Excellent 4</i>	<i>Good 3</i>	<i>Acceptable 2</i>	<i>Needs Improvement 1</i>
Quality of presentation materials Score: 	Content is original, accurate in facts and evidence. Presentation is orderly, purposeful , topics are clearly identified , and presentation flows smoothly . Graphics are appropriately sized and positioned, clear, and easily understandable .	Content is mostly original and accurate in facts and evidence. Presentation is mostly orderly and purposeful , topics are clearly identified , and presentation for the most part flows smoothly . Graphics are mostly appropriately sized and positioned, clear, and easily understandable .	Content reveals sufficient effort in originality and accuracy of facts and evidence. Presentation is reasonably orderly and purposeful , topics are clearly identified , and the presentation flow is sufficiently smooth . Graphics are sufficiently well-prepared but are somewhat misaligned, ineffective, unclear, or understandable .	Content reveals minimal effort in originality and accuracy of facts and evidence. Presentation is not orderly and purposeful , topics are not clearly identified , and the presentation flow is not smooth . Graphics are poorly prepared, misaligned, ineffective, unclear, and are not easily understandable .
Mastery of the subject Score: 	Presentation reveals outstanding depth of subject knowledge, exceptionally well developed critical thinking skills, and a substantial ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from the literature to the dissertation research.	Presentation reveals good depth of subject knowledge, well developed critical thinking skills, and a notable ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from the literature to the dissertation research.	Presentation reveals a sufficient depth of subject knowledge, fairly well developed critical thinking skills, and a reasonable ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from the literature to the dissertation research.	Presentation reveals a minimal knowledge of the subject, undeveloped critical thinking skills, and a lack of the ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from the literature to the dissertation research.
Quality of responses to questions Score: 	Questions are handled skillfully and answered thoroughly	Answers reveal a significant skill and are mostly thorough .	Questions are handled sufficiently skillfully and are answered reasonably well	Questions are answered poorly or mostly not answered
Delivery preparation and techniques Score: 	The speaker appears polished and confident; has obviously practiced delivery multiple times . Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling .	The speaker appears comfortable and has likely practiced several times . Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting .	The speaker appears somewhat uncomfortable and somewhat lacking in practice but is sufficiently well prepared . Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable .	The speaker appears uncomfortable, obviously has not practiced and is does not seem to know the content. Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation .

Average score for the written and oral rubrics of 15 or below: failure to pass the DRP defense.

15–20 points: conditional pass with the conditions set by the student’s doctoral committee.

20–40 points: passed the DRP defense.

Date:

Doctoral Research Proposal**Written Communication Rubric**

Student:

Reviewer:

<i>Student Outcome</i>	<i>Excellent 4</i>	<i>Good 3</i>	<i>Acceptable 2</i>	<i>Needs Improvement 1</i>
Abstract Score: 	The abstract provides a clear, concise and accurate description of the research problem(s) and aims, significance of the work, and the research design.	The abstract provides a mostly clear, concise and accurate description of the research problem(s) and aims, significance of the work, and the research design.	The abstract provides a reasonably accurate description of the research problem(s) and aims, significance of the work, and the research design but somewhat lacks in clarity or omits some key points.	The abstract lacks in clarity and does not provide an accurate description of the research problem(s) and aims, significance of the work, and the research design.
Specific aims Score: 	Specific aims are clearly stated, skillfully crafted and accurately describe the purpose and goals of the proposed research.	Specific aims are mostly well written and describe the purpose and goals of the proposed research with sufficient clarity.	Specific aims provide a reasonably clear description of the purpose and goals of the proposed research.	Specific aims provide a minimal and inaccurate description of the purpose and goals of the proposed research or demonstrate minimal understanding of the research goals.
Significance and impact of the proposed research Score: 	Significance and impact of the proposed research are clearly articulated, demonstrating a deep understanding of the research problem(s) and the potential outcomes of the proposed work.	Significance and impact of the proposed research are mostly clearly articulated, demonstrating a good understanding of the research problem(s) and the potential outcomes of the proposed work.	Significance and impact of the proposed research are reasonably clearly articulated, demonstrating some understanding of the research problem(s) and the potential outcomes of the proposed work.	Significance and impact of the proposed research are not well described and demonstrate minimal understanding of the research problem(s) and the potential outcomes of the proposed work.
Research design Score: 	The research design is well-reasoned and appropriate for accomplishing the specific aims, demonstrating a deep understanding of methods, research strategies, and potential problems.	The research design is mostly well-reasoned and appropriate for accomplishing the specific aims, demonstrating a good understanding of methods, research strategies, and potential problems.	The research design is reasonable and mostly appropriate for accomplishing the specific aims, demonstrating some understanding of methods, research strategies, and potential problems.	The research design has significant weaknesses and is inappropriate to accomplish the specific aims, demonstrating minimal understanding of methods, research strategies, and potential problems.
Literature Score: 	Demonstrates skillful use of the relevant literature to support the proposed research and discuss prior art.	Demonstrates thoughtful use of the literature to support the proposed research and discuss prior art. The literature is mostly relevant and carefully selected.	Demonstrates an attempt to use the relevant literature to support the proposed research and discuss prior art. The literature is reasonably relevant and selected.	Barely demonstrates an attempt to use credible sources to support the proposed research and discuss prior art. Key references are missing or the literature is not relevant.
Quality of writing, graphics, and formatting Score: 	The writing is compelling, concise, accurate, and effective. Graphics are appropriately sized, clear, virtually error-free, and easily understandable. The text and references are also well-formatted and virtually error-free.	The writing is sufficiently compelling, concise, accurate, and mostly effective. Graphics are mostly appropriately sized, clear, easily understandable, and contain few errors. The text and references are also well-formatted and contain few errors.	The writing is reasonable but somewhat lacking in accuracy and effectiveness. Graphics are somewhat unclear and disorganized and contain a significant number of errors. The text and references are somewhat lacking in attention to appropriate format and contain some errors.	The writing is ineffective, mundane, and inaccurate. Graphics are too small, unclear, poorly organized, and contain many errors. The text and references are not appropriately formatted and contain many errors.