

Outcomes Assessment of Graduate Student Performance

Written Thesis and Oral Defense

Committee member returns form directly to the Graduate Coordinator

Student's Name _____

Your Name _____

Role on Committee (circle one): Chair Member

Rate this student's work by circling the appropriate number according to your expectations for a well qualified psychology Master's graduate using the following scale:

- 5: Significantly exceeds expected levels of performance
- 4: Exceeds expected levels of performance
- 3: At expected levels of performance
- 2: Below expected levels of performance
- 1: Significantly below expected levels of performance

Relevant review and integration of the literature.

5=Scholarship is excellent. All of the relevant literature is reviewed, and its relation to the research question is clearly and logically presented. The student has gone well beyond the minimum necessary to establish the rationale for the study and, thus, demonstrates an understanding of the "bigger picture."

4=Scholarship is very good. Most of the relevant literature is reviewed, and its relation to the research question is adequately presented. The student has included some literature beyond the minimum necessary to establish the rationale for the study and, thus, demonstrates an appreciation of the "bigger picture."

3=Scholarship is minimally acceptable. Much of the relevant literature is reviewed, and the relation to the research question is apparent, but could have been described more clearly. The student has provided the minimum necessary to establish the rationale for the study, but does not show an appreciation of the "bigger picture."

2=Scholarship is lacking. Literature review is incomplete, and its relation to the research question is not clearly described. The review falls short of the minimum necessary to establish the rationale for the study.

1=Scholarship is poor. A substantial portion of the relevant literature is missing and, as such, the relation to the research question is poorly established. The review falls far short of the minimum necessary to establish the rationale for the study.

Comments:

Demonstrates understanding and critical analysis of the problems in the literature reviewed.

5=Clearly presents analysis of the literature cited that points to their strengths and limitations relative to the research question.

4=Clearly presents an analysis of the strengths and limitations of the literature cited but does not relate the analysis to the research question.

3=Demonstrates an appreciation of the methodological strengths and limitations of some of the research cited.

2=Describes the methodology used for the important studies cited.

1=Fails to present an analysis of the literature cited. Author merely summarizes research.

Comments:

The paper is clearly organized.

5=The author uses a logical outline consistent with APA style that uses a “funnel” technique in the literature review that clearly leads to the research question and hypotheses, and the methods, results, and discussion clearly point to the research question and hypotheses.

4=The paper is appropriately organized but the transitions may be weaker making it harder for the reader to follow.

3=The paper is organized under standard APA headings, but the relationship between literature review, research questions, methods, results, and discussion is hard to follow.

2=The paper follows standard APA organization and headings with some deviations in order of presentation and the organization of the literature review, methods, results, and discussion is hard to follow.

1=The paper does not follow standard APA organization and headings.

Comments:

Paper conforms to APA/thesis style requirements and uses standard grammar and mechanics.

5=With few exceptions paper conforms to APA/thesis style, uses standard grammar, and has few punctuation, spelling, and other mechanical errors.

4=Paper conforms to APA/thesis style but contains technical mistakes in grammar or mechanics or has more than a few spelling errors.

3=Paper generally conforms to APA/thesis style but may contain technical errors in citations headings or other matters, but contains relatively few mechanical or grammatical errors.

2. Paper generally conforms to APA/thesis style and standard grammar and mechanics, but may contain more than a few technical errors in both APA/thesis style and the use of standard grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

1=Paper contains numerous major errors in either APA/thesis style or the use of standard grammar or mechanics.

Comments:

Design

5=The study was exceptionally well designed. The approach was sophisticated and was appropriate for the research question, and the procedures used show an advanced understanding of methodological principles. The design was exceptionally well articulated in the thesis document; use of terminology was flawless.

4=The study was well designed. The approach was sound and was appropriate for the research question, and the procedures used indicate a clear understanding of methodological principles. The design was clearly articulated in the thesis document; use of terminology was very good.

3=The study was appropriately designed. While the study design may lack sophistication or innovation, the approach generally was appropriate for the research question, and the procedures used indicate a basic understanding of methodological principles. The design was articulated in the thesis document, but more clarity was needed; use of terminology generally was appropriate.

2=The study contained some design flaws. The approach may not have been the most appropriate for the research question, and the procedures used indicate some deficiencies in the understanding of methodological principles. The description of the design in the thesis document was unclear or incomplete; there were some problems with terminology.

1=The study was poorly designed and contained major flaws. The approach was inappropriate for the research question, and the procedures used indicate a poor understanding of methodological principles. The description of the design in the thesis document was poor; terminology was used inappropriately.

Comments:

Execution

5=Execution was outstanding. Procedures were implemented with exceptional methodological rigor, and any technical difficulties were handled in a sophisticated manner. Descriptions of the methods/procedures in the thesis document were exceptionally clear; use of terminology was flawless.

4=Execution was very good. Procedures were implemented soundly, and any technical difficulties were handled appropriately. Descriptions of the methods/procedures in the thesis document were clear; use terminology was very good.

3=Execution was acceptable. Procedures generally were implemented appropriately, and any technical difficulties were addressed, at least in part. Descriptions of the methods/procedures in the thesis document were present, but could have been clearer; use of terminology generally was appropriate.

2=Execution could have been better. Procedures needed to be implemented more rigorously, and some of the technical difficulties could have been handled more effectively. Descriptions of the methods/procedures in the thesis document were unclear or incomplete; there were some problems with terminology.

1=Execution was poor. Procedures were not implemented rigorously, and technical difficulties were handled poorly. Descriptions of the methods/procedures in the thesis document were poor; terminology was used inappropriately.

Comments:

The paper uses appropriate statistical and/or graphical analysis of data.

- 5-The statistical and/or graphical analysis would be acceptable for a professional paper.
- 4-The statistical and/or graphical analysis is appropriate considering limitations of the project in terms of such factors as number of participants or trials.
- 3=The project used statistical and/or graphical analysis that did not allow for obtaining maximum information relative to any limitations imposed by the conduct of the study.
- 2=The project used statistical and/or graphic analysis that was not appropriate but was correctly performed.
- 1=The project uses analytical methods that were neither appropriate nor correctly performed.

Comments:

An appropriate interpretation of data was presented.

- 5=Data interpretation is excellent. Student shows excellent comprehension and communicates findings in a manner very advanced for a Master's level student.
- 4= Data interpretation is advanced. Student shows good comprehension and communicates findings in a manner somewhat advanced for a Master's level student.
- 3=Data interpretation is acceptable. The data were generally interpreted appropriately and student shows comprehension and communicates findings in a manner acceptable for a Master's level student.
- 2=Data interpretation is below expectations. Inappropriate data interpretation was present throughout the document, and student shows comprehension and communicates findings in a manner below expectations for a Master's level student.
- 1= Data interpretation is poor. Inappropriate data interpretation was frequently present throughout the document, and student shows comprehension and communicates findings in a manner far below expectations for a Master's level student.

Comments:

Oral Defense of Thesis

Oral defense preparation and organization.

5= Presentation provided very clear, succinct, and logical overview of the study with the student articulating a strong connection between the rationale and conclusions.

4= Presentation was succinct and logical with student articulating good connection between rationale and conclusions.

3= Presentation was adequate with only minor problems with logical flow and succinctness. Student articulated adequate connection between rationale and conclusions.

2= Presentation lacked succinctness with multiple problems of logic. Student articulated inadequate degree of connection between rationale and conclusions.

1= Presentation was poorly organized with little to no connection between rationale and conclusion.

Comments:

Oral defense presentation skills.

5= Presentation was excellent. Presentation was delivered in a manner that mastery of research topic was clearly evident. Student demonstrated appropriate use of relevant terminology and articulated ideas clearly.

4= Presentation was very good. Presentation was delivered in a manner that good understanding of research topic was evident. Student demonstrated some appropriate use of relevant terminology and articulated ideas clearly.

3= Presentation was at expectations. Presentation was delivered clearly, for the most part, with only a few areas where student showed a lack of understanding of the project. Student demonstrated some use of appropriate terminology.

2= Presentation was below expectations. Presentation frequently lacked clarity and problems with communication distracted from presentation. Infrequent use of appropriate terminology.

1= Presentation was poor. Presentation lacked clarity throughout, and student demonstrated numerous difficulties in communication. Student demonstrated little to no evidence of appropriate terminology.

Comments:

Oral Defense answers to questions.

5= Substantive and methodological questions were answered accurately, and reflected deep understanding of the research topic.

4= Substantive and methodological questions were answered accurately and reflected good understanding of the research topic.

3= Substantive and methodological questions were answered accurately and reflected adequate understanding of the research topic.

2= Methodological questions were answered accurately but little understanding of the substantive aspects of the research topic.

1= Many substantive and methodological questions were answered inaccurately.

Comments:
