

**Graduate Assessment Rubric for the Doctor of Philosophy**

This rubric documents outcomes assessment for our doctoral graduate programs PhD/CVEN and PhD/EAS. It must be completed by the chair of the student’s faculty committee, in collaboration with the full committee, at the time of the doctoral defense. Assessment is based on two products, (1) the student’s draft dissertation, and (2) the student’s oral presentation, including the slide deck.

	Below Proficient	Proficient	Above Proficient
Technical Ability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• fundamentals</li> <li>• policy and methods</li> <li>• professional judgment</li> </ul>	Student uncertain with principal concepts, unaware of relevant policy and methods, and unable to explain choices or judgments.	Student shows proficiency with principal concepts, awareness of relevant policy and methods, and reasoned choices and judgment.	Student shows mastery of principal concepts, fluency with relevant policies and methods, and rigorous basis for choices and judgment.
Communication Skills <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focused</li> <li>• structured</li> <li>• persuasive</li> </ul>	Student tentative, lengthy, and unfocused, lacking organization and structure, so presentation is hard to follow. Written products hampered by structural, grammar, or spelling errors. Oral defense shows lack of depth in topic.	Student minimizes unnecessary writing and speaking, using a general organization and structure, so presentation is comprehensible. Written products suitable for presentation at conference or in journal after editing. Oral defense shows comfort with topic.	Student is deliberate, concise, and focused, with clear and consistent organization and structure, so presentation is persuasive. Written products ready for presentation at conference or in refereed journal. Fluent debate in oral defense.
Scholarly Achievement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• original idea</li> <li>• contextualized</li> <li>• conclusions valid</li> </ul>	Student struggles to explain idea, which lacks context to the technical literature.	Student articulates an original idea in the context of the relevant technical literature.	Potential for impact demonstrated by grant proposals, patent applications, or startup companies.
Research Outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• methods</li> <li>• findings</li> <li>• impact</li> </ul>	Methods inappropriate or applied incorrectly. Findings are unclear, unsubstantiated, or lacking novelty. No grants, patents, or startups.	Methods appropriate and applied correctly, and findings constitute an original contribution to the student’s field, but without funded grants, patent registrations, or startup companies.	Appropriate methods applied, assessed, and updated as necessary. Findings constitute a major step forward in the student’s field. Impact demonstrated by funded grants, patent registrations, or startup companies.

