

Rubric for Evaluating PhD Dissertation *(This page to be filled out by Committee Chair or Graduate Director)*

Student _____ Advisor _____

Dissertation Title _____

Date of entry into PhD Program[†] _____ Student was (check one) _____ part time or _____ full time.

Date of Passing Preliminary Exam _____ Date of Proposal _____ Date of Defense _____

Total time to complete PhD degree (circle one): > 5.0 years 4.5-5.0 years 3.5-4.5 years 3.0-3.5 years < 3.0 years

This student produced (fill in the number): Scoring Factor (SF): Raw Scores: (Number × SF)

____ Accepted or published journal articles 1.5

____ Submitted journal articles 1.0

____ Conference publications 0.5

____ National Conference presentations 0.3

____ Potential Journal publications 0.2

Total Publication Performance Score: _____

Committee Members (and Department):

- At the conclusion of the defense, each committee member should fill out the response sheet. For each attribute which a committee member feels is somewhat or very deficient, a short explanation should be provided.
- This document should be completed, even if the committee feels that the thesis is unacceptable.
- Please attach a copy of the abstract and conclusions to this evaluation form. The adviser should also include copies of any journal publications or referred conference proceedings that have already resulted from this dissertation
- Place of employment or additional graduate study, if known _____

[†]Either when the student successfully completed an MS degree, successfully completed 8 courses beyond the BS degree if skipping the MS degree, or changed projects and/or research advisors.

Ph.D. Thesis Response Sheet

(one for each committee member – circle response and return directly and confidentially to designated department administrative staff)

Attribute	Very Deficient	Somewhat Deficient	Acceptable	Very Good	Outstanding	Comments
Quality of dissertation research	Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of dissertations at Pitt	Acceptable, but disappointing (10 th to 25 th percentile of dissertations at Pitt)	Acceptable (25 th to 75 th percentile of dissertations at Pitt)	Among 75 th to 90 th percentile of dissertations at Pitt	Among top 10% of dissertations at Pitt.	
Contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires committee to stretch to find contribution. • Closer to MS than outstanding PhD dissertation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extends prior knowledge to some degree; • In total is a contribution, but contains no single major contribution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates originality • Makes some contributions • Introduces new methodology or techniques to field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very original work; • At least one important contribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original and creative. • Novel and important technical contributions; 	
Quality of writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires a professional editor • Sentence structure, language and style deficient • Major revisions required for technical content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing is weak • A number of typos, grammatical and spelling errors • A number of technical changes required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited number of typos (grammatical errors and spelling) that do not detract from work • Some changes necessary Some new technical contributions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very well written; • Easy to read and understand • Few changes or additions required. Significant technical contributions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well organized, relevant, and technically complete • Excellent clarity and use of references • Well edited 	

Attribute	Very Deficient	Somewhat Deficient	Acceptable	Very Good	Outstanding	
Defense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very poorly organized. • Disjointed presentation. • Unable to answer a number of questions. • Slides of very poor quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not well organized; • Rambled; dwelt too long on less important aspects • Had difficulty with questions. • Some slides difficult to read • Typos and other errors in slides. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable – slides clear • Good presentation skills • Able to answer most questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well thought out slides. • Professional presentation • Almost all questions addressed in a professional manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well organized, very professional, • All questions addressed in a knowledgeable and respectable manner. • Slides outstanding. 	
Other – explain						

(09/16/2008)

Any additional comments and explanations for any perceived deficiencies: