

## School of Physical Therapy – PhD program Oral Qualifying Examination Scoring Rubric

Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Assessment Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations (0)	Partially Meet Expectation (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Exceeds Expectations (3)	Score (0-3)		
<b>CONTENT (50%)</b>							
Organization (10%)	Presentation is not organized and poorly balanced with respect to time spent on certain sections; content is not informative and does not convey useful information.	Presentation is somewhat organized, but imbalanced with respect to time spent on certain sections; content is somewhat informative and occasionally conveys useful information.	Presentation is organized, with appropriate time devoted to sections; content is mostly informative and conveys key information.	Presentation is highly organized and logical, with appropriate time devoted to sections; content is informative and conveys key information.			
Breadth and Depth of Knowledge (15%)	No evidence of confidence and/or competence; relies excessively on presentation content, often gives unclear explanations, is often not easily understood.	Lacks confidence and/or competence; uses presentation resources too extensively, occasionally gives unclear explanations, is sometimes not easily understood.	Shows a high level of confidence and competence; uses presentation resources as a guide, gives moderately detailed explanations, is understandable.	Demonstrates a very high level of confidence and competence indicative of an expert in the discipline; uses presentation resources as a guide, gives detailed explanations, is easily understandable.			
Synthesis of Evidence (15%)	Failure to adequately understand/explain necessary scientific principles and/or background information and/or failure to put the work in appropriate perspective.	Neglects some key perspectives and only partially places work in perspective of past and present studies; inadequately explains some key scientific principles.	Appropriately puts the work in perspective of past and present studies in the literature and is capable of introducing and explaining necessary scientific principles.	Demonstrates a high-level understanding of past and current literature and brings together concepts to think deeply about the research topic.			
Critical Thinking (10%)	Presentation does not reflect well-developed critical thinking skills.	Presentation reveals a limited ability to draw from knowledge in different areas.	Presentation reveals the ability to draw from knowledge in different areas.	Presentation reveals the ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple areas.			
<b>PRESENTATION (30%)</b>							
Presentation Design (15%)	The design detracts greatly from the presentation content and/or is not visually pleasing; use of figures, tables and/or diagrams is poorly executed and does not facilitate understanding of the material presented.	The design is adequate, but does not look polished or professional; use of figures, diagrams and tables does not facilitate understanding of the material presented.	The design is polished; slides/sections are visually pleasing and aid the viewer in comprehension of presented material; figures and other diagrams are included.	The design is polished with a very professional appearance; slides/sections are visually pleasing and aid the viewer in comprehension of presented material; figures, tables and other diagrams are quickly interpreted and appropriate to the topic discussed.			

Assessment Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations (0)	Partially Meet Expectation (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Exceeds Expectations (3)	Score (0-3)		
Presentation Skills (15%)	Becomes flustered during presentation; unfamiliar with presentation content, tends to read text directly from the slide/sections; fails to engage with audience; presentation much too short or much too long for expected duration; clear difficulty working with the technology.	Appears unrehearsed and unfamiliar with some presentation content; spends too much time on some sections of the presentation; does not show much engagement with audience through eye contact; presentation too short or too long for expected duration; presenter has difficulty working with the technology.	Speaks easily on the topic; presenter spends an appropriate amount of time discussing each slide/section; shows appropriate eye contact with audience; presenter is comfortable with technology.	Speaks easily with confidence, enthusiasm and authority on the topic; shows high engagement with the audience through frequent eye contact; keeps on topic and spends an appropriate amount of time on each slide/figure; presenter appears very comfortable with the technology.			
<b>RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS (20%)</b>							
Completeness (10%)	Responses to questions are vague or confused; limited evidence of understanding of the field; no ability to link concepts; no apparent awareness of the limitations of the methodologies or his/her interpretations of the findings.	Responses to questions suggest a shallow understanding of the field and limited understanding of the implications of his/her work; does not clearly link concepts; lacks awareness of the limits of the methodologies or his/her interpretations of the findings.	Responses to questions reflect an understanding of field and implications of his/her work; shows critical thinking by linking concepts; is aware of the limits of the methodologies and/or his/her interpretations of the findings.	Responses to questions reflect a deep understanding of field and implications of his/her work; shows critical thinking by linking concepts with evidence; clearly articulates limits of the methodologies and/or his/her interpretations of the findings.			
Quality of Responses (10%)	Does not adequately defend research; does not answer key questions or inaccurately answers questions; frequently shows a need for deeper reflection on key points; often responds defensively to questions.	Adequately defends research; answers questions, but often with inaccuracies or little insight; frequently shows a need for deeper reflection on minor points; sometimes responds defensively to probing questions.	Competently defends research by providing very helpful answers to questions.	Masterfully defends research by providing accurate, clear and insightful answers to questions.			

Reference: Utah State University - Rubric for Dissertation and Defense

Exam Chair: _____	_____	Signature	Score: _____	Overall Average
Faculty Member: _____	_____	Signature	Score: _____	Score: _____
Faculty Member: _____	_____	Signature	Score: _____	Pass: _____
		Signature		Fail: _____

\*Pass: Overall average score across all evaluators must be  $\geq 1.8/3$ . \*\* Excel scoring sheet in Google Share Drive/PhD Program.

Comments: