

**School of Physical Therapy – PhD program
Written 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)
QUALITY OF THE SCHOLARLY WORK (75%)					
Research Problems & Significance of the Study (10%)	Fails to provide sufficient evidence to describe the problem(s) and/or impact of those problem(s).	Provides some evidence to describe the problem(s) and the impact of those problem(s).	Provides sufficient evidence to describe the problem(s) and the impact of those problem(s).	Demonstrates the ability to synthesize evidence to build a strong case for the research problem(s).	
Background and Justification, including Theoretical Framework (15%)	Fails to present a clear purpose/aim that addresses the identified gap in the literature.	Provides some interpretation of the literature that identifies the gap or need for more information. Some selected evidence leads logically to the purpose or aims of the study.	Provides a clear presentation and interpretation of the literature that identifies the gap or need for more information. The selected evidence leads logically to the purpose or aims of the study.	Provides a clear, complete, and synthesized overview of the literature which leads logically to the purpose or aims of the study. There is an excellent relationship between the gap in literature and purpose or aims.	
Research Purpose and Aims (5%)	Fails to present a clear purpose/aim that addresses the identified gap in the literature, and does not identify the target population.	Provides a purpose/aim that partially addresses the identified gap in the literature and partially identifies the target population.	Provides a purpose/aim that addresses the identified gap in the literature and identifies the target population.	Provides a clear, purpose/aim that addresses the identified gap in the literature and clearly identifies the target population.	
Research Method – Design (5%)	Fails to provide an appropriate research design for the study.	Provides a somewhat appropriate research design for the study.	Adequately describes an appropriate research design for the study.	Clearly describes an appropriate research design for the study.	
Research Design – Participants (5%)	Selection process is not justified. Power analysis is not performed.	Selection process is partially justified. Power analysis is not performed.	Selection process is justified. Power analysis is included if applicable.	Selection process is clear and justified with carefully selected evidence. Power analysis is included if applicable and correctly applied.	
Research Method – Measures & Instruments (5%)	Fails to adequately describe the measurements taken and instrumentation used to assess each measure. Does not provide psychometric properties of the instrument for the measurement described.	Partially describes the measurements taken and instrumentation used to assess each measure. Provides some evidence that selected tools are reliable and valid for the target population.	Adequately describes the measurements taken and instrumentation used to assess each measure. Provides evidence that selected tools are reliable and valid for the target population.	Provides clear description of the measurements taken and instrumentation used to assess each measure. Provides evidence that selected tools are reliable and valid for the population and it is clear the student selected the tool(s) based on a careful critical appraisal of the evidence.	

Assessment Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations (0)	Partially Meet Expectation (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Exceeds Expectations (3)	Score (0-3)
Research Method – Procedures (5%)	Fails to provide a description of the procedures. Difficult to follow, details are omitted, and/or fails to align with the purpose/aims.	Provides a description for parts of the procedures that aligns with the purpose/aims.	Provides a complete description of the procedures that aligns with the purpose/aims.	Provides a clear and logical description of the procedures that align with purpose/aims. All details allow for replication. Controls are in place as appropriate.	
Research Method – Data Analysis (5%)	Fails to tie the analysis directly to purpose/aim(s) and/or there are errors in the proposed and/or actual analysis.	Provides the analysis that are partially tie to the purpose/aim(s). There are errors in the proposed and/or actual analysis. Demonstrates partial understanding of statistical analysis and application.	Provides a direct tie between the analysis and the purpose/aim(s). There are minor errors in the proposed and/or actual analysis. Demonstrates understanding of statistical analysis and application.	Provides a direct tie between the analysis and the purpose/aim(s). There are no errors in the proposed and/or actual analysis. Demonstrates an excellent understanding of statistical analysis and application.	
Strength & Weakness (Manuscript) or Potential Problems (Grant) (5%)	Fails to provide the study's strengths and weaknesses as an individual study and in relationship to other literature. For grants, fails to identify any potential problem and alternate strategy.	Did not provides the study's strengths and weaknesses clearly as an individual study and in relationship to other literature. For grants, did not clearly identify a potential problem and alternate strategy.	Provides a description of the study's strengths and weaknesses as an individual study and in relationship to other literature. For grants, identifies at least one potential problem and alternate strategy.	Provides a clear description of the study's strengths and weaknesses as an individual study and in relationship to other literature. Clearly addresses weaknesses using evidence and offers solutions or justification. For grants, identifies two potential problems and alternate strategies.	
Use of References (5%)	Fails to use literature appropriately. Selected references are limited, weak, dated, or inaccurate. Shows limited ability to discriminate between relevant and non-relevant material. Does not critically evaluate the selected literature. (Plagiarism is an automatic failure of exam).	Able to use selected references to support parts of the scholarly work. There is some quantity and quality to support the scholarly work. Demonstrates some ability to discriminate between relevant and non-relevant material.	Able to use selected references appropriately to support most of the scholarly work. There is a sufficient quantity and quality to support the scholarly work. Demonstrates ability to discriminate between relevant and non-relevant material.	Consistently use and knowledge of reference material. Clear evidence of synthesis and able to discriminate between relevant and non-relevant material.	
Supporting Tables, Figures, Appendices (5%)	Tables, figures, and/or appendices are poor and/or restate the information in the text. Doesn't add value. For grants, visual display of timeline is non-existent or ineffective.	Parts of tables, figures, and/or appendices are acceptable and add some insight for the reader. For grants, a timeline is provided but not realistic.	Tables, figures, and/or appendices are acceptable and add insight for the reader. For grants, visual display of timeline is provided and most parts are realistic.	Tables, figures, and/or appendices are clearly presented and add insight for the reader. For grants, effective visual display of timeline provides a realistic plan for the study.	

Assessment Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations (0)	Partially Meet Expectation (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Exceeds Expectations (3)	Score (0-3)		
Adherence to Journal Author or Funding Guidelines (5%)	Disorganized, fails to divide the manuscript or proposal into specified sections.	Organized as directed by the journal guidelines or RFP with some formatting errors.	Follows the journal or funding guidelines with a few minor formatting errors.	Consistently follows the journal or funding guidelines with no formatting errors.			
QUALITY OF WRITING (25%)							
Organization (10%)	Most information is not well-organized.	Some sections are not well-organized.	The author demonstrates logical organization of information.	The author demonstrates highly logical organization of information.			
Mechanics and Sentence Structure (10%)	Sentences sound awkward, are distractingly repetitive or are difficult to understand.	Some sections are not well-organized; most sentences are well constructed, but they are similar in structure with little variation.	Most sentences are well constructed and have varied structure and length.	Sentences are well constructed and have varied structure and length.			
Citation, Grammar and Spelling (5%)	Numerous errors in citation, grammar and/or spelling that interfere with understanding.	Several errors in citation, grammar, mechanics and/or spelling that interfere with understanding.	A few errors in citation, grammar and/or spelling, but they do not interfere with understanding.	No errors in citation, grammar, mechanics and/or spelling.			

Reference: Utah State University - Rubric for Dissertation and Defense

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

*Pass: Overall average score across all evaluators must be $\geq 1.8/3$.

** Excel scoring sheet in Google Share Drive/PhD Program.

Comments: