Scoring Rubric for Ph.D Oral Comprehensive Exam (Department of Geological Sciences)

Student_____ Date_____ Committee Member_____

Initial the appropriate box in each category. Each student's performance will be scored in four categories listed below. The committee's ranking will be based upon a five-point scale (5 = Exemplary, 4 = Strong, 3 = Competent, 2 = Marginal, 1 = Unacceptable). The minimum successful score will be "Competent" or better from a majority of the Committee.

	Identification of Knowledge Gap and Scientific Plan to Address	Response to Questions	Support from Literature	Technical Knowledge
5 – Exemplary	Provides substantial evidence of current gaps/shortcomings in state of knowledge and clearly presents state-of-the-art methods and a reasonable plan to address them	Responses to questions are specific, defendable, and complex. Student needs no prompting and demonstrates intellectual independence from advisor and committee.	Provides substantial, well-chosen evidence (research or textual citations) used strategically.	Demonstrates high-level understanding of main technical concepts needed to undertake proposed science plan. Can clearly articulate how these concepts apply to and advance their research agenda.
4 – Strong	Provides considerable evidence of current gaps/shortcomings in state of knowledge and clearly presents appropriate methods and a reasonable plan to address them	Responses to question are more general, but still accurate; analyses go beyond the obvious. Little/no prompting required.	Provides considerable and appropriate evidence and, makes effort to contextualize it.	Demonstrates appreciable understanding of main technical concepts needed to undertake proposed science plan. Can explain how these concepts directly apply to their research plan.
3 – Competent	Provides sufficient evidence of current gaps/shortcomings in state of knowledge and adequately presents useful methods and a plan to address them	Responses to questions are overly general and disorganized; may have some factual, interpretive, or conceptual errors. Student answers benefit from prompting by committee.	Provides some evidence but not always relevant, sufficient, or integrated into the response.	Demonstrates basic understanding of main technical concepts needed to undertake proposed science plan. Can explain at a basic level how these concepts could apply to their research plan.
2 – Marginal	Provides minimal evidence of current gaps/shortcomings in state of knowledge and struggles to presents any methods and a plan to address them	Responses to questions are vague or irrelevant. Student requires substantial prompting to develop an answer.	Evidence usually only narrative or anecdotal; awkwardly or incorrectly incorporated.	Struggles to explain without committee assistance the main technical concepts needed to undertake proposed science plan. Also struggles to explain at a basic level how these concepts could apply to their research plan.
1 – Unacceptable	Does not recognize current gaps/shortcomings in state of knowledge and has no plan to address them	No discernable response to most questions given.	Little or no evidence cited to support responses.	Is not aware of the main technical concepts needed to undertake proposed science plan.
Comments				