

Student Name: _____

PhD Criminal Justice Written Qualifying Examination Oral Defense/Appeal Rubric – Completed by: _____ Date: _____

Segment 1- Research and Quantitative Methods
To be completed by each committee member.

Please check boxes for all evaluation criteria that you feel are appropriate within each attribute category. After all attribute boxes are checked, selected the most appropriate cell and score the exam.

As per the Graduate Handbook, the intent of the oral defense/appeal is to defend and clarify to the committee the responses provided during the written segment(s) and NOT to restructure or present a new response. The oral answer should demonstrate that the student has adequate knowledge to continue in the PhD program.

Attribute	Description	Poor (0)	Adequate (1)	Good (2)
Pointed Answer	While defending their written answer, the student provides a complementary and clarified answer that is focused on the probative questions asked and answered all portions.	Unacceptable oral answers include any of the following: <input type="radio"/> An answer that is off topic or only tangentially related; <input type="radio"/> Answer does not respond to question in its entirety; <input type="radio"/> An answer that lacks a position.	Oral answer defends the written answer by addressing the probative questions directly and in all portions, but lacks refinement and clarity at times. The combination of the oral and written answers constitutes an acceptable answer.	Oral answer addresses the probative questions directly and clearly, in all portions. Nuances and refinement are present. The combination of the oral and written answers constitutes a strong answer.
Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	The oral answer builds upon the written answer and demonstrates depth and breadth of knowledge of the topic under examination. Depth of knowledge refers to mastery of topical area, while breadth refers to ability to connect and critically position the answer in its larger context (i.e., system or research methodology).	Unacceptable oral answers include any of the following: <input type="radio"/> An answer that lacks depth and demonstrates an undergraduate level of topical knowledge (e.g., no sophistication, no nuance, overgeneralizations and sweeping statements); <input type="radio"/> An answer that lacks breadth, is not connected to its context, and devoid of critical thinking about implications.	Oral answer demonstrates some breadth and depth of knowledge, but one of these facets is weaker and open to criticism. The student should be able to provide a reasonable rebuttal or response to criticism. The combination of the oral and written answers show an acceptable level of knowledge.	Oral answer demonstrate advanced and nuanced knowledge of the topical area, clearly represents the connections of the answer to its larger context and discusses implications. The combination of the oral and written answers shows a strong body of knowledge.
Accuracy of Argument	The oral answer provided is substantively and factually accurate.	Unacceptable answers include: <input type="radio"/> Seriously flawed (i.e., substantive misstatement of fact that demonstrates clear lack of understanding of fundamental concept); <input type="radio"/> Repetition of incorrect statements to the point where the tenets of the students' argument are invalidated.	Most tenets of the oral answer provided are correct and accurately represent the content of graduate coursework. Some aspects are not well represented, without invalidating the whole answer.	The substance and facts of the oral answer is rigorous and accurate.

Student Name:

Overall	Does not meet or below expectations - score = 0-2 (Fail)	Meets or exceeds expectations - score = 3-6 (Pass)
	Comments:	

Committee Member Signature _____ Date: _____