## **Comprehensive Exam Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric**

Criteria	Inadequate Achievement	Growing	Proficient	Exceptional
Presentation     Voice, tone, clarity     Precision in terminology     Flow     Relationship to technology	<ul> <li>Poor awareness of audience</li> <li>Inappropriate language</li> <li>cannot achieve a minimum level of clarity (e.g., nerves, volume, tone, language)</li> <li>Connection to medium entirely lacking</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>pace, clarity, and/or voice is uneven</li> <li>excess verbiage (e.g., "um" "like") interferes with understanding</li> <li>reading of text reflects poor confidence</li> <li>modest disconnection between oral and visual</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Consistent and clear</li> <li>Uses inflection in voice</li> <li>Vocabulary is precise and confident</li> <li>Visual media complements oral or aids in understanding</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Voice is vibrant with effective use of inflection</li> <li>Conveys enthusiasm and sparks interest</li> <li>Flawless communication</li> <li>Introduces concepts with precision</li> <li>Media is creative and highly effective</li> </ul>
Research Question  • Importance, justification of research question	<ul> <li>Insufficient link to published evidence</li> <li>Minimal justification or justification not logical</li> <li>Research question not relevant or not important</li> </ul>	Research question not highly important but still relevant     An obvious extension of previous research	<ul> <li>Research question an important issue</li> <li>Demonstrates a firm grasp of entire field (vs 1 or 2 papers)</li> <li>Well justified and timely</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Novel research question</li> <li>Reflects new thinking</li> <li>Potentially highly important</li> <li>Represents new paradigm/theory</li> <li>Demonstrates high level of expertise</li> </ul>
Study Design	<ul> <li>Minimal link to research question</li> <li>Methods are poorly chosen, haphazard, or obviously flawed</li> <li>Cannot justify/defend design</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>study design has flaws but student understands after discussion</li> <li>some difficulty defending design or identifying other options</li> </ul>	obvious connection to research question     Strong justification/ rationale     research methods are clearly articulated and sound	research design is novel and/or challenges "experts" in the audience
<ul> <li>Clarity of thinking</li> <li>Ability to respond to questions</li> <li>Ability to justify/explain</li> <li>Foundational knowledge</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Poor understanding of research method/design</li> <li>Little foundational knowledge</li> <li>Poor understanding of the literature</li> <li>Inability to answer basic questions</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Needs help to answer questions</li> <li>Unable to recognize weaknesses in design</li> <li>Cannot propose alternative design(s) without help</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Strong answers to questions reflecting understanding</li> <li>identifies and acknowledges potential weaknesses</li> <li>responds to feedback and can alter perspective during discussion.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Presentation almost perfect with critical assessment included</li> <li>Can engage in philosophical discussion or topics unrelated to study</li> <li>Effective debating skills (may correct audience)</li> </ul>

OUTCOME	Inadequate Achievement	Growing	Proficient	Exceptional
	Must select if TWO or more     Criteria above scored     inadequate	Typically selected if the majority of Criteria fall within the "Growing" category. *	Typically selected if the majority of Criteria fall within the "Proficient" category. *	Typically selected if the majority of Criteria fall within the "Exceptional" category *
Overall, final assessment	<ul> <li>Minimal knowledge</li> <li>Ineffective communication</li> <li>Clear misconceptions, bias, or inability to understand comments</li> <li>Research proposal is completely ineffective/illogical</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Research proposal flawed but some logic is evident</li> <li>Needs help to understand flaws or alternative viewpoints</li> <li>Difficult to follow without clarification</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Strong research question and design</li> <li>Clearly justified and evidence based</li> <li>Able to acknowledge and respond to critical appraisal.</li> <li>Strong knowledge base</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Challenges audience members with novel way of thinking</li> <li>Prepared for virtually all questions/discussion topics</li> <li>Teaches, inspires, and demonstrates unique expertise and depth of thinking</li> </ul>
	FAIL	CONDITIONAL PASS	PASS	PASS

<sup>\*</sup>Although selection of the final score (growing, proficient, exceptional) typically corresponds to the column with the majority of scores from each category above, committee members may choose to place a higher weight on certain categories for their final assessment based on in camera discussions.