

Comprehensive Exam Written Paper Scoring Rubric

Criteria	Inadequate Achievement	Growing	Proficient	Exceptional
Quality of research consulted <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary and secondary sources • Depth and breadth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Literature consulted is random and haphazard ○ Limited evidence of understanding key research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliance on secondary sources, with few primary ○ Struggles to identify <i>key research</i> ○ Consults only research in narrow field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Balance between primary and secondary sources ○ Consulted some key research in field ○ Stays within limited field or body of research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relies on primary research, with secondary sources when appropriate ○ Includes research outside narrow field ○ Clear evidence student recognizes key research
Literature/research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synthesis and critical appraisal of current research environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inability to synthesize existing literature ○ Ineffective in critical appraisal of existing needs within literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Synthesis of existing literature is uneven, or lacking in key realms ○ Struggles to articulate a critical appraisal, or what is needed, within extant literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Synthesizes existing literature, with indication of what this means for future research ○ Critical appraisal is emerging 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clearly synthesizes existing research ○ Critical appraisal of the literature, and future path, flows logically from this synthesis, and is clearly articulated
Objectives/aims of review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of objective • Focus of article 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review objectives are absent, flawed, or article fails to address objectives/aims 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review objectives are implied, but not stated, or lacks clarity ○ Article sections are mostly passive summaries with minimal critical analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review objectives are clearly stated, and the article develops an argument or stance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review objectives are novel and clearly stated and these are met through a clear and compelling evidence-based argument or stance
Clarity of writing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flow and cohesion • Spelling and grammar • Referencing precision, use of reference tool 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Paper lacks clear organization with scattered ideas and limited flow ○ Spelling and grammatical errors are ubiquitous ○ Referencing is haphazard and a distraction to the reader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Occasional lapses in coherence and organization are evident ○ Some spelling and grammatical errors are obvious, but unresolved ○ Choice of reference software is poor, resulting in inconsistencies or errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Writing is coherent and organized, with minor grammatical errors ○ Referencing is accurate and follows a consistent style that conveys necessary information regarding the sources used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are no spelling, usage, or grammatical errors ○ Referencing is flawless ○ Writing conveys a natural flow, and displays narrative craft (tells a story)

OUTCOME	Inadequate Achievement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Must select if TWO or more Criteria above scored inadequate</i> 	Growing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Typically selected if the majority of Criteria fall within the "Growing" category. *</i> 	Proficient <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Typically selected if the majority of Criteria fall within the "Proficient" category. *</i> 	Exceptional <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Typically selected if the majority of Criteria fall within the "Exceptional" category.. *</i>
Overall, final assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cannot produce argument ○ Makes no contribution to existing literature ○ Misrepresents or misunderstands existing evidence ○ Writing completely ineffective / incoherent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Simple summaries of existing literature, with little evidence of critical thinking ○ Repeats common themes in literature or lacks depth of thinking on existing evidence ○ Writing is understandable but difficult to follow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Extends existing literature with some novel interpretations ○ Develops a capable, evidence-based argument at a level expected of a PhD candidate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Effectively proposes an entirely novel approach in the field ○ Reconsiders existing literature in a unique way ○ Uncovers existing gap in research literature or effectively proposes a new paradigm or theory
	FAIL	CONDITIONAL PASS	PASS	PASS
<i>*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.</i>				