

Rubric Definitions – Comprehensive Exam Paper, PhD Program, GSSW, 2014/15

Please enter a score from 1 to 5 using the guidelines for Emerging, Developing, and Mastering levels as anchor points:

Required Elements

	<i>Emerging (1)</i>	<i>Developing (3)</i>	<i>Mastering (5)</i>	<i>SCORE</i>
RE1.1 Statement of substantive/problem area (requires prevalence and nature of the problems; its history & recent trends; analyzes biases & omissions, particularly around vulnerable populations)	Begins to define the problem, may present one needed element. Many areas missing or poorly covered. Discussion of vulnerable populations is superficial	Covers most of the required elements but not in enough depth – more like completing an annotated list than an analysis. Begins to analyze biases and omissions, particularly for vulnerable populations, citing convincing evidence	Analyzes the required elements in depth, shows ability to synthesize rather than annotate. Covers biases and omissions, particularly for vulnerable populations, in depth. If gaps are identified, goes beyond documentation of the evidence for that, and demonstrates original thought about the social justice implications	
RE1.2 Analysis of theoretical frameworks for examining problem	Uses only one theory, or the coverage of two theories is superficial	Describes two theories in some detail, but does not evidence much critical review. Discussion of the utility of the theory is there, but without enough application to the problem area	Uses at least 2 theories – defines and critically reviews each. Analyzes the utility of the theories to inform social intervention in the substantive/problem area	
RE1.3 Review of key policy approaches	Describes a policy but either misses one much more relevant to the topic or misses many details of the policy's impact and limitations	Defines a relevant policy for the area, begins to analyze its impacts and limitations, but lacks context, doesn't provide enough examples, may list, but not describe, reform suggestions	Discusses at least one relevant social policy impacting the problem. Analyzes its impacts and limitations; suggests reforms	
RE1.4 Critical review of relevant research	Concretely discusses some research in this area, with no synthesis of the overall body of research. Does not indicate awareness of extent of research	Begins a discussion of the scope of the available research, but may be unsure of the dominant research methods, may write by listing, rather than critically comparing. May be unsure of the gaps in this area	Critically analyzes the existing research in this area, analyzing dominant methods, and identifying gaps in the knowledge. May describe the search, or the scope of what is available. Suggests two thoughtful research questions (depending on year of comp)	

Critical Thinking Expectations (from Washington State University Critical Thinking Project: <http://wsuctproject.wsu.edu/ctm.htm>, resource guide)

	<i>Emerging (1)</i>	<i>Developing (3)</i>	<i>Mastering (5)</i>	<i>SCORE</i>
CT1.1 Considers the influence of context and assumptions	<p>Approach to the issue is egocentric or socio-centric. Does not relate issue to other contexts (cultural, political, historical, etc.). Shows little awareness of social justice.</p> <p>Analysis is grounded in absolutes, with little acknowledgement of own biases.</p> <p>Does not fully recognize context or surface assumptions and underlying ethical implications</p>	<p>Presents and explores relevant contexts and assumptions regarding the issue, although in a limited way.</p> <p>Analysis includes some empirical verification, but primarily relies on established authorities.</p> <p>Provides some recognition of context and consideration of assumptions and their implications, begins to frame this problem in the context of societal privilege and prejudice</p>	<p>Analyzes the issue with a clear sense of scope and context, including an assessment of audience. Considers other integral contexts.</p> <p>Analysis acknowledges complexity and bias of vantage and values, although may elect to hold to bias in context.</p> <p>Identifies influence of context and questions assumptions, addressing ethical dimensions underlying the issue. Demonstrates understanding of the ways societal privilege and prejudice have not only impacted the problem, but set the frame for analysis and intervention with the problem</p>	

CT1.2 Presents, assesses, and analyzes appropriate supporting data/evidence	<p>No evidence of search, selection or source evaluation skills.</p> <p>Repeats information provided without question or dismisses evidence without adequate justification.</p> <p>Does not distinguish among fact, opinion, and value judgments.</p> <p>Conflates cause and correlation; presents evidence and ideas out of sequence.</p> <p>Data/evidence or sources are simplistic, inappropriate, or not related to topic.</p>	<p>Demonstrates adequate skill in searching, selecting, and evaluating sources to meet the information need.</p> <p>Use of evidence is qualified and selective.</p> <p>Discerns fact from opinion and may recognize bias in evidence, although attribution is inappropriate.</p> <p>Distinguishes causality from correlation, though presentation may be flawed.</p> <p>Appropriate data/evidence or sources provided, although exploration appears to have been routine.</p>	<p>Evidence of search, selection, and source evaluation skills; notable identification of uniquely salient resources.</p> <p>Examines evidence and its source; questions its accuracy, relevance, and completeness.</p> <p>Demonstrates understanding of how facts shape but may not confirm opinion. Recognizes bias, including selection bias.</p> <p>Correlations are distinct from causal relationships between and among ideas. Sequence of presentation reflects clear organization of ideas, subordinating for importance and impact.</p> <p>Information needed is clearly defined and integrated to meet comprehensive requirement.</p>	
CT1.3 Identifies and assesses conclusions, implications, and consequences	<p>Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences, or conclusion is a simplistic summary.</p> <p>Conclusions presented as absolute, and may attribute conclusion to external authority.</p>	<p>Conclusions consider or provide evidence of consequences extending beyond a single discipline or issue. Presents implications that may impact other people or issues.</p> <p>Presents conclusions as relative and only loosely related to consequences.</p> <p>Implications may include vague reference to conclusions.</p>	<p>Identifies, discusses, and extends conclusions, implications, and consequences. Considers context, assumptions, data, and evidence. Qualifies own assertions with balance.</p> <p>Conclusions qualify as the best available evidence within the context. Consequences are considered and integrated. Implications are clearly developed, and consider ambiguities.</p>	

PhD Level Writing Expectations

	<i>Emerging (1)</i>	<i>Developing (3)</i>	<i>Mastering (5)</i>	<i>SCORE</i>
WE1.1 Writing flows well – thoughts, transitions, grammar are good	Not proofread	Problems with grammar & transitions between topics slow down, confuse the reader	Smooth flow of ideas and informative transitions between topics	
WE1.2 Literature references are specific and analyzed in enough detail	Numerous non-specific references grouped in parenthetical citations.	Mixes specific and non-specific references, some works clearly analyzed, others included hastily.	Gives the sense that each work read and referenced is unique, makes some contribution to knowledge in this problem area.	
WE1.3 Primary sources are used	Many secondary citations to works that are in print and need to be read in this problem area	Most citations are to primary sources but may rely on secondary citation when the original author is difficult to understand	Minimizes use of secondary citations; reads original works for theory, history, research, etc. The exception is out of print works.	
WE1.4 APA style used for citations and references	Barely there	Most APA citing/referencing conventions are met, sometimes inconsistently	References and citations follow APA style requirements	

INSTRUCTIONS: Each committee member should score the comprehensive exam paper using the rubrics above, recording the score in the column titled *SCORE* on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high). The rubric form should NOT be submitted with the comments that are to be distributed to the full committee and the student, but should be brought to the meeting and turned into the chair of the committee at the end of the comprehensive exam meeting. The chair of the comprehensive exam committee should complete the attached summary of the ratings for all three members of the comprehensive exam committee. Scores for each element range from a low of 1 to a high of 5. This summary rating sheet should be included with the paperwork indicating pass/fail and returned to the PhD Program Coordinator.

	<i>Reader 1</i>	<i>Reader 2</i>	<i>Chair</i>
REQUIRED ELEMENTS 1.1			
REQUIRED ELEMENTS 1.2			
REQUIRED ELEMENTS 1.3			
REQUIRED ELEMENTS 1.4			
CRITICAL THINKING 1.1			
CRITICAL THINKING 1.2			
CRITICAL THINKING 1.3			
WRITING EXPECTATIONS 1.1			
WRITING EXPECTATIONS 1.2			
WRITING EXPECTATIONS 1.3			
WRITING EXPECTATIONS 1.4			