

Part I: Written Thesis Rubric

Criterion	Exceptional (4)	Strong/Good (3)	Marginal/Satisfactory (2)	Needs improvement/ Unacceptable (1)	Score
Organization: Overall organization and presentation of research.	Thesis is well-organized and structured. All required information is presented. Demonstrates logical sequencing of ideas.	Thesis is organized, and all required information is presented. Minimal difficulty with sequencing ideas.	Thesis organization is adequate or has a logical organization, but idea sequencing is not fully developed.	Thesis is disorganized and poorly structured, or the flow of information is confusing.	
Background: Ability to critically evaluate the value and contribution of published literature in the field and to integrate information into a cohesive overview. Ability to articulate the impact of research on the field within the context of prior research.	Thesis demonstrates command and understanding of the current research in the field. Review is flawlessly formatted. All sources are cited with no errors. Thesis has significant authenticity and will make an important contribution to the field.	Current research in the field is presented. Thesis may contain inconsistent citations. Thesis is relevant and will make a good contribution to the field.	Limited research is presented, or research presented is not relevant to the topic. Citations are not presented in the correct format. Thesis is moderately relevant and will make a nominal contribution to the field.	Literature review is irrelevant to topic. Citations are absent. Thesis will make little or no contribution to the field.	
Methodology/Analysis Ability to design and use appropriate methodology, ability to analyze a problem, evaluate arguments, and articulate a critical response or analysis of material.	Arguments and explanations are clear, valid, and convincing. Data interpretation is appropriate and uses correct methodology. Demonstrates an advanced ability to articulate a critical response and an extraordinary analysis of material.	Arguments presented have minor flaws. There is some weakness in interpretation. Demonstrates an above average ability to articulate a critical response and an above average analysis of material.	The arguments and explanations presented are incomplete. Demonstrates a limited ability to articulate a critical response and a satisfactory analysis of material.	The arguments and explanations presented do not adequately address the problem. Data interpretation is inappropriate and/or uses incorrect methodology. Lack of ability to articulate a critical response. Analysis of material is absent.	
Conclusions: Ability to draw conclusions from a body of knowledge	Discussion is detailed and accurate. Conclusions are based on outcomes and a in-depth analysis of material. Recommendations for future research is indicated.	Discussion is sufficient with few errors. Conclusions are based on a detailed examination of outcomes and appropriate for study.	Discussion is lacking scrutiny and critical thinking. Some ideas or information is inaccurate, and conclusions are not entirely supported by the findings.	Limited discussion of topic, poor understanding of material. Inability to draw conclusions based on findings or conclusions are not supported by findings.	
TOTAL Score (Minimum: 4/Maximum: 16)					

Part II: Oral Thesis Defense Rubric

Criterion	Exceptional (4)	Strong/Good (3)	Marginal/Satisfactory (2)	Needs improvement/ Unacceptable (1)	Score
Oral Presentation Style	Consistently made eye contact, used appropriate tone of voice, appeared confident and enthusiastic and kept the attention of the reviewers. The use of visual aids was appropriate and supported findings. Visual aids enhanced presentation.	Made eye contact numerous times, tone of voice was appropriate, demonstrated confidence/enthusiasm for most of the presentation and kept the attention of the reviewers. Visual aids did not distract from presentation.	Made occasional eye contact, sometimes appeared uncomfortable but was able to communicate ideas to the reviewers. Did not rely too heavily on notes or visual aids.	Made no eye contact, appeared uncomfortable throughout presentation, seemed unfocused and unable to keep the attention of the reviewers. Relied on written notes. Overuse of visual aids.	
Understanding of Topic	Demonstrated a comprehensive knowledge of the subject matter. Appeared to be an expert on the subject being presented. The topic is clearly understood, and information is presented convincingly and effortlessly.	Demonstrated a working knowledge of the subject matter. The topic is presented in-depth and with ease.	Demonstrated a basic knowledge of the subject matter. The main points of the topic were presented but overall knowledge lacks depth.	Demonstrated little or no knowledge of the subject.	
Communication of Results	All content was directly related to the topic and thoroughly developed. Demonstrated extraordinary knowledge of the topic. Opinions were supported by fact wherever possible. Major points were supported with relevant facts. The presentation included several significant findings that are evidence-based, accurate, and undoubtedly expressed.	Most content was directly related to the topic. Included many details that demonstrated knowledge of the topic. Most opinions were supported by facts. Most major points were supported with relevant facts. The presentation included a few significant findings that are supported by research, accurate and clearly expressed.	Had difficulty explaining how the content and topic relate. Many opinions were not factually supported. Information presented was not thorough. The relevance of some of the facts was questionable. The presentation included at least one significant finding or inconclusive findings.	Presentation did not relate to topic. Included few details and relied heavily upon unsupported opinion. Information had several inaccuracies or was not clear. No significant findings presented.	
Quality of Response to questions	Able to use questions to further demonstrate understanding of the topic without hesitancy and is able to elaborate on information presented.	Able to satisfactorily answer questions and provide additional information upon request though there may be some hesitancy in response.	Able to address reviewer questions by repeating parts of the presentation or rewording previous answers to questions. Does not provide any further information or clarification.	Unable to answer reviewer questions or comment further on any part of the presentation.	
TOTAL Score (Minimum: 4/Maximum: 16)					