STUDENT: **DATE:**

PPOL Dissertation Proposal Defense Rubric

Table 2: Rubric for Dissertation Proposal Defense

	Fail: Completely Unacceptable (1)	Fail: Unacceptable (2)	Pass: Acceptable (3)	Pass: Very Good (4)	Pass: Exemplary (5)	SCORE
Depth of thought/integration	The answer does not integrate knowledge across disciplines or relevant literatures. The answer does not provide support for the aims of the exam question is too brief and/or too long without substance.	The answer does not integrate knowledge across disciplines or relevant literatures. The answer does not provide enough support for the aims of the exam question is too brief and/or too long without substance.	The answer does an acceptable job of integrating knowledge across disciplines or relevant literatures. The answer does provide acceptable support for the aims of the exam question is acceptable in length.	Very good answer that includes a good level of integration, and/or critiques based on sources across disciplines or relevant literatures. The answer provides strong support for the aims of the exam question and is succinctly written.	Extensive answer that includes an excellent level of integration and/or based on sources across disciplines or relevant literatures. The answer provides very strong support for the aims of the exam question and is succinctly written.	
Incorporation of relevant literature	The focus of the exam is not relevant to the field of Public Policy broadly defined. The material reviewed is not relevant to the goals/focus of the exam. The material reviewed omits seminal work, or is insufficient.	The focus of the exam is not completely relevant to the field of Public Policy broadly defined. The material reviewed is not completely relevant to the goals/focus of the exam. The material reviewed omits some seminal work, or is somewhat insufficient.	The focus of the exam is relevant to the field of Public Policy broadly defined. The material reviewed is not relevant to the goals/focus of the exam. The material reviewed includes minimally acceptable levels of seminal work, and is minimally sufficient.	The focus of the exam is relevant to the field of Public Policy broadly defined. The material reviewed is relevant to the goals/focus of the exam. The material reviewed includes very good levels of seminal work, and is sufficient.	The focus of the exam is highly relevant to the field of Public Policy and highly interdisciplinary. The material reviewed is highly relevant to the goals/focus of the exam. The material reviewed includes excellent levels of seminal work, and is more than sufficient.	

	Fail: Completely Unacceptable (1)	Fail: Unacceptable (2)	Pass: Acceptable (3)	Pass: Very Good (4)	Pass: Exemplary (5)	SCORE
Quality of writing	Numerous errors in spelling, typing, grammar and format. The writing is poorly organized and lacks clarity. Writing is not of the expected professional quality. Citations not used appropriately.	Some errors in spelling, typing, grammar, and format. The writing is not well-organized and lacks some clarity errors such that they detract from the ability to accurately convey ideas. Citations not used completely appropriate.	Minimal errors in spelling, typing, grammar, and format. Some organizational and clarity errors but they do not detract from the ability to accurately convey ideas. Citations used appropriately.	Very few to no apparent errors in spelling, typing, grammar and format. Well organized and clear; accurately convey ideas. The writing is of professional quality. Citations used appropriately with very few to no errors.	No apparent errors in spelling, typing, grammar and format. Extremely well organized and clear; accurately convey ideas. The writing is of professional quality. Citations used appropriately.	
Oral Component	The presentation had significant errors or omissions. Responses to questions were inappropriate or demonstrated lack of understanding of the literature and study findings. The presentation did not follow a logical sequence. The presentation was not well paced. The presenter did not demonstrate confidence and/or ability to engage the audience.			The presentation had few errors or omissions. Responses to questions were appropriate or demonstrated a good understanding of the literature and study findings. The presentation followed a logical sequence. The presentation was well paced. The presenter demonstrated confidence and/or ability to engage the audience.	The presentation was accurate and comprehensive. Responses to questions were appropriate or demonstrated an in-depth understanding of the literature and study findings. The presentation followed a logical sequence. The presentation was well paced. The presentation was of professional quality and served as a model for other students.	
					TOTAL	
					AVERAGE	