Rubric for Evaluating PhD Dissertation Research Proposal
(This page should be filled out by the student or Committee Chairman/advisor prior to distribution to Committee)

Chair of Evaluation Committee____________________________________ Date of Proposal Review ______________________________

Research Proposal Title _____________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Committee Members and Department

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
After evaluating the dissertation research proposal, each committee member should fill out the response sheets provided. For each attribute which a committee member feels is somewhat or very deficient, a short explanation should be provided. A Confidential Comment section at the bottom of the rubric is provided for explanations of the reasoning behind the overall evaluation of the research proposal if desired. Completed forms are to be treated as confidential and are to be turned in to the Chair of the Evaluation Committee (or Advisor), not the student.

A summary of written comments from committee members as well as any edited copies of the research proposal submitted by committee members WILL be provided to the student by the chair of the examining committee (or advisor) and; a verbal summarization of the overall evaluation of the research proposal by the committee WILL be provided to the student by the chair of the examining committee (or advisor) or during a prescheduled meeting of the advisory committee.

All evaluation documents including rubrics and written comments must be completed.

A copy of the completed forms (both rubrics and written comments) must be sent to the Chair of the Entomology Graduate Committee within 1 week of the completion of the proposal review process.
### Dissertation Research Proposal Rubric

**Attribute** | **Does Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations**
--- | --- | --- | ---
**Overall quality of science** | □ Arguments are incorrect, incoherent, or flawed  
□ Objectives are poorly defined  
□ Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills  
□ Reflects poor understanding of subject matter and associated literature  
□ Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts  
□ Demonstrates limited originality  
□ Displays limited creativity and insight  
□ Little potential for success of research | □ Arguments are coherent and clear  
□ Objectives are clear  
□ Demonstrates average critical thinking skills  
□ Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature  
□ Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts  
□ Demonstrates originality  
□ Displays creativity and insight  
□ Good potential for success of research | □ Arguments are superior  
□ Objectives are well defined  
□ Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills  
□ Reflects mastery of subject matter and associated literature.  
□ Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts  
□ Demonstrates exceptional originality  
□ Displays exceptional creativity and insight  
□ Excellent potential for success of research

**Contribution to discipline** | □ Limited potential for discovery  
□ Limited expansion upon previous research  
□ Limited theoretical or applied significance  
□ Limited publication potential | □ Some potential for discovery  
□ Builds upon previous research  
□ Reasonable theoretical or applied significance  
□ Reasonable publication potential | □ Exceptional potential for discovery  
□ Greatly extends previous research  
□ Exceptional theoretical or applied significance  
□ Exceptional publication potential

**Quality of writing** | □ Writing is weak  
□ Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent  
□ Organization is poor  
□ Documentation is poor | □ Writing is adequate  
□ Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent  
□ Organization is logical  
□ Documentation is adequate | □ Writing is publication quality  
□ No grammatical or spelling errors apparent  
□ Organization is excellent  
□ Documentation is excellent

**Overall Assessment** | □ Does not meet expectations | □ Meets Expectations | □ Exceeds Expectations

**Comments:**
Completed by: ___________________________ Date: ________________

**Individual Committee Member comments for student concerning performance on Dissertation Research Proposal:**

Committee Member Signature ___________________________ Date: ________________