Appendix (A) Doctoral Scholarship Rubric

Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric – General. Revised: Summer 2014

Outcomes: Describe the scholarship outcomes for graduate students in your department.
The Department of Theatre uses the traditional outcome designators: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Unacceptable. E. indicates that the faculty regards the student's scholarship to be at a level commensurate with publications in upper-tier journals. VG. means a student's scholarship is of superior quality and commensurate with publications in second-tier journals. G. means that the student's scholarship, while not deemed publishable, has the potential to become so. Students whose scholarship remains unacceptable, after suitable attempts at remediation, are discontinued. It is normal for more advanced students to achieve a better rating on their scholarship than those just beginning.

Components of **Doctoral Scholarship** and their Characteristics at Different Quality Levels

	Excellent (4)	**Very Good (3)**	**Good (2)**	**Unacceptable (1)**
Frame	focuses the study sharply with a problem, question, thesis, or a purpose that is central to the scholarship in a field, positions the research as intellectually adventurous; i.e., as an attempt to lead (rather than simply participate in) a particular scholarly conversation, written in a style that is comparable to the best writing in the field and with a regard for interdisciplinarity,	offers a focusing statement that clearly sets forth an important purpose, problem, question, or thesis,

positions the research project as a distinct contribution to an ongoing scholarly conversation,

sets a high standard for the writing style for the rest of article or essay, | focuses the project clearly by means of a question, problem, thesis, or purpose that pertains demonstrably to a field,

positions the project as a contribution to an ongoing scholarly conversation,

exhibits writing that is correct, clear, and direct, | does not focus the research project specifically enough,

unintelligible to its intended audience,

errors in spelling, grammar, and syntax, |
| **Grounding in Pertinent Research** | demonstrates a thorough and sophisticated understanding of conclusions, methodologies and arguments from scholarship and other resources important to the project, | demonstrates an advanced understanding and appreciation of the conclusions, methodologies and arguments typically used in scholarship and resources important to the | demonstrates a normative understanding of conclusions, methodologies and arguments in scholarship and other resources important to the project, | lacks a useful understanding of prior studies or other useful resources, |

	achieves a sophisticated and original grouping of previous scholarship according to similarities and dissimilarities among methodologies, sources, evidence, and/or argumentative strategies	project,

skillfully groups previous scholarship according to similarities and dissimilarities among methodologies, sources, evidence, argumentative strategies, | | |
| **Evidence and Methodology** | develops a new methodology or significantly modifies an existing methodology,

clearly explains those assumptions that determine (1) what shall be regarded as evidence, (2) how it shall be gathered, (3) the norms for interpreting it and (4) the norms for deciding how evidence shall be distributed within central arguments,

discovers new evidence or makes innovative use of evidence already familiar to the field,

offers a clear and original analysis of evidentiary sources | makes skillful use of previously developed methodologies,

clearly explains those assumptions that determine (1) what shall be regarded as evidence, (2) how it shall be gathered, (3) the norms for interpreting it and (4) the norms for deciding how evidence shall be used to make persuasive arguments,

succeeds in gathering evidence, the sufficiency of which exceeds models found in discipline-specific published research,

offers a clear analysis of evidentiary sources, | uses a methodology that is customary for the type of study being undertaken,

clearly states the assumptions that determine (1) what shall be regarded as evidence, (2) how it shall be gathered, (3) the norms for interpreting it and (4) the norms for deciding how evidence shall be used to make persuasive arguments,

offers evidence of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the professional norms of the discipline,

offers a clear analysis of evidentiary sources | unclear methodology,

with questionable pertinence to the study,

reveals inadequate evidence and/or a poor understanding of the evidence,

does not develop a clear and effective methodology, |
| **Results and Discussion** | solves the problem, answers the question, demonstrates the | solves the problem, answers the question, | coherent and clearly written, | confusing to a reader in the field, |

	hypothesis, or achieves the purpose set forward in the introduction, sets forth new discoveries or new interpretations of former discoveries that change the direction of research and/or the assumptions on which it is based	demonstrates the hypothesis, or achieves the purpose set forward in the introduction, expands or develops but does not significantly change a field or discipline,	accomplishes most of what is promised in the introduction	inconsistent with the evidence and the methodology accomplishes little or none of what is promised in the introduction,
Conclusion	explains changes to the field explicit and implicit in the results.	reassesses the field of research or the discipline in light of the expansions and amendments offered in the results.	consistent with the results and the methodology	insufficiently significant, strained or unclear relationship to the results and/or introduction.
Overall	Alters the field in a significant way, provides awareness or perspective that can alter the way readers live their lives, earns a recommendation to publish from the faculty member who assigned the project	offers a definite contribution to an important scholarly "conversation," earns a recommendation to revise and publish from the faculty member who assigned the project.	shows an advanced understanding of how scholarship is conducted in a specific field earns a recommendation to revise along lines that can lead to publication.	falls below the standards set forward in the first three columns, receives a "fail" from the faculty member who assigned the project.