

APPENDIX C

Pepperdine University – Graduate School of Education and Psychology – Psychology Division
DISSERTATION PRELIMINARY ORAL EXAMINATION RESULTS

Student Name: _____ CWID: _____

Student's Individual Study Working Title:

Team Members: _____

Team Project Title: _____

Evaluation Criteria: Evidence of mastery of research approach and relevant literature; Evidence of critical thinking; Quality of written document (content, comprehensiveness, analysis, writing); Content of oral presentation (quality, accuracy, organization); Oral presentation skills (clarity, flow, visual presentation, etc.); Evidence of preparation and practice; Response to Q & A.

ORAL EXAMINATION PERFORMANCE

Individual Result: _____ Pass with Distinction _____ Pass _____ Pass with Concerns _____ Retake/Did not Pass

Team Result: (___N/A) _____ Pass with Distinction _____ Pass _____ Pass with Concerns _____ Retake/Did not Pass

Comments:

WRITTEN DOCUMENT _____ Exemplary _____ Strong _____ Acceptable _____ Weak _____ Unacceptable

Comments:

REQUIRED MODIFICATIONS: (attach additional pages as necessary) (___ no modifications required)

This student has successfully completed the Preliminary Oral Examination. The dissertation proposal has been submitted to *Turn It In*, reviewed, and approved. Pending IRB approval, this student may now proceed with his/her clinical dissertation research.

Chairperson's Name

Chairperson's Signature

Date

Committee Member Name

Committee Member Signature

Date

Committee Member Name

Committee Member Signature

Date

Committee Member Name

Committee Member Signature

Date

Table 4. Dissertation Proposal Evaluation Rubric and Ratings

INSTRUCTIONS: Please use this form during Dissertation Committee deliberations and rate each student’s performance in each of the four categories in the columns below. The feedback should be provided to the student and the form submitted with the Preliminary Orals Results Form (Appendix C) to the Program Administrator.

Scoring Level	Study Rationale (Statement of the Problem) and Research Aims/Objectives	Review of the Literature	Methodology	APA Format and Writing
4 Exemplary	In addition to meeting the requirements of “3,” the uniqueness of the project is fully demonstrated and has the potential to make a highly important contribution to the field.	In addition to meeting the requirements of “3,” the literature review has the potential of being a stand-alone publication.	In addition to meeting the requirements of “3,” the methodology is highly rigorous and sophisticated; exhibits a complex understanding of research methodology.	In addition to meeting the requirements of “3,” the document demonstrates outstanding, publication-quality, academic writing skills
3 Strong	Research aims are clearly defined. Clinical contribution is addressed and research support is offered for the need. The rationale for the proposed study is clear, concise and exhibits an integrated understanding of the issues.	The review is comprehensive and includes conceptual and methodological critique. Current citations are included in the review; no secondary citations are used. The review is well organized and exhibits an integrated understanding of the relevant literature.	The methodology is appropriate, well-defined, and sufficiently rigorous. Issues relevant to protecting human subjects are addressed, including more complex considerations.	Demonstrates clarity, coherence, logic, and flow in the presentation of content. Strong transitional segues are used to structure the document. Minimal to no errors in syntax, punctuation, and spelling. Negligible number of typographical errors. Follows APA format.
2 Acceptable	Research aims are defined, although vague. Clinical contribution of proposed study is addressed but in need of development. The conceptualization of the proposed study is relatively clear.	There is a basic review with inclusion of relevant research. Most citations are current; minimal to no use of secondary citations. The review is organized and follows a logical progression.	The methodology is basic and, while appropriate, could be more thoroughly developed. Basic issues relevant to the protection of human subjects are addressed.	The proposal mostly demonstrates coherence, logic, and flow in the presentation of content. Minimal number of syntax, punctuation, and spelling errors. Minimal number of typographical errors; Follows APA format with few errors.
1 Weak	Research aims are missing or ill-defined. No rationale is offered for clinical contribution of proposed study. There is no clear conceptualization offered for the proposed study.	The review is missing key pieces of relevant research or includes literature unrelated to the proposed dissertation. The citations are dated and/or numerous secondary citations are used. The review is disorganized.	The methodology is ill-defined and incongruent with the aims of the proposed study. Key issues relevant to the protection of human subjects are overlooked.	The proposal lacks coherence, logic, and flow in the presentation of content. Numerous errors of syntax, punctuation, and spelling. Excessive typographical errors. Numerous APA format errors.
0 Unacceptable				
Rating Please check the numerical rating for each category	Study Rationale and Research Aims/Objectives	Review of the Literature	Methodology	APA Format and Writing
	0 1 2 3 4 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	0 1 2 3 4 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	0 1 2 3 4 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	0 1 2 3 4 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>