



**WAYNE STATE**  
**College of Fine, Performing**  
**and Communication Arts**

**PROSPECTUS/DISSERTATION ASSESSMENT INSTRUCTIONS**

Dear faculty advisors,

After your student has successfully defended a prospectus or dissertation, please assess it with the attached rubric and send the results to the Graduate Director. Typically, we used prospectus defenses to assess two of our PhD Program Learning Outcomes.

Please identify these data only by the prospectus or defense (A, B, C, or 1, 2, 3, whatever). not by individual students' names. These data are for aggregate assessment of the program, NOT for assessment of any individual performance, so please don't associate student names with data. The final assessment report will not include any student or faculty information.

Use the first rubric for a prospectus. Use the second rubric for a dissertation.

Thank you for your assistance!

# Department of Communication

## Ph.D. Assessment: Rubric for Assessment of Prospectus for Assessing Student Learning Outcome 1

**SLO1:** Review literature in the communication field to identify new research questions.

Advisers: In consultation with the prospectus/dissertation committee, please assess the project’s review of literature and description of the research problem using this rubric. Please do not submit any material that identifies the student or yourself with the assessment; these are for program assessment only and are not used for individual evaluations.

Category	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Weak	1 Unacceptable
Description of research problem; scope; significance	Research problem is stated clearly and logically presented. Study is appropriately focused in scope. Engagement with prior scholarship clearly illustrates need for the present study. Contribution of study to knowledge broadly and to scholarship within the field is clearly articulated.	A research problem is identified reasonably well. Connections are established with the literature. Engagement with prior scholarship adequately illustrates need for the present study. Contribution of study to knowledge broadly and to scholarship within the field is adequately articulated.	Although a research problem is identified, the statement is too broad or the description fails to establish the importance of the problem area. Connections to the literature are unclear, debatable, or insignificant. Elements are poorly formed, ambiguous, or not logically connected to the description of the problem, purpose, or research methods.	No research problem is clearly identified. Statement of the problem, significance, purpose, questions/ hypotheses, or definitions of constructs and variables are omitted or inappropriate.
Synthesis of current literature	Mastery of literature is demonstrated through thorough citation, review, and synthesis of relevant scholarship that includes key and logical details. An appropriate theoretical/conceptual framework is developed and clearly articulated. Connections to present study are clearly articulated. Author explains how his/her work fits into the context of existing scholarship. Attention is given to different perspectives, conditionalities, threats to validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	Adequate familiarity with relevant literature is demonstrated through citation, review, and synthesis of relevant scholarship that includes key constructs, variables, concepts, and details.	Key construct(s) or variable(s) are not connected to the research literature. Selected literature is from unreliable sources or is irrelevant to the student’s study. Literary supports are vague or ambiguous.	Review of literature is missing or consisted of non-research-based articles. Propositions are irrelevant, inaccurate, or inappropriate.

Style guidelines	Consistent application of recommended style guidelines, especially in regards to citations, references, and tables.	Few and minor lapses relevant to citations, references, tables, and other style guidelines.	Several mistakes relevant to citations, references, tables, and other style guidelines.	Severe problems relevant to citations, references, tables, and other style guidelines.
Writing mechanics	No structural, grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.	Few and minor structural, grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.	Several structural, grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.	Replete with structural, grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.

# Department of Communication

## Ph.D. Assessment: Rubric for Assessment of Dissertation for Assessing Student Learning Outcome 2

**SLO2:** Conduct a study using appropriate methodology to answer a research question.

Advisers: In consultation with the prospectus/dissertation committee, please assess the project and its outcome using this rubric. Please do not submit any material that identifies the student or yourself with the assessment; these are for program assessment only and are not used for individual evaluations.

Category	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Weak	1 Unacceptable
Research problem; Scope; Significance	Research problem is stated clearly and logically presented. Study is appropriately focused in scope. Engagement with prior scholarship clearly illustrates need for the present study. Contribution of study to knowledge broadly and to scholarship within the field is clearly articulated.	A research problem is identified reasonably well. Connections are established with the literature. Engagement with prior scholarship adequately illustrates need for the present study. Contribution of study to knowledge broadly and to scholarship within the field is adequately articulated.	Although a research problem is identified, the statement is too broad or the description fails to establish the importance of the problem area. Connections to the literature are unclear, debatable, or insignificant. Elements are poorly formed, ambiguous, or not logically connected to the description of the problem, purpose, or research methods.	No research problem is clearly identified. Statement of the problem, significance, purpose, questions/ hypotheses, or definitions of constructs and variables are omitted or inappropriate.
Methods	Chosen method is appropriate to the research problem. Research problem can be clearly investigated by the texts and sources or quantitative and qualitative data to be used for study. Description of context and population is meaningful. Selection process will result in representative sample of population. Procedures are thorough, manageable, and powerful for generating reliable and valid data. Analytical methods are sufficiently clear, specific, and appropriate to questions of interest and research design.	Instruments and observations are identified by name and described. Procedures for implementing study are identified and described in a chronological fashion. Context, population, and selection strategy is adequately identified and described. Size of population, sample, and comparison groups are identified. Descriptive and inferential methods are identified.	Research design is confusing or incomplete given the questions of interest and selection strategy. Limitations and assumptions are identified incompletely. Procedures are confusing, incomplete, or irrelevant to purpose, questions of interest, or selection strategy. Description of instruments, selection strategy, or observation protocol is confusing, incomplete, or irrelevant to the study. Descriptive or inferential methods were confusing, incomplete, or irrelevant to RQs and research design.	Research design is not identified or is not appropriate. Limitations and assumptions are omitted. Description of instruments, selection strategy, or observation protocol is omitted.

Review of Literature	Mastery of literature is demonstrated through thorough citation, review, and synthesis of relevant scholarship that includes key and logical details. An appropriate theoretical/conceptual framework is developed and clearly articulated. Connections to present study are clearly articulated. Author explains how his/her work fits into the context of existing scholarship. Attention is given to different perspectives, conditionalities, threats to validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	Adequate familiarity with relevant literature is demonstrated through citation, review, and synthesis of relevant scholarship that includes key constructs, variables, concepts, and details.	Key construct(s) or variable(s) are not connected to the research literature. Selected literature is from unreliable sources or is irrelevant to the student's study. Literary supports are vague or ambiguous.	Review of literature is missing or consisted of non-research-based articles. Propositions are irrelevant, inaccurate, or inappropriate.
Analysis/ Results and Discussion	Clear and logical connections are drawn between the research problem, literature review, theoretical/ conceptual framework, and analysis. Conclusions and central argument are supported by the analysis of the evidence or texts/sources, and are interpretive and not summative or descriptive. Conclusions and central argument contribute original insights to the research problem.	Reasonable connections are drawn between the problem statement, supportive evidence, and research questions.	Weak connections are drawn between the problem statement, supportive evidence, and research questions.	Severe problems with logic and reasoning are present.
Style Guidelines	Consistent application of recommended style guidelines, especially in regards to citations, references, and tables.	Few and minor lapses relevant to citations, references, tables, and other style guidelines.	Several mistakes relevant to citations, references, tables, and other style guidelines.	Severe problems relevant to citations, references, tables, and other style guidelines.
Writing Mechanics	No structural, grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.	Few and minor structural, grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.	Several structural, grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.	Replete with structural, grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.