

Please include a completed evaluation sheet from each committee member when the signed **THESIS/DISSERTATION ORAL DEFENSE FORM** is submitted to **Sociology Director of Graduate Studies** for his/her signature.

UNT Sociology Graduate Program: Student Learning Outcomes: Thesis/Dissertation Evaluation

The Sociology Department conducts an evaluation of student learning outcomes to determine the extent to which current curricula contributes to the development of key graduate student competencies. Please use the scoring rubrics provided to evaluate the Thesis or Dissertation defense of students for whom you serve as a member of his or her advisory committee. The information collected will help guide any efforts to strengthen or modify program curricula or procedures with the goal of better meeting the program's educational mission.

Student's Name: _____ Date: _____

Faculty Member's Name: _____

Please circle or highlight one: Thesis Dissertation

Element	Rating	Comments
Statement of the Problem		
Review of the Literature		
Theory and Hypotheses		
Methodology		
Data Analysis and Findings		
Interpretations, Conclusions, and Implications		
Quality of Writing		
Oral Presentation		

Revised 5/5/2020

Elements	Unacceptable (U) 1 Point	Acceptable (A) 2 Points	Target/Professional (T) 3 Points
Statement of the Problem	No evidence was provided to support the significance of the study. A description of the approach for investigating the problem is not provided or it is incomplete	The study is relevant to the field. There is adequate evidence provided to support the significance of the problem. The approach for investigating the problem is appropriate.	The study has a strong theoretical basis and the findings can be generalized to other populations. Abundant and compelling evidence was provided to support the significance of the study for the field. The proposed work has the potential to make a contribution to the field.
Review of Literature	The material reviewed is not relevant to the goals/focus of the study. The material reviewed is out of date, omits seminal work, or is insufficient. The quality of the material reviewed is marginal or not appropriate for scientific research.	The introduction is well organized, integrates findings from several sources. The review is thoughtful and provides clarification of the area of study and supports the chosen methodology. Articles are relevant, timely, and seminal, coming primarily from sources.	Extensive review that includes summaries, synthesis, and critiques of rigorous evidence-based sources. The review provides strong support for the aims of the project and the research design and methodology selected.
Theory and Hypotheses	A theoretical framework is not provided, or is inadequate. Hypotheses are not, or are inadequately, developed and formulated based on the theoretical framework.	A theoretical framework is provided and is adequate. Hypotheses are adequately developed and formulated based on the theoretical framework.	A powerful and elaborate theoretical framework is provided. Hypotheses are flawlessly developed and formulated based on the theoretical framework.
Methodology	Significant aspects of the design and methodology are inappropriate for the problem under study. The discussion of reliability and validity of measurement is omitted, insufficient, or inaccurate.	The design and methodology are appropriate. The discussion of reliability and validity of measurement is correct and sufficient, with problems having been identified.	Study design and methodology are appropriate and represent the quality necessary for publication in peer-reviewed journals. The reliability and validity of measurement are clearly described.
Data Analysis and Findings	The analyses are not appropriate or accurately described. Major errors in data analyses or reporting of findings were made. Inappropriate interpretation of the results.	The analyses are reported and accurately described. Few errors in data analyses and reporting of findings. Maintains distinctions between data and interpretations.	Reports data analyses with a level of clarity and accuracy necessary for publication in a refereed journal or other publication outlet.
Interpretations, Conclusions, and Implications	Draws unrelated, inaccurate, or overstated conclusions. Stated limitations of the study are inaccurate or insufficient. Implications for future research and practice are either omitted, insufficient, or unrelated to the findings or to the limitations of the study.	Draws accurate conclusions from the data. Stated limitations of the study are appropriate. Implications for future research and practice are thoughtful and appropriately related to the findings and/or the limitations in the study.	Conclusions are accurate, appropriately linked to the problem and methodology. Implications of practice and future research are compelling in their potential applications. Conclusions add to the knowledge base and are insightful in their implications for further study.
Quality of Writing	Did not adhere to SAS guidelines or other style requirements. Numerous errors in spelling, typing, grammar, and format. The writing is poorly organized and lacks clarity. Writing is not of the expected professional quality.	Very few or minor errors in ASA style or other style requirements. 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.	No errors in ASA style or other style requirements. No errors in spelling, typing, grammar, and format. Well organized and clear; accurately convey ideas. The writing is of professional quality.
Oral Component	Content: The presentation had significant errors or omissions. Responses to questions were inappropriate or demonstrated lack of understanding of the literature and study findings. Delivery: The presentation did not follow logical sequence. The presentation was not well paced. The presenter did not demonstrate confidence and/or ability to engage the audience.	Content: The presentation had few errors or omissions. Responses to questions were appropriate or demonstrated a good understanding of the literature and study findings. Delivery: The presentation followed a logical sequence. The presentation was well paced. The presenter demonstrated confidence and/or ability to engage audience.	Content: The presentation was accurate and comprehensive. Responses to questions were appropriate or demonstrated an in-depth understanding of the literature and study findings. Delivery: 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.