

HELPS PhD Comprehensive Exam Rubric

CRITERIA	Met (exceeded expectations) 5	Met (without conditions) 4	Met (with conditions) 3	Did not meet (needs improvement) 2	Did not meet (unacceptable) 1
CONTENT KNOWLEDGE	<p>Candidate demonstrates advanced understanding of concepts learned in core courses.</p> <p>Concepts are integrated into the candidate's own insights.</p> <p>Candidate provides conclusions that show analysis and synthesis of ideas.</p>	<p>Candidate demonstrates advanced understanding of concepts learned in core courses.</p> <p>Concepts are integrated into the candidate's own insights.</p> <p>Some of the candidate's conclusions are not supported in the response.</p>	<p>Candidate demonstrates basic understanding of concepts learned in core courses.</p> <p>Some concepts are integrated into the candidate's own insights.</p> <p>Some of the candidate's conclusions are not supported in the response.</p>	<p>Candidate demonstrates limited understanding of concepts learned in core course.</p> <p>Only a few concepts are integrated into the candidate's own insights.</p> <p>None of the candidate's conclusions are supported in the response.</p>	<p>Candidate did not demonstrate understanding of concepts learned in core courses.</p> <p>No concepts are integrated into the candidate's own insights.</p> <p>None of the candidate's conclusions are supported in the response.</p>
PROFESSIONAL SKILL	<p>Candidate demonstrates strong acumen for pressing issues facing vulnerable, marginalized, or underrepresented college students, MSIs and/or higher education.</p> <p>Candidate provides a stance or statement of position on the dilemma of practice.</p> <p>Candidate provides consideration of problems, issues, approaches, and impacts relevant to vulnerable, marginalize, or underrepresented communities that also align with their stance or position.</p>	<p>Candidate demonstrates strong acumen for pressing issues facing vulnerable, marginalized, or underrepresented college students, MSIs and/or higher education.</p> <p>Candidate provides a stance or statement of position on the dilemma of practice.</p> <p>Candidate provides consideration of problems, issues, approaches, and impacts relevant to vulnerable, marginalize, or underrepresented communities, but some do not align with their stance or position.</p>	<p>Candidate demonstrates sufficient acumen for pressing issues facing vulnerable, marginalized, or underrepresented college students, MSIs and/or higher education.</p> <p>Candidate provides a stance or statement of position on the dilemma of practice.</p> <p>Candidate provides consideration of problems, issues, approaches, and impacts relevant to vulnerable, marginalize, or underrepresented communities but they do not align with their stance or position.</p>	<p>Candidate demonstrates limited acumen for pressing issues facing vulnerable, marginalized, or underrepresented college students, MSIs and/or higher education.</p> <p>Candidate does not provide a stance or statement of position on the dilemma of practice.</p> <p>Candidate does not provide consideration of problems, issues, approaches, and impacts relevant to vulnerable, marginalize, or underrepresented communities.</p>	<p>Candidate does not demonstrate acumen for pressing issues facing vulnerable, marginalized, or underrepresented college students, MSIs and/or higher education.</p> <p>Candidate does not provide a stance or statement of position on the dilemma of practice.</p> <p>Candidate does not provide consideration of problems, issues, approaches, and impacts relevant to vulnerable, marginalize, or underrepresented communities</p>

CRITERIA	Met (exceeded expectations) 5	Met (without conditions) 4	Met (with conditions) 3	Did not meet (needs improvement) 2	Did not meet (unacceptable) 1
SCHOLARLY WRITING	<p>Candidate uses at least 5 current sources, including 3 or more peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books.</p> <p>Candidate includes research from scholars and activists from under-represented communities.</p> <p>Candidate ties together information from all sources without disjointedness.</p> <p>Candidate cites all data obtained from other sources. APA citation style is used in both text and bibliography.</p> <p>No spelling or grammar mistakes.</p>	<p>Candidate uses at least 5 current sources, including 3 or more peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books.</p> <p>Candidate includes research from scholars and activists from under-represented communities.</p> <p>Candidate ties together information from sources without disjointedness.</p> <p>Candidate cites all data obtained from other sources. APA citation style is used in both text and bibliography.</p> <p>Minimal spelling or grammar mistakes.</p>	<p>Candidate uses at least 5 current resources but fewer than 3 are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books.</p> <p>Candidate includes research from scholars and activists from under-represented communities.</p> <p>Candidate mostly ties together information from sources with some disjointedness.</p> <p>Candidate cites most data obtained from other sources. APA citation style is used in both text and bibliography.</p> <p>Noticeable spelling or grammar mistakes.</p>	<p>Candidate uses fewer than 5 current sources, or fewer than 2 are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books.</p> <p>Candidate does not include research from scholars and activists from under-represented communities.</p> <p>Candidate sometimes ties together information from sources and disjointedness is apparent.</p> <p>Candidate cites some data obtained from other sources. Citation style is either inconsistent or incorrect.</p> <p>Unacceptable number of spelling or grammar mistakes.</p>	<p>Candidate does not use current sources.</p> <p>Candidate does not include research from scholars and activists from under-represented communities.</p> <p>Candidate does not tie together information from sources.</p> <p>Candidate does not cite data obtained from other sources.</p> <p>Unacceptable number of spelling or grammar mistakes.</p>
RESEARCH ANALYSIS	<p>Candidate clearly describes and explains the theoretical assumptions that inform and contextualize the research question and methodology.</p> <p>Candidate effectively evaluates the extent to which the literature review addresses the theoretical framework and the research at hand.</p> <p>Candidate clearly identifies all aspects of the methodology that are included in the article.</p>	<p>For the most part, candidate clearly describes and explains the theoretical assumptions that inform and contextualize the research question and methodology.</p> <p>For the most part, candidate effectively evaluates the extent to which the literature review addresses the theoretical framework and the research at hand.</p> <p>Candidate clearly all identifies most aspects of the methodology that are included in the article.</p>	<p>For the most, candidate describes and explains the theoretical assumptions that inform and contextualize the research question and methodology.</p> <p>Candidate somewhat effectively evaluates the extent to which the literature review addresses the theoretical framework and the research at hand.</p> <p>Candidate identifies some aspects of the methodology that are included in the article.</p>	<p>To a limited extent, candidate describes and explains the theoretical assumptions that inform and contextualize the research question and methodology.</p> <p>Candidate ineffectively evaluates the extent to which the literature review addresses the theoretical framework and the research at hand.</p> <p>Candidate significantly omits aspects of the methodology that are included in the article.</p> <p>Student's analysis of the</p>	<p>Student does not adequately describe and explain the theoretical assumptions that inform and contextualize the research question and methodology; student ineffectively evaluates the extent to which the literature review addresses the theoretical framework and the research at hand.</p> <p>The student significantly omits aspects of the methodology that are included in the article, including identification of</p>

CRITERIA	Met (exceeded expectations) 5	Met (without conditions) 4	Met (with conditions) 3	Did not meet (needs improvement) 2	Did not meet (unacceptable) 1
	<p>Candidate's analysis of each section of the methodology reflects a significant understanding based on acceptable research practice.</p> <p>Candidate effectively discusses how well data interpretations answer research questions or hypotheses.</p> <p>Candidate effectively discusses how findings are extended to a broader context; how implications and limitations are presented; and how questions for further research are posed.</p>	<p>Candidate's analysis of each section of the methodology reflects a significant understanding based on acceptable research practice.</p> <p>Candidate effectively discusses how well data interpretations answer research questions or hypotheses.</p> <p>Candidate effectively discusses how findings are extended to a broader context; how implications and limitations are presented; and how questions for further research are posed.</p>	<p>Candidate's analysis of the methodology, for the most part, reflects an emerging understanding based on acceptable research practice.</p> <p>Candidate adequately discusses how well data interpretations answer research questions or hypotheses.</p> <p>Candidate adequately discusses how findings are extended to a broader context; how implications and limitations are presented; and how questions for further research are posed.</p>	<p>methodology demonstrates the student does not understand the methodology based on acceptable research practice.</p> <p>The student inadequately discusses data interpretations; findings; implications and limitations; and questions for further research.</p>	<p>the principal methodology; the design; the statement of the problem; research questions/hypotheses; population/target population; description of the sample/participants/data sources; instrumentation; procedures; data analyses; and limitations.</p> <p>Student's analysis of the methodology demonstrates the student does not understand the methodology based on acceptable research practice.</p> <p>The student inadequately discusses data interpretations; findings; implications and limitations; and questions for further research.</p>