### Rating Scale and Explanations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = Unacceptable</td>
<td>Error(s) in exposition of the field and/or omission of key source(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Poor</td>
<td>Minor errors, omissions, and/or lack of synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Average/Acceptable</td>
<td>Adequate and accurate exposition of key sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Very Good</td>
<td>Good coverage and synthesis of key sources plus additional relevant material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Exceptional</td>
<td>Thorough review and excellent synthesis of sources, including some obscure but relevant ones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Knowledge of the discipline
- **Rating:** 1 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 3 = Average/Acceptable, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Exceptional
- **Explanations:**
  - Error(s) in exposition of the field and/or omission of key source(s)
  - Minor errors, omissions, and/or lack of synthesis
  - Adequate and accurate exposition of key sources
  - Good coverage and synthesis of key sources plus additional relevant material
  - Thorough review and excellent synthesis of sources, including some obscure but relevant ones

### Appropriate methodology
- **Rating:** 1 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 3 = Average/Acceptable, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Exceptional
- **Explanations:**
  - Errors in methodology selection and/or use
  - Minor methodological errors and/or omissions
  - Methodology applied correctly and adequately; appropriate documentation
  - Methodology applied correctly, explained clearly, and documented well
  - Mastery of finer points of methodology plus elegant application and/or supplementary approaches

### Application of knowledge and methodology to original research topic
- **Rating:** 1 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 3 = Average/Acceptable, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Exceptional
- **Explanations:**
  - Discipline and methodology not referenced/applied well
  - Some links to discipline knowledge and methodology but not clearly integrated with research
  - Adequate connection between knowledge of discipline and use of methodology and research
  - Clear exposition of relationship of disciplinary knowledge and methodology to original research
  - Insightful references to sources and application of methodology to excellent research topic

### Critical thinking
- **Rating:** 1 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 3 = Average/Acceptable, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Exceptional
- **Explanations:**
  - Muddled presentation with errors in reasoning and/or without much analysis and synthesis
  - Reasoning sometimes confused, simplistic, and/or not clearly explained
  - Adequate reasoning, explanation of assumptions, and supporting evidence
  - Clear reasoning with organized presentation of evidence, assumptions, and conclusions
  - Clear and organized argument that represents sound, original, and complex thought

### Effective written communication
- **Rating:** 1 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 3 = Average/Acceptable, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Exceptional
- **Explanations:**
  - Writing generally unclear, with consistent errors and/or poor organization
  - Writing sometimes unclear with weak organization and/or grammatical errors
  - Writing clear, concise, and organized, with minor or no grammatical errors
  - Writing generally error-free with clear organization and depth
  - Elegant writing with fully developed arguments, clear organization, and correct grammar

### Effective oral communication
- **Rating:** 1 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 3 = Average/Acceptable, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Exceptional
- **Explanations:**
  - Presentation generally unclear, with poor organization and/or marred by distracting mannerisms or language
  - Presentation sometimes unclear, with weak organization, and/or some distracting mannerisms or language
  - Presentation organized to convey main points of thesis/dissertation clearly and without distractions
  - Articulate presentation with clear organization and professional language
  - Elegant, confident, and engaging presentation with clear organization and flow

### Overall quality (not necessarily average of earlier ratings)
- **Rating:** 1 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 3 = Average/Acceptable, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Exceptional
- **Explanations:**
  - Unacceptable
  - Poor
  - Average/acceptable
  - Very Good
  - Exceptional
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