

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Student UIN: \_\_\_\_\_

Dept/Major: \_\_\_\_\_

Degree Being Pursued: \_\_\_\_\_

Distance Education Student (Check One): Yes  , No

Product of Research, if Applicable (Check One): Thesis  , Non-Thesis  , Dissertation  , Record of Study

## Faculty Evaluation of Graduate Student Learning Outcomes

Faculty Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Committee Role: (Co-)Chair  , Member

Dept Affiliation: Inside  , Outside

**INSTRUCTIONS: This section should be completed for ALL students. Check the box most appropriate for this student.**

	How well does the student meet your expectations in the following areas?	*USE THIS DESCRIPTION TO CALIBRATE EXPECTATIONS*				Not Observable	
		Well Above (5)	Above (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Below (2)		Well Below (1)
1	<b>Exhibits a coherent understanding of discipline-specific knowledge?</b>	Ideal clarity on critical concepts	Strong clarity on critical concepts	Articulates foundational concepts across the breadth of the discipline; distinguishes between opposing theoretical frameworks; some clarity	Poor clarity on critical concepts	No clarity on critical concepts	
2	<b>Applies discipline-specific knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions?</b>	Applies all relevant info; ideal resolution	Applies most relevant info; strong resolution	Applies relevant concepts to justify decisions; may not apply all relevant information; may not come to the ideal resolution	Relies on some irrelevant info; poor resolution	Relies on irrelevant info; incorrect resolution	
3	<b>Uses a variety of sources and alternative views when critically evaluating ideas and information?</b>	Ideal sources; considers all views; critical evaluation	Strong sources; considers most views; some critical eval	Sources used to evaluate are both relevant and applicable; student seeks multiple perspectives; information considered is generally thorough; some critical thought applied	Mediocre sources; lacking viewpoints; little critical eval	Poor sources; missing critical viewpoints; no critical eval	
4	<b>Communicates effectively?</b>	Crystal clear; seamless transitions	Very clear; smooth transitions	Central message is clear and consistent in written and oral form; ideas presented in logical order; transitions between ideas are adequate	Lacking clarity or order; poor transitions	Unclear; illogical; no transitions	
5	<b>Teaches or explains the subject matter in their discipline to a range of audiences?</b>	Ideal delivery; ideal for audience	Strong delivery; well designed for audience	Delivery techniques and language choices are appropriate for the audience; student has the ability to transition between different audiences; may not be flawless or smooth	Mediocre delivery; somewhat appropriate for audience	Poor delivery; inappropriate for audience	
6	<b>Exhibits proficiency in technology appropriate to solve problems in their discipline?</b>	Expert proficiency	Advanced proficiency	Demonstrates basic knowledge of, and basic proficiency in technology and tools specific to the discipline; may rely on others for some guidance	Lacking proficiency	No proficiency	
7	<b>Chooses ethical courses of action in research or practice?</b>	Addresses all ethical questions	Addresses most ethical questions	Recognizes ethical questions; attempts to apply ethical perspectives & concepts to research and practice	Doesn't recognize all ethical questions	Doesn't recognize any ethical questions	

Student UIN: \_\_\_\_\_

**INSTRUCTIONS: The following section should be completed for MS-Thesis Option students & Doctoral Students completing a dissertation.**

How well does the student meet your expectations in the following areas?		*USE THIS DESCRIPTION TO CALIBRATE EXPECTATIONS*				Not Observable	
		Well Above (5)	Above (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Below (2)		Well Below (1)
8	<b>Develops clear, hypothesis-driven, or data supported research plans?</b>	Ideal clarity; well supported by data	Strong clarity; well supported by data	Articulates research questions supported by data, or relying on clear hypotheses; may not identify all complexities and nuances inherent to the proposed research	Somewhat clear; mildly supported by data	Unclear; unsupported by data	
9	<b>Conducts valid, data-supported and theoretically consistent research?</b>	Ideal controls, quality or reproducibility; ideal analysis	Strong controls, quality or reproducibility; strong analysis	Executes research with appropriate controls, sufficient quality and reproducibility, and valid analysis using methods appropriate to the discipline	Poor controls, quality or reproducibility; Poor analysis	No controls, quality or reproducibility; Incorrect analysis	
10	<b>Effectively disseminates research results in appropriate contexts?</b>	Expertly conveys relevance or applicability	Conveys relevance or applicability with skill	Information presented attempts to distill a large body of knowledge into relevant points; demonstrates relevance of completed research; articulates broader applicability of research	Poor ability to convey relevance or applicability	Unable to convey relevance or applicability	
11	<b>Did this student pass his/her final defense? (Check One)</b>				<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	
12	<b>Would you recommend that this student go on to a Ph.D. program or pursue a post-doc position? (Check One)</b>				<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	