**PhD Comprehensive Exam (PhD – Marine Science) Scoring Rubric – (PhD Outcome 1)**

**Student\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Committee Member\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Circle the appropriated boxes in each category.** Each student’s performance will be scored in five categories: Understanding of Questions, Response to Questions, Support, Organization, and Language. The committee’s ranking will be based upon a five point scale (5 = Exemplary, 4 = Strong, 3 = Competent, 2 = Marginal, 1 = Unacceptable). The minimum successful score will be “Competent” or better from a majority of the Committee, with no score being “Unacceptable”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Understanding of Questions** | **Response to Questions** | **Support** | **Organization** | **Language** |
| **5 – Exemplary** | Responds incisively and directly to the questions asked. | Responses to questions are specific, defendable, and complex. | Provides substantial, well-chosen evidence (research or textual citations) used strategically. | Responses contain appropriate, clear and adequate transitions between sentences and paragraphs. | Apt and precise diction, syntactic variety, clear command of Standard English. |
| **4 – Strong** | Most responses are direct and relevant to the questions asked. | Responses to question are more general, but still accurate; analyses go beyond the obvious. | Provides sufficient and appropriate evidence and, makes effort to contextualize it. | Responses contain distinct units of thought in paragraphs, coherently arranged; occasional weakness in transitions between sentences, paragraphs or thoughts. | Some mechanical difficulties; occasional problematic word choices or awkward syntax errors; occasional grammar errors; some wordiness. |
| **3 – Competent** | Responds adequately to the questions asked; occasionally responds with unrelated information. | Responses to questions are overly general and disorganized; may have some factual, interpretive, or conceptual errors. | Provides some evidence but not always relevant, sufficient, or integrated into the response. | Responses are uneven; paragraphs sometimes effective, but others are brief, weakly unified, or undeveloped; some awkward or missing transitions between thoughts. | Occasional major grammar  errors (e.g., agreement, tense);  frequent minor grammar errors  (e.g., prepositions, articles); occasional imprecise diction; awkward syntax; wordiness. |
| **2 – Marginal** | Confuses some significant concepts in the questions asked. | Responses to questions are vague or irrelevant. | Evidence usually only narrative or anecdotal; awkwardly or incorrectly incorporated. | Repetitive, wanders. | Frequent major and minor grammar problems; frequent imprecise diction; wordiness; awkward syntax; repetitive sentence patterns; problems impede meaning. |
| **1 – Unacceptable** | Does not understand questions and/or concepts. | No discernable response to most questions given. | Little or no evidence cited to support responses. | Responses are arbitrary or not structured, illogical or not coherent. | Numerous grammatical errors  and stylistic problems; English overwhelmingly  non- Standard; errors in every sentence |