Appendix A   Maryland's iSchool Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessments

Program Goals

How people access, use, and communicate information has become critical to professional success, life-long learning, and even government policies.

This Ph.D. program is an interdisciplinary program taught by a multidisciplinary faculty at a leading public research university. This doctoral degree is an academic degree rather than a professional one, providing a background in theory and method that will prepare graduates for careers in conducting research and teaching in Information Studies. In order to complete the program, students will have to demonstrate high attainment in scholarship and critical thinking, as well as the ability to carry out independent scholarly research.

Assessment Activities

Learning Outcome One
Students will demonstrate adequate yearly progress towards the Ph.D. degree through their performance in coursework and research activities.

Benchmark Measure: First Year and Annual Reviews

Measures and Criteria:
A committee comprised of at least three and no more than five full-time faculty members, a majority of whom must be members of the college faculty, will conduct the required first year review. Subsequent annual reviews will be conducted by at least the student's advisor, and a committee if requested by the student and/or the advisor. Students should prepare a portfolio of work and make a brief (10 minute) presentation of their progress to the committee. The student's advisor and the other faculty members will review the student's work; meet with the student to hear the presentation and discuss the student's progress; and write a report of the discussion, which sets expectations and identifies any recommendations made.

Students will be evaluated in several areas including:
- Course performance
- Contributions to ongoing research projects
- Initiative in these research activities
- Ability to present and communicate their research

The program goal is for 80% of students to receive an average score of "meets expectations" or higher in each category of the rubric.

Learning Outcome Two
Students will complete an Integrative Paper that demonstrates the ability to independently conduct and disseminate high quality research and scholarship.

Benchmark Measure: The Integrative Paper

Measures and Criteria:
A committee comprised of the student's advisor and at least two other college faculty members will review the Integrative Paper, write evaluations, and then discuss the evaluations with the student. Then the committee will reach a decision regarding the grade assigned to the paper. Each faculty reviewer will assign one of these grades to the Integrative Paper being reviewed. The advisor will write a report of the discussion and the recommendations made, which will include all of the comments from the committee and the final grade assigned to the student, and will send the report to the student.

Students will be evaluated in several areas including:
- Identification or communication of a research problem;
- Identification of key literature;
- Use of appropriate research methods;
- A clear and succinct statement of research questions;
- Validity of the results;
- Preparation of an Integrative Paper that makes a significant and original contribution to the field;
- Production of a paper that is suitable for publication

The program goal is for 85% of students to receive an average score of "meets expectations" or higher on every requirement.

Learning Outcome Three
Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively plan and propose novel research and scholarship on a significant problem in the information field.

Benchmark Measure: Dissertation Proposal

Measures and Criteria:
Before beginning to collect data for their dissertation research, students will prepare and present a proposal to their committee. The proposal must include a literature review, a research plan, a description of the proposed research methods, a description of the research goals and objectives, a proposed timeline, an outline of the potential limitations of the study, and any other elements deemed appropriate by their committee.

Students' proposals will be evaluated as to how well they meet each of the following requirements:
- Identification of a significant and original problem
- Review of the relevant literature and description of the gap that the dissertation addresses
- Exploration of key assumptions or theories supporting the work
- Inclusion of a clear, succinct statement of the research questions to be addressed
- Selection of methodology appropriate to the research questions
- Description of a clear plan for presenting data and findings
- Creation of a written product that is clear, well-organized, and grammatically correct
- Inclusion of a detailed, feasible timeline in which the work will be completed

Each committee member will fill out an evaluation. The program goal is for 90% of students to receive an average score of "meets expectations" or higher on every requirement.

Learning Outcome Four
Students will demonstrate ability to conduct and disseminate novel research and scholarship on a significant problem in the information field.

Benchmark Measure: Dissertation Defense

Measures and Criteria:
Each committee member shall complete the 8-category assessment rubric and provide written comments to the student based on the overall written product and oral presentation. The written comments of each committee member and verbal summarization of the overall evaluation of the student's performance will be provided to the student by the chair of the Dissertation Committee.

Students will be evaluated based on how well they meet each of the following requirements:
- Identification of a significant and original problem
- Review of the relevant literature and description of the gap that the dissertation addresses
- Exploration of key assumptions or theories supporting the work
- Clear and succinct statement of research question(s)
- Appropriate choice of methodology
- Clear and thorough presentation of data and discussion of findings
- Creation of a written product that is clear, well-organized, and grammatically correct
- Delivery of a clear, well-organized presentation of the study
- Production of material that is suitable for publication

The program goal is for 95% of students to receive average scores of "meets expectations" or higher in each category of the rubric.

Discussion and Findings

The College of Information Studies and the Doctoral Committee will review these learning benchmarks on an annual basis to assess their suitability for gauging the success of each Ph.D. student. The data generated by these assessment processes, particularly students' scores on specific rubric items, will be used to shed light on where students may be facing obstacles in their Ph.D. degree progression. This information will be used to motivate continued discussion about these benchmarks and the measures and criteria used to assess student success on each of them, with the goal of iteratively improving and evolving the Ph.D. program to better meet the needs of the students, to optimize the quality of the education the students receive, and to ensure the program's ongoing success.

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)   **Ph.D. in Information Studies**

Outcome: Make successful progress toward completing the doctoral program, including completing course requirements and milestones.

Committee Member Requirements

An initial annual review will be conducted at the end of the second semester of taking doctoral courses. Subsequent annual reviews will be conducted during the spring semester of each year in which a program milestone is not completed (i.e. Integrative Paper, dissertation proposal, or dissertation). In years when the student completes one or more program milestones, that milestone review will constitute the student's annual review for that academic year.

A committee comprised of at least three and no more than five full-time faculty members, a majority of whom must be members of the college faculty, will conduct the required first year review. Subsequent annual reviews will be conducted by at least the student's advisor, and a committee if requested by the student and/or the advisor. The student's advisor and the other faculty members will review the student's work; meet with the student to discuss the student's portfolio or current status; and write a report of the discussion which sets expectations and identifies any recommendations made.

The committee or advisor will create a report from the review and send it to the Graduate Student Services Office for placement in the student's file. In the case of annual reviews that occur while a student is completing coursework, at the end of the semester in which the review occurs, the Graduate Student Services Office will conduct an administrative review of the student's grades (including the grades for that semester) and other materials to ensure that the student is meeting all University requirements in terms of academic performance (e.g., sufficient GPA), course selection for completion of program requirements, and any other issues of administrative or academic standing. In the case of annual reviews that occur after the student has completed coursework, the student's standing in the program will be assessed by the successful completion of program milestones or by demonstrating to the committee continuing progress toward completing milestones and receiving the degree. Upon completion of the review, the student and the committee members will receive a letter summarizing the results of the annual review and any administrative reviews, including a copy of the completed DGOA form, which shows the names and signatures of the faculty who participated in the evaluation.

While it is ideal for the Committee to reach a consensus, in cases where there is a disagreement about the outcome, the student passes if no or only one member of the committee vote(s) to fail the student, and fails if two or more committee members vote to fail the student.

Annual Review Assessment Guidelines

Indicator: Demonstrates progress toward degree.	
Outstanding	During Coursework: The student maintains a grade of A *in all* of their courses in the past year. After Coursework: The student has made exceptional progress toward program milestones.
Exceeds Expectations	During Coursework: The student maintains a grade of A *in all but one* of their courses in the past year. After Coursework: The student has made *significantly above average* progress toward program milestones.
Meets Expectations	During Coursework: The student maintains a grade of A *in more than half* of their courses in the past year. After Coursework: The student has made *acceptable* progress toward program milestones.
Below Expectations	During Coursework: The student receives a grade of B or below *in more than half* of their courses in the past year. After Coursework: The student has made *minimal* progress toward program milestones.
Unsatisfactory	During Coursework: The student receives *any grade* of C or below in the past year. After Coursework: The student has made *no* meaningful progress toward program milestones.

Indicator: Clearly communicates an evolving research agenda.	
Outstanding	The student is able to clearly articulate a remarkably impressive research agenda and has made tremendous progress over the past year in advancing that agenda.
Exceeds Expectations	The student is able to clearly articulate a strong research agenda and has made very significant progress over the past year in advancing that agenda.
Meets Expectations	The student is able to clearly articulate a coherent and compelling research agenda and has made progress over the past year in advancing that agenda.
Below Expectations	The student states a number of research interests, but does not clearly communicate a coherent research agenda.
Unsatisfactory	The student does not show any research interests or future plans to develop a research agenda during the doctoral program.

Indicator: Participates actively in research activities.	
Outstanding	The student has participated regularly in research activities. These activities show promise to further the student's stated research interests. Some of these research activities have resulted in multiple publications or conference presentations as sole author or first author in a co-authored paper.
Exceeds Expectations	The student has participated regularly in research activities. These activities show promise to further the student's stated research interests. Some of these research activities have resulted in either one publication or conference presentation as an author or co-author.
Meets Expectations	The student has participated regularly in research activities. These activities show promise to further the student's stated research interests.

Below Expectations	The student demonstrates a shallow participation in research activities. Such activities do not hold promise to further the student's stated research interests.
Unsatisfactory	The student has not participated successfully in research activities.

Indicator: Takes initiative in research activities.	
Outstanding	The student has participated regularly in research activities. They have shown great ability to work independently when given tasks, and they contribute original thought, motivation, and initiative to work beyond the requirements of a project. They have been lead authors on projects that have resulted in publication, funded grants, or conference presentations.
Exceeds Expectations	The student has regularly initiated their own research activities. They have shown great ability to work independently when given tasks, and they contribute original thought, motivation, and initiative to work beyond the requirements of a project. They have been major contributors or (co)authors on projects that have resulted in publication, funded grants, or conference presentations.
Meets Expectations	The student has successfully initiated their own research activities. Their work in these projects consistently meets the expectations of their advisor(s) or faculty who were supervising the research. The student shows initiative in designing the research activity and following through.
Below Expectations	The student's work has not consistently met the expectations of their advisor(s) or faculty who were supervising the research.
Unsatisfactory	The student has not initiated any research activities or shown any meaningful curiosity or creativity in research.

Indicator: Demonstrates ability to analyze, critique, and synthesize research.	
Outstanding	Student shows exceptional ability to understand their research literature, synthesize ideas, and has shown exceptional ability to develop novel ideas and knowledge that further the literature.
Exceeds Expectations	Student shows the above average ability to understand their research literature, synthesize ideas, and has shown ability to develop novel ideas and knowledge that further the literature.
Meets Expectations	Student shows acceptable ability to understand their research literature, synthesize ideas, and develop research interests that build from the conceptual base.
Below Expectations	Student shows some ability to understand their research literature. However, they need improvement on synthesizing ideas and developing new knowledge that build from their conceptual base.
Unsatisfactory	Student shows little ability to understand their research literature, synthesize new concepts, and build new ideas.

Indicator: Demonstrates scholarly oral communication skills.	
Outstanding	Student shows exceptional oral communication skills via course participation, research activities, conference presentations, or other venues. The student has demonstrated excellent poise in presenting in formal venues.

Exceeds Expectations	Student shows above average oral communication skills via course participation, research activities, conference presentations, or other venues. The student has also experience presenting in formal venues.
Meets Expectations	Student shows acceptable oral communication skills via course participation, research activities, conference presentations, or other venues.
Below Expectations	Student shows basic oral communication skills via course participation, research activities, conference presentations, or other venues. However, their ability to clearly communicate their research requires further improvement.
Unsatisfactory	Student has not shown adequate basic oral communication skills via course participation, research activities, conference presentations, or other venues.

Indicator: Demonstrates scholarly written communication skills. Evidence can come from the student's writing sample, coursework, or other written artifacts (i.e. publications etc.).	
Outstanding	Student shows exceptional ability to communicate research or ideas in writing. The student has received endorsements from their committee members that their writing is particularly strong. The student also has documented formal examples of their writing such as publications that have undergone the academic peer review processes.
Exceeds Expectations	Student shows above average ability to communicate research or ideas in writing. The student has received endorsements from their committee members that their writing is particularly strong.
Meets Expectations	Student shows acceptable ability to communicate research or ideas in writing.
Below Expectations	Student has basic ability to communicate research or ideas in writing. However, they may need improvement in any areas such as writing in an academic style or grammar.
Unsatisfactory	Student has poor ability to communicate research or ideas in their writing.

First-Year Review Assessment Form

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)　　　　**Ph.D. in Information Studies**

Outcome: Make successful progress toward completing the doctoral program, including completing course requirements and milestones.

Student's Name: _____　　　**Committee Member Signatures**

　　　　　　　　　print name

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　_____ Advisor
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　print name　　　　　　　　signature

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　_____
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　print name　　　　　　　　signature

Review Date: _____
　　　　　　　mm/dd/yyyy
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　_____
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　print name　　　　　　　　signature

Indicators	Outstanding	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
1. Demonstrates progress toward degree.					
2. Clearly communicates an evolving research agenda.					
3. Participates actively in research activities.					
4. Takes initiative in research activities.					
5. Demonstrates ability to analyze, critique, and synthesize research.					
6. Demonstrates scholarly oral communication skills.					
7. Demonstrates scholarly written communication skills.					

Please fill out and sign this form and submit it to the PhD Program Coordinator. Thank you!

Annual Review Assessment Form

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)   **Ph.D. in Information Studies**

Outcome: Make successful progress toward completing the doctoral program, including completing course requirements and milestones.

Student's Name: _____   **Signatures**

print name

Check one: □2nd-year □ 3rd-year □ 4th-year   Advisor
                 □5th-year □ 6th-year □ 7th-year   (required)

_____
print name   signature

_____   Committee
print name   signature   members

Review Date: _____   (optional)
mm/dd/yyyy   _____
print name   signature

Indicators	Outstanding	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
1. Demonstrates progress toward degree.					
2. Clearly communicates an evolving research agenda.					
3. Participates actively in research activities.					
4. Takes initiative in research activities.					
5. Demonstrates ability to analyze, critique, and synthesize research.					
6. Demonstrates scholarly oral communication skills.					
7. Demonstrates scholarly written communication skills.					

Please fill out and sign this form and submit it to the PhD Program Coordinator. Thank you!

Integrative Paper

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)　　　　**Ph.D. in Information Studies**

Outcome: Complete an Integrative Paper that demonstrates ability to independently conduct and disseminate high quality research/scholarship.

Committee Member Requirements

The Integrative Paper Committee should comprise
- a chair, who must be the student's advisor
- 3 to 5 members, including the chair
- a majority of whom must be Full Members of the Graduate Faculty
- a majority of whom must be members of the iSchool faculty.

Unlike the dissertation examining committee, which must be approved by both the Doctoral Committee and the Graduate School, the Integrative Paper committee does not need to be approved by the Graduate School.

The committee will review the Integrative Paper, write evaluations, and then meet to discuss the evaluations without the student. Then, the committee will reach a decision regarding the grade assigned to the paper. Each faculty reviewer will assign one of these grades to the Integrative Paper being reviewed. The advisor will write a report of the discussion and the recommendations made, which will include all of the comments from the committee and the grade assigned by the committee, and will send this report to the student.

The review is very much like the editorial process at a professional journal. There are three independent readings of the paper, followed by an overall recommendation. The requirements for clarity of expression, quality of work and methodology, and originality are at the level of a research journal. The standard for acceptance is that the paper be comparable to articles published in respectable academic journals.

The committee must have at least two weeks to review the paper, as well as an additional two weeks to review any revised versions to receive a passing grade for the semester in which the Integrative Paper will be attempted. Students should allot time accordingly while writing the paper.

The range of evaluations of the Integrative Paper follows standard reviewing practices for journal and conference submissions. The potential designations a faculty member may give to a paper are:
- **Accept as is.** This indicates passage of the requirement with no further work on the part of the student. Such a designation is assigned if the paper is on a level with those that might be accepted in a refereed journal or conference.
- **Accept with minor revisions**. This indicates that the core of the paper is acceptable in its current form, but a few small

changes are required on the part of the student. Upon completion of these small changes, which should be enumerated by the IP committee, the paper will be on a level with those that might be accepted in a refereed journal or conference.

- **Revise and resubmit**. This indicates that paper is not acceptable in its current form, but the paper has potential to be acceptable with major work from the student. Upon completion of major revisions, which should be enumerated by the IP committee, the paper may reach the level of acceptability.
- **Reject**. This indicates a major failing to meet the requirements of the paper.

If a submission is not made by 2 weeks before the end of the semester, the outcome is an automatic reject.

The student's advisor and other members of the committee review the Integrative Paper, write evaluations, and then meet to discuss the evaluations. A presentation of the Integrative Paper is optional, depending on the student's and/or committee's preference. Each faculty reviewer assigns one of the above outcomes to the Integrative Paper under review. The advisor writes a report of the discussion and the recommendations made (i.e., accept as is, minor revisions, revise & resubmit, or reject), which includes all of the comments from the committee and the grade assigned by the committee.

Acceptable: Accept as is or Accept with minor revisions
To meet the Integrative Paper requirement, a student must receive a passing grade from every reviewer of the paper. If the student receives a mixed recommendation outcome of "accept as is", or "accept with minor revisions" from IP committee members, this requirement is automatically satisfied. Minor revisions only need to be reviewed by the IP chair. The student will have up to two weeks to complete these revisions. In both of these cases, the appropriate passing grade is entered into the student's record for the Integrative Paper course.

Not acceptable: Revise and resubmit or Reject
In the case of a recommendation of "revise and resubmit," the student will have an opportunity to make major revisions to make an acceptable Integrative Paper. The revision period shall be no longer than two months. The student will receive an Incomplete grade for the duration of the revision period. The revised paper is then reviewed by the same IP committee to determine if the necessary changes have been made. If so, the student passes the requirement.

The committee will create a report from the review of the Integrative Paper and send it to the Graduate Student Services Office for placement in the student's file. Upon completion of the paper, the student will receive a copy of the completed DGOA form, which shows the names and signatures of the faculty who participated in the evaluation. The student and the advisor will work with the Graduate Student Services Office to complete the "Advance to Candidacy" paperwork.

Integrative Paper Assessment Guidelines

Indicator: Identifies and communicates the research problem.	
Outstanding	The student demonstrates exceptional depth in outlining the research problem.
Exceeds Expectations	The student presents the research problem with ample considerations of the broader implications of the work.
Meets Expectations	The student clearly states the research problem.
Below Expectations	The research problem is vague and not well defined. Questions remain as to exactly what the problem is.
Unsatisfactory	The student does not effectively convey the research problem.

Indicator: Details the motivations for undertaking the research.	
Outstanding	The student demonstrates exceptional motivations for the research and potential outcomes.
Exceeds Expectations	The student presents compelling motivations for undertaking research.
Meets Expectations	The student presents motivations for undertaking the work.
Below Expectations	The research motivation is vague and not well defined. Questions remain as to how significant the problem is overall.
Unsatisfactory	The student does not effectively convey the significance of the research.

Indicator: Identifies key literature.	
Outstanding	The student shows an impressive ability to interconnect and extend the knowledge of multiple disciplines.
Exceeds Expectations	The student shows a distinct ability to interconnect and extend the knowledge of multiple disciplines.
Meets Expectations	The student addresses and synthesizes the key literature of the field.
Below Expectations	The student only weakly synthesizes key literature.
Unsatisfactory	The student fails to synthesize the key literature.

Indicator: States research question(s) clearly and succinctly.	
Outstanding	The student shows exceptional insight in stating research questions.
Exceeds Expectations	The student shows impressive insight in stating the research questions.
Meets Expectations	The student clearly and succinctly states the research questions.
Below Expectations	The student presents research question(s) that lack depth or do not match the research method utilized.
Unsatisfactory	The student does not clearly state the research question(s) or the questions are poorly conceived and/or formed.

Indicator: Designs study appropriate to field of study and the research question(s).	
Outstanding	The student proposes an innovative design and approach to examining the research question(s).
Exceeds Expectations	The student proposes a creative design and approach to examining the research question(s).
Meets Expectations	The student proposes a design and approach appropriate to the field of study and the research question.
Below Expectations	The student proposes a study design that is not fully developed.
Unsatisfactory	The student proposes a study design does not answer the research question.

Indicator: Presents data and findings clearly and thoroughly.	
Outstanding	Student demonstrates an exceptional approach to analyzing data, synthesizing findings, identifying significance and building new ideas from their data.
Exceeds Expectations	Student demonstrates a strong approach to analyzing data, synthesizing findings, identifying significance and building new ideas from their data.
Meets Expectations	Student appropriately analyzes data, synthesizes findings, identifies significance, and builds new ideas from their data.
Below Expectations	Student does not fully analyze data, synthesize findings, identify significance and/or build new ideas from their data.
Unsatisfactory	Student does not properly analyze data, synthesize findings, identify significance and/or build new ideas from their data.

Indicator: Prepares an Integrative Paper that makes an original contribution.	
Outstanding	The student paper shows exceptional insight in advancing scholarship.
Exceeds Expectations	The student paper shows deep depth and wide breadth in advancing scholarship.
Meets Expectations	The student paper makes an original contribution to scholarship.
Below Expectations	The student paper makes a limited contribution to scholarship.
Unsatisfactory	The student paper makes no contribution to scholarship.

Indicator: Produces material that is suitable for publication.	
Outstanding	Journal or conference publications will result from this research.
Exceeds Expectations	Journal or conference publications are highly likely to result from this research.
Meets Expectations	Journal or conference publications may result from this research.
Below Expectations	Significant revisions will be necessary for journal or conference publications to result from this research.
Unsatisfactory	It is unlikely that journal or conference publications will result from this research.

Integrative Paper Assessment Form

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)   **Ph.D. in Information Studies**

Outcome: Complete an Integrative Paper that demonstrates ability to independently conduct and disseminate high quality research/scholarship.

Student's Name: _____   **Committee Member Signatures**

Check one: □ Accept as is   _____ (Chair)
            □ Accept w/ minor revisions (up to 2 weeks to revise)   print name   signature
            □ Revise and resubmit (up to 2 months to revise)
            □ Reject   _____
                                print name   signature
Review Date: _____
            mm/dd/yyyy   _____
                                print name   signature

Indicators	Outstanding	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
1. Identifies and clearly states the research problem.					
2. Details the motivations for undertaking the research.					
3. Identifies key literature supporting the study.					
4. States research question(s) clearly and succinctly.					
5. Designs study appropriate to field of study and the research question(s).					
6. Presents data and findings clearly and thoroughly.					
7. Prepares an Integrative Paper that makes an original contribution.					
8. Produces material that is suitable for publication.					

Please fill out and sign this form and submit it to the PhD Program Coordinator. Thank you!

Dissertation Proposal

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)   **Ph.D. in Information Studies**

Outcome: Effectively plans and proposes novel research and scholarship on a significant problem in the information field.

Committee Member Requirements

The student must submit a dissertation proposal to the committee, which will be written before data collection begins. This proposal will include a literature review, research plan, research methods to be used, research goals and objectives, timelines for the work, potential limitations, and any other elements deemed appropriate by the committee. The chair and the committee will work with the student to determine to format and content of the proposal and what type of proposal defense will be required. Any changes to the goals, objectives, methods, plan, or other major element of the dissertation work must be approved by the chair in consultation with the other members of the committee.

At the defense, the student will give a presentation to the committee – lasting a minimum of 15 minutes and a maximum 45 minutes – that summarizes their proposal and what they will do in the dissertation itself. Generally, it is recommended that the student prepares for a 20 minute talk. After this presentation, there will be questions from audience and then non-Ph.D. holders will be asked to leave as questions are asked from the committee. After the questions and suggestions from the committee are completed, the student will be asked to leave while the committee deliberates. Upon successful completion, the dissertation committee will sign a form to indicate that the student has passed the proposal. While it is ideal for the Committee to reach a consensus, in cases where there is a disagreement about the outcome, the student passes if no or only one member of the committee vote(s) to fail the student, and fails if two or more committee members vote to fail the student.

The completed forms and related documents will be forwarded to the Student Services Office for inclusion in the student's file. The student and will receive a copy of the completed DGOA form, which shows the names and signatures of the faculty who participated in the evaluation.

Dissertation Proposal Assessment Guidelines

Indicator: Identifies significant and original problem.	
Outstanding	The student identifies an exceptionally significant and original problem that will make a potentially transformative contribution to the field.
Exceeds Expectations	The student identifies a highly significant and original problem that will make a major contribution to the field.
Meets Expectations	The student identifies an original and significant problem that will make a contribution to the field.
Below Expectations	The student identifies a somewhat significant and original problem that is somewhat likely to make a contribution to the field.
Unsatisfactory	The student identifies a problem of limited originality and significance that is unlikely to make a contribution to the field.

Indicator: Bases the study on relevant literature.	
Outstanding	The student demonstrates mastery of subject matter and associated literature.
Exceeds Expectations	The student demonstrates very sound knowledge of subject matter and associated literature.
Meets Expectations	The student demonstrates good knowledge of subject matter and associated literature.
Below Expectations	The student demonstrates some knowledge of subject matter and associated literature.
Unsatisfactory	The student demonstrates a lack of understanding of subject matter and associated literature.

Indicator: Explores key assumptions or theories supporting the work.	
Outstanding	The student demonstrates mastery of key assumptions or theoretical concepts.
Exceeds Expectations	The student demonstrates very sound understanding of key assumptions or theoretical concepts.
Meets Expectations	The student demonstrates good understanding of key assumptions or theoretical concepts.
Below Expectations	The student demonstrates some understanding of key assumptions or theoretical concepts.
Unsatisfactory	The student demonstrates a lack of understanding of key assumptions or theoretical concepts.

Indicator: States research question(s) clearly and succinctly.	
Outstanding	The student clearly states one or more research questions with the potential to transform research in the field.

Exceeds Expectations	The student clearly states one or more compelling research questions.
Meets Expectations	The student clearly states one or more research questions.
Below Expectations	The student fails to clearly state research questions.
Unsatisfactory	The student fails to clearly develop, state, or employ research questions.

Indicator: Chooses methodology appropriate to question(s).	
Outstanding	Research reflects mastery of the state-of-the-field research methods/tools. The rationale for using chosen methods/tools is exceptionally clear.
Exceeds Expectations	Research uses state-of-the-field research methods/tools. The rationale for using chosen methods/tools used is very well articulated.
Meets Expectations	The methodology chosen is appropriate for investigating proposed questions. The rationale for using the chosen tools/methodologies is clear.
Below Expectations	The methodology chosen is somewhat well-aligned with or appropriate for investigating proposed questions. The rationale for using the chosen tools/methodologies is somewhat clear.
Unsatisfactory	The methodology chosen is not well-aligned with or appropriate for investigating proposed questions. The rationale for using the chosen tools/methodologies is not clear.

Indicator: Describes clear plan for presentation of data and findings.	
Outstanding	The described plan for the presentation of data and findings is exceptionally clear and very well justified.
Exceeds Expectations	The described plan for the presentation of data and findings is very clear and well justified.
Meets Expectations	The described plan for the presentation of data and findings is clear and justified.
Below Expectations	The described plan for the presentation of data and findings is only somewhat clear or only somewhat justified.
Unsatisfactory	The described plan for the presentation of data and findings is not clear or is insufficiently justified.

Indicator: Creates a written product that is clear, well organized, and grammatically correct.	
Outstanding	Organization and documentation are excellent. There are no apparent grammatical, spelling, or word usage errors. Overall, the writing is of publishable quality.
Exceeds Expectations	Organization and documentation are very good. There are very few grammatical, spelling, or word usage errors. Overall, the writing is of a very good quality.

Meets Expectations	Organization is good and documentation is acceptable. There is a limited number of grammatical, spelling, or word usage mistakes. Overall, the writing is acceptable.
Below Expectations	Organization and documentation are marginally adequate. There are some grammatical, spelling, or word usage mistakes. Overall, the writing is somewhat acceptable.
Unsatisfactory	Organization and documentation are not adequate. There are numerous grammatical, spelling, or word usage mistakes. Overall, the writing is of an unacceptable quality.

Indicator: Describes a detailed and feasible timeline of work to be completed.	
Outstanding	Timeline is exceptionally clear and detailed. Work seems highly likely to be completed in the time allowed.
Exceeds Expectations	Timeline is very clear and detailed. Very good potential for completion of the work in the time allowed.
Meets Expectations	Timeline is acceptable and detailed. Good potential for completion of the work in the time allowed.
Below Expectations	Timeline is somewhat clear or detailed. Some potential for completion of the work in the time allowed.
Unsatisfactory	Timeline is unclear or insufficiently detailed. Work seems unlikely to be completed in time allowed.

Dissertation Proposal Assessment Form

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)   **Ph.D. in Information Studies**

Outcome: Effectively plans and proposes novel research/scholarship on a significant problem in the information field.

Student's Name: _____   **Committee Member Signatures**

print name

_____ Advisor
print name   signature

Proposal Defense Date: _____
mm/dd/yyyy

_____ Dean's Representative
print name   signature

_____
print name   signature

_____
print name   signature

_____
print name   signature

Indicators	Outstanding	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
1. Identifies significant and original problem.					
2. Bases the study on relevant literature.					
3. Explores key assumptions or theories supporting the work.					
4. States research question(s) clearly and succinctly.					
5. Chooses methodology appropriate to question(s).					
6. Describes a clear plan for presentation of data and findings.					
7. Creates a written product that is clear, well-organized, and grammatically correct.					
8. Describes detailed and feasible timeline of work to be completed.					

Please fill out and sign this form and submit it to the PhD Program Coordinator. Thank you!

Dissertation

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)   **Ph.D. in Information Studies**

Outcome: Conduct and disseminate novel research/scholarship on a significant problem in the information field.

Committee Member Requirements

Each committee member shall complete the assessment rubric and provide written comments to the student based on the overall written product and oral presentation. The written comments of each committee member and verbal summarization of the overall evaluation of the student's performance will be provided to the student by the chair of the Dissertation Committee.

After questioning has been completed, the student and any others who are not members of the Dissertation Examining Committee are asked to leave the room while the Dissertation Examining Committee discusses whether or not the dissertation and its defense are satisfactory.

The Committee has the following options:

- To accept the dissertation without any recommended changes and sign the Report of Examining Committee.
- To accept the dissertation with recommendations for changes and, except for the chair, sign the Report of the Examining Committee. The chair will check that the changes to the dissertation have been made, and, upon his or her approval, sign the Report of Examining Committee.
- To recommend revisions to the dissertation and not sign the Report of Examining Committee until the student has made the changes and submitted the revised dissertation for the Dissertation Examining Committee's approval. The Dissertation Examining Committee members sign the Report of Examining Committee if they approve the revised dissertation.
- To recommend revisions and convene a second in-person meeting of the Dissertation Examining Committee to review the dissertation and complete the student's examination.
- To rule the dissertation (including its examination) unsatisfactory. In that circumstance, the student fails.

Following the examination, the chair, in the presence of the Dean's Representative, must inform the student of the outcome of the examination. The chair and the Dean's Representative both sign a Report of the Examining Committee indicating which of the above alternatives has been adopted. A copy of this statement is to be included in the student's file at the graduate program office, and a copy is given to the student. The student passes if one member refuses to sign the report, but the other members of the Dissertation Examining Committee agree to sign, before or after the approval of recommended changes. Two or more negative votes constitute a failure of the candidate to meet the dissertation requirement. In cases of failure, the Dissertation Examining Committee must specify in detail and in writing the nature of the deficiencies in the dissertation and/or the oral performance that led to failure. This statement is to be submitted to the program's Graduate Director, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the student. A second examination may be permitted if the student will be in good standing at the time of the proposed second examination. A second examination requires the approval of the program's Graduate Director and the Dean of the Graduate School. If the student fails this second examination, or if a second examination is not permitted, the student's admission to the graduate program is terminated.

The completed forms and related documents will be forwarded to the Graduate Student Services Office for inclusion in the student's file. The student will receive a copy of the completed DGOA form, which shows the names and signatures of the faculty who participated in the evaluation.

Dissertation Assessment Guidelines

Indicator: Identifies significant and original problem	
Outstanding	The student identifies an exceptionally significant and original problem that will make a potentially transformative contribution to the field.
Exceeds Expectations	The student identifies a highly significant and original problem that will make a major contribution to the field.
Meets Expectations	The student identifies an original and significant problem that will make a contribution to the field.
Below Expectations	The student identifies a somewhat significant and original problem that is somewhat likely to make a contribution to the field.
Unsatisfactory	The student identifies a problem of limited originality and significance that is unlikely to make a contribution to the field.

Indicator: Creates theoretical framework based on relevant literature	
Outstanding	The student demonstrates 1) mastery of subject matter and associated literature, and 2) mastery of theoretical concepts.
Exceeds Expectations	The student demonstrates 1) very sound knowledge of subject matter and associated literature, and 2) very sound understanding of theoretical concepts.
Meets Expectations	The student demonstrates 1) good knowledge of subject matter and associated literature, and 2) good understanding of theoretical concepts.
Below Expectations	The student demonstrates 1) some knowledge of subject matter and associated literature, and 2) some understanding of theoretical concepts.
Unsatisfactory	The student demonstrates 1) a lack of understanding of subject matter and associated literature, and 2) a lack of understanding of theoretical concepts.

Indicator: States research question(s) clearly and succinctly	
Outstanding	The student clearly states one or more research questions with the potential to transform research in the information field or a related field or subfield.
Exceeds Expectations	The student clearly states one or more compelling research questions.
Meets Expectations	The student clearly states one or more research questions.
Below Expectations	The student fails to clearly state research questions.
Unsatisfactory	The student fails to clearly develop, state, or employ research questions.

Indicator: Chooses methodology appropriate to question(s)

Outstanding	Research reflects mastery of the state-of-the-field research methods/tools. The rationale for using chosen methods/tools is exceptionally clear.
Exceeds Expectations	State-of-the-field research methods/tools are used to solve the defined problems. The rationale for using chosen methods/tools used is very well articulated.
Meets Expectations	The methodology chosen is well-aligned with or appropriate for investigating proposed questions. The rationale for using the chosen tools/methodologies is clear.
Below Expectations	The methodology chosen is somewhat well-aligned with or appropriate for investigating proposed questions. The rationale for using the chosen tools/methodologies is somewhat clear.
Unsatisfactory	The methodology chosen is not well-aligned with or appropriate for investigating proposed questions. The rationale for using the chosen tools/methodologies is not clear.

Indicator: Presents data clearly, draws appropriate conclusions, and thoroughly discusses findings
Outstanding	Analysis and interpretation of data and findings is exceptionally comprehensive and clear. The student draws groundbreaking conclusions from data and findings.
Exceeds Expectations	Analysis and interpretation of data and findings is very comprehensive and clear. The student draws important conclusions from data and findings.
Meets Expectations	Analysis and interpretation of data and findings is comprehensive and clear. The student draws appropriate conclusions from data and findings.
Below Expectations	Analysis and interpretation of data and findings is somewhat comprehensive and clear. The student draws somewhat appropriate conclusions from data and findings.
Unsatisfactory	Analysis and interpretation of data and findings is not comprehensive and is unclear. The conclusions drawn by the student do not flow logically from data or findings.

Indicator: Creates a written product that is clear, well organized and grammatically correct.
Outstanding	Organization and documentation are excellent. There are no apparent grammatical, spelling, or word usage errors. Overall, the writing is of publishable quality.
Exceeds Expectations	Organization and documentation are very good. There are very few grammatical, spelling, or word usage errors. Overall, the writing is of a very good quality.
Meets Expectations	Organization is good and documentation is acceptable. There is a limited number of grammatical, spelling, or word usage mistakes. Overall, the writing is acceptable.
Below Expectations	Organization and documentation are marginally adequate. There are some grammatical, spelling or word usage mistakes. Overall, the writing is somewhat acceptable.
Unsatisfactory	Organization and documentation are not adequate. There are numerous grammatical, spelling, or word usage mistakes. Overall, the writing is of an unacceptable quality.

Indicator: Produces material that is suitable for publication.	
Outstanding	Journal or conference publications will result from this research.
Exceeds Expectations	Journal or conference publications are highly likely to result from this research.
Meets Expectations	Journal or conference publications may result from this research.
Below Expectations	Significant revisions will be necessary for journal or conference publications to result from this research.
Unsatisfactory	It is unlikely that journal or conference publications will result from this research.

Dissertation Assessment Form

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)   **Ph.D. in Information Studies**

Outcome: Conduct and disseminate novel research/scholarship on a significant problem in the information field.

Student's Name: _____   **Committee Member Signatures**

<div align="center">print name</div>

                                                                   Advisor

Defense Date: _____   print name   signature

<div align="center">mm/dd/yyyy</div>

_____ Dean's Representative

<div align="center">print name   signature</div>

<div align="center">print name   signature</div>

<div align="center">print name   signature</div>

<div align="center">print name   signature</div>

Indicators	Outstanding	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
1. Identifies significant and original problem.					
2. Bases the study on relevant literature.					
3. Explores key assumptions or theories supporting the work.					
4. States research question(s) clearly and succinctly.					
5. Chooses methodology appropriate to question(s).					
6. Presents data clearly, draws appropriate conclusions, and thoroughly discusses findings.					
7. Creates a written product that is clear, well-organized, and grammatically correct.					
8. Produces material that is suitable for publication.					

<div align="center">Please fill out and sign this form and submit it to the PhD Program Coordinator. Thank you!</div>