

*Below are student assessment rubrics used by GSLC. These rubrics serve as guidelines for all GSLC instructors, but each instructor may make adjustments to the rubrics to suit each specific assignment. The rubrics on pp.1-7 are adopted from the following source:
<https://www.emu.edu/teaching/design/teach/rubrics.html>*

(last update: March 20, 2023)

ESSAY EXAM GRADING RUBRIC

	Sophisticated 90-100	Highly Competent 80-89	Fairly Competent 70-79	Not Yet Competent 0-69
Depth of analysis	Paper goes beyond the assignment to explore the implications of arguments or evidence in new contexts.	Paper fully meets the parameters of the assignment with some degree of application.	Paper demonstrates understanding of the assignment.	Paper does not address the assignment.
Grasp of reading(s)	Paper represents the authors' arguments, evidence and conclusions accurately, fairly and eloquently. Demonstrates a firm understanding of the implications of the author's arguments.	Paper represents the author's arguments, evidence and conclusions accurately.	Paper represents the authors' arguments, evidence and conclusions accurately though not sufficiently clearly and there are minor inaccuracies.	Paper badly misrepresents the authors' arguments, evidence, and/or conclusions.
Thesis paragraph	Clearly and eloquently identifies a demonstrable and nuanced central argument. Provides the reader with a clear sense of the nature of evidence that will follow. Reveals the organizational structure of the paper. Guides the reader smoothly and logically into the body of the paper.	Thesis paragraph clearly identifies a demonstrable central argument. Gives the reader a reasonably good sense of the nature of evidence that will follow.	Thesis paragraph identifies a central argument that is demonstrable, though not stated sufficiently clearly. Thesis paragraph does not guide the reader into the body of the paper.	Thesis paragraph does not have a discernable central argument. The argument is not demonstrable.
Evidence	Evidence used to support the central point is rich, detailed and well chosen.	Evidence used to support the central point is well chosen, though not particularly rich or detailed.	Connection between argument and evidence is not clearly articulated in all cases.	Evidence used does not clearly support the main argument.

	<p>Evidence sections employ appropriate illustrations and/or quotations.</p> <p>The connection between argument and evidence is clearly and compellingly articulated in all cases.</p> <p>(Where applicable) Important opposing evidence (i.e., evidence that might seem to contradict your argument) is considered and convincingly refuted.</p>	<p>The connection between argument and evidence is clearly articulated.</p> <p>(Where applicable) Some opposing evidence is considered and refuted.</p>		
Conclusion	<p>(Elegantly) synthesizes and reframes key points from the paper.</p> <p>Suggests new perspectives or questions relevant to the central argument, and brings closure.</p>	<p>Synthesizes and brings closure but does not examine new perspectives or questions.</p>	<p>Restates the same points as the topic paragraph without reframing them.</p> <p>Introduces new material rather than new perspectives.</p>	<p>Is missing or cursory.</p> <p>Repeats the topic paragraph more-or-less verbatim.</p>
Organization	<p>Organization of paper as a whole is logical and quickly apparent.</p> <p>Connections among paragraphs are clearly articulated.</p> <p>Transitions between paragraphs are smooth.</p> <p>Every paragraph makes one distinct and coherent point, expressed in a clear topic sentence; the parts of each paragraph connect logically and persuasively, and internal transitions are smooth.</p>	<p>Organization of paper as a whole is logical and apparent, but transitions between paragraphs are not consistently smooth.</p> <p>Every paragraph makes one distinct and coherent point and, for the most part, the parts of each paragraph connect logically and effectively.</p> <p>In all but a few cases, the paragraph's point is expressed in a clear topic sentence.</p>	<p>Organization of the paper as a whole can only be discerned with effort.</p> <p>Not all parts of the paper fit the organizational structure.</p> <p>Not all the parts of the paper are effectively integrated.</p> <p>In a number of paragraphs, there is not a distinct or coherent point.</p> <p>Topic sentences are missing or unclear in a number of paragraphs.</p> <p>In a number of paragraphs, the parts do not connect logically.</p>	<p>Organization of the paper as a whole is not logical or discernable.</p>
Clarity	<p>Throughout the paper, wording is precise and unambiguous.</p> <p>Sentence structure is consistently clear and lucid.</p> <p>Quotations are all framed effectively in the text (i.e.,</p>	<p>Paper is for the most part precisely worded and unambiguous.</p> <p>Sentence structure is mostly clear.</p>	<p>Wording is imprecise or ambiguous fairly often.</p> <p>Sentence structure is often confusing.</p> <p>Quotations are not framed effectively in the text.</p>	<p>Throughout the paper, wording is imprecise or ambiguous.</p> <p>Sentence structure is consistently confusing.</p>

	integrated properly in terms of both grammar and meaning) and explicated where necessary.	Quotations are framed effectively in the text.		
Mechanics	<p>Paper is clean and appropriately formatted.</p> <p>There are no incomplete or run-on sentences.</p> <p>Quotes are all properly attributed and cited.</p> <p>There are virtually no spelling or grammatical errors.</p>	<p>There are a few minor spelling or grammatical errors.</p> <p>Quotes are all properly attributed and cited.</p>	<p>There are a number of spelling and grammatical errors.</p> <p>In a few places, quotes are not attributed and cited.</p>	<p>Paper is unacceptably sloppy.</p> <p>Quotes are frequently not attributed or improperly cited.</p>

COMMENTS: _____

ORAL PRESENTATION GRADING RUBRIC

Components	3-Sophisticated	2-Competent	1-Not yet Competent
Organization	Presentation is clear, logical, and organized. Listener can follow line of reasoning.	Presentation is generally clear and well organized. A few minor points may be confusing.	Organization is haphazard; listener can follow presentation only with effort. Arguments are not clear.
Style	Level of presentation is appropriate for the audience. Presentation is a planned conversation, paced for audience understanding. It is not a reading of a paper. Speaker is comfortable in front of the group and can be heard by all.	Level of presentation is generally appropriate. Pacing is sometimes too fast or too slow. Presenter seems slightly uncomfortable at times, and audience occasionally has trouble hearing him/her.	Aspects of presentation are too elementary or too sophisticated for audience. Presenter seems uncomfortable and can be heard only if listener is very attentive. Much of the information is read.
Use of Communication Aids	Communication aids enhance presentation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font on the visuals is readable. Information is represented and organized to maximize audience comprehension. Details are minimized so that main points stand out. 	Communication aids contribute to the quality of the presentation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Font size is mostly readable. Appropriate information is included. Some material is not supported by visual aids. 	Communication aids are poorly prepared or used inappropriately. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Font size is too small to read. Too much information is included. Details or some unimportant information is highlighted, and may confuse the audience.
Content			
Depth of Content	Speaker provides accurate and complete explanations of key concepts and theories, drawing on relevant literature. Applications of theory illuminate issues. Listeners gain insights.	For the most part, explanations of concepts and theories are accurate and complete. Some helpful applications are included.	Explanations of concepts and/or theories are inaccurate or incomplete. Little attempt is made to tie theory to practice. Listeners gain little from the presentation.
Accuracy of Content	Information (e.g., names, facts) included in the presentation is consistently accurate.	No significant errors are made. Listeners recognize any errors to be the result of nervousness or oversight.	Enough errors are made to distract a knowledgeable listener. Some information is accurate but the listener must determine what information is reliable.
Use of Language			
Grammar and Word Choice	Sentences are complete and grammatical. They flow together easily. Words are well chosen; they express the intended meaning precisely.	Sentences are complete and grammatical for the most part. They flow together easily. With some exceptions, words are well chosen and precise.	Listeners can follow presentation, but they are distracted by some grammatical errors and use of slang. Some sentences are halting, incomplete, or vocabulary is limited or inappropriate.
Freedom from Bias (e.g., sexism, racism, heterosexism, agism, etc.,)	Both oral language and body language are free from bias.	Oral language and body language are free from bias with one or two minor exceptions.	Oral language and/or body language includes some identifiable bias. Some listeners will be offended.
Responsiveness to Audience			
Verbal Interaction	Consistently clarifies, restates, and responds to questions. Summarizes when needed.	Generally responsive to audience questions and needs. Misses some opportunities for interaction.	Responds to questions inadequately.
Body Language	Body language reflects comfort interacting with audience	Body language reflects some discomfort interacting with audience.	Body language reveals a reluctance to interact with audience.

CLASSROOM PARTICIPATION GRADING RUBRIC

	A (18-20 points)	B (16-17 points)	C (14-15 points)	D (13 or lower)
Frequency and Quality	Attends class regularly and <i>always contributes</i> to the discussion by raising thoughtful questions, analyzing relevant issues, building on others' ideas, synthesizing across readings and discussions, expanding the class' perspective, and appropriately challenging assumptions and perspectives	Attends class regularly and <i>sometimes contributes</i> to the discussion in the aforementioned ways.	Attends class regularly but <i>rarely contributes</i> to the discussion in the aforementioned ways.	Attends class regularly but <i>never contributes</i> to the discussion in the aforementioned ways.

GROUP WORK GRADING RUBRIC

Category	4	3	2	1
Contribution to Group Goals Score: _____	Consistently and actively works toward group goals; willingly accepts and fulfills individual role within the group.	Works toward group goals without occasional prompting; accepts and fulfills individual role within the group.	Works toward group goals with occasional prompting.	Works toward group goals only when prompted.
Consideration or Others Score: _____	Shows sensitivity to the feelings and learning needs of others; values the knowledge, opinion, and skills of all group members.	Shows and expresses sensitivity to the feelings of others; encourages the participation of others.	Show sensitivity to the feelings of others.	Needs occasional reminders to be sensitive to the feelings of others.
Contribution or Knowledge Score: _____	Consistently and actively contributes knowledges, opinions, and skills without prompting or reminding.	Contributes knowledge, opinions, and skills without prompting or reminding.	Contributes information to the group with occasional prompting and reminding.	Contribute information to the group only when prompted.
Working and Sharing with Others Score: _____	Helps the group identify necessary changes and encourages group action for change; does assigned work without reminders.	Willingly participates in needed changes; usually does the assigned work and rarely needs reminding.	Participates in needed changes with occasional prompting; often needs reminding to do the assigned work.	Participates in needed changes when prompted and encourages; always or often relies on others to do the work.
Total Overall Score: _____	Comments:			

INDEPENDENT STUDY EVALUATION RUBRIC
(for master's students)

CONTENT	SCORE
1. <u>Introduction</u> : Relevant and well-grounded contextual information (i.e., background, problem statement or rationale), definition of terms, research questions. (10 points) Comments:	
2. <u>Literature Review</u> : Accurate and appropriate theoretical frameworks or models. (15 points) Comments:	
3. <u>Methodology</u> : Inclusion of essential components (i.e., sample selection, data collection tools and procedures, data analysis techniques) with justification of choices of methods. (15 points) Comments:	
4. <u>Results</u> : Clear presentation and logical interpretation of results. (15 points) Comments:	
5. <u>Discussion</u> : Interpretation expanded and contextualized to the wider and existing literature, and containing, if any, a fresh perspective. (15 points) Comments:	
6. Contributions to research and practical knowledge (10 points) Comments:	
LANGUAGE & ORGANIZATION	
7. Use correct language and follow an academic writing style (e.g., clear, concise) (10 points) Comments:	
8. Reflect organizational structure of text (systematic, sequential, logically coherent) and appropriate use of visuals (tables, figures, pictures) (10 points) Comments:	
Total points 1 - 8	

Note: ≥ 90 points = very good; 80-89 = good; 70-79 = pass; less than 69 = fail

SCORING RUBRICS FOR ADMISSION TO PHD PROGRAMS

I: TOEFL or IELTS Score:	_____	PASS	_____	NOT PASS	
II: Statement of purpose:	5	4	3	2	1

Interview Evaluation Criteria

III: Academic background knowledge	5	4	3	2	1
IV: Determination	5	4	3	2	1
V: Attitude	5	4	3	2	1
VI: Oral English Proficiency	5	4	3	2	1

Additional comments:

Note:

- The score from each category (II-VI) has an equal weight; the total score is 25.
- Passing score = 70%
 - Minimum score for Type 1 Scholarship = 90%
 - Minimum score for Type 2 Scholarship = 85%
 - Minimum score for Type 3 Scholarship = 80%

Descriptions of scoring rubrics for admission to PhD programs

	5	4	3	2	1
(Written) Statement of purpose	Students demonstrate specific research interests and convincingly explain why their interests are current and important to the field of study, either in terms of theory or practice.	Students have some research interests but may not be able to clearly explain why their interests are current or important to the field of study. However, students have a strong academic record suggesting their potential to succeed in their PhD study.	Students demonstrate some research interests, but may not be able to explain why the interests are important to the field of study.	Students have unclear research interests, or the research interests are based on obsolete topics.	Students do not articulate their research interests.
Academic background knowledge	Students have strong theoretical and research knowledge. For example, students have conducted a research project and demonstrate fundamental knowledge of research methods, such as research tools and designs. When asked, students are able to summarize published research that interests them.	Students have sufficient theoretical and research knowledge. When asked, students are also able to summarize published research or theories that interests them.	Students have moderate theoretical and research knowledge. The knowledge gained may be from reading of academic articles or previous academic courses taken.	Students have some theoretical and research knowledge (e.g., have taken a research method course).	Students have very little theoretical and research knowledge.
Determination:	Students demonstrate strong determination to pursue the degree and have track records of achievements. They also have a career plan after graduation. Students demonstrate potential to succeed (e.g., realistic aims and plans)	Students demonstrate strong determination to pursue the degree and are able to provide an example of past achievements.	Students demonstrate some determination to pursue the degree.	Students demonstrate little determination to pursue the degree.	Students demonstrate very little determination to pursue the degree.
Attitude:	Students clearly demonstrate positive attitudes towards advanced studies and the academic community. Students also demonstrate self-confidence, maturity, and eagerness to learn and be part of NIDA community.	Students demonstrate positive attitudes towards advanced studies and the academic community. However, students may demonstrate a moderate level of self-confidence, maturity, and eagerness to learn and be part of NIDA community.	Students demonstrate somewhat positive attitudes towards advanced studies and the academic community. Students may demonstrate some self-confidence, maturity, and eagerness to learn and be part of NIDA community.	Students are not enthusiastic about advanced studies and the academic community. Students may demonstrate some self-confidence, maturity, and eagerness to learn and be part of NIDA community.	Students are not enthusiastic about advanced studies and the academic community. Students also do not demonstrate self-confidence, maturity, and eagerness to learn and be part of NIDA community.
Oral English Proficiency	Students are able to communicate in English effectively and fluently.	Students are able to communicate well in English. Although there may be a few instances where students have difficulty expressing ideas, the interviewers can generally understand the students.	Students are able to communicate in English but may have difficulty expressing ideas. The interviewers may occasionally need to ask for clarifications.	Students are able to communicate in English but there are some instances of communication breakdowns due to students' English proficiency.	Students are unable to communicate well in English. There are many instances of communication breakdowns due to students' English proficiency.

Rubric for the PhD QE Examination
PASSING SCORE = 65%
 (Revised in September 2021)

Criteria	(90-100)	(76-89)	(61-75)	(Below 60)	Score (raw & converted)
Content (50%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a clear and thorough understanding of the course content. • Presents highly accurate facts/figures. • Uses rich, detailed and well-chosen evidence (examples) to support points being made • Explores the issues/topics insightfully. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a relatively clear understanding of the course content. • Presents accurate facts/figures. • Uses well-chosen and sufficient evidence to support points being made • Explores the issues/topics satisfactorily. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding of the course content. • Presents somewhat accurate facts/figures. • Uses enough evidence to support points being made • Explores the issues/topics adequately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates no or little understanding of the course content. • Presents mostly inaccurate facts/figures. • Uses irrelevant or no evidence to support points being made. 	(e.g., 90 / 45%)
Arguments (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates the ability to define, synthesize, analyze and critique key concepts of the subjects. • Presents very coherent arguments, i.e., orderly, consistent and logical arguments, without self-contradiction • Explores the implications of arguments or evidence in new contexts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates the ability to define, synthesize, analyze or critique key concepts of the subjects. • Presents coherent, i.e., orderly & logical arguments with no evidence of self-contradiction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates the ability to define, synthesize, analyze or critique key concepts of the subjects. • Presents somewhat coherent, i.e., orderly & logical arguments, with perhaps some inconsistencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates almost no ability to define, synthesize, analyze and/or critique key concepts of the subjects. • Lacks coherence, i.e., orderly & logical, in arguments, with self-contradictory information. 	
Organization (15%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization as a whole is clearly logical and quickly apparent. • Has 3 all sections (introduction body & conclusion) <u>with a clear</u> topic sentence. <p><u>In each paragraph:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains one main idea and supporting details that flow together. • Demonstrates logical connection between ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization as a whole is logical and apparent. • Has all 3 sections <u>with or without</u> a topic sentence. <p><u>In each paragraph:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains one main idea and supporting details. • Demonstrates logical connection between ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization as a whole is somewhat logical. • May or may not have all 3 sections <p><u>In each paragraph:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains one main idea and some supporting details • Demonstrates some logical connection between ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization as a whole is illogical. • May or may not have all 3 sections. <p><u>In each paragraph:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains no main idea and/or irrelevant supporting details. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses smooth transitions between paragraphs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly uses transitions between paragraphs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses some transitions between paragraphs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates no or almost no logical connection between ideas. • Uses few or no transitions between paragraphs. 	
Language (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses correct grammar (e.g., no incomplete, run-on sentences) • Uses accurate and precise word choices • Uses appropriate punctuation. • Sources are attributed and cited properly. • The entire answer is clearly and eloquently articulated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly uses correct grammar • Uses mostly accurate word choices • Uses mostly appropriate punctuation. • Sources are attributed and/or cited properly. • The entire answer is clearly articulated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occasionally uses incorrect grammar • Occasionally uses unclear word choices • Uses some punctuation. • Sources may or may not be cited. • The entire answer is comprehensible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly uses incorrect grammar • Uses unclear and/ or redundant word choices • Mostly lacks punctuation. • No citations are included. • The entire answer is almost incomprehensible. 	
TOTAL (converted score)					

Further comments:

PHD DISSERTATION PROPOSAL DEFENSE EVALUATION RUBRIC

CONTENT

1. Introduction: Relevant and well-grounded contextual information (i.e., background, problem statement or rationale), definition of terms, research questions. (20 points)

Comments:

2. Literature Review: Accurate and appropriate theoretical frameworks or models (20 points)

Comments:

3. Methodology: Inclusion of essential components (i.e., sample selection, data collection tools and procedures, data analysis techniques) with justification of choices of methods (20 points)

Comments:

4. Contributions to research and practical knowledge (10 points)

Comments:

5. Creativity and innovation in overall research (10 points)

Comments:

LANGUAGE & ORGANIZATION

6. Use correct language and follow an academic writing style (e.g., clear, concise) (10 points)

Comments:

7. Reflect organizational structure of text (systematic, sequential, logically coherent) and appropriate use of visuals (tables, figures, pictures) (10 points)

Comments:

Total points 1 - 7

SCORE

Note: ≥ 90 points = very good; 80-89 = good; 70-79 = pass; less than 69 = fail

PhD DISSERTATION DEFENSE EVALUATION FORM

CONTENT	SCORE
1. <u>Introduction</u> : Relevant and well-grounded contextual information (i.e., background, problem statement or rationale), definition of terms, research questions. (10 points) Comments:	
2. <u>Literature Review</u> : Accurate and appropriate theoretical frameworks or models. (15 points) Comments:	
3. <u>Methodology</u> : Inclusion of essential components (i.e., sample selection, data collection tools and procedures, data analysis techniques) with justification of choices of methods. (15 points) Comments:	
4. <u>Results</u> : Clear presentation and logical interpretation of results. (15 points) Comments:	
5. <u>Discussion</u> : Interpretation expanded and contextualized to the wider and existing literature, and containing, if any, a fresh perspective. (15 points) Comments:	
6. Contributions to research and practical knowledge (10 points) Comments:	
LANGUAGE & ORGANIZATION	
7. Use correct language and follow an academic writing style (e.g., clear, concise) (10 points) Comments:	
8. Reflect organizational structure of text (systematic, sequential, logically coherent) and appropriate use of visuals (tables, figures, pictures) (10 points) Comments:	
Total points 1 - 8	

Note: ≥ 90 points = very good; 80-89 = good; 70-79 = pass; less than 69 = fail