PREV Pre-Dissertation Competency Evaluation Form

Name: ____________________________________                     Date: ______________

Project Title: ____________________________________________________________

Rating Scale
0= Far Below Expectation (significant omissions, poorly communicated content)
1= Below Expectations (not ready for submission as a manuscript because it lacks qualities such as those specified in each
category below)
2= Minor Revisions Required in order to Meet Expectations (as specified below)
3= Meets Expectations (sufficient attention and quality in all components)
4= Meets Expectations (strong in all component areas)
5= Exceeds Expectations (excellent with respect to qualities such as those listed in each category below)

(Must meet expectations in each area prior to final acceptance of project)

_____ Rationale (sufficient justification, relevant literature cited, theoretically grounded)
_____ Methods (each required section present, sufficient detail, accurate)
_____ Analyses (appropriate, clearly presented, accurate)
_____ Results (organized, follow from hypotheses, accurate)
_____ Discussion (relevant literature cited, limitations acknowledged, implications for practice, research, policy
discussed as appropriate)
_____ Writing quality (well-structured sentences & paragraphs, no errors of grammar or typos, clear and precise
language, organized, structured, headings)
_____ APA 6th edition format
_____ Attention to diversity (e.g. indicates sample composition in lit review, addresses limitations of measurement and
external validity with diverse populations)
_____ Attention to ecological and social justice factors bearing upon topic (levels of ecology evident in
conceptualization, relevant issues of marginalization or reproduction of status quo addressed)

This pre-dissertation paper is _____ Accepted _____ Not accepted

Overall Rating: (0-5) ____________ (see next page for rubric)

________________________________  ______________
Advisor Signature     Date
The number circled indicates the level the student achieved in this competency area.

5  This pre-dissertation paper goes beyond the expected level for a typical doctoral student at this stage of training. A thorough, accurate, and comprehensive understanding of specialty area/research topic is demonstrated along with a strong rationale for the study. Every element of the task is presented with clarity, depth of thought, and focused and coherent organization. Analyses well suited to questions, presented very well. Evidence base included. The content is expressed with superior precision and literacy.

4  This pre-dissertation paper includes all elements of a publishable research project, well justified, research addresses the relevant elements and demonstrates a solid understanding of the area. It shows clear and sophisticated thinking and good organization and structure. Presentation of material is skillful and thorough. Well-cited. Evidence base included.

3  This pre-dissertation paper includes all elements of a publishable research project. The content, while sound, may also be slightly under-elaborated or at a minimally acceptable level. Like the 4 – level response, it shows clarity of thought but may lack tight, cohesive organization (some digressions may be evident). Content is adequate to demonstrate competency, but more would be needed to gain higher levels of expertise in the area.

2  This pre-dissertation paper neglects one or more components (rationale, results) such that it provides only a superficial or underdeveloped treatment of the area. Evidence base may be insufficient. It may show some clarity of thought while being overly simplistic. Problems in organization may be evident. The writing frequently impedes communication of the writer’s ideas. Content is presented at the minimal level, and is not unacceptable for a doctoral student at this stage of development. Room for improvement is evident.

1  This pre-dissertation paper seriously neglects or distorts one or more of the relevant elements or offers less than minimal treatment of the area. Evidence base not presented. Alternatively, it may demonstrate substantial problems with analysis, organization, and understanding of the topic. Presentation is unorganized, poor reflection of knowledge.

0  This pre-dissertation paper entirely fails to address the topic or relevant tasks. Alternatively, it demonstrates marked problems with organization and mechanics that makes the presentation extremely difficult to follow.

Additional Comments and Recommendations: