



# California Institute of Integral Studies

## MA THESIS/PhD DISSERTATION ASSESSMENT

This form is to be used to request assessment of the thesis or dissertation. It is formatted in a rubric to give a clear understanding of the assessment criteria. It is expected that a thesis or dissertation approved by a committee would be evaluated as being above the "emerging" category in all areas.

Before scheduling the oral defense, submit this form to the committee chair to obtain informal feedback which you can use to refine the thesis or dissertation. Then submit this form to all of the committee members, including the chair, to obtain formal feedback. The committee chair will collect the forms and submit them to the Registrar's Office.

For assistance, contact your program manager/coordinator.

**Student Use:** Student Name and Address: *(please print legibly)*

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ CIIS ID Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Academic Division:  M.A.  Ph.D. Program: \_\_\_\_\_

Thesis/Dissertation Committee Chair Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Thesis/Dissertation Committee Member Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Thesis/Dissertation Committee Member Name: *(if applicable)* \_\_\_\_\_

Thesis/Dissertation Committee Member Name: *(if applicable)* \_\_\_\_\_

Thesis/Dissertation Committee External Member Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Department/Program Chair Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Thesis/Dissertation Title: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Student Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Committee Chair or Member Use:**

Circle one number in each category. Do not omit any categories.

	Exemplary Scholarship		Developed Scholarship		Developing Scholarship		Emerging Scholarship			
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Abstract</b>	Clear and concise; smoothly draws the reader in; states the problem, findings, methodology, and significance.		Organized well; states the research problem, findings, methodology, and significance.		The abstract has an introduction to the finding; statement of the problem; findings, methodology, and/or significance may need some more organizational work.		Introduction to the problem or findings missing or not developed in a clear way; findings, methodology, and/or significance not well organized.			

	Exemplary Scholarship		Developed Scholarship			Developing Scholarship			Emerging Scholarship	
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Research Question or Thesis</b>	The question or thesis is original and significant in its potential contribution; it calls forth new knowledge; is fully developed by the work of the dissertation and has obvious potential to address critical issues within the respective field.		The question or thesis is original and clear in its potential contribution; it is well-situated to advance existing knowledge; it is well developed by the work of the dissertation.			The question or thesis may be original but its significance to the field is not well supported; it is developed by the work of the dissertation but not as thoroughly as required.			The question or thesis needs more development to enhance its originality; the case is not well developed that it is interesting or important; the question or thesis is not strongly supported or developed by the work of the dissertation.	
<b>Personal Relation to the Topic</b>	Clear and critically articulates personal standpoint in relation to the topic; makes clear the integral transformation their work has provided for themselves; articulates well the potential importance their work has for society at large.		Clearly and critically recognized own situation and context as part of self-inquiry and expresses personal assumptions regarding method and topic.			Addresses personal context in general terms but may not make a strong case for a personal connection.			Relation to the topic is not established well or is absent; reflective standpoint is not expressed clearly or is absent.	
<b>Literature Review</b>	Mastery of and creative and critical engagement with both canonical and current relevant literature in the field. Demonstrates the gap in the literature relevant to their study and makes a compelling argument as to why the candidate's research will address the gap, significantly contributing to the body of research in their field.		An insightful review that draws connections and integrates literature in a new way; includes canonical and current relevant literature; demonstrates that the student can use the literature to discuss scholarly trends and to develop hypotheses; draws a clear relationship to the gap in literature their work will address.			Provides an analysis of previous findings; adequate coverage but limited as to viewpoints presented; reference to and discussion of canonical and current relevant literature but weak connection with their question or thesis; may not develop a strong connection to the gap in the literature their work addresses.			The literature review does not include some of the important references related to the field and subject of the study; incomplete; relevance to the research question unclear; may only provide a list of previous findings without being in dialogue with the literature; there are omissions and unsubstantiated interpretations; little evidence the candidate understands the canonical and current literature within their field; may not address the gap in the literature being investigated.	

	Exemplary Scholarship		Developed Scholarship			Developing Scholarship			Emerging Scholarship	
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Theoretical Frameworks</b>	Works with multiple demonstrably relevant theories or models; looks at the complementarity and tensions of competing theories; uses theory to generate questions, answers, and considers their implications; addresses how their work will contribute to, support, or change established theory.		Current theories are connected to and provide a clear framework for the research; well-versed in theory; gaps in the research identified in existing theories; discusses the impact on existing theories their research implies.			Current theories are connected to but provide a weak framework for the research; the research connects back to theoretical work weakly; little or no discussion of the impact on existing theories their research implies.			Theoretical framework is missing, unclear, or misunderstood; it is not connected to the literature review or research questions clearly; little or no discussion of the impact of theory on their research; may reject theory as important or pertinent to their study.	
<b>Methods and Approaches</b>	High quality, creative, study design; design of study manifests a deep understanding of the field; clear explanation of methodological choices, ethical considerations, and integration of approaches; iteratively explores questions raised by the data or theoretical analysis; communicates very clearly; discusses the limitations of the methodology, study design, and potential biases inherent in study; discussion of connection between methodology and data analysis clear and concise.		Creative methodology and study design; study biases and/or limitations within the study clearly understood and discussed; ethical issues are considered appropriately; discussion of connection between methodology and data analysis clear and concise.			Shows basic competence in understanding methodology and study design; some consideration of ethical issues; choice of methodology and study design acceptable but lacking originality; study biases and/or limitations within the study design discussed but may not be well developed; connection between the methodology and the data analysis discussed but may not be clearly developed.			Uses a methodology and/or population that does not lend itself well to the study of the question; is unaware of, or has not identified, the biases and/or limitation within the study design; ethical issues of research are not considered; a clear connection between the methodology and the data analysis either not discussed or not clearly made.	
<b>Theoretical Analysis, Discussion, and Interpretation</b>	Analysis is rigorous, nuanced, and transparent; findings are tied to the research question and theoretical foundations; a rigorous discussion of the validity of the findings are engaged in and compared to previous work in the field.		Analysis is thorough, complete and well-connected to the research question and theoretical framework; validity of the findings are addressed rigorously.			The analysis connects back to theory but may not establish a clear connection; aspects of the data are adequately considered but a more thorough analysis should be considered; validity of the findings are addressed but may lack a thorough approach.			Analysis may be incomplete and/or poorly organized and/or implemented; findings may not be supported by the analysis; discussion of the findings may not be well organized and/or not address all of the findings clearly and/or be missing portions such as a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the research, validity of the findings may not be addressed.	

	Exemplary Scholarship		Developed Scholarship			Developing Scholarship			Emerging Scholarship	
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Conclusions</b>	Provides a focused discussion of conclusions, situating them in the literature to draw connections or point to differences with previous work; advances the field(s) of knowledge and raises questions for the future; makes a compelling argument as to the importance of their findings and how those findings address the 'gap' in the literature originally identified.		Conclusions are well-presented and insightful; they return to the larger context to identify future directions and/or discuss how the field needs to change; accentuates the 'gap' in the literature the study addresses and presents a compelling argument as to how their study fulfills this area.			Summarizes the results and provides a general discussion in reference to the literature; the results are situated as to their significance; little or no discussion of the 'gap' in the literature their study addresses.			May not include a summary of results; summary may not be clear and organized; the connection between the findings and data may not be established in a convincing way; little or no interpretation is provided or the interpretation may not fit the findings.	
<b>Writing and Scholarly Voice</b>	Writing is fluid, precise, and clear; lexicon of the field is clearly explained and defined; the tone is professional; vocabulary and syntax are mature; scholarly style and format are accurately used; the candidate's 'voice' is heard and yields a definitive presence, authority, and understanding of the issues being discussed.		Writing is grammatically correct, fluid, precise, and clear; lexicon of the field is clearly explained and defined; the tone is professional; vocabulary and syntax are mature; scholarly style and format are accurately used.			Writing is somewhat developed and professional; spelling, punctuation, grammar, in general, meet program and institutional standards; dissertation formatting is adequate; the lexicon of the respective field is understood and used properly.			More work developing academic writing skills necessary; syntax or vocabulary may not be well developed; a reliance on jargon may be a weakness; errors in spelling, punctuation or formatting may be present; document may have formatting problems; the candidate may not have a command of the field's lexicon.	
<b>Diversity</b>	Provides a sophisticated, critical, and nuanced analysis of key considerations and debates where relevant to the topic, methodology, and conclusions. Recognizes the existence of multiple frameworks and avoid inappropriately universalizing results.		Provides analyses of some of the diversity considerations and debates that are relevant to the topic, methodology, and conclusions; recognizes the existence of multiple frameworks and epistemologies and avoids inappropriately universalizing results.			Discusses relevant issues of diversity but could provide greater depth or nuance; recognized the existence of multiple frameworks and epistemologies, but does not address these sufficiently.			Fails to address questions of diversity where such considerations are clearly relevant to the work. Makes claims that are inappropriately universalizing.	

Role: (check one)  Committee Chair  Committee Member  Committee External Member

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

*Committee Members – submit this form to the committee chair; submit other feedback to the chair in writing separately (e.g., in the dissertation text)*

*Committee Chair – submit this form, and those from the committee members, to the registrar’s office*

REGISTRAR'S OFFICE USE ONLY

Date Received from Committee Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

REG: 8/19/15