**This packet contains Word versions**

**of the following documents:**

**Dissertation Learning Outcome Assessment**

**Evaluation by Graduating Ph.D. Student**

**These Word versions are provided for the convenience of students who prefer to use them rather than the pdf versions provided in a separate packet.**

**Dissertation Learning Outcome Assessment**

**Department of Psychology. University of Texas at El Paso**

**Student \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Defense Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Committee Member (printed name) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Committee Member (signature) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Instructions:** Circle the number that best matches your assessment of the dissertation on each dimension. If the dimension was not assessed or does not apply, do not circle any number and indicate this in the comments. Comments are strongly encouraged if your assessment is non-satisfactory.

A copy of your ratings and comments, with this page removed, will be shared with the student and the student's mentor. Your ratings will also be included in group analyses conducted by the Psychology Department and reported on an annual basis to the university and SACS, as part of the university's assessment of student outcomes.

After you have completed this form, please sign it and place it in the envelope provided by the chair of the committee.

**Standards for Rankings**

“*Limited*”

– Significant flaws/limitations suggesting student has limited effectiveness in this dimension

“*Slightly Limited*”

“*Effective*” (*Standard for Masters work*)

– Minor flaws/limitations suggesting student has ability to work effectively in the dimension with guidance from a more experienced researcher or as member of a research team

“*Good*” (*Standard for PhD work*)

“*Excellent*”

– Nearly flawless suggesting student has ability to be very productive in this dimension

**Mastery of Theoretical and Empirical Literature**

*Probing student about scientific literature may be particularly important when Defense is written in a more “manuscript” ready format with less breadth of coverage.*

**In the written document, the thoroughness and depth of the coverage regarding the theoretical and empirical scientific literature was**

**1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9**

Limited Slightly Effective Good Excellent

Limited

|  |
| --- |
| Comments for Student and Mentor |

**In the oral presentation/defense, the student's ability to discuss the theoretical and empirical scientific literature was**

**1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9**

Limited Slightly Effective Good Excellent

Limited

|  |
| --- |
| Comments for Student and Mentor |

**Justification of Research**

**In the introduction section of the written document, the justification of the proposed research within the existing theoretical and empirical scientific literature was**

**1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9**

Limited Slightly Effective Good Excellent

Limited

|  |
| --- |
| Comments for Student and Mentor |

**(please go on to the next page)**

**Using, Discussing, and Justifying Methodology and Statistics**

*Note: Choices about methodology and statistics can involve imperfect alternatives (e.g., both between and within subject approaches have limitations). Ratings below “Satisfactory” should not reflect these inherent limitations, but the student's understanding and/or discussion about these choices (e.g., failure recognize limitation of correlation with regard to causal inferences)*

**In the *written document*, the presentation, discussion, and justification of the methodology was**

**1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9**

Limited Slightly Effective Good Excellent

Limited

|  |
| --- |
| Comments for Student and Mentor |

**In the *oral presentation/defense*, the student's ability to discuss the methodology was**

**1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9**

Limited Slightly Effective Good Excellent

Limited

|  |
| --- |
| Comments for Student and Mentor |

**In the *written document*, the presentation, discussion, and justification of the statistics was**

**1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9**

Limited Slightly Effective Good Excellent

Limited

|  |
| --- |
| Comments for Student and Mentor |

**(please go on to the next page)**

**Using, Discussing, and Justifying Methodology and Statistics (continued)**

**In the *oral presentation/defense*, the student's ability to discuss the statistics was**

**1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9**

Limited Slightly Effective Good Excellent

Limited

|  |
| --- |
| Comments for Student and Mentor |

**Meaningfulness of Research Findings**

**In the *discussion section of the written document*, the discussion about the meaningfulness of the findings (either in terms of placing them in the scientific literature or discussing their applied benefits) was**

**1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9**

Limited Slightly Effective Good Excellent

Limited

|  |
| --- |
| Comments for Student and Mentor |

**Additional Comments for Student and Mentor Regarding the Dissertation**

|  |
| --- |
| Comments for Student and Mentor |

**EVALUATION BY GRADUATING PH.D. STUDENT**

**UTEP PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT**

**Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date:**

**Thank you for providing feedback and sharing insights that can help us improve the graduate program in psychology. Please answer the following questions by typing in your answers, then scan the completed form as a pdf and email it to the Graduate Program Director (Dr. James Wood, jawood@utep.ed). A blank copy of this form in Word format is available on the Psychology Department website.**

**Please tell us a little about the job(s) you have accepted and/or are seeking.**

**Did your career goals change while you were in the program? If so, what led to these changes?**

**Are there courses that we did not offer that you think would be useful for future students?**

**Do you have any specific recommendations about things we could change (course requirements, non-course requirements, etc.) to make the program better?**

**Are there positive aspects of the program that you consider particularly important or that have been especially valuable to you?**

**Please add any other comments or ideas that you think are relevant.**