Thesis/Dissertation Evaluation Form UNT Counseling Psychology Program

Thesis ProposalThesis Defense	Dissertation Proposal	Dissertation Defense			
Student:	Date:				
Title of Thesis/Dissertation:					
Committee Members:					

Please use the rating scale for each of the items listed below

(1) the dissertation unacceptable	on is (2) the dissertation reflects potential but at this point unacceptable quality.	(3) the dissertation reflects work deer proficient based student's level of training.	emed on the	refl wo) the disse lects high rk beyond bected.	quality	ref wo	the dissertation lects exemplary rk which far exceeds at is expected.
1. Lit	erature Review							
1a.	Adequacy of literature review		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Clarity of rationale, RQs, hypo		1	2 2	3 3 3	4	5	N/A
1c.	Relevance/consideration of div	versity factors	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2. Res	earch Method							
2a.	Representativeness of the samp	ple	1	2	3	4	5	
2b.	Sampling & recruitment metho	ods	1	2 2 2	3 3 3	4	5 5 5 5	
	Sample size & power		1	2	3	4	5	
	Psychometrics of instruments		1	2	3	4	5	
2e.	Research design		1	2	3	4	5	
3. Res								
3a. Data cleaning & preliminary analyses3b. Correctness of hypothesis analyses		1	2 2	3	4	5	N/A	
		1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
3c.	Clarity and organization of the	section	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	cussion							
	Clarity and organization of the		1	2 2 2	3	4	5	N/A
4b. Integration of results with literature 4c. Discussion of strengths and limitations			1	2	3 3 3 3	4	5 5	N/A
			1		3	4		N/A
4d.	Implications/contributions to d	liversity issues	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	semination							
5a. Quality of writing5b. APA Style in the submitted writings5c. Quality of oral presentation		1	2	3	4	5		
		1	2 2 2	3 3 3	4	5 5 5		
		1	2	3	4 4	5		
	5d. Quality of visual aids		1				5	
5e. Process of responses (e.g., confidence, non-defensiveness)		-	2	3	4	5		
51.	Content of responses (e.g., comma	and of material)	1	2	3	4	5	
6. Sco			1	2	2	Α	E	
	Significance of the issue		1	2	3	4	5	
6b. Contribution to the literature			1	2	3	4	5	