

QE MAJOR Examiners' Rubric, to use in assessment and when providing feedback

I: Depth and breadth of knowledge/Awareness of limitations of knowledge

Assessment	Rubric	Action by examiner
Unacceptable	Knowledge is incomplete/overly narrow; uncritical/superficial; and/or out-of-date.	Recommend second attempt (optional for written exams only, and involves delaying the oral), or fail ; provide feedback.
Acceptable: <i>as expected in a successful MSc. graduate*</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a systematic understanding of a fair body of knowledge, including, where appropriate, relevant knowledge outside the discipline. • Has a working comprehension of how established research techniques are used. • Is critically aware of current problems/current research. • Appreciates the complexity of knowledge, and the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines. 	Provide feedback to help the student be more thorough, comprehensive, critical and/or current.
Good: <i>advanced over a recent MSc graduate</i>	Advanced over MSc level, but still some limitations in knowledge or reasoning skills compared to a PhD student at graduation.	Provide feedback to help the student continue to become more thorough, comprehensive, critical and/or current.
Outstanding: <i>already reaching the standards expected by the end of a PhD*</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advanced over MSc in having a <i>thorough</i> understanding of a <i>substantial</i> body of knowledge. • Appreciates what is the <i>forefront</i> of the discipline. • Can make informed judgments on complex issues. • Appreciates the limits of their own work. • Has innovative ideas of their own. 	Congratulate them!

* as laid out in OCAV Learning Expectations (<http://oucqa.ca/framework/appendix-1/>)

From UoG Graduate LOs:

Any other comments on the student's critical thinking skills?

- Is the student applying logical principles to solve problems, and in an innovative way? If not, how could they improve?
- Can the student compare the relative merits of different hypotheses?
- Can the student evaluate the relative merits of different approaches to solving problems?
- Can the student critically evaluate the limits of their own knowledge, and how these limits constrain their understanding and their analyses? If not, how could they improve?

Any other comments on the student's informational and quantitative literacies?

- Has the student shown a good ability to extract material from a variety of resources, and assess its quality and validity? If not, how could they improve?
- Is the student able to identify gaps in the information they retrieved?
- Has the candidate also shown evidence of good quantitative literacy, i.e. the competent extraction of correct information from graphs, statistical outputs etc.; and a good ability, if asked, to present information in a quantitatively literate way? If not, how could they improve?

II: Communication skills

Grade	Rubric	Action
Unacceptable	Cannot develop a sustained written argument; and/or is unclear and hard to follow when presenting orally; and/or does not listen to or answer questions appropriately.	Recommend second attempt (optional for written exams only, and involves delaying the oral), fail ; provide feedback.
Acceptable: <i>as expected in a successful MSc. graduate*</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurately uses a breadth of discipline-appropriate vocabulary. • Is able to develop a sustained written argument. • Orally presents in ways that are clear and easy to understand, and actively listens and responds effectively to questions. 	Provide feedback to help the student improve their written and/or oral communication skills.
Good: <i>advanced over an MSc graduate</i>	Advanced over MSc level, but still needs some development in their written or oral presentation/argumentation skills	Provide feedback to help the student continue to improve their written and/or oral communication skills.
Outstanding: <i>already reaching the standards expected by the end of a PhD*</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can communicate even very complex and/or ambiguous ideas, issues and conclusions clearly and effectively. • This includes writing in a sophisticated manner, and showing a high degree of skill in answering questions. 	Congratulate them!

* as laid out in OCAV Learning Expectations (<http://oucqa.ca/framework/appendix-1/>)

From UoG Graduate LOs:

Any other comments on the student’s professionalism?

- Does the student show the intellectual independence needed for academic development? If not, how could they improve?

Any other comments on the student’s “global understanding”?

- Does the student understand the historical and cultural context of their work, and also how their academic discipline may operate differently outside of their own country? If not, how could they improve?