| Student Name: | Graduate Student Self-Evaluation |  |  |
|---------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Student UIN:  | Learning Outcomes                |  |  |
|               | Learning Outcomes                |  |  |

| = -                 |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Major:              |  |
| egree Reing Pursued |  |

Dept:

Distance Education Student (Circle One): Yes / No

Student Enrollment Status (Circle One): Part-time / Full-time

Product of Research, if Applicable (Circle One): Thesis / Dissertation / Record of Study

INSTRUCTIONS: Check the box most appropriate for your competency level.

| How well do you meet the   |  |   | *USE THIS DESCRIPTION TO CALIBRATE EXPECTATIONS*  |   |  |         |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|---------|
| following learning outcomes  | Well Above   | Above   | Meets Expectations  | Below   | Well Below   | I Don't |
| expected by TAMU?  | (5)  | (4)   | (3)   | (2)   | (1)  | Know    |
| Exhibits a coherent understanding of discipline-specific knowledge?                                | Ideal clarity on critical concepts                               | Strong clarity on critical concepts                               | Articulates foundational concepts across the breadth of the discipline; distinguishes between opposing theoretical frameworks; some clarity                                 | Poor clarity on critical concepts                                   | No clarity on critical concepts                                      |         |
| Applies discipline-specific knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions? | Applies all relevant info; ideal resolution                      | Applies most relevant info; strong resolution                     | Applies relevant concepts to justify decisions; may not apply all relevant information; may not come to the ideal resolution  | Relies on some irrelevant info; poor resolution                     | Relies on irrelevant info; incorrect resolution                      |         |
| Uses a variety of sources and alternative views when critically evaluating ideas and information?  | Ideal sources;<br>considers all<br>views; critical<br>evaluation | Strong sources;<br>considers most<br>views; some<br>critical eval | Sources used to evaluate are both relevant and applicable; student seeks multiple perspectives; information considered is generally thorough; some critical thought applied | Mediocre sources;<br>lacking<br>viewpoints; little<br>critical eval | Poor sources;<br>missing critical<br>viewpoints; no<br>critical eval |         |
| 4 Communicates effectively?  | Crystal clear;<br>seamless<br>transitions                        | Very clear;<br>smooth transitions                                 | Central message is clear and consistent in written and oral form; ideas presented in logical order; transitions between ideas are adequate                                  | Lacking clarity or order; poor transitions                          | Unclear; illogical;<br>no transitions                                |         |
| Teaches or explains the subject matter in their discipline to a range of audiences?                | • •  | Strong delivery;<br>well designed for<br>audience                 | Delivery techniques and language choices are appropriate for the audience; student has the ability to transition between different audiences; may not be flawless or smooth | Mediocre delivery;<br>somewhat<br>appropriate for<br>audience       | Poor delivery;<br>inappropriate for<br>audience                      |         |
| Exhibits proficiency in technology 6 appropriate to solve problems in their discipline?            | Expert proficiency   | Advanced proficiency  | Demonstrates basic knowledge of, and basic proficiency in technology and tools specific to the discipline; may rely on others for some guidance                             | Lacking proficiency   | No proficiency   |         |
| Chooses ethical courses of action in research or practice?   | Addresses all ethical questions                                  | Addresses most ethical questions                                  | Recognizes ethical questions; attempts to apply ethical perspectives & concepts to research and practice  | Doesn't recognize all ethical questions                             | Doesn't recognize any ethical questions                              |         |

INSTRUCTIONS: The following section should be completed if you are a MS-thesis option student or doctoral student completing a dissertation.

Check the box most appropriate for your competency level.

| How well do you meet the following learning outcomes expected by TAMU? | Well Above<br>(5)                | Above<br>(4)   | *USE THIS DESCRIPTION TO CALIBRATE EXPECTATIONS*  Meets Expectations (3)  | Below<br>(2)   | Well Below<br>(1)  | I Don'<br>Know |
|--|----------------------------------|--|---|--|--|----------------|
| Develops clear, hypothesis-driven, or                                  | Ideal clarity; well supported by | Strong clarity;<br>well supported<br>by data                 | Articulates research questions supported by data, or relying on clear hypotheses; may not identify all complexities and nuances inherent to the proposed research                     | Somewhat clear;  | Unclear;<br>unsupported by<br>data                                   |                |
| Conducts valid, data-supported and                                     | quality or reproducibility;      | Strong controls, quality or reproducibility; strong analysis | Executes research with appropriate controls, sufficient quality and reproducibility, and valid analysis using methods appropriate to the discipline                                   | Poor controls, quality or reproducibility; Poor analysis | No controls,<br>quality or<br>reproducibility;<br>Incorrect analysis |                |
| Effectively disseminates research results in appropriate contexts?     | relevance or applicability       | Conveys<br>relevance or<br>applicability with<br>skill       | Information presented attempts to distill a large body of knowledge into relevant points; demonstrates relevance of completed research; articulates broader applicability of research | Poor ability to convey relevance or applicability        | Unable to convey relevance or applicability                          |                |
| Did you pass your final defense? ((                                    | \                                |  |   | Yes  | No   |                |