## Qualifying Exam Internal Score Sheet

**Student Name:** _____

**Prospectus Advisor:** _____

**Qualifying Exam Chair:** _____

**Other Committee Members:** _____

_____

| Criteria | Fail | Pass with Reservations | Pass | High Pass |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Intellectual merit of proposed research questions** | The research question is <u>not clearly</u> formulated to contribute to existing literature; OR it is <u>not complex</u> enough for a dissertation chapter. | The research questions have potential to contribute to the existing literature but need <u>more detail</u>. The proposal may lead to a dissertation chapter but needs more work. | The research questions are <u>well-defined</u> AND have potential to contribute to the existing literature. The proposal will lead to one or more dissertation chapters. | The research questions are <u>well-defined</u> AND have <u>clear potential</u> to make <u>substantial</u> contribution to the existing literature. The proposal could lead to a published paper in a recognized journal. |
| **Command and connection to the literature** | Does not mention most relevant work; OR incorrectly describes the relevant work; OR does not | Mentions relevant research without discussing its relevance; OR provides limited | Clearly describes relevant existing research AND explains in a <u>sufficiently clear</u> | Clearly describes relevant existing research AND explains in a <u>precise</u> way how |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | place the question in the literature cited; OR <u>struggles to answer most clarifying</u> questions. | references to relevant literature; OR is not clear about how the question adds to the literature; OR <u>struggles to answer some</u> clarifying questions. | way how their work relates and adds to the existing literature. The student answers <u>most</u> clarifying questions. | their work relates and adds to the existing literature. The student answers <u>all</u> clarifying questions. |
| **Feasibility of proposed research** | Is not feasible due to an inadequate empirical design or data limitations; OR the theoretical model is not appropriate to address the question (e.g., the mechanism in the model is not related to the research question); OR the timeline is not realistic. | Includes <u>limited results and unclear</u> evidence of the project's feasibility; OR unclear description about the underlying mechanisms in a model or how to calibrate it; OR the unfinished part of the project may not be viable within the expected timeline for graduation. | Is likely to be feasible but does not include a full set of preliminary results. Evidence is presented to demonstrate the project's feasibility within the expected timeline for graduation. | Includes a full set of initial results or definitive evidence of the project's feasibility within the expected timeline for graduation. |
| **Clarity of writing in a standard format** | Needs <u>extensive</u> revisions to meet a standard format for economics. | Only some parts of the proposal are organized in a clear, logical way; needs <u>some</u> revisions to | <u>Most</u> of the proposal is organized in a clear, logical way AND may need <u>minimal</u> revisions to meet a standard | The <u>entire</u> proposal is organized in a clear, logical way AND expressed in a standard format for economics. |

| | | meet a standard format for economics. | format for economics. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Organization of the oral presentation** | The presentation lacks logical organization (it is hard to follow). | The presentation is partly unclear or somewhat lacks logical organization; OR the slides contain errors or too much/too little information. | Most of the presentation is clear, logically organized, and most slides show correct information in a concise, professional way. | Delivers a clear, logically organized presentation with the slides that show correct information in a concise, professional way. |

**Overall grade**     1. [   ] High Pass   2. [   ] Pass   3. [   ] Pass with Reservations   4. [   ] Fail