



<p>C. Editorial Defense</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. After having heard from the supervisory committee and chair, summarize the requested changes with the chair. If the chair thinks this is feasible and do-able, a meeting will be set up for your editorial defense. Findings and discussion/conclusions are the focus of this meeting..</li> <li>2. Ask each member to bring a completed evaluation form (forms 7 and 8) of the last draft of the written document to the editorial defense.</li> <li>3. Schedule the editorial defense at least two weeks after the committee members get the last draft. Distribute forms 7 and 8.</li> <li>4. Successfully complete the editorial defense.</li> <li>5. When the defense is successful, take the evaluation forms and the final dissertation draft to the graduate school for approval.</li> </ol> <p>D. Final Dissertation Defense</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. After notification of success by the graduate school, the chair sets the date for the final defense with the student.</li> <li>2. Advertise date, time and location of final defense.</li> <li>3. Two weeks prior to the defense and in conjunction with the chair/committee, determine if a clean copy of the dissertation needs to be distributed to the committee members.</li> <li>4. Successfully complete final defense.</li> <li>5. Complete form 5 and the signature page of dissertation (use acid-free paper).</li> <li>6. The candidate then goes to the graduate school and the library to complete the process as described in the <u>Guide to Formatting Theses and Dissertation</u>.</li> <li>7. The candidate arranges for copies of the final dissertation for the School of Nursing, the Library, the Chair and the committee members if they wish to have one.</li> </ol>	<p>Within 5 years of establishing Candidacy</p>		<p><b>Forms 5, 7, 8, 9,10 &amp; 11</b></p>
<p><b>V. Graduation</b></p>			<p><b>Forms 5 &amp; 12</b></p>

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Student ID#: \_\_\_\_\_

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY

School of Nursing & Health Studies-Doctoral Program

**Form 1**

FACULTY MENTOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_ has been assigned as a faculty mentor  
Faculty member (please print or type)

for \_\_\_\_\_. The student and mentor will  
Student (please print or type)

work to choose a supervisory committee. The committee will be named no later than 12 months after the student is admitted or (for part time students only) after completing 12 credit hours.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Doctoral Program Mentor/Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Approved 2/26/99 Ph.D. Committee  
Revised 8-17-2005; 12/06

Copies to: School of Nursing & Health Studies  
Advisor  
Student

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY

School of Nursing & Health Studies-Doctoral Program

Form 2

APPOINTMENT OF Ph.D. SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

\_\_\_\_\_  
Student (type) (signature) (date)

Student ID#: \_\_\_\_\_

The following individuals have agreed to serve on the supervisory committee for the above mentioned student:

**Acceptance Signature/Date**

**Replacement Signature/Date**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for requesting committee membership change

Request submitted by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Student Signature / date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Program Chairperson/date

Approved 2/26/99 Ph.D. Committee/Reviewed 12/5/06; 2/8/12  
Copies to: School of Nursing & Health Studies, Student Services  
Student  
Mentor

**PhD IN NURSING**  
**Coursework Planning Sheet**  
**Form 3 (1 of 2)**

<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Course</i>	<i>Credits</i>	<i>Planned Semester</i>	<i>Grade</i>
<b>MSN Coursework</b>				
BSN-PhD takes 12 hours		(12)		
MSN-PhD transfers 12 hours				
MSN Theory Course	N5550	3		
MSN Research Course	N5555	3		
Cultural Diversity & Values	N5527	3		
Policy, Politics & Ethics	N5528	3		
Transfer in from MSN Coursework	Various		Completed	NA
<b>PhD Coursework from SoNHS</b>				
		<b>31 total*</b>		
Summer Research Institute Year I	N5603	2		
Summer Research Institute Year II	N5604	2		
Statistics I	N5612	3		
Statistics II	N5622	3		
Qualitative Methods	N5670	3		
Quantitative Methods	N5668	3		
Ethics/Responsible Conduct of Research	N5697	3		
Designing Research	N5666	3		
Theory Development I	N5608	3		
Theory Development II	N5610	3		
State of the Science	N5631	3		
<b>Collateral Examples– Sociology, Psychology, Nutrition, Physiology, Etc.</b>		<b>18 total</b>		
Psychometrics Option	N5662			
Epidemiology Course	N5664			
Community-Based Health Interventions	N5697			
Educator Research Options				
Laboratory Research Options				
		<b>49 coursework credit hours post MSN</b>		
		<b>61 coursework credit hours post BSN</b>		

In addition to 61 coursework credit hours post BSN, a minimum of 12 dissertation credit hours are completed individually with your faculty mentor/chair for a total of 73 credit hours in the PhD in Nursing program. Post MSN coursework, with a minimum of 12 dissertation credit hours will total 61 credit hours.

**PhD Part-Time Program of Study  
Sequence of Coursework  
Form 3 (2 of 2)**

<b>Summer</b>	<b>Fall</b>	<b>Spring</b>
Summer Institute 1 (2) RCR Ethics (3)	Theory 1 (5608) State of the Science (5631)	Qualitative Methods (N5670) Quantitative Methods (N5668)
Summer Institute 2 (2) Collateral #1 (3)	Statistics I (5612) Collateral #2 (3)	Theory II (N5610) Statistics 2 (5622)
Collateral #3 (3)	Collateral #4 (3) Collateral #5 (3)	Research Design (N5666) Collateral #6
(Comps Prep) Dissertation Hours	Comps Proposal Defense	Dissertation Hours = 12 hours minimum

Summer Collateral Options

- Psychometrics (N5664)

Fall/Spring Collateral Options

- Advanced Qualitative Research & Mixed Methods (N5671)
- Epidemiology (N5664)
- Community Based Health Interventions (N5697)
- Educator Research Courses
- Laboratory Research Courses

Approved Curriculum & Faculty Steering Fall 2013

**PhD in Nursing  
Mentoring Rubric  
Form 4**

**ALL** of the following measures must be successfully completed and documented before graduation:

Participate in Summer Institute I class discussion about potential committee members and desired mentoring qualities	Date of activity completion: _____ Faculty's signature: _____
Participate in Summer Institute II class mentoring discussion with newly admitted students	Date of activity completion: _____ Faculty's signature: _____

PhD Fac Mtg, June 2013, Accepted

**PhD in Nursing  
Student Learning Outcomes Documentation Form  
Form 5**

**ALL** of the following measures must be successfully completed and documented in the student's file in the Student Affairs Office before graduation:

Student Learning Outcome	Documentations of Outcome Achievement
Mentoring (see rubric)	Date of rubric completion (attach completed rubric): _____  Chair's signature: _____
Comprehensive Examination (see rubric)	Date of rubric completion (attach completed rubric): _____  Chair's signature: _____
Dissertation (see rubric)	Date of rubric completion (attach completed rubric): _____  Chair's signature: _____
Grant Application	Date of submission (attach documentation): _____  Chair's signature: _____
Manuscript Acceptance	Date of acceptance or publication (attach documentation): _____  Chair's signature: _____
Presentation	Date presentation completed (attached documentation): _____  Chair's signature: _____

Signatures:

Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Committee Members: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Form 6

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Comprehensive Examination Rubric- Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**This form is to be used for both the written and oral comprehensive examination. No more than (up to) one check in the “Does Not Meet Expectations” column in any/all Attribute columns constitutes a passing evaluation; more than one check in the “Does Not Meet Expectations” column for any attribute(s) constitutes a failing evaluation.**

*(To be completed by each committee member, and placed in student’s file in the Student Affairs office as formal documentation)*

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectation	Exceeds Expectations
<p>Background/rationale:                      --Demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of literature related to the topic of the student’s nursing research by discussing the background/rationale for the article and how it relates to current literature in the field.                      --Evaluate how effectively the background/rationale in the article supports the hypothesis/research question(s)                      --Rate the strength of the argument for the research question(s) in the article                      --Discuss how the argument could have been strengthened.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are incorrect, incoherent, or flawed.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills.  <input type="checkbox"/> Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited originality.  <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are coherent and clear.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills.  <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates originality.  <input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are superior.  <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills.  <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality.  <input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight.</p>
Comments:			
<p>Theoretical Framework/Conceptual Framework                      --Describe the theoretical framework and/or theoretical underpinnings used in the article/study, including historic and philosophic foundations and paradigmatic underpinnings as appropriate.                      --Discuss other theories that could have been applied.                      --Describe advantages of different possible theoretical approaches.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are incorrect, incoherent, or flawed.  <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are poorly defined.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills.  <input type="checkbox"/> Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited originality.  <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are coherent and clear.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills.  <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates originality.  <input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are superior.  <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills.  <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts.  <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality.  <input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight.</p>
Comments:			

<p>Research Design</p> <p>--Evaluate the research design used in the article (i.e., variable, sample population and sample size).</p> <p>--Discuss the appropriateness of the research design in relation to the research questions/hypotheses.</p> <p>--Discuss the strength of the study design in answering the research questions/hypotheses.</p> <p>--Propose alternative study design(s) to address the research question(s) and additional findings that may have been possible using these alternative study designs.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are incorrect, incoherent, or flawed. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited originality. <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight.	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are coherent and clear. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates originality. <input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight.	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are superior. <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality. <input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight.
<p>Comments:</p>			
<p>Data Analysis and Presentation</p> <p>--Evaluate data analysis used in the article.</p> <p>--Discuss whether results were presented accurately/clearly.</p> <p>--Discuss impact of tables, text and figures; are these consistent/redundant.</p> <p>--Discuss strategies to strengthen the analysis.</p> <p>--Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the interpretation of study findings and make suggestions for improvement.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited originality. <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates originality. <input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight.	<input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality. <input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight.
<p>Comments:</p>			
<p>Implications</p> <p>--Discuss why the study is important.</p> <p>--State how this study advances the science.</p> <p>--Describe study limitations.</p> <p>--Discuss what would need to be done to translate study findings into practice.</p> <p>--Propose the next study for the authors to perform.</p> <p>Place the findings of this study in the context of the field/state of the science.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited originality. <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates originality. <input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight.	<input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality. <input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight.
<p>Comments:</p>			

Quality of Writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is weak. <input type="checkbox"/> Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent. <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is poor. <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is poor.	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is adequate. <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent. <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is logical. <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is adequate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is publication quality. <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical and spelling errors apparent. <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is excellent. <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is excellent.
	Comments:		
Overall quality of presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized. <input type="checkbox"/> Poor presentation. <input type="checkbox"/> Poor communication skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts difficult to read.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly organized. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear presentation. <input type="checkbox"/> Good communication skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts clear.	<input type="checkbox"/> Well organized. <input type="checkbox"/> Professional presentation. <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent communication skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts outstanding.
	Comments:		
Quality of response to questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are incomplete. <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are poorly presented.  <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits lack of knowledge in subject area.  <input type="checkbox"/> Responses do not meet level expected of Ph.D. graduate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are complete. <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are well organized.  <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area.  <input type="checkbox"/> Responses meets level expected of Ph.D. graduate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are eloquent. <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments skillfully presented.  <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area.  <input type="checkbox"/> Responses exceed level expected of Ph.D. graduate.
	Comments:		
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
Overall Comments:			

Faculty Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Student ID#: \_\_\_\_\_

**School of Nursing & Health Studies-Doctoral Program  
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY  
FORM 7**

**REPORT OF RESULTS OF EXAMINATION FOR DOCTORAL STUDENTS**

- Comprehensive Examination
- Dissertation Proposal Defense
- Dissertation Editorial Defense
- Final Dissertation Examination

This is to certify that \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of student) (Date)

passed/failed (Circle one) the above checked Examination/Evaluation for the Ph.D. in  
Nursing\_\_\_\_\_  
(emphasis area)

Comments:

Evaluation\*

Signature (s) (Examining Committee)

	(Chair)
	(Member)
	(Member)
	(Member)
	(Member)

\*Superior, Good, Fair, Inferior (Failed)

If a Final Dissertation Defense Examination or Research Project, please furnish title of thesis/project:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

The Chair of the Examining Committee should submit the original copy of this report to the appropriate office.

Approved 2/26/99 Ph.D. Committee/Reviewed 12/5/06

Copies to:      UMKC Registrar's Office  
                  School of Nursing, Student Services  
                  Advisor; Student

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Student ID#: \_\_\_\_\_

**UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY**  
**School of Nursing & Health Studies-Doctoral Program**  
**Form 8**

To: Chairperson, Institutional Review Board

From: Chairperson, Supervisory Committee/Course Faculty

The undersigned have examined a dissertation proposal or course project entitled:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ presented by

\_\_\_\_\_ (please print or type).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Committee Chairperson (signature) Date

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

All members of a Supervisory Committee sign to indicate unanimous approval of this proposal as required by School of Nursing policy.

\_\_\_\_\_ Approved by Institutional Review Board on Human Experimentation

Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson (signature)

Approved 2/26/99 Ph.D. Committee/Reviewed 12/5/06

Copies to: School of Nursing Student Services  
Advisor  
Student

**PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THESIS OR DISSERTATION  
BY DEGREE CANDIDATE'S SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Form 9**

TO: Dean, School of Graduate Studies

RE: Candidate's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Degree sought: \_\_\_\_\_

The SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE for the degree candidate named above, has reviewed this manuscript and finds it acceptable, pending satisfactory defense by the candidate at the final examination.

The bibliographic reference format approved by the committee for this candidate's work is:

\_\_\_\_\_ Turabian – Parenthetical author/date format

\_\_\_\_\_ Turabian – Numbered list format

\_\_\_\_\_ American Psychological Association (APA) [Approved standard for use by:  
Psychology, School of Education, Conservatory of Music, and School of Nursing]

\_\_\_\_\_ Association of Computing Machinery (ACM) – [CSTP Standard]

\_\_\_\_\_ Journal of the American Medical Association- [Approved standard for School of  
Dentistry]

\_\_\_\_\_ Handbook for Authors of Papers in American Chemical Society Publications –  
[Approved standard for Department of Chemistry, School of Biological Sciences,  
and School of Pharmacy]

\_\_\_\_\_ Council of Biology Editors. CBE Style Manual – [An approved alternative standard  
for School of Biological Sciences. Also an approved style for some students with a  
Pharmacology focus in their research.]

\_\_\_\_\_ ASM Style Manual for Journals and Books – American Society of Microbiology –  
[An approved alternative standard for School of Biological Sciences]

\_\_\_\_\_ Style Manual for Guidance in the Preparation of Papers for Journals Published by  
the American Institute of Physics, 3d ed. New York: AIP, 1978. [Physics students]

\_\_\_\_\_ Chicago Manual of Style [Approved standard for History]

\_\_\_\_\_ AMSPLAIN Double Spaced [Approved standard for Mathematics]

\_\_\_\_\_ Alternate Style Manual: [List alternate source and attach a copy of the guidelines to  
this form]

---

Comments:

Signature of Supervisory Committee Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

Date signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Typed name of Chair \_\_\_\_\_

**Doctoral Dissertation Final Report Form.  
Form 10**

Please go to the following link, complete the form, print, and return to the dissertation chair for signature and their follow up of the form(s) to the School of Graduate Studies. <http://sgs.umkc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Doctoral-Final-Evaluation-form-non-IPhD1.doc>

**Form 11**

**Student Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Dissertation Rubric- Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**This form is to be used for both the written and oral dissertation evaluation. No more than (up to) one check in the “Does Not Meet Expectations” column in any/all Attribute columns constitutes a passing evaluation; more than one check in the “Does Not Meet Expectations” column for any attribute(s) constitutes a failing evaluation.**

*(To be completed by each committee member, and placed in student’s file in the Student Affairs office as formal documentation)*

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectation	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality of science	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are incorrect, incoherent, or flawed. <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are poorly defined. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited originality. <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight.	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are coherent and clear. <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are clear. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates originality. <input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight.	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are superior. <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are well defined. <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality. <input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight.
Comments:			
Contribution to discipline	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of discovery. <input type="checkbox"/> Limited expansion upon previous research. <input type="checkbox"/> Limited theoretical or applied significance. <input type="checkbox"/> Limited publication potential.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence of discovery. <input type="checkbox"/> Builds upon previous research. <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable theoretical or applied significance. <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable publication potential.	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional evidence of discovery. <input type="checkbox"/> Greatly extends previous research. <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional theoretical or applied significance. <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional publication potential.
Comments:			
Quality of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is weak. <input type="checkbox"/> Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent. <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is poor. <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is poor.	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is adequate. <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent. <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is logical. <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is adequate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is publication quality. <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical and spelling errors apparent. <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is excellent. <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is excellent.
Comments:			
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
Overall Comments:			

**Student Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Dissertation Rubric- Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

*(To be completed by each committee member, and placed in student's file in the Student Affairs office as formal documentation)*

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectation	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality of presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized. <input type="checkbox"/> Poor presentation. <input type="checkbox"/> Poor communication skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts difficult to read.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly organized. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear presentation. <input type="checkbox"/> Good communication skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts clear.	<input type="checkbox"/> Well organized. <input type="checkbox"/> Professional presentation. <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent communication skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts outstanding.
Comments:			
Overall breadth of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation unacceptable. <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals critical weaknesses in depth of knowledge in subject matter. <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation does not reflect well developed critical thinking skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is narrow in scope.	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation acceptable. <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals some in depth of knowledge in subject matter. <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals above average critical thinking skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the ability to draw from knowledge in several disciplines.	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation superior. <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals exceptional in depth of knowledge in subject matter. <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals well developed critical thinking skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple disciplines.
Comments:			
Quality of response to questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are incomplete. <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are poorly presented. <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits lack of knowledge in subject area. <input type="checkbox"/> Responses do not meet level expected of Ph.D. graduate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are complete. <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are well organized. <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area. <input type="checkbox"/> Responses meets level expected of Ph.D. graduate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are eloquent. <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments skillfully presented. <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area. <input type="checkbox"/> Responses exceed level expected of Ph.D. graduate.
Comments:			
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
Overall Comments:			

Faculty Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI – KANSAS CITY  
**School of Nursing & Health Studies**  
**Form 12**  
**DOCTORAL DEGREE PROGRAM OF STUDY**

In consultation with the Supervisory Committee, the student should initiate this application, secure the approvals indicated below, and present the original to the School of Nursing & Health Studies Student Services Office. Once approved, the original will be sent to the School of Graduate Studies and copies sent to the student and faculty advisor.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Name (Printed or Typed)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Student Identification Number

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Current Address

\_\_\_\_\_  
 PhD  
 Degree Sought

\_\_\_\_\_  
 City, State

\_\_\_\_\_  
 ZIP Code

If you have received a Master's or other advanced degree from an accredited university, please list below the degree title (M.S., M.A., etc); the total semester credit hours required for the degree(s), where taken, and date of degree awarded (to be verified by the Supervisory Committee; See attached transcript).

Degree Title	Total Degree Hrs. Required	Institution	Date Received

List below all the courses proposed for your doctoral degree program over and above the courses taken for the degree(s) listed above. At least 60% of the total number of hours taken at UMKC applicable toward this degree program must be at the 500 or higher level. No more than one half of all Post-Baccalaureate work may be taken from another university.

Number	Title	Hours	Grade	Number	Title	Hours	Grade
N5603	Research Institute I	2					
N5604	Research Institute II	2					
N5608	Theory Development I	3					
N5610	Theory Development II	3					
N5612	Statistics I	3					
N5622	Statistics II	3					
N5668	Quantitative Research	3					
N5670	Qualitative Research Methods	3					
N5662	Psychometrics	3					
N5631	State of the Science	3					
N5664	Epidemiology	3					
N5666	Designing Research	3					
					500 Level		
					Total		

REQUIREMENTS	DATE COMPLETED
Residency Requirement: Successful completion of a minimum of 21 credit hours, exclusive of dissertation research, in no more than 18 months:  _____ _____	_____ _____
Comprehensive Examination:  _____	_____
Dissertation Title _____ _____	
Final Dissertation Examination Date: _____	_____
Attach Completed Copy of PhD in Nursing Form 5, Student Learning Outcomes Documentation Form	_____

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS	APPROVALS	
	SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE	
	Chairperson	Date
		Date
		Date
		Date
		Date
	DEAN School of Nursing	Date
_____ Student's Signature		Date

Approved Ph.D. Committee/Approved 2/26/99/Reviewed 2/8/12

Copies to:      UMKC Registrar's Office  
School of Nursing & Health Studies Student Services  
Advisor & Student

