

MEngr/MS/PhD Project/Defense Presentation and Report/Thesis/Dissertation Evaluation Form

Student: _____

Date: _____

Evaluators: _____
(committee members)

Evaluation Instructions:

- Complete the **Defense Presentation Rubric** on page 2, checking either MEngr MS, or PhD at the top.
- Complete the **Manuscript Rubric** on page 3, checking either: MEngr, MS, or PhD at the top.
- Both rubrics are to be used for MEngr, MS, and PhD students with expected performance expectations:
 - MEngr students are expected to perform over the range of Competent/Proficient/Master (2-4).
 - MS students are expected to perform over the range of Competent/Proficient/Master (2-4).
 - PhD students are expected to perform over the range of Proficient/Master/Expert (3-5).

Some students may perform outside of these ranges. If a MEngr student is not required to submit a written report, the manuscript rubric may be completed based on the written presentation content (slides).

- The rubrics on this form should be completed by the Major Professor with committee agreement.
- In case of disagreement, a committee member may fill out a separate form.

Notes/Comments:

Defense Presentation Rubric: MEngr Project *or* MS Thesis *or* PhD Dissertation

<i>Competency</i>	Novice 1	Competent 2	Proficient 3	Master 4	Expert 5	Sub-Score
Organization and Language 12%	Fails to recognize audience and purpose Poorly organized with poor or sporadic detail. Distracting grammar and spelling errors.	Some effort to target audience and purpose. Minimally organized with marginal detail. Acceptable grammar & some spelling errors.	Audience and purpose clearly understood. Moderately organized with appropriate detail. Solid grammar & minimal spelling errors.	Constructed for audience and purpose. Well-organized with insightful detail. Good grammar and sparse spelling errors.	Tailor-made for audience and purpose. Thoroughly organized with astute detail. Excellent grammar and no spelling errors.	
Background and Motivation 14%	Incomplete description of problem and previous work. Insufficient argument for research significance.	Reasonable description of problem and previous work. Obscure argument for research significance.	Suitable description of research and previous work. Clear argument for research significance.	Good description of research and previous work. Strong, clear argument for research significance.	Insightful description of problem and previous work. Convincing argument for research significance.	
Research Methods 16%	Contribution unclear and/or un-differentiable from previous work. Inadequate derivation of research design & theory. Poor description of equipment & procedures.	Contribution is obscure and difficult to differentiate from previous work. Incomplete derivation of research design & theory. Adequate description of equipment & procedures.	Contribution sufficiently defined and differentiated from previous work. Coherent derivation of research design & theory. Appropriate description of equipment & procedures.	Notable contribution, clearly differentiated from previous work. Rigorous derivation of research design & theory. Good description of equipment & procedures.	Considerable contribution, easily differentiated from previous work. Eloquent derivation of research design & theory. Insightful description of equipment & procedures.	
Research Results and Conclusions 16%	Novelty, significance, and impact of results unclear. Methods and/or hypotheses poorly validated. Conclusions unclear from analysis of results.	Novelty, significance, and impact of results are vague. Methods and/or hypotheses sufficiently validated. Conclusions backed by analysis of results.	Novelty, significance, and impact of results conveyed. Methods and/or hypotheses clearly validated. Conclusions supported by analysis of results.	Novelty, significance, and impact well conveyed. Methods and/or hypotheses strongly validated. Conclusions corroborated by analysis of results.	Novelty, significance, and impact expertly conveyed. Methods and/or hypotheses convincingly validated. Conclusions verified by analysis of results.	
Mastery of Topic 16%	Incomplete understanding of research & presented work. Unsatisfying responses to questions and comments.	Competent understanding of research & presented work. Reasonable responses to questions and comments.	Solid understanding of research & presented work. Knowledgeable responses to questions and comments.	Adept understanding of research & presented work. Proficient responses to questions and comments.	Expert understanding of research & presented work. Skillful responses to questions and comments.	
Visual Aids 14%	Insufficient pictures, plots, figures, and tables. Visualizations inhibit communication of research.	Appropriate pictures, plots, figures, and tables. Visualizations enable communication of research.	Descriptive pictures, plots, figures, and tables. Visualizations serve communication of research.	Informative, quality pictures, plots, figures, and tables. Visualizations aid in communicating research.	Illuminating pictures, plots, figures, and tables. Visualizations enhance communication of research.	
Delivery Style 12%	Poor, distracting articulation, insufficient descriptors. Presentation style limits communication of research.	Rudimentary articulation, adequate descriptors. Presentation style permits communication of research.	Adaptive articulation, appropriate descriptors. Presentation style serves communication of research.	Illustrative articulation, strong descriptors. Presentation style supports communication of research.	Eloquent articulation, excellent descriptors. Presentation style optimizes communication of research.	

Notes/Comments:

Manuscript Rubric: MEngr Project *or* MS Thesis *or* PhD Dissertation

<i>Competency</i>	Novice 1	Competent 2	Proficient 3	Master 4	Expert 5	Sub-Score
Abstract 12%	Poor, confusing summary of significance & methods. Results unclear, main conclusions poorly explained.	Summarizes significance and methods. Presents results with clear conclusions.	Efficient summary of significance and methods. Effectively summarizes results and main conclusions.	Good, clear summary of methods and significance. Strong summary of results and significant conclusions.	Captivating and strong summary of methods and significance. Excellent summary of results and main conclusions.	
Introduction 14%	Appropriate review of previous work with limitations identified. Unclear argument for importance of research. Goals and scope of work obscure.	Acceptable review of previous work with limitations identified. Sufficient argument for importance of research. Goals and scope of work adequately stated.	Descriptive review of previous work with limitations identified. Clear, sufficient argument for importance of research. Goals and scope of work precisely stated.	Good review of previous work with limitations identified. Convincing argument for importance of research. Goals and scope of work effectively defined.	Insightful review of previous work with limitations identified. Incontrovertible argument for importance of research. Goals and scope of work excellently elucidated.	
Research Methods 16%	Insufficient theoretical analysis & mathematical detail, poor use of figures/diagrams/images. Out-of-date equipment, procedures, and data collection. Author contributions unclear.	Adequate theoretical analysis & mathematical detail, appropriate use of figures/diagrams/images. Appropriate equipment, procedures, and data collection. Author contributions implied.	Proficient theoretical analysis & mathematical detail, good use of figures/diagrams/images. Advanced equipment, procedures, and data collection. Author contributions indicated.	Strong theoretical analysis & mathematical detail, strong use of figures/diagrams/images. State-of-the-art equipment, procedures, and data collection. Strong contributions signified.	Cutting-edge theory, analysis & mathematical detail, excellent use of figures/diagrams/images. State-of-the-art equipment, procedures, and data collection. Great contributions signified.	
Research Results 16%	Results validate methods and/or confirm hypotheses. Low-quality, insufficient plots, figures, and visualizations. Applies deficient statistical tools & analysis, unclear description of features of the results.	Results corroborate methods and/or confirm hypotheses. Appropriate plots, figures, and visualizations. Applies reasonable statistical tools & analysis, describes features of the results.	Results confirm methods and/or hypotheses. Good plots, figures, and visualizations. Applies modern statistical tools & analysis, presents significant features of the results.	Results validate methods and/or confirm hypotheses. High-quality plots, figures, and visualizations. Applies advanced statistical tools & analysis, highlights important features.	Results affirm methods and/or confirm hypotheses. Excellent, illuminating plots, figures, and visualizations. Applies innovative statistical tools & analysis, summarizes important features.	
Discussion and Conclusions 16%	Goals & scope not considered in discussion of results. Borderline conclusions with undefined limitations. Significance within field vague, suggested future work unclear.	Discussion of results consider goals & scope of work. Appropriate conclusions with some limitations mentioned. Defines significance within field, suggests future work.	Results interpreted in context of goals and scope of work. Logical conclusions with defined limitations. Explains significance within field, points to future work.	Results effectively evaluated in context of goals and scope. Compelling conclusions with clearly defined limitations. Significance strongly explained, future work directions outlined.	Results expertly evaluated in context of goals and scope. Indisputable conclusions with well-defined limitations. Significance expounded; future directions specified.	
Originality and Significance 14%	Insufficient theory, design, approach, or application. Negligible impact expected. Publication or IP not produced nor anticipated.	Sufficient theory, design, approach, or application. Minimal impact expected. Low-impact publication produced or anticipated.	Strong theory, design, approach, or application. Targeted impact expected. Publication and/or IP produced or anticipated.	State-of-the art theory, design, approach, or application. Significant impact expected. Significant publication(s) or IP produced or anticipated.	Innovative theory, design, approach, or application. Broad impact expected. Consequential publication(s) or IP produced or anticipated.	
Style and Mechanics 12%	Unclear, wordy, difficult to read & understand. Distracting grammar/spelling errors, poor use of voice and verb tense.	Reasonably clear and concise, some effort to read/understand. Some grammar/spelling errors, acceptable use of voice and verb tense.	Clear and concise, easy to read & understand. Minimal grammar/spelling errors, appropriate use of voice and verb tense.	Well-written, concise, easy to read & understand. Scarce grammar/spelling errors, good use of voice and verb tense.	Eloquent, concise, pleasure to read & understand. Absent of grammar/spelling errors, excellent use of voice and verb tense.	

Notes/Comments: