

Rubric for Evaluating MS Thesis

(This page should be filled out by the student or Committee Chairman/advisor prior to distribution to Committee)
(Version September 25, 2012)

Student _____ Date of Defense _____

Advisor _____ Date of Enrollment in Program: _____

Thesis Title _____

Committee Members and Department

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

- At the conclusion of the defense, **each committee member should fill out the response sheet**. For each attribute which a committee member feels is somewhat or very deficient, a short explanation should be provided. Since completed forms are to be treated as **confidential**, they are to be **turned in to the Committee Chair (advisor)**, not the student.
- This document should be completed, even if the committee feels that the thesis is unacceptable.
- A copy of the thesis abstract and conclusions, as well as copies of all journal publications or referred conference proceedings that have already resulted from the thesis work, must accompany these evaluation forms. All materials must be sent to Nick Mance, 306 CNBIO, 300 Technology Drive.
- Student has accepted a position at _____ or will continue on for a PhD at _____ (if student has yet to accept a position, please leave blank). Indicate whether student has or intends to apply (yes no) and/or has been accepted (yes no) to a PhD program or medical school.

MS Thesis Response Sheet

(one for each committee member – **circle chosen response** and return directly and confidentially to the student’s advisor or the Chair of the Bioengineering Graduate Committee)

Attribute	Very Deficient	Somewhat Deficient	Acceptable	Very Good	Outstanding
Quality of thesis	Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of theses.	Acceptable, but disappointing (75 th to 90 th percentile of theses.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable (25th to 75th percentile of theses.) Extensions possible, but may require more work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Among 10th to 25th percentile of theses; Provides opportunities for additional, fruitful PhD research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Among top 10% of theses. Student will be able to further extend; Solid basis for PhD dissertation
Contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires committee to stretch to find originality. Closer to BS than MS work. 	Shows a little originality, but mostly very pedantic and plodding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates originality Makes limited contributions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original, creative work; At least one good contribution for an MS thesis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original and creative. Several important contributions for an MS thesis.
Publications and potential publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At best an un-refereed abstract or conference proceeding. Nothing has been submitted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No papers submitted Could be a refereed abstract or conference proceeding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one abstract or conference proceeding Should be able to publish a paper from work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one abstract or conference proceedings One good publication submitted or accepted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One or more papers accepted or published in a <u>leading journal</u>

Attribute	Very Deficient	Somewhat Deficient	Acceptable	Very Good	Outstanding
Quality of writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires a professional editor Sentence structure, language and style deficient. Major revisions required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing is weak A number of typos, grammatical and spelling errors. A number of changes required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable (25th to 75th percentile). Limited number of typos (grammatical errors and spelling). Some normal changes necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very well written; Easy to read and understand Very few changes or additions required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reads like an outstanding publication. No typos, grammatical or spelling errors. No revisions or changes; acceptable as is.
Defense (Oral Presentation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very poorly organized. Disjointed presentation. Unable to answer a number of questions. Slides and handouts of very poor quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not well organized; Rambled; dwelt too long on less important aspects Had difficulty with questions. Some slides and handouts difficult to read Typos and other errors in slides. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable – slides and handouts clear Good presentation skills Able to answer most questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well thought out slides and handouts. Professional presentation Almost all questions addressed in a professional manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well organized, very professional, All questions addressed in a knowledgeable and respectable manner. Slides and handouts outstanding.
Other – explain					

Comments and reasons for any noted deficiencies:
(9/25/2012)