

**Rubric for Evaluating Thesis/Dissertation Proposal and Defense**

*Page 1 should be completed by the Exam Office or committee chairman prior to distribution to committee*

**Chair of Evaluation Committee:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Supervisor:** \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Circle One:** Master's Thesis Proposal

Master's Thesis Defense

PhD Proposal

PhD Dissertation Defense

**Thesis/Dissertation Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Committee Members (include department/designation):**

Name	Designation	Department

At the conclusion of the presentation/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. **Confidential Comment** sections at the bottom of the rubric are provided for explanations of the reasoning behind the overall evaluation of the examinee's performance if desired. Completed forms are to be treated as **confidential** and are to be **turned in to the Director of Graduate Studies**, not the student.

A summary of **written comments** from the committee members **WILL** be provided to the student by the chair of the examining committee. A verbal summary of the overall evaluation of the student's performance **WILL** also be provided to the student by that individual.

All examination documents (rubrics and written comments) must be completed regardless of the outcome of the presentation or defense.

A copy of the completed forms (both rubrics and written comments) must be sent to the \_\_\_\_\_ within 48 hours of the conclusion of the Master's or Doctorate proposal presentation or defense.

**To be completed by each committee member. Please check boxes for all evaluation criteria you feel are appropriate within each attribute category.**

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality presentation  <input type="checkbox"/> Attribute not applicable	<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
Overall breadth of knowledge  <input type="checkbox"/> Attribute not applicable	<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 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 depth of subject knowledge <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
Quality of response to questions  <input type="checkbox"/> Attribute not applicable	<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 a (Master's / 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 meet level expected of a (Master's / Ph.D.) graduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are eloquent <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are skillfully presented <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses exceed level expected of a (Master's / Ph.D.) graduate
Use of communication aids  <input type="checkbox"/> Attribute not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Communication aids are poorly prepared <input type="checkbox"/> Too much information included <input type="checkbox"/> Listeners are confused <input type="checkbox"/> Communication aids are used inappropriately	<input type="checkbox"/> Communication aids contribute to the quality of the presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate information is included <input type="checkbox"/> Listeners can easily follow the presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Some material is not supported by communication aids	<input type="checkbox"/> Communication aids enhance the presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Details are minimized so major points stand out <input type="checkbox"/> Information is organized to maximize audience understanding <input type="checkbox"/> Reliance on communication aids is minimal

**Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Summary of written comments from ALL committee members for student concerning performance on proposal presentation / defense:**


Scale (5=Best, 1=bad)

<u>Content</u>	<u>Scale 1-5</u>
Professional and confident (Max 05)	
Engaged with audience (Max 05)	
Clear voice with good pace (Max 05)	
Command of language (Max 05)	
Response to questions (Max 05)	
Comments on Delivery (if any)	
Total Marks	

(Please initial any one appropriate box)

Proposal is recommended without any change.

Proposal is recommended with minor changes (can be verified by Supervisor)

Proposal is recommended with Major changes (to be verified by Supervisor/ Examiner)

I am not convinced and do not recommend the Proposal

Examiner Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_