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)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Very Deficient</th>
<th>Somewhat Deficient</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Quality of thesis          | Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of theses.                              | Acceptable, but disappointing (75th to 90th percentile of theses.)           | • Acceptable (25th to 75th percentile of theses;  
  • Extensions possible, but may require more work. | • Among 10th to 25th percentile of theses;  
  • Provides opportunities for additional, fruitful PhD research.   | • Among top 10% of theses.  
  • Student will be able to further extend;  
  • Solid basis for PhD dissertation |
| Contributions              | • Requires committee to stretch to find originality.  
  • Closer to BS than MS work.                                                   | Shows a little originality, but mostly very pedantic and plodding           | • Demonstrates originality  
  • Makes limited contributions                                                  | • Original, creative work;  
  • At least one good contribution for an MS thesis.                            | • Original and creative.  
  • Several important contributions for an MS thesis.                           |
| Publications and potential publications | • At best an un-refereed abstract or conference proceeding.  
  • Nothing has been submitted.                                                 | • No papers submitted  
  • Could be a refereed abstract or conference proceeding.                       | • At least one abstract or conference proceeding  
  • Should be able to publish a paper from work.                                 | • At least one abstract or conference proceedings  
  • One good publication submitted or accepted.                                 | • One or more papers accepted or published in a leading journal               |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Very Deficient</th>
<th>Somewhat Deficient</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of writing</td>
<td>• Requires a professional editor</td>
<td>• Writing is weak</td>
<td>• Acceptable (25th to 75th percentile).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sentence structure, language and style deficient.</td>
<td>• A number of typos, grammatical and spelling errors.</td>
<td>• Limited number of typos (grammatical errors and spelling).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Major revisions required</td>
<td>• A number of changes required.</td>
<td>• Some normal changes necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense (Oral Presentation)</td>
<td>• Very poorly organized.</td>
<td>• Not well organized;</td>
<td>• Acceptable – slides and handouts clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disjointed presentation.</td>
<td>• Rambled; dwelt too long on less important aspects</td>
<td>• Good presentation skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unable to answer a number of questions.</td>
<td>• Had difficulty with questions.</td>
<td>• Able to answer most questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Slides and handouts of very poor quality</td>
<td>• Some slides and handouts difficult to read</td>
<td>• Well thought out slides and handouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Typos and other errors in slides.</td>
<td>• Professional presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Almost all questions addressed in a professional manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Slides and handouts outstanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – explain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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