

BIOL 7950– Final Research Seminar

To the Evaluator: This seminar course is strictly a Departmental requirement (not Graduate School), however the evaluation is very important to the student. Evaluations are given by the student's advisory committee and grade (S/U) is based upon the majority decision. Please complete both sides of this form during and/or immediately after the seminar presentation, and return to the Major Advisor or the Graduate Program Office (Funchess 331).
Your comments will be distributed to the student and the student's advisor to provide feedback

Date: _____ Student Name: _____

1. Please comment on the following. If you wish, use scale of 1-5 (1 - Excellent, 5 - Poor)

Introductory Remark:

Definition of the research problem and the context/contribution of this work to the published body of literature in this area:

Presentation of methods:

Presentation of results:

Presentation of conclusions:

Delivery:

Visual aids:

Relevancy of the content of the talk:

Overall Clarity:

2. Suggestions for improvement (Please expand on the reverse side as necessary):
3. Other comments (Please expand on the reverse side as necessary):
4. FINAL GRADE: This seminar course is strictly a departmental requirement. Grading is strictly Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory (S/U)
What grade would you give this student?
Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory _____
Please return this evaluation form to the Major Advisor or Graduate Office (Funchess 331)
Thank you for your time and effort

Student Name _____ MS _____ PhD proposal _____ PhD defense _____

	Meets Expectations (3)			Exceeds Expectation (4)		Exemplary (5)	
	Unacceptable (1)	Fair (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectation (4)	Exemplary (5)	Score	
Introduction/Background	No introduction or background	Present but not clear or informative	Provided basic intro. & background info. related to the project	Intro & background were relevant and identified the place and significance of the current project within a larger field of study	Provided unique insight, relevance, and exceptional clarity introducing project and its place and significance within a field of study		
Research Question (RQ)/ Objectives/ Hypothesis	No hypothesis/RQ given or was exceptionally weak	Hypothesis/RQ was not clear or well-constructed	Hypothesis/RQ was clearly presented and well-constructed	Hypothesis/RQ was clear, well-constructed, and provided insight into the rationale for the project	Hypothesis/RQ was clear, well-constructed, and the student effectively argued that it addressed a pressing question in the field		
Explanation of Methodology/ strategy	Not or poorly explained	Explained, but seemed inadequate for the study goals/purpose	Adequate and clearly explained	Appropriate, clear, and well-connected to the hypothesis/RQ /objectives	Appropriate, clear, well-connected to the hypothesis/RQ/objectives, and showed exceptionally creative and/or meticulous investigation		
Presentation and Interpretation of Results/Conclusions	Results/conclusions not presented	Results/conclusions presented, but unclear or not fully developed	Results clearly presented, conclusions clearly flow from results and relate back to hypothesis/RQ/objectives	Results clearly presented, discussion hits major points and nuanced interpretations, conclusions clearly flow from results and relate back to hypothesis/RQ/objectives	Results clearly presented, discussion hits major points and nuanced interpretations, conclusions clearly flow from results and relate back to hypothesis/RQ/objectives, exceptionally clear take-home message		
Overall Design and Use of Images/Text	Disorganized and hard to follow. Images and/or text unreadable or detracts. Uses slides with too much text. Gross spelling/grammatical errors. Relies heavily on slides and notes	Adequate organization, but somewhat hard to follow. Images did not add or detract from effectiveness. Some spelling/grammatical errors.	Well organized. Images added to the understanding. Text easily readable. Appropriate image size and amount of text.	Attractive formatting. Organization and images added in understanding and provided clarity. Appropriate, well-written, and helpful text.	Professional appearance and organization. Images and text arrangement exceptionally well done and greatly enhanced understanding		
Verbal Delivery and Engagement with the Audience	Did not engage audience; movements, expression detracted from the presentation	Delivery & expression did not add or take away from the presentation. Didn't engage audience.	Verbal delivery added to presentation. Engaged audience. Made good eye contact	Delivery, movement, & expression emphasized key points. Developed rapport with audience.	Movement and expression conveyed poise and enthusiasm while explaining the project. Audience well engaged.		
Demonstration of Value/Significance of the Topic	Student understanding was not evident, did not explain the significance of the topic	Communicated minimal understanding of project significance	Illustrated clear understanding; argued the topic was important	Illustrated unique understanding; persuaded listener that project filled a need in the field	Illustrated exceptional understanding, persuaded the listener of critical significance of the project		
Answers to Questions	Unable to address questions	Able to partially address some of the questions	Able to address most of the questions	Answers added to and extended the topics discussed	Answers showed exceptional insight into the field		

Reviewer Name _____

Graduate Student Thesis Rubric

Student name _____

M.S
 Ph.D

Date _____

Very deficient → Acceptable → Outstanding

	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of dissertation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contribution to scientific literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall quality of science	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Introduction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Literature review	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Writing quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Number of scientific publications from _____

Comments:

Graduate Student Oral Exam Rubric

Student _____

Date _____

- MS defense seminar
 PhD prelim
 PhD defense seminar

Very deficient → Acceptable → Outstanding

1 2 3 4 5

Overall Quality of Science

(check one box per line)

Coherence and clarity of scientific arguments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(for thesis students only) Clarity of scientific objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of originality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall Depth and Breadth of Knowledge

Understanding subject matter (for thesis) and literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Critical thinking skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Knowledge in multiple disciplines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Quality of Communication Skills

Completeness of responses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Organization and presentation of arguments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Confidence in communication skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Responses meet level expected of student (MS or PhD)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

BIOL 7950– Final Research Seminar

To the Evaluator: This seminar course is strictly a Departmental requirement (not Graduate School), however the evaluation is very important to the student. Evaluations are given by the student's advisory committee and grade (S/U) is based upon the majority decision. Please complete both sides of this form during and/or immediately after the seminar presentation, and return to the Major Advisor or the Graduate Program Office (Funchess 331).
Your comments will be distributed to the student and the student's advisor to provide feedback

Date: _____ Student Name: _____

1. Please comment on the following. If you wish, use scale of 1-5 (1 - Excellent, 5 - Poor)

Introductory Remark:

Definition of the research problem and the context/contribution of this work to the published body of literature in this area:

Presentation of methods:

Presentation of results:

Presentation of conclusions:

Delivery:

Visual aids:

Relevancy of the content of the talk:

Overall Clarity:

2. Suggestions for improvement (Please expand on the reverse side as necessary):
3. Other comments (Please expand on the reverse side as necessary):
4. FINAL GRADE: This seminar course is strictly a departmental requirement. Grading is strictly Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory (S/U)
What grade would you give this student?
Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory _____
Please return this evaluation form to the Major Advisor or Graduate Office (Funchess 331)
Thank you for your time and effort

Student Name _____ MS _____ PhD proposal _____ PhD defense _____

	Unacceptable (1)	Fair (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectation (4)	Exemplary (5)	Score
Introduction/ Background	No introduction or background	Present but not clear or informative	Provided basic intro. & background info. related to the project	Intro & background were relevant and identified the place and significance of the current project within a larger field of study	Provided unique insight, relevance, and exceptional clarity introducing project and its place and significance within a field of study	
Research Question (RQ)/ Objectives/ Hypothesis	No hypothesis/RQ given or was exceptionally weak	Hypothesis/RQ was not clear or well-constructed	Hypothesis/RQ was clearly presented and well-constructed	Hypothesis/RQ was clear, well-constructed, and provided insight into the rationale for the project	Hypothesis/RQ was clear, well-constructed, and the student effectively argued that it addressed a pressing question in the field	
Explanation of Methodology/ strategy	Not or poorly explained	Explained, but seemed inadequate for the study goals/purpose	Adequate and clearly explained	Appropriate, clear, and well-connected to the hypothesis/RQ	Appropriate, clear, well-connected to the hypothesis/RQ/objectives, and showed exceptionally creative and/or meticulous investigation	
Presentation and Interpretation of Results/Conclusions	Results/conclusions not presented	Results/conclusions presented, but unclear or not fully developed	Results clearly presented, conclusions clearly flow from results and relate back to hypothesis/RQ/objectives	Results clearly presented, discussion hits major points and nuanced interpretations, conclusions clearly flow from results and relate back to hypothesis/RQ/objectives	Results clearly presented, discussion hits major points and nuanced interpretations, conclusions clearly flow from results and relate back to hypothesis/RQ/objectives, exceptionally clear take-home message	
Overall Design and Use of Images/Text	Disorganized and hard to follow. Images and/or text unreadable or detracts. Uses slides with too much text. Gross spelling/grammatical errors. Relies heavily on slides and notes	Adequate organization, but somewhat hard to follow. Images did not add or detract from effectiveness. Some spelling/grammatical errors.	Well organized. Images added to the understanding. Text easily readable. Appropriate image size and amount of text.	Attractive formatting. Organization and images added in understanding and provided clarity. Appropriate, well-written, and helpful text.	Professional appearance and organization. Images and text arrangement exceptionally well done and greatly enhanced understanding	
Verbal Delivery and Engagement with the Audience	Did not engage audience; movements, expression detracted from the presentation	Delivery & expression did not add or take away from the presentation. Didn't engage audience.	Verbal delivery added to presentation. Engaged audience. Made good eye contact	Delivery, movement, & expression emphasized key points. Developed rapport with audience.	Movement and expression conveyed poise and enthusiasm while explaining the project. Audience well engaged.	
Demonstration of Value/Significance of the Topic	Student understanding was not evident, did not explain the significance of the topic	Communicated minimal understanding of project significance	Illustrated clear understanding; argued the topic was important	Illustrated unique understanding; persuaded listener that project filled a need in the field	Illustrated exceptional understanding, persuaded the listener of critical significance of the project	
Answers to Questions	Unable to address questions	Able to partially address some of the questions	Able to address most of the questions	Answers added to and extended the topics discussed	Answers showed exceptional insight into the field	

Reviewer Name _____

Graduate Student Thesis Rubric

Student name _____

M.S.
 Ph.D

Date _____

Very deficient → Acceptable → Outstanding

	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of dissertation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contribution to scientific literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall quality of science	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Introduction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Literature review	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Writing quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Number of scientific publications from _____

Comments:

Graduate Student Oral Exam Rubric

Student _____

Date _____

- MS defense seminar
- PhD prelim
- PhD defense seminar

Very deficient → Acceptable → Outstanding

1 2 3 4 5

Overall Quality of Science

(check one box per line)

Coherence and clarity of scientific arguments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(for thesis students only) Clarity of scientific objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of originality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall Depth and Breadth of Knowledge

Understanding subject matter (for thesis) and literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Critical thinking skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Knowledge in multiple disciplines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Quality of Communication Skills

Completeness of responses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Organization and presentation of arguments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Confidence in communication skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Responses meet level expected of student (MS or PhD)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

BIOL 7950– Final Research Seminar

To the Evaluator: This seminar course is strictly a Departmental requirement (not Graduate School), however the evaluation is very important to the student. Evaluations are given by the student's advisory committee and grade (S/U) is based upon the majority decision. Please complete both sides of this form during and/or immediately after the seminar presentation, and return to the Major Advisor or the Graduate Program Office (Funchess 331).
Your comments will be distributed to the student and the student's advisor to provide feedback

Date: _____ Student Name: _____

1. Please comment on the following. If you wish, use scale of 1-5 (1 - Excellent, 5 - Poor)

Introductory Remark:

Definition of the research problem and the context/contribution of this work to the published body of literature in this area:

Presentation of methods:

Presentation of results:

Presentation of conclusions:

Delivery:

Visual aids:

Relevancy of the content of the talk:

Overall Clarity:

2. Suggestions for improvement (Please expand on the reverse side as necessary):
3. Other comments (Please expand on the reverse side as necessary):
4. FINAL GRADE: This seminar course is strictly a departmental requirement. Grading is strictly Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory (S/U)
What grade would you give this student?
Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory _____
Please return this evaluation form to the Major Advisor or Graduate Office (Funchess 331)
Thank you for your time and effort

Student Name _____ MS _____ PhD proposal _____ PhD defense _____

	Meets Expectations (3)			Exceeds Expectation (4)		Exemplary (5)		Score
	Unacceptable (1)	Fair (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectation (4)	Exemplary (5)	Score		
Introduction/Background	No introduction or background	Present but not clear or informative	Provided basic intro. & background info. related to the project	Intro & background were relevant and identified the place and significance of the current project within a larger field of study	Provided unique insight, relevance, and exceptional clarity introducing project and its place and significance within a field of study			
Research Question (RQ)/ Objectives/ Hypothesis	No hypothesis/RQ given or was exceptionally weak	Hypothesis/RQ was not clear or well-constructed	Hypothesis/RQ was clearly presented and well-constructed	Hypothesis/RQ was clear, well-constructed, and provided insight into the rationale for the project	Hypothesis/RQ was clear, well-constructed, and the student effectively argued that it addressed a pressing question in the field			
Explanation of Methodology/strategy	Not or poorly explained	Explained, but seemed inadequate for the study goals/purpose	Adequate and clearly explained	Appropriate, clear, and well-connected to the hypothesis/RQ /objectives	Appropriate, clear, well-connected to the hypothesis/RQ/objectives, and showed exceptionally creative and/or meticulous investigation			
Presentation and Interpretation of Results/Conclusions	Results/conclusions not presented	Results/conclusions presented, but unclear or not fully developed	Results clearly presented, conclusions clearly flow from results and relate back to hypothesis/RQ/objectives	Results clearly presented, discussion hits major points and nuanced interpretations, conclusions clearly flow from results and relate back to hypothesis/RQ/objectives	Results clearly presented, discussion hits major points and nuanced interpretations, conclusions clearly flow from results and relate back to hypothesis/RQ/objectives, exceptionally clear take-home message			
Overall Design and Use of Images/Text	Disorganized and hard to follow. Images and/or text unreadable or detracts. Uses slides with too much text. Gross spelling/grammatical errors. Relies heavily on slides and notes	Adequate organization, but somewhat hard to follow. Images did not add or detract from effectiveness. Some spelling/grammatical errors.	Well organized. Images added to the understanding. Text easily readable. Appropriate image size and amount of text.	Attractive formatting. Organization and images added in understanding and provided clarity. Appropriate, well-written, and helpful text.	Professional appearance and organization. Images and text arrangement exceptionally well done and greatly enhanced understanding			
Verbal Delivery and Engagement with the Audience	Did not engage audience; movements, expression detracted from the presentation	Delivery & expression did not add or take away from the presentation. Didn't engage audience.	Verbal delivery added to presentation. Engaged audience. Made good eye contact	Delivery, movement, & expression emphasized key points. Developed rapport with audience.	Movement and expression conveyed poise and enthusiasm while explaining the project. Audience well engaged.			
Demonstration of Value/Significance of the Topic	Student understanding was not evident, did not explain the significance of the topic	Communicated minimal understanding of project significance	Illustrated clear understanding; argued the topic was important	Illustrated unique understanding; persuaded listener that project filled a need in the field	Illustrated exceptional understanding, persuaded the listener of critical significance of the project			
Answers to Questions	Unable to address questions	Able to partially address some of the questions	Able to address most of the questions	Answers added to and extended the topics discussed	Answers showed exceptional insight into the field			

Reviewer Name _____

Graduate Student Thesis Rubric

Student name _____

M.S.
 Ph.D.

Date _____

Very deficient → Acceptable → Outstanding

	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of dissertation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contribution to scientific literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall quality of science	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Introduction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Literature review	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Writing quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Number of scientific publications from _____

Comments:

Graduate Student Oral Exam Rubric

Student _____

Date _____

- MS defense seminar
 PhD prelim
 PhD defense seminar

Very deficient → Acceptable → Outstanding

1 2 3 4 5

Overall Quality of Science

(check one box per line)

Coherence and clarity of scientific arguments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(for thesis students only) Clarity of scientific objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of originality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall Depth and Breadth of Knowledge

Understanding subject matter (for thesis) and literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Critical thinking skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Knowledge in multiple disciplines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Quality of Communication Skills

Completeness of responses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Organization and presentation of arguments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Confidence in communication skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Responses meet level expected of student (MS or PhD)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

BIOL 7950– Final Research Seminar

To the Evaluator: This seminar course is strictly a Departmental requirement (not Graduate School), however the evaluation is very important to the student. Evaluations are given by the student's advisory committee and grade (S/U) is based upon the majority decision. Please complete both sides of this form during and/or immediately after the seminar presentation, and return to the Major Advisor or the Graduate Program Office (Funchess 331).
Your comments will be distributed to the student and the student's advisor to provide feedback

Date: _____ Student Name: _____

1. Please comment on the following. If you wish, use scale of 1-5 (1 - Excellent, 5 - Poor)

Introductory Remark:

Definition of the research problem and the context/contribution of this work to the published body of literature in this area:

Presentation of methods:

Presentation of results:

Presentation of conclusions:

Delivery:

Visual aids:

Relevancy of the content of the talk:

Overall Clarity:

2. Suggestions for improvement (Please expand on the reverse side as necessary):
3. Other comments (Please expand on the reverse side as necessary):
4. FINAL GRADE: This seminar course is strictly a departmental requirement. Grading is strictly Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory (S/U)
What grade would you give this student?
Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory _____
Please return this evaluation form to the Major Advisor or Graduate Office (Funchess 331)
Thank you for your time and effort

Student Name _____ MS _____ PhD proposal _____ PhD defense _____

	Unacceptable (1)	Fair (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectation (4)	Exemplary (5)	Score
Introduction/ Background	No introduction or background	Present but not clear or informative	Provided basic intro. & background info. related to the project	Intro & background were relevant and identified the place and significance of the current project within a larger field of study	Provided unique insight, relevance, and exceptional clarity introducing project and its place and significance within a field of study	
Research Question (RQ)/ Objectives/ Hypothesis	No hypothesis/RQ given or was exceptionally weak	Hypothesis/RQ was not clear or well-constructed	Hypothesis/RQ was clearly presented and well-constructed	Hypothesis/RQ was clear, well-constructed, and provided insight into the rationale for the project	Hypothesis/RQ was clear, well-constructed, and the student effectively argued that it addressed a pressing question in the field	
Explanation of Methodology/ strategy	Not or poorly explained	Explained, but seemed inadequate for the study goals/purpose	Adequate and clearly explained	Appropriate, clear, and well-connected to the hypothesis/RQ	Appropriate, clear, well-connected to the hypothesis/RQ/objectives, and showed exceptionally creative and/or meticulous investigation	
Presentation and Interpretation of Results/Conclusions	Results/conclusions not presented	Results/conclusions presented, but unclear or not fully developed	Results clearly presented, conclusions clearly flow from results and relate back to hypothesis/RQ/objectives	Results clearly presented, discussion hits major points and nuanced interpretations, conclusions clearly flow from results and relate back to hypothesis/RQ/objectives	Results clearly presented, discussion hits major points and nuanced interpretations, conclusions clearly flow from results and relate back to hypothesis/RQ/objectives, exceptionally clear take-home message	
Overall Design and Use of Images/Text	Disorganized and hard to follow. Images and/or text unreadable or detracts. Uses slides with too much text. Gross spelling/grammatical errors. Relies heavily on slides and notes	Adequate organization, but somewhat hard to follow. Images did not add or detract from effectiveness. Some spelling/grammatical errors.	Well organized. Images added to the understanding. Text easily readable. Appropriate image size and amount of text.	Attractive formatting. Organization and images added in understanding and provided clarity. Appropriate, well-written, and helpful text.	Professional appearance and organization. Images and text arrangement exceptionally well done and greatly enhanced understanding	
Verbal Delivery and Engagement with the Audience	Did not engage audience; movements, expression detracted from the presentation	Delivery & expression did not add or take away from the presentation. Didn't engage audience.	Verbal delivery added to presentation. Engaged audience. Made good eye contact	Delivery, movement, & expression emphasized key points. Developed rapport with audience.	Movement and expression conveyed poise and enthusiasm while explaining the project. Audience well engaged.	
Demonstration of Value/Significance of the Topic	Student understanding was not evident, did not explain the significance of the topic	Communicated minimal understanding of project significance	Illustrated clear understanding; argued the topic was important	Illustrated unique understanding; persuaded listener that project filled a need in the field	Illustrated exceptional understanding, persuaded the listener of critical significance of the project	
Answers to Questions	Unable to address questions	Able to partially address some of the questions	Able to address most of the questions	Answers added to and extended the topics discussed	Answers showed exceptional insight into the field	

Reviewer Name _____

Graduate Student Thesis Rubric

Student name _____

M.S.
 Ph.D.

Date _____

Very deficient → Acceptable → Outstanding

	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of dissertation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contribution to scientific literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall quality of science	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Introduction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Literature review	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Writing quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Number of scientific publications from _____

Comments:

Graduate Student Oral Exam Rubric

Student _____

Date _____

- MS defense seminar
- PhD prelim
- PhD defense seminar

Very deficient → Acceptable → Outstanding

1 2 3 4 5

Overall Quality of Science

(check one box per line)

Coherence and clarity of scientific arguments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(for thesis students only) Clarity of scientific objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of originality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall Depth and Breadth of Knowledge

Understanding subject matter (for thesis) and literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Critical thinking skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Knowledge in multiple disciplines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Quality of Communication Skills

Completeness of responses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Organization and presentation of arguments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Confidence in communication skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Responses meet level expected of student (MS or PhD)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

We are currently evaluating our graduate program in response to the forthcoming SACS review. Our records indicate that you are graduating this term and as such are eligible to participate in our exit survey for graduate students. Below is a questionnaire that requests some basic information about your program. Please take a minute to complete the questionnaire, and mail back to me. Your input is an extremely important part of our evaluation process, and all information is completely confidential. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Mary Mendonça

Graduate Program Officer

**Exit Survey for PhD/MS/MS-NT Students
Department of Biological Sciences**

Student's name: _____ Date: _____

Major advisor: _____

Area of Emphasis: _____

Committee members: _____

Date of graduation: _____

Degree conferred (MST, MST-NT, or PHD): _____

1. New Student Orientation

A. Were you given an opportunity to attend a departmental orientation at the start of your program?
 Yes No Don't recall

Please answer B, C, & D if you attended a departmental orientation at the start of your program.

B. To what extent did the departmental orientation provide you with adequate knowledge of departmental guidelines necessary to complete your program (e.g., describing the advisory committee, plan of study, research proposal, seminar requirement)?

Excellent knowledge base Very Good Good Adequate Poor

C. To what extent did the departmental orientation provide you with adequate knowledge of key departmental and university resources important in completing your program (e.g., library, on-campus funding opportunities, etc.)?

Excellent knowledge base Very Good Good Adequate Poor

D. To what extent did the departmental graduate website supplement the orientation as an additional source of information about departmental guidelines and/or department/university resources that were important to your program?

Excellent supplement Very Good Good Adequate Poor

2. Program (please check most appropriate answer to each question).

A. To what extent did the coursework defining your specific area of research provide you with a fundamental knowledge of your sub discipline?

Excellent knowledge base Very Good Good Adequate Poor

B. To what extent did the general coursework comprising your plan of study (including those courses defining your specific area of emphasis) provide you with an acceptable knowledge of general biology?

Excellent knowledge base Very Good Good Adequate Poor

C. To what extent did the coursework defining your specific area of research provide you with a practical knowledge of applying biology to real world issues or problems?

Excellent knowledge base Very Good Good Adequate Poor

D. To what extent did the coursework comprising your plan of study provide you with practical experience in technical writing?

Excellent training Very Good Good Adequate Poor

E. How many courses comprising your plan of study contained a significant writing component as part of the course evaluation process? _____

F. To what extent did the coursework comprising your plan of study provide you with a practical knowledge in understanding research?

Excellent knowledge base Very Good Good Adequate Poor

G. To what extent did the coursework comprising your plan of study provide you with a practical experience in conducting research?

Excellent knowledge base Very Good Good Adequate Poor

H. Did you take any graduate seminar (discussion) courses as part of your plan of study?

No Yes (if yes, please list the number of seminar courses taken _____)

3. Final Exam (check most appropriate answer to each question):

A. Were you given a formal written and oral examination at the end of your program?

- Oral and written exam
 Oral Exam only
 Written exam only
 No formal exam

B. Were you asked to demonstrate a mastery of fundamental knowledge of your research sub-discipline at your final exam?

Yes: No: Unknown: N/A:

C. Was the final exam useful in integrating the fundamental aspects of your program as defined by your coursework and/or your research dissertation experience?

Extremely useful Highly useful Somewhat useful Not useful

D. Were you asked to demonstrate some level of knowledge of general biology at your final exam, outside of your research sub-discipline?

Yes: No: Unknown: N/A:

4. Career Status and General Program Evaluation (check most appropriate answer to each question).

A. What is your current job status?

- Job in chosen biological field if so list: _____
 Searching for job in chosen biological field
 Job in non-chosen biological field list: _____
 Job in non-biological or science field, if so list: _____
 Post-doctoral appointment, if so list: _____
 Post-graduate professional school (e.g., Med/vet school) _____
 Other (please indicate): _____
 PhD at University: _____

B. Would you recommend the Auburn University **Biological Science** _____ program to another student?

Yes No

Other comments:

SACS Questionnaire for DBS Faculty

Your name: _____

Name of your graduate student: _____

Date of graduation: _____

Degree conferred (MST, MST-NT, or PHD): _____

I. Please answer this section if the student graduated from the PhD program:

1) Did the student's thesis/dissertation contain an acceptable general literature review section of their sub discipline, as certified by the student's advisory committee?

Yes: _____ No: _____ Unknown: _____ N/A: _____

2) Did the student demonstrate a mastery of fundamental knowledge of their sub discipline at their oral defense exam, as certified by the student's advisory committee?

Yes: _____ No: _____ Unknown: _____ N/A: _____

3) Did the student demonstrate a satisfactory understanding of how their research can be applied toward understanding and solving real-world problems, as certified by the student's advisory committee?

Yes: _____ No: _____ Unknown: _____ N/A: _____

4) Has the student published or submitted for publication their thesis/dissertation in peer-reviewed journals or other scholarly outlets? (Respond to all categories that apply, and include the appropriate publication information in the space indicated).

___ Yes, in peer-reviewed journals (if yes, complete the following):

No. of papers: _____ Journals: _____

___ Yes, in non-peer reviewed journals (if yes, complete the following):

No. of papers: _____ Journals: _____

___ No publications yet, but planned in future (if yes, give no. of publications)

___ No publications are planned

___ Unknown

5) Where is the student now? (check the appropriate line below and complete the information to the right, if applicable)

___ Job in chosen biological field. Position (complete, if known): _____

___ Searching for job in chosen biological field

___ Job in non-chosen biological field. Position: _____

___ Job in non-biological or science field. Position: _____

___ Post-doctoral position (i.e., for AU-Ph.D. graduates). Position: _____

___ Ph.D. position (i.e., for AU-MST graduates). Position: _____

___ Unknown