

BIOL 8950 - First Seminar for Doctoral Students

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 the grade (S/U) is based upon the majority decision. Please complete this form during and/or immediately after the seminar presentation, and return to the Major Advisor or the Graduate Office (Funchess 331). Your comments will be distributed to the student and the student's advisor to provide feedback.

Date _____ / _____ / _____ Student Name _____

I. Please comment on the following. If you wish, use a scale of 1-5. (1 = excellent, 5 = poor)

Definition of the problem:

Presentation of previous research in the area, including 1) the student's contribution or/and 2) contribution of others in the field:

Creativity:

Presentation of student's preliminary results (if applicable):

Delivery:

Visual aids:

Overall clarity:

Fielding questions:

II. Suggestions for improvement:

III. Other comments:

IV. 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 or 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)		
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 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 8950 - First Seminar for Doctoral Students

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 the grade (S/U) is based upon the majority decision. Please complete this form during and/or immediately after the seminar presentation, and return to the Major Advisor or the Graduate Office (Funchess 331). Your comments will be distributed to the student and the student's advisor to provide feedback.

Date _____ / _____ / _____ Student Name _____

I. Please comment on the following. If you wish, use a scale of 1-5. (1 - excellent, 5 = poor)

Definition of the problem:

Presentation of previous research in the area, including 1) the student's contribution or/and 2) contribution of others in the field:

Creativity:

Presentation of student's preliminary results (if applicable):

Delivery:

Visual aids:

Overall clarity:

Fielding questions:

II. Suggestions for improvement:

III. Other comments:

IV. **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 or 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/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 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 8950 - First Seminar for Doctoral Students

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 the grade (S/U) is based upon the majority decision. Please complete this form during and/or immediately after the seminar presentation, and return to the Major Advisor or the Graduate Office (Funchess 331). Your comments will be distributed to the student and the student's advisor to provide feedback .

Date _____/_____/_____ Student Name _____

I. Please comment on the following. If you wish, use a scale of 1-5. (1 – excellent, 5 = poor)

Definition of the problem:

Presentation of previous research in the area, including 1) the student's contribution or/and 2) contribution of others in the field:

Creativity:

Presentation of student's preliminary results (if applicable):

Delivery:

Visual aids:

Overall clarity:

Fielding questions:

II. Suggestions for improvement:

III. Other comments:

IV. **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 or 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/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 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 8950 - First Seminar for Doctoral Students

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 the grade (S/U) is based upon the majority decision. Please complete this form during and/or immediately after the seminar presentation, and return to the Major Advisor or the Graduate Office (Funchess 331). Your comments will be distributed to the student and the student's advisor to provide feedback .

Date _____/_____/_____ Student Name _____

I. Please comment on the following. If you wish, use a scale of 1-5. (1 – excellent, 5 = poor)

Definition of the problem:

Presentation of previous research in the area, including 1) the student's contribution or/and 2) contribution of others in the field:

Creativity:

Presentation of student's preliminary results (if applicable):

Delivery:

Visual aids:

Overall clarity:

Fielding questions:

II. Suggestions for improvement:

III. Other comments:

IV. **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 or 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/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, exceptionally clear take-home message	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 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:

