

Student Name:

Form Polytechnic GEC 10

**Rubric for Evaluating MS Directed Project and Defense**

*(This page should be filled out by the student or Committee Chairman/advisor prior to distribution to Committee)*

Chair of Evaluation Committee \_\_\_\_\_

Advisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Directed Project Defense \_\_\_\_\_

Directed Project Title \_\_\_\_\_

Committee Members and Department

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

At the conclusion of the Directed Project 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. **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 **turned in to the Chair of the Evaluation Committee (or Advisor)**, 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 (or Advisor) and a verbal summarization of the overall evaluation of the student’s performance by the committee **WILL** be provided to the student by that individual.

All examination documents (rubrics and written comments) must be completed regardless of the outcome of the Directed Project Defense.

A copy of the completed forms (both rubrics and written comments) must be sent to the Associate Dean for Graduate Programs within 48 hours of the conclusion of the Directed Project Defense.

Student Name:

Form Polytechnic GEC 10

**Directed Project Defense Rubric – Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality presentation	<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"/> 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"/> 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 MS 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 MS 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 MS graduate
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations

Comments:

Student Name:

Form Polytechnic GEC 10

**Directed Project Defense Rubric – Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality presentation	<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"/> 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"/> 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 MS 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 MS 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 MS graduate
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations

Comments:

Student Name:

Form Polytechnic GEC 10

**Directed Project Defense Rubric – Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality presentation	<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"/> 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"/> 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 MS 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 MS 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 MS graduate
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations

Comments:

**Directed Project Rubric – Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality of science	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are incoherent or flawed <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are poorly defined <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are coherent and clear <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are clear <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are superior <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are well defined <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight
Contribution to discipline	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Limited expansion upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Limited theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Limited publication potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Builds upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable publication potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Greatly extends previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional publication potential
Responsible Conduct of Research	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates unacceptable originality <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is inadequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates acceptable originality <input type="checkbox"/> Considers regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is excellent
Quality of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is weak <input type="checkbox"/> Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is logical	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is publication quality <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is excellent
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
Comments:			

**Directed Project Rubric – Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality of science	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are incoherent or flawed <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are poorly defined <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are coherent and clear <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are clear <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are superior <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are well defined <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight
Contribution to discipline	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Limited expansion upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Limited theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Limited publication potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Builds upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable publication potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Greatly extends previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional publication potential
Responsible Conduct of Research	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates unacceptable originality <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is inadequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates acceptable originality <input type="checkbox"/> Considers regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is excellent
Quality of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is weak <input type="checkbox"/> Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is logical	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is publication quality <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is excellent
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
Comments:			

**Directed Project Rubric – Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality of science	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are incoherent or flawed <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are poorly defined <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are coherent and clear <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are clear <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are superior <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are well defined <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight
Contribution to discipline	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Limited expansion upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Limited theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Limited publication potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Builds upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable publication potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Greatly extends previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional publication potential
Responsible Conduct of Research	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates unacceptable originality <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is inadequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates acceptable originality <input type="checkbox"/> Considers regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is excellent
Quality of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is weak <input type="checkbox"/> Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is logical	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is publication quality <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is excellent
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
Comments:			

Student Name:

Form Polytechnic GEC 10

Chair of Examining Committee: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Summary of written comments from ALL committee members for student concerning performance on Directed Project and Defense:**



Student Name:

Form Polytechnic GEC 10

Chair of Examining Committee Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_