

Dissertation defense rubric

Attribute	Does not meet expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations
Quality of oral presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation was poorly organized and poorly delivered. Student displayed little or no eye contact with audience or read entire presentation; visual aids were poorly designed or confusing	<input type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation was coherently organized; hypothesis, approach, results and conclusions effectively communicated; visual aids were generally well-designed and added to the presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation was well organized; student was confident in material and able to professionally articulate hypothesis, approach, results and conclusions in an engaging, logical, and thoughtful manner; visual aids were professional, clear, concise, and appropriate
Quality of response to questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Student confuses significant concepts; response to questions are incorrect, vague or not relevant	<input type="checkbox"/> Student responds appropriately address the question; claims are supported by data or literature citations	<input type="checkbox"/> Student responds appropriately to address the question; many responses demonstrate significant insight into the problem.
Breadth of scientific knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> Student fails to adequately understand/explain necessary scientific principles and/or background information and/or fails to put the work in appropriate perspective	<input type="checkbox"/> Student appropriately puts the work in perspective of past and present studies in the literature and is capable of introducing and explaining necessary scientific principles.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student demonstrates a high level understanding of past and current literature and brings together concepts to think deeply about the research topic.
Quality of Written document	<input type="checkbox"/> Document is poorly written and/or the work is poorly justified; grammatical and scientific errors are present in abundance	<input type="checkbox"/> Document is written well and with sufficient depth to put the work in context; the rationale for the work, the experimental design, the results and the conclusions are appropriately described	<input type="checkbox"/> Document is exceptionally well written; the rationale, approaches, results, conclusions are described in a logical and compelling manner.
Ability to think critically	<input type="checkbox"/> Student is unable to independently put key concepts together	<input type="checkbox"/> Student makes appropriate connections between his/her results and between his/her results and related scientific literature	<input type="checkbox"/> Student brings together concepts and/or results in a way that promotes significant advances in his/her field of study
Contribution to discipline	<input type="checkbox"/> The work makes no or a limited contribution to the literature	<input type="checkbox"/> The work advances knowledge in the discipline	<input type="checkbox"/> The work makes a significant impact on the discipline
Overall assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Fails to meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds expectations