

Rubric for Evaluating PhD Dissertation

*(This page should be filled out by the student or Committee Chairman/advisor prior to distribution to Committee)
(Version November 14, 2008)*

Student _____ Date of Defense _____

Advisor _____ Date of Dissertation Proposal: _____

Date of Enrollment in Program: _____ Date Prelim Exam Passed: _____

Dissertation Title _____

Committee Members and Department

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

- At the conclusion of the defense, **each committee member should fill out the response sheet**. For each attribute which a committee member feels is somewhat or very deficient, a short explanation should be provided. Since completed forms are to be treated as **confidential**, they are to be **turned in to the Committee Chair (advisor)**, not the student.
- This document should be completed, even if the committee feels that the dissertation is unacceptable.
- A copy of the dissertation abstract and conclusions, as well as copies of all journal publications or referred conference proceedings that have already resulted from the dissertation work, must accompany this evaluation form. All materials must be sent to Dr. David Vorp, Chair of the Bioengineering Graduate Committee, 200 Bridgeside Point.
- Student has accepted a position at _____
(if student has yet to accept a position, please leave blank). Indicate whether student has or intends to apply (yes no) and/or has been accepted (yes no) to a medical school.

Ph.D. Dissertation Response Sheet

(one for each committee member – **circle chosen response** and return directly and confidentially to the student’s advisor or the Chair of the Bioengineering Graduate Committee)

Attribute	Very Deficient	Somewhat Deficient	Acceptable	Very Good	Outstanding
Quality of dissertation	Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of dissertations.	Acceptable, but disappointing (75 th to 90 th percentile of dissertations.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable (25th to 75th percentile of dissertations.) • Extensions possible, but may require more work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Among 10th to 25th percentile of dissertations • Provides opportunities for additional, fruitful research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Among top 10% of dissertations. • Student will be able to further extend; • Solid basis for funded projects
Contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires committee to stretch to find contribution. • Closer to MS than outstanding PhD dissertation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extends prior knowledge to some degree; • In total is a contribution, but contains no single major contribution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates originality • Makes some contributions • Introduces new methodology or techniques to field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very original work; • At least one important contribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original and creative. • Several important contributions.
Publications and potential publications.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At best a conference proceeding. • Nothing has been submitted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential exists for a publication in a second tier journal. • Presented work at least one conference. • No papers submitted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one paper has been submitted to a recognized journal • Should be able to publish one or two papers from dissertation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one paper has been accepted by a recognized journal. • Three or more good publications should result. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one paper has been fully accepted or published in a <u>leading</u> journal • More than three <u>high-impact</u> publications will result

Attribute	Very Deficient	Somewhat Deficient	Acceptable	Very Good	Outstanding
Quality of writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires a professional editor Sentence structure, language and style deficient. Major revisions required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing is weak A number of typos, grammatical and spelling errors. A number of changes required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable (25th to 75th percentile). Limited number of typos (grammatical errors and spelling). Some normal changes necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very well written; Easy to read and understand Very few changes or additions required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reads like an outstanding publication. No typos, grammatical or spelling errors. No revisions or changes; acceptable as is.
Defense (Oral Presentation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very poorly organized. Disjointed presentation. Unable to answer a number of questions. Slides and handouts of very poor quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not well organized; Rambled; dwelt too long on less important aspects Had difficulty with questions. Some slides and handouts difficult to read Typos and other errors in slides. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable – slides and handouts clear Good presentation skills Able to answer most questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well thought out slides and handouts. Professional presentation Almost all questions addressed in a professional manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well organized, very professional, All questions addressed in a knowledgeable and respectable manner. Slides and handouts outstanding.
Other – explain					

Comments and reasons for any deficiencies:
(11/14/2009)