CaBS Dissertation Rubric (Written & Oral Assessment)

Thank you for being a part of our student's committee. As part of our program assessment, we respectfully request that you fill this form out by circling which description best captures the student's performance within each dissertation component (row) with regard to the dissertation document (Introduction, Methods, Data Analysis/Results, Discussion, & Scientific Writing) and defense (Presentation & Professionalism). We appreciate your time. If you cannot complete this form at the defense, please feel free to fill it out and send it to jrobinson@auburn.edu.

Student Name: _____

Dissertation Component	Evaluation Criteria				
	Developed	In Development		Not Developed	
	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Fair	Poor
Introduction	Introduces the research topic with a thorough and critical assessment of the scientific literature. Importance and justification clearly explained. Research objective and hypothesis/hypotheses presented clearly.	Introduces the research topic with a thorough and critical assessment of the scientific literature. Importance and justification less clearly explained. Research objective and hypothesis/hypotheses presented clearly.	Introduces the research topic, but with less thorough review of the scientific literature. Research objective or hypothesis/hypotheses presented, but not clearly.	Scientific literature review is sparse and missing key elements. Importance and justification weakly explained. Objective or hypothesis/hypotheses poorly presented.	No literature in the introduction. Importance and justification poorly explained. Objective or hypothesis/hypotheses lacking.
Methods	Research methods complete, clear, and thoroughly explained. Reproducible.	Research methods less clearly written, but complete and reproducible.	Research methods less clearly written. Some minor components missing.	Methods written in a confusing manner. Components of methodology incompletely described, inaccurately described, or missing.	Inaccurate or incomplete methods. No detail of methodology used.
Data Analysis/Results	Appropriate statistics and/or data analysis. Calculations are correct. Results presented clearly. All necessary information is provided for rigor/reproducibility. Tables and graphs are professional and thoroughly explained.	Appropriate statistics and/or data analysis. Calculations are correct. Results presented clearly. Minor missing information or incorrect presentation of results. Tables and graphs are prepared correctly, but explanation is weak.	Less than ideal analytic/statistical methods chosen. Calculations are correct. Results could be presented better. Tables and graphs are acceptable, but contain minor errors with weak explanation.	Major statistical errors or use of inappropriate data analytic methods. Results are missing critical components. Tables and graphs are not presented professionally and contain errors.	Inappropriate statistics and/or data analysis. Many incorrect calculations, tables and graphs poorly or incorrectly prepared without explanation. Results incomplete and/or poorly presented.
Discussion	Explains results correctly and relates them to previous literature. Expresses importance of the results. Weaknesses and future directions addressed. Accurately summarizes research. Strong conclusions drawn.	Explains most results correctly and relates them to previous literature. Weaknesses and future directions are addressed, but less thoroughly. Summarizes research simplistically. Conclusion is strong.	Explains most results correctly and relates them to previous literature. Weaknesses and future directions addressed, but could be better. Weak or simplistic conclusions.	Results discussed correctly, but little relation to previous literature. Weaknesses and future directions not adequately addressed. Verbatim text from the introduction. Weak or simplistic conclusions.	No relation to previous literature. No presentation of importance of results. Weaknesses and future directions minimally discussed or not discussed at all.
Scientific Writing	References formatted correctly. Topic and transitional sentences included in paragraphs. Minimal errors in punctuation, spelling, verb-noun agreement. No comma splices or slang.	Organization is good, some transitions lacking. Flow is generally good. Proper reference format. Few minor grammatical/spelling errors.	Weak introductory sentences to paragraphs. Paragraph transitions are lacking. Inconsistent reference format, or minor formatting errors present. Several minor grammatical and/or spelling errors.	Weak introductory sentences to paragraphs. Paragraph transitions lacking. Inconsistent reference format. Many grammatical/spelling errors. Use of slang.	No organization. Incoherent random ideas without direction. Incorrect reference format, or no references at all. Many grammatical/spelling errors. Use of slang. Incomplete sentences or missing words.
Presentation	Clear and concise review of the project. Stayed on topic and within the time constraints set forth at the start of the defense. Spoke clearly and at a reasonable pace.	Clear and concise review of the project. Minor deviations from topic. Spoke clearly. Had minor time management issues.	Review of the project was sufficient. Minor deviations from topic. Spoke well, but had some minor nervousness. Minor time management issues.	Presentation lacked important details, or summary was incomplete. Topic deviations. Spoke well, but had more serious nervousness issues. Time management was lacking.	Presentation had major flaws. Topic deviations. Poor time management.
Professionalism	Interacts and communicates professionally. Answers questions thoughtfully. Responsive to feedback.	Interacts and communicates professionally. Answers questions well, but could be more thoughtful in their responses. Responsive to feedback.	Interacts and communicates adequately. Answers questions, but is not always thoughtful in their responses or misinterprets what is being asked. Not as responsive to feedback as they could be.	Interactions and communication are lacking. Answers questions, but in a more defensive tone, and misinterprets most questions. Not very responsive to feedback.	Does not communicate or interact well. Unable to comprehend and/or correctly answer questions. Does not take feedback well.