

FINAL

Instructions for Using these Evaluation Forms

1. We are using a new scoring system to try to provide a more uniform assessment of the students' performances. The scores are based on the following scale:
1 = Outstanding: Excellent grasp of details and ability to integrate these details, with no or minimal prompting
2 = Very Good: Good grasp of details and ability to integrate these details, with minimal prompting
3 = Good: Recalls details or provides answer with some prompting; has moderate to good integration
4 = Mediocre: Recalls details or provides answer only with significant prompting; moderate to weak integration
5 = Poor: Inability to recall details or provide answer, even with significant prompting; weak or no integration
2. Write comments about the different criteria listed on the Written and Oral Evaluation Forms, but wait to assign final scores until the student steps out of the room at the end of the Question-and-Answer period.
3. You may keep track of the core areas that are discussed by listing each topic in the spaces entitled "Core material addressed" in the Oral Evaluation Form. It is acceptable if the topics that you list are different from the topics listed by other committee members.
4. At the end of the Question-and-Answer Period, the student will be asked to leave the room, to allow the committee to discuss the performance.
5. You will be given a short time to independently complete your evaluation form, and to assign scores to the different criteria. The most important criterion is the last one on the form: "What is the overall impression of the student's performance?" This criterion should not be calculated mathematically from the other scores; instead, this score should reflect your overall, general assessment of the student's performance on both the written and oral exams.
6. The Chair will ask the student's advisor to hand in their evaluation form, and to comment on their opinion specifically about the student's performance in the oral examination
7. The Chair and the remaining committee members will discuss their evaluation of the student, using the criteria in the Oral Evaluation Form. You will be allowed to change your scores, if the discussion brings to light any issues that influence the score.
8. You will give your evaluation form to the Chair. The Chair will calculate the average score of the criterion "What is the overall impression of the student's performance?", using the scores from the Chair's form and from the four committee members' forms (the advisor's scores will not be included in this calculation).
9. If the criterion "What is the overall impression of the student's performance?" receives **a score of 4 or higher from at least three faculty members**, or if the **average score for this criterion from all five faculty members is higher than 3.0**, the student will be given a Fail. Students who receive a Fail will be given a chance to take a second examination at a later date.
10. If the student does not fail the examination, but there is a deficiency in a specific area covered in the Oral Examination, the student may be given a Conditional Pass. The Chair and the two committee members will discuss this deficiency, and determine the appropriate action, such as requesting the student to write an essay on the topic.
11. If the Written Proposal has significant weaknesses identified in the Evaluation Form for the Written Proposal and during the discussion, the committee can decide to have the student re-write a portion or all of the Written Proposal. If this decision is made, the student will be given a Conditional Pass.

FINAL

Evaluation of the Written Proposal for Admission to Candidacy Exam

Name of Student: _____

Name of Evaluator: _____ Date: _____

Please fill out this table as you read the student's Written Proposal. You should assign a score of 1 – 5 for each question/criteria, using the scoring system that is presented beneath the table. Brief comments can be included in the table. Please **bring this completed table to the student's Oral Qualifying Examination**. It is important that you provide the completed table at the examination, because it will be used to evaluate the student's performance.

| Question/Criteria | Score | Comments |
|--|-------|----------|
| Is the proposal driven by a novel hypothesis, of the student's own design? | | |
| Is it clearly written? | | |
| Does it adequately cover the background and relevant concepts? | | |
| Do the aims test the hypothesis or address the relevant questions? | | |
| Will the experiments answer the relevant questions? | | |
| Are proper controls included? | | |
| Are solutions to potential problems or unexpected results presented? | | |
| Are alternative hypotheses or models considered? | | |
| What is the <u>overall impression</u> of the student's performance? This score should <u>not</u> be calculated mathematically from the other scores; instead, this score should reflect your overall, general assessment of the proposal. | | |

- 1 = Outstanding:** Excellent grasp of details and ability to integrate these details, with no or minimal prompting
2 = Very Good: Good grasp of details and ability to integrate these details, with minimal prompting
3 = Good: Recalls details or provides answer with some prompting; has moderate to good integration
4 = Mediocre: Recalls details or provides answer only with significant prompting; moderate to weak integration
5 = Poor: Inability to recall details or provide answer, even with significant prompting; weak or no integration

FINAL

Evaluation of the Oral Presentation for Admission to Candidacy Exam

Name of Student: _____

Name of Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Oral Examination

| Question/Criteria | Comments | Score |
|---|----------|-------|
| Was the presentation well organized? | | |
| Was the presentation delivered well? | | |
| Did the presentation demonstrate that the student understood the hypothesis and project? | | |
| During the Oral Examination, did the student grasp identified deficiencies in the Written Proposal and provide solutions? | | |
| Did the student demonstrate a breadth of knowledge and understanding of the background literature supporting the proposal? | | |
| During the Oral Examination, did the student indicate ownership of the hypothesis and material in the Written Proposal? | | |
| Did they demonstrate overall knowledge of the core material from the 1 st -year curriculum? | | |
| Core material addressed: | | |
| Could they integrate information from different areas, to provide in-depth, rigorous answers? | | |
| Could they design reasonable experimental approaches to answer research questions? | | |
| Did they demonstrate creative, original thinking that was more than just rote-memory? | | |
| Could they reason-out answers to difficult questions? | | |
| What is the overall impression of the student's performance? This score should <i>not</i> be calculated mathematically from the other scores; instead, this score should reflect your overall assessment of the written and oral portions of the exam. | | |

1 = Outstanding: Excellent grasp of details and ability to integrate these details, with no or minimal prompting

2 = Very Good: Good grasp of details and ability to integrate these details, with minimal prompting

3 = Good: Recalls details or provides answer with some prompting; has moderate to good integration

4 = Mediocre: Recalls details or provides answer only with significant prompting; moderate to weak integration

5 = Poor: Inability to recall details or provide answer, even with significant prompting; weak or no integration