

RICE UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICAL AND BIOMOLECULAR ENGINEERING

Evaluation of PhD Thesis Proposal

Student: _____

Date of Presentation: _____

Committee Member: _____

Please review accompanying guidelines for evaluation and provide your assessment. Please use grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 only (no fractions). Give the completed form to the graduate student at conclusion of the thesis proposal defense, who will then return it to the CHBE Department Coordinator. Alternatively, the completed form can be emailed. The information on this form should be instructive for the graduate student. Also, the information will be used in identifying the Kobayashi Award recipient.

	Grade 1 (Unsatisfactory) to 5 (Excellent)	Comments
Objective		
Literature review		
Research results		
Proposed research		
Written proposal, organization		
Written proposal, quality of writing		
Oral presentation		
Response to questions		

GENERAL COMMENTS:

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION

Use the following scale: 5 (Excellent); 4 (Very Good); 3 (Good); 2 (Fair); 1 (Unsatisfactory)

<i>Objective</i>	<p>Excellent: Compelling statement of objective that demonstrates the challenge of the research and its applications</p> <p>Good: Objective and applications are clearly stated, motivated, and challenging</p> <p>Fair: Objective or applications partially clear and too simple</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Objective and potential applications are not clear</p>
<i>Literature review</i>	<p>Excellent: Identifies all relevant results and techniques from the literature and synthesizes them well</p> <p>Good: Cites major works and places them in context</p> <p>Fair: Misses a few major works or places them out of context</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Fails to cite or assimilate previous work</p>
<i>Research results</i>	<p>Excellent: Experiments and/or theory, computations well chosen and executed and interpreted fully and correctly</p> <p>Good: Experiments and/or theory, computations are reasonable but some errors exist or interpretation is incomplete</p> <p>Fair: Minimal results but well-motivated and interpreted</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Minimal results and/or major errors in results or analysis</p>
<i>Proposed research</i>	<p>Excellent: Well thought out experiments and/or theory to achieve novel results and meet objective; includes potential open-ended developments</p> <p>Good: Good overall plan needing some further development</p> <p>Fair: Plan is actionable but has minor flaws or ambiguity</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Sketchy outline of future work with few specifics</p>
<i>Written proposal, organization</i>	<p>Excellent: Logical progression of thought within overall proposal and within each section; figures illustrate main points</p> <p>Good: Occasional portion of reasoning omitted or misplaced</p> <p>Fair: Few important statements are not sufficiently motivated; order of presentation is not always logical or effective.</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Repetition, misplaced items, poor figures hinder reader understanding</p>
<i>Written proposal, quality of writing</i>	<p>Excellent: Ideas expressed clearly and concisely in fluent prose with minimal typos or grammatical errors</p> <p>Good: Coherent presentation with average style and limited typos, grammatical errors</p> <p>Fair: Some parts difficult to understand, noticeable errors</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Significant parts difficult to understand, numerous errors</p>
<i>Oral presentation</i>	<p>Excellent: Engaging, polished presentation with well crafted slides that illustrate key points and emphasize conclusions</p> <p>Good: Solid presentation with coherent narrative, conclusions</p> <p>Fair: Presentation is understandable but not fully convincing</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Too much or too little detail; goals and directions not clear; order of slides not logical; poor slides; reads directly from many slides</p>
<i>Response to questions</i>	<p>Excellent: Complete answers that demonstrate deep understanding of research field beyond contents of thesis</p> <p>Good: Competent answers that demonstrate understanding of issues directly relevant to thesis</p> <p>Fair: Answer reveal minor gaps in understanding thesis work or directly related areas</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Answers reveal significant gaps in understanding thesis work and its context</p>