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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 1 (Unsatisfactory) to 5 (Excellent)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written proposal, organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written proposal, quality of writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL COMMENTS:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION

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

Objective

Excellent: Compelling statement of objective that demonstrates the challenge of the research and its applications
Good: Objective and applications are clearly stated, motivated, and challenging
Fair: Objective or applications partially clear and too simple
Unsatisfactory: Objective and potential applications are not clear

Literature review

Excellent: Identifies all relevant results and techniques from the literature and synthesizes them well
Good: Cites major works and places them in context
Fair: Misses a few major works or places them out of context
Unsatisfactory: Fails to cite or assimilate previous work

Research results

Excellent: Experiments and/or theory, computations well chosen and executed and interpreted fully and correctly
Good: Experiments and/or theory, computations are reasonable but some errors exist or interpretation is incomplete
Fair: Minimal results but well-motivated and interpreted
Unsatisfactory: Minimal results and/or major errors in results or analysis

Proposed research

Excellent: Well thought out experiments and/or theory to achieve novel results and meet objective; includes potential open-ended developments
Good: Good overall plan needing some further development
Fair: Plan is actionable but has minor flaws or ambiguity
Unsatisfactory: Sketchy outline of future work with few specifics

Written proposal, organization

Excellent: Logical progression of thought within overall proposal and within each section; figures illustrate main points
Good: Occasional portion of reasoning omitted or misplaced
Fair: Few important statements are not sufficiently motivated; order of presentation is not always logical or effective.
Unsatisfactory: Repetition, misplaced items, poor figures hinder reader understanding

Written proposal, quality of writing

Excellent: Ideas expressed clearly and concisely in fluent prose with minimal typos or grammatical errors
Good: Coherent presentation with average style and limited typos, grammatical errors
Fair: Some parts difficult to understand, noticeable errors
Unsatisfactory: Significant parts difficult to understand, numerous errors

Oral presentation

Excellent: Engaging, polished presentation with well crafted slides that illustrate key points and emphasize conclusions
Good: Solid presentation with coherent narrative, conclusions
Fair: Presentation is understandable but not fully convincing
Unsatisfactory: Too much or too little detail; goals and directions not clear; order of slides not logical; poor slides; reads directly from many slides

Response to questions

Excellent: Complete answers that demonstrate deep understanding of research field beyond contents of thesis
Good: Competent answers that demonstrate understanding of issues directly relevant to thesis
Fair: Answer reveal minor gaps in understanding thesis work or directly related areas
Unsatisfactory: Answers reveal significant gaps in understanding thesis work and its context