

SLO 1C: Oral Defense of Research Rubric

Student: _____ **Term:** _____ **Evaluator:** _____

To be completed by each oral defense committee member. Please check boxes for all evaluation criteria that you feel are appropriate within each attribute category.

Attribute	Comments	Does Not Meet Expectations <i>Provide specific comments when selected</i>	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Quality of presentation		Organization weak <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poorly designed slides, with no clear outline or direction Visual aids poorly designed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Font too small, lack consistency, text/figures not organized on slide Poor communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Soft/mumbled voice, avoids eye contact Text is often read word-for-word Generally confusing, excessive wordiness 	Organization clear <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easy to follow, consistent layout, with suitable headings Visual aids clear <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easy to read text, graphs, figures animations, etc. Only a few distracting elements Effective communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate voice and frequent eye contact Minimal "word-for-word" reading of text Occasionally difficult to follow 	Exceptional organization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent organization using both slides and voice Visual aids outstanding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses only the minimally required amount of text. Publication-grade images/figures/animations. Excellent communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Voice and eye contact convey confidence Slides effectively used to enhance a great talk Precise diction and syntax
Breadth of knowledge in research area		Poor depth of general knowledge (including ≥ 5 errors) Poor depth of specific knowledge (≥ 5 errors) and is unable to make connections relevant to research in the field) Weak display of critical thinking skills <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge does not extend and connect knowledge Weaknesses in interpretation or methodology not considered Broader implications not considered 	Displayed depth of knowledge in general research discipline (2-4 errors) Displayed depth of knowledge in specific research area (2-4 errors) making some connections to relevant research in field Presentation reveals above average critical thinking skills <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Displays some interconnection of knowledge Able to identify some weaknesses in interpretation/methods Broader implications considered 	Outstanding depth of knowledge in general discipline (0-1 errors) Exceptional depth of knowledge in research area (0-1 errors) and makes frequent connections to relevant research in the field. Presentation reveals well-developed critical thinking skills <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple disciplines Able to identify weaknesses in interpretation/methods Broader implications skillfully integrated
Quality of response to questions		Responses were incomplete, unorganized, lacked relevance. Responses required significant aid from committee Responses do not meet level expected of a MS graduate	Responses are mostly complete, well-organized, direct and relevant. Limited amount of unrelated information. Responses required minimal aid from committee Responses meet level expected of a MS graduate	Responses were eloquent, direct and relevant, demonstrating a high-level of understanding Responses demonstrated independence and were skillfully presented Responses exceed level expected of a MS graduate
Overall		Does not meet expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Comments				