

Rubric for Evaluation of MS Thesis Proposal

Student Name:

Title of MS Thesis Proposal:

Evaluator:

Evaluation Date:

Rating (1 through 10, with 1-3 being 'Inadequate', 4-6 being 'Adequate', 7-9 being 'Good' and 10 being 'Outstanding'; write 'UJ' or 'NA' if unable to judge or 'non-applicable', respectively.)

1. Problem Statement: Rating ___/10

Criteria for assigning rating (in a scale of 1 through 10):

[10]: Completely novel, well-motivated problem with clearly defined objectives. The solution of the problem would have an impact beyond the immediate research question.

[7-9]: Novel problem with well-defined objectives. Its solution would have some impact for the research area.

[4-6]: Well-studied problem with objectives but little chance of impact. Weakly motivated.

[1-3]: Uninteresting problem with little probability of impact. Objectives not defined. Absent or unconvincing motivation.

2. Literature Review/Background: Rating ___/10

Criteria for assigning rating (in a scale of 1 through 10):

[10]: Critical analysis of most relevant work, compares most relevant existing methods using quantitative measures, clearly and accurately evaluates weaknesses or knowledge gaps, gives a clear understanding of the current state of the art.

[7-9]: Presents pertinent work, compares and contrasts some existing methods using qualitative arguments, gives a clear understanding of the current state of the art.

[4-6]: Describes most existing approaches, little or no comparison and contrast, gives an acceptable, but incomplete understanding of the state of the art.

[1-3]: Significant work missing, describes work with little or no qualitative or quantitative assessment, gives an unacceptably incomplete understanding of the state of the art.

3. Proposed Theory / Research Methodology: Rating ___/10

Criteria for assigning rating (in a scale of 1 through 10):

[10]: Proposed theory or methodology represents a significant contribution (an improvement over existing methods, or a novel and sound alternative to existing methods) for accomplishing or evaluating the project objectives. Research steps are focused on the objectives.

[7-9]: Proposed theory or methodology is appropriate for accomplishing or evaluating the project objectives.

[4-6]: Theory or methodology is not innovative and does not clearly allow for an evaluation of the objectives.

[1-3]: Reproduction of existing work and/or lack of alignment between methods and objectives.

4. **Writing:**

Rating ___/10

Criteria for assigning rating (in a scale of 1 through 10):

[10]: Clear, well-organized technical writing with no issues with formatting, grammar, spelling, mechanics, typography, equations, algorithms, proofs, figures, tables, and bibliography.

7-9]: Clear, well-organized technical writing, but with minor to moderate with issues with the aforementioned elements.

[4-6]: Moderate to significant issues with writing and organization. Significant problems with the aforementioned elements.

[1-3]: Unacceptable writing, organization, or presentation.

5. **Oral Presentation:**

Rating ___/10

Criteria for assigning rating (in a scale of 1 through 10):

[10]: Clear, well-organized technical presentation with well-formatted presentation materials clearly focused on project objectives, methods, results and analysis and conclusions. Presentation was very professional, the presenter was confident and had great knowledge on the area of the research. Responded well to questions.

[7-9]: Clear, well-organized technical presentation, but with minor to moderate with issues with the aforementioned elements. Quality of presentation was above average. Minor issues with responses to questions.

[4-6]: Moderate to significant issues with presentation. Significant problems with the aforementioned elements. Difficulty responding to questions.

[1-3]: Unacceptable presentation materials. Unacceptable answers to basic questions.