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## Ph.D. Dissertation Defense Assessment Form

### Part 1: Written Dissertation Document Assessment
(This pre-defense form can be filled out by advisor before oral defense)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of field</th>
<th>Excellent (5)</th>
<th>Very Good (4)</th>
<th>Good (3)</th>
<th>Fair (2)</th>
<th>Poor (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covers key articles in the field; Uses literature to help make points in presentation and answer questions; critically evaluates the current state of literature suggest follow-on studies based on a body of work.</td>
<td>Covers key articles in the field. Can use literature to help make points in presentation and answer questions.</td>
<td>Covers some key articles. Uses findings from literature to help make points</td>
<td>Covers a few articles but misses some key major literature results.</td>
<td>Missing citations. Does not know most of the key works in the field. Misrepresents other’s work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work ethic</th>
<th>Is in lab when expected. Excels both in class and in the lab. Goes above what is expected</th>
<th>In lab when expected; Finishes work on time. Does well both in class and in the lab</th>
<th>In lab when expected; works hard on project but sometime late.</th>
<th>Not always in lab; work gets done but sometimes late</th>
<th>Not always in lab; work is not completed as expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing skills</th>
<th>Has distinct structure with clearly defined sections. Coherent sentences. Clear aims/goals. Dissertation is well motivated and has the potential to get published</th>
<th>Has distinct structure with clearly defined sections. Coherent sentences. Clear aims/goals. Well motivated.</th>
<th>Clearly defined sections. Coherent sentences and clear aims/goals. Could improve writing to help “sell” idea to reviewer.</th>
<th>Some spelling or grammar errors. Some structure but could be clearer.</th>
<th>Very hard to read or follow. Sections are not clearly defined.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comments:**
# Ph.D. Dissertation Defense Assessment Form

## Part 2: Oral Presentation Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of field</th>
<th>Excellent (5)</th>
<th>Very Good (4)</th>
<th>Good (3)</th>
<th>Fair (2)</th>
<th>Poor (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remembers key articles in the field; Can use literature to help make points in presentation and answer questions; Can critically evaluate the current state of literature suggest follow-on studies based on a body of work.</td>
<td>Remembers key articles in the field. Can use literature to help make points in presentation and answer questions.</td>
<td>Remembers some key articles. Occasionally remembers content paper but not author/year Uses findings from literature to help make points</td>
<td>Knows a few articles but misses some key major literature results. Cannot remember author/year for articles. Has trouble remembering papers for use in presentation.</td>
<td>Missing citations. Does not know most of the key works in the field. Misrepresents other’s work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

| Critical thinking skills | Can think on his/her feet; points out gaps in knowledge or problems with existing technology; uses quantitative reasoning to answer questions. | Points out gaps in knowledge or problems with existing technology | Can point out issues in tech/knowledge after some hints from committee | Cannot independently point out gaps/problems in field. However, understands points made by committee | Lacks fundamental critical thinking skills when responding to committee. |

Comments:

| Breadth of knowledge | Answers committee questions by using advanced concepts from many areas of bioengineering | Answers committee questions using fundamentals from across BioE | Has demonstrated solid background in many areas of BioE but has some weaker areas from BioE | Weak in several key areas of BioE fundamental to the field | Shows lack of fundamentals across most of the field. |

Comments:

| Oral communication | Is clear and precise in oral presentations. Is comfortable answering audience questions | Is clear and precise in oral presentations | Presents in understandable manner. | Lacks confidence / somewhat hard to follow | Presentation very hard to follow or understand. |

Comments: