

Ph.D. Dissertation Defense Assessment Form

Candidate Name:

Circle Degree: Ph.D. / M.S. Thesis / M.S. Non-thesis / M.Eng.

Facilities visited during program:

CUBEInC, CU Rhodes/Rhodes Annex, CU BRC, CU-MUSC, AMRL, CLIF, others (list)

Title of Thesis/Dissertation:

Defense Date:

Advisor Name:

Committee Member Names:

Do you have a committee member from an external department or field?

Committee Members' Department(s)/Field(s):

Have you been a co-author for a journal paper or conference proceeding, or co-inventor on a patent with someone from a department or field other than Bioengineering?

Collaborators Department(s)/Field(s):

Number of Papers published or currently under review:

Number of Papers in preparation:

Number of Patents applied for or approved:

Number of undergrads mentored:

Number of K-12 students or teachers mentored:

Professional Society Memberships:

Number of Awards or Fellowships received since enrolling in PhD/MS program:

Please attach your CV (see template on webpage)

Updated Address:

Updated Email:

Updated Position:

Company:

Location:

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)

	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
Knowledge of field	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.	Covers key articles in the field. Can use literature to help make points in presentation and answer questions.	Covers some key articles. Uses findings from literature to help make points	Covers a few articles but misses some key major literature results.	Missing citations. Does not know most of the key works in the field. Misrepresents other's work
Comments:					
Work ethic	Is in lab when expected. Excels both in class and in the lab. Goes above what is expected	In lab when expected; Finishes work on time. Does well both in class and in the lab	In lab when expected; works hard on project but sometime late.	Not always in lab; work gets done but sometimes late	Not always in lab; work is not completed as expected
Comments:					
Writing skills	Has distinct structure with clearly defined sections. Coherent sentences. Clear aims/goals. Dissertation is well motivated and has the potential to get published	Has distinct structure with clearly defined sections. Coherent sentences. Clear aims/goals. Well motivated.	Clearly defined sections. Coherent sentences and clear aims/goals. Could improve writing to help "sell" idea to reviewer.	Some spelling or grammar errors. Some structure but could be clearer.	Very hard to read or follow. Sections are not clearly defined.
Comments:					

Ph.D. Dissertation Defense Assessment Form

Part 2: Oral Presentation Assessment

	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
Knowledge of field	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.	Remembers key articles in the field. Can use literature to help make points in presentation and answer questions.	Remembers some key articles. Occasionally remembers content paper but not author/year Uses findings from literature to help make points	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.	Missing citations. Does not know most of the key works in the field. Misrepresents other's work
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:					