

Student Name: _____

Proposal Exam Assessment

Part 1: Written Proposal

1. Signed GS2? Yes _____ No _____

Does committee include someone from outside the Bioengineering department? _____

If so, from which department/institution is the committee member: _____

2. Which format is the proposal in? NSF _____ NIH _____

Will this actually be submitted to a funding agency? If so, where? _____

3. Overall Assessment of written document:

	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
Pragmatic Envisioning Skills	Has a well-founded and clearly stated hypothesis or overall project goal.	Has a well-founded hypothesis/goal. Could be stated earlier or more clearly in the document.	Has a hypothesis / goal. Motivation not very clear and/or statement is not clear.	Some attempt at hypothesis/goal statement. Not clearly stated and/or lacks the motivation.	No defined hypothesis or goal is stated in the proposal
Comments: _____					
Critical evaluation of literature (advanced knowledge)	Demonstrates critical evaluation of the current state of the literature. Multiple research groups properly cited. Clear description of the works that motivate the reasoning for the proposed work.	Demonstrates critical evaluation of the current state of the literature. Multiple research groups properly cited, most works are clearly described and demonstrate what motivates the reasoning for the proposed work.	Describes prior work. Properly cites multiple research groups. However, connection to current work is not always clear.	Describes prior work. Some key results are missing or results from only a few groups are mentioned. Connection to current work is not always clear.	Lacks a good description of prior work. Key results are missing or results from only a few groups are mentioned. Connection to current work is not clear.
Comments: _____					
Applied research principles	Preliminary results well described and interpreted, show capability and proof-of-concept, support goal. Methods for future experiments clearly described; alternate approaches to ensure success are described. Includes a timeline for overall project.	Preliminary results well described and interpreted, show capability and proof-of-concept. Includes timeline for project. Future experiments are sketched out and good in concept.	Includes some description of preliminary results, timeline, and future experiments. Methods could be clearer.	Includes a timeline and descriptions of future experiments. Few initial results are presented. Methods are missing details.	Missing timeline, initial results and/or descriptions of future experiments. Descriptions of Methods are hard to follow.
Comments: _____					
Writing skills	Has distinct proposal structure with clearly defined sections. Coherent sentences. Clear aims/goals. Proposal is well motivated and has the potential to be funded.	Has distinct proposal 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 grammatical errors are present. Some Structure is present, but it could be clearer.	Very hard to read or follow. Sections are not clearly defined.
Comments: _____					

Advisor initials: _____ Committee initials: _____

Student Name: _____

Part 2: Proposal Exam Presentation Assessment

	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
Pragmatic Envisioning Skills	Has a well-founded and clearly stated hypothesis or overall project goal.	Has a well-founded hypothesis/goal. Could be stated earlier or more clearly in the document.	Has a hypothesis/goal. Motivation not very clear and/or statement is not clear.	Some attempt at hypothesis/goal statement. Not clearly stated and/or lacks the motivation.	No defined hypothesis or goal is stated in the Proposal.
Comments:					
Critical evaluation of literature (advanced knowledge)	Demonstrates critical evaluation the current state of literature. Multiple research groups properly cited; clear description of the works that motivate the reasoning for the proposed work.	Demonstrates critical evaluation the current state of literature. Multiple research groups properly cited. Most works are clearly described; works motivate the reasoning for the proposed work.	Describes prior work. Properly cites multiple research groups. However, connection to current work is not always clear.	Describes prior work. Some key results are missing or results from only a few groups are mentioned. Connection to current work is not always clear.	Lacks a good description of prior work. Key results are missing, or results from only a few groups are mentioned. Connection to current work is not clear.
Comments:					
Applied research principles	Preliminary results well described and interpreted; show capability and proof-of-concept and support goal. Methods for future experiments clearly described; alternative approaches to ensure success described. Includes a timeline for overall project.	Preliminary results well described and interpreted, show capability and proof-of-concept. Includes timeline for project. Future experiments are sketched out and good in concept.	Includes some description of preliminary results, timeline, and future experiments. Methods could be clearer.	Includes a timeline and descriptions of future experiments. Few initial results presented. Details are missing from Methods.	Timeline, initial results and/or descriptions of future experiments are missing. Descriptions of methods are hard to follow.
Comments:					
Oral presentation skills	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:					

Advisor initials: _____ Committee initials: _____