Biological Sciences Department

Rubric for Assessing IB PhD Dissertation Defense

Name of PhD Candidate: ___________________________________________________________

Name of Evaluator: _______________________________________________________________

Signature: _________________________________________  Date: ______________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature review of chosen field Knowledge</td>
<td>Shallow, mistaken, containing large gaps, incorrectly cited</td>
<td>Appropriate coverage, accurately represented, up to date.</td>
<td>Extensive, shows deep understanding of material and theory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific merit of work</td>
<td>Unoriginal, limited potential for publication</td>
<td>Useful contribution, shows some creativity and insight</td>
<td>Sophisticated, highly creative, publishable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking Knowledge</td>
<td>Narrow, trivial, or flawed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope and quality of data collected</td>
<td>Incomplete, or biased data not supporting analysis</td>
<td>Data support tests of hypotheses</td>
<td>Novel, high quality data set.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking Knowledge</td>
<td>Inappropriate analyses, incorrect interpretation.</td>
<td>Reliable analyses, logical conclusions</td>
<td>Creative and insightful analyses and interpretation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of interpretation</td>
<td>Inappropriate analyses, incorrect interpretation.</td>
<td>Reliable analyses, logical conclusions</td>
<td>Creative and insightful analyses and interpretation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and depth of writing</td>
<td>Numerous grammatical and spelling errors, poor organization</td>
<td>Adequate attention to grammar, spelling and organization</td>
<td>Publication quality, logically organized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td>Hard to follow, confusing, little learned by audience.</td>
<td>Some organization, lack of coherence, some points clear.</td>
<td>Engaging, points clearly made and understood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other recommendations or comments:

Please send completed forms to Dr. Stacee Caplan at scaplan4@fau.edu.