Presentation Rubric for Evaluating MS Thesis & PhD Dissertation Defenses

Committee Members and Students are responsible for being aware of the evaluation rubric in advance of the defense.

(This page will be completed by the thesis/dissertation committee and a copy of the rubric will be distributed to the committee and student prior to the defense)

Student Name:

Graduate Program:

Date of Defense:

Committee Member:

At the conclusion of the defense, **each committee member must complete the attached response sheets.**
For each attribute that a committee member feels is somewhat or very deficient, a short explanation should be provided. **Confidential Comment** sections at the bottom of the rubric are provided for explanations of the reasoning behind the overall evaluation of the examinee's performance if desired. Completed forms are to be treated as **confidential** and are to be **turned in to the Graduate Programs Office (H Rose for PhD, Katelyn McGuigan for MSPH/MS),** not to the student.

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI
MILLER SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
DEPARTMENT of
PUBLIC HEALTH SCIENCES

Oral Thesis/Dissertation Defense Rubric

(To be completed by each committee member. Please check each evaluation criteria that you feel are appropriate within each attribute category. You may select from more than one category (ex. can select from meets expectations and exceeds expectations). The total score per attribute may include a decimal (ex. 4.0 or 4.5).

Numeric Score	**1 - 2**	**3**	**4 - 5**	**Total Score**
Attribute for Oral	**Does NOT meet expectations** (*provide a short explanation for each attribute that you select in this category)*	**Meets Expectations**	**Exceeds Expectations**	
Overall quality of presentation	☐ Poorly organized ☐ Poor presentation ☐ Poor communication skills ☐ Slides and handouts difficult to read	☐ Clearly organized ☐ Clear presentation ☐ Good communication skills ☐ Slides and handouts clear	☐ Well organized ☐ Professional presentation ☐ Excellent communication skills ☐ Slides and handouts outstanding	
Overall breadth of knowledge and critical thinking	☐ Presentation unacceptable ☐ Presentation reveals critical weakness in depth of knowledge in subject matter ☐ Reasoning confused, simplistic and/or not clearly explained ☐ Presentation is narrow in scope	☐ Presentation acceptable ☐ Presentation reveals some depth of knowledge in subject matter ☐ Adequate reasoning, explanation of assumptions, and supporting evidence ☐ Presentation reveals the ability to draw from knowledge in several disciplines	☐ Presentation superior ☐ Presentation reveals exceptional depth of subject knowledge ☐ Clear and organized argument that represents sound, original and complex thought ☐ Presentation reveals the ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple disciplines	

Quality of response to questions	☐ Responses are incomplete or require prompting ☐ Arguments are poorly presented ☐ Respondent exhibits lack of knowledge in subject area ☐ Responses do not meet level expected of degree program of graduate	☐ Responses are complete ☐ Arguments are well organized ☐ Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area ☐ Responses meet level expected of degree program of graduate	☐ Responses are eloquent ☐ Arguments are skillfully presented ☐ Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area ☐ Responses exceed level expected of degree program of graduate	
Overall Oral Presentation assessment	◯ Does not meet expectations	◯ Meets expectations	◯ Exceeds expectations	
Confidential Comments				

Written Thesis/Dissertation Rubric

(To be completed by each committee member. Please check each evaluation criteria that you feel are appropriate within each attribute category. You may select from more than one category (ex. can select from meets expectations and exceeds expectations). The total score per attribute may include a decimal (ex. 4.0 or 4.5).

Numeric Score	**1 - 2**	**3**	**4 - 5**	**Total Score**
Attribute for Written	**Does NOT meet expectations** (*provide a short explanation for each attribute that you select in this category)*	**Meets Expectations**	**Exceeds Expectations**	
Overall quality of science	☐ Arguments are incorrect, incoherent or flawed ☐ Objectives are poorly defined ☐ Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature ☐ Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts ☐ Displays limited creativity and insight	☐ Arguments are coherent and clear ☐ Objectives are clear ☐ Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature ☐ Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts ☐ Demonstrates originality ☐ Displays creativity and insight	☐ Arguments are superior ☐ Objectives are well defined ☐ Exhibits mastery of subject matter and literature ☐ Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts ☐ Demonstrates originality, creativity and insight	
Contribution to discipline	☐ Limited evidence of discovery ☐ Limited expansion upon previous research ☐ Limited theoretical or applied significance	☐ Some evidence of discovery ☐ Builds upon previous research ☐ Reasonable theoretical or applied significance	☐ Exceptional evidence of discovery ☐ Greatly extends previous research ☐ Exceptional theoretical or applied significance	

Quality of writing	☐ Writing is weak ☐ Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent ☐ Organization is poor ☐ Documentation is poor	☐ Writing is adequate ☐ Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent ☐ Organization is logical ☐ Documentation is adequate	☐ Writing is publication quality ☐ No grammatical or spelling errors observed ☐ Organization is excellent ☐ Documentation is excellent	
Appropriate methodology/quality of analysis	◯ Errors in methodology selection and/or use	◯ Methodology applied correctly and adequately, clearly explained	◯ Mastery of finer points of methodology plus elegant application and/or supplementary approaches	
Overall Written Presentation assessment	◯ Does not meet expectations	◯ Meets expectations	◯ Exceeds expectations	
Confidential Comments				