EVALUATION RUBRIC: PROPOSAL DEFENSE

Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Committee Member: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion\* | Poor  (1) | Fair  (2) | Competent (3) | Good (4) | Excellent (5) |
| Understands and interprets scientific literature relevant to research topic |  |  |  |  |  |
| Places their research in a broader scientific and sociological/cultural context |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demonstrates ability to formulate hypotheses and develop experimental design |  |  |  |  |  |
| Discusses appropriate analyses for relevant data types |  |  |  |  |  |
| Defends research methodology and interpretation and considers alternative interpretations |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interprets and presents preliminary research results in oral and written formats |  |  |  |  |  |

(\*passing indicates an average score across the committee members of 3 or greater in at least 3 of the 5 categories)

Comments: