**Student: Completed by: Date:**

**Instructions for scoring:** Within each criterion, check one box in each row (From Criterion 1: choose one “a,” one “b,” and one “c” from the three columns; same for other criteria), then add the values earned for each criterion (1 point for each box under “Does not meet expectations,” 2 points for each check box under “Meets expectations,” 3 points for “Exceeds expectations”). Minimum score per Criterion is 2 or 3, max is 6 or 9. At the end of your assessment, you should have 14 checked boxes (no more, no less). Add scores over 5 criteria for total score. Score ranges at bottom determine outcome of defense.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Does not meet expectations = 1 points** | **Meets expectations = 2 points** | **Exceeds expectations = 3 points** | **Score** |
| 1. Demonstrated ability to apply in-depth knowledge of a specialized field to the design and execution of an original research question | a.¨ Framing and context reflects limited understanding of subject and associated literature  b.¨ Demonstrates limited critical thinking skills  c.¨ Inadequate statement of hypotheses and/or objectives are poorly defined | a.¨ Framing and context reflects adequate understanding of subject and associated literature  b.¨ Demonstrates adequate critical thinking skills  c.¨ Adequate statement of hypotheses and/or description of objectives | a.¨ Framing and context reflects exceptional understanding of subject and associated literature  b.¨ Demonstrates excellent critical thinking skills  c.¨ Excellent statement of hypotheses and/or objectives are well defined |  |
| 2. Demonstrated ability to approach solutions of new problems with methodical and logical application of sound scientific methods and entomological principles | a.¨ Ineffective research plan  b.¨ Statistical analyses not performed appropriately or incomplete | a.¨ Adequate research plan  b.¨ Statistical analyses sufficient | a.¨ Innovative research plan  b.¨ Highly competent statistical analyses |  |
| 3. Quality of writing | a.¨ Organization is poor  b.¨ Writing is weak and/or unclear  c.¨ Numerous grammatical and spelling errors | a.¨ Organization is good  b.¨ Writing is adequate  c.¨ Few grammatical and spelling errors | a.¨ Organization is excellent  b.¨ Writing is excellent and clear  c.¨ No grammatical and spelling errors |  |
| 4. Interpretation, originality, and contribution to discipline | a.¨ Inadequate interpretation  b.¨ Limited novelty  c.¨ Limited publication potential | a.¨ Adequate interpretation  b.¨ Some novelty  c.¨ Good publication potential | a.¨ Exceptional interpretation  b.¨ Exceptional novelty  c.¨ High profile publication potential and/or portions of research project already published |  |
| 5. Oral presentation | a.¨ Presentation style ineffective  b.¨ Slides need improvement  c.¨ Significance of research unclear | a.¨ Presentation style effective  b.¨ Slides adequately conveyed information  c.¨ Significance of research clear | a.¨ Presentation style is exceptional  b.¨ Slides were very clear and exceptionally effective in conveying information  c.¨ Significance of research was exceptionally communicated |  |
|  |  |  | **Total score:** |  |

Overall judgment: 14-27: Does not meet expectations | 28-36: Meets expectations | 37-42: Exceeds expectations.

**Comments (use back of page if necessary):**