

# Integrated Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Discipline

## Evaluation of Dissertation Research and Final Defense Cover Page to Be Filled Out by Student

✱ Student provides an electronic version of this form or brings a copy of this form to the meeting for each committee member ✱  
and fills out this cover page prior to dissertation defense

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Defense: \_\_\_\_\_

Supervising Professor: \_\_\_\_\_

Mo/Yr Started \_\_\_\_\_

Is official Advancement to Candidacy form on file in the Dean's office?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Is Dissertation Proposal on file in the Dean's office?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Title of Dissertation: \_\_\_\_\_

Has the student enrolled in two semesters of Dissertation (IBMS 7099)?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Honors/Awards/Grants received since entering the IBMS Graduate Program:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Presentations at national meetings since entering the IBMS Graduate Program:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Manuscripts since entering the IBMS Graduate Program. Indicate whether each manuscript is accepted or under review, and precede a title with \* if publication required peer-review:

# Evaluation of Dissertation Research and Final Defense

Submitted by Each Member of the Research Supervising Committee

**Name of Committee Member:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions to Evaluator:** Rate each item in whole numbers with 1, 2, 3, or 4; then provide an Overall Rating out to one decimal.

	No Proficiency Demonstrated Failure (1)	Marginal Proficiency Demonstrated Unsatisfactory (2)	Proficiency Demonstrated Satisfactory (3)	Exceptional Proficiency Demonstrated Honors (4)	RATING (1-4)
<b>WRITTEN DISSERTATION</b>					
<b>Background and Significance</b>	<b>Failed to convincingly describe</b> the significance of the research.	<b>Superficial</b> description of the significance of the research.	<b>Satisfactory</b> description of the significance of the research.	<b>Exceptional</b> description of the significance of the research.	
<b>Hypothesis</b>	<b>Failed to formulate and establish</b> a testable hypothesis.	<b>Weak</b> formulation of a testable hypothesis on which the research was based.	<b>Satisfactory</b> formulation of a testable hypothesis on which the research was based.	<b>Exceptional</b> formulation of a testable hypothesis on which the research was based; including effectively providing implications of proving the hypothesis true.	
<b>Experimental Strategies and Methods</b>	<b>Failed to employ</b> a realistic strategy and appropriate methods for testing the stated hypothesis.	<b>Undeveloped justification for choice of experimental strategies and methods</b> used for testing the stated hypothesis.	<b>Satisfactory justification for choice of experimental strategies and methods</b> used for testing the stated hypothesis.	<b>Fully developed justification for choice of experimental strategies and methods</b> used for testing the stated hypothesis.	
<b>Data Collection, Analysis and Interpretation</b>	<b>Failed to collect and analyze</b> any data resulting in valid conclusions regarding stated hypotheses.	<b>Unsatisfactory</b> data collection and analysis resulting in ambiguous conclusions regarding stated hypothesis.	<b>Satisfactory</b> data collection and analysis demonstrating valid conclusions regarding stated hypothesis.	<b>Exceptional</b> data collection and analysis demonstrating valid conclusions, including <b>insights impacting the general field of study.</b>	
<b>Discussion and Future Studies</b>	<b>Failed to argue</b> that research results advanced the state of the field or to provide a vision of “where research could go” after completion of project.	<b>Superficial vision</b> of how research results advanced the state of the field or “where research could go” after completion of project.	<b>Satisfactory vision</b> of how research results advanced the state of the field or “where research could go” after completion of project.	<b>Exceptional vision</b> of how research results advanced the state of the field or “where research could go” after completion of project.	

## ORAL DEFENSE

<b>Verbal Communication</b>	<b>Failed to communicate ideas</b> or explain conclusions.	<b>Marginally effective communication</b> of findings, lacking clarity of important details.	<b>Satisfactory communication of findings</b> with clarity and expected detail.	<b>Exceptional communication of findings</b> with clarity and detail and implications of results in relation to the field of study.	
<b>Knowledge Directly Related to Student's Research Project</b>	<b>Failed to demonstrate</b> knowledge directly related to research project.	<b>Superficial knowledge</b> directly related to research project.	<b>Satisfactory knowledge</b> directly related to research project.	<b>Exceptionally comprehensive knowledge</b> directly related to research project.	
<b>Knowledge From the Literature Related to Research Area</b>	<b>Failed to demonstrate general knowledge</b> from the relevant literature.	<b>Superficial general knowledge</b> from the relevant literature.	<b>Satisfactory general knowledge</b> from the relevant literature.	<b>Exceptionally comprehensive knowledge</b> from the relevant literature.	
<b>Responses to Criticisms From Committee</b>	<b>Failed to address</b> criticisms of research project.	<b>Rarely</b> addressed criticisms of research project successfully.	<b>Frequently</b> addressed criticisms of research project successfully.	<b>Always</b> addressed criticisms of research project successfully.	
<b>Overall Critical Thinking and Independence</b>	<b>Failed to demonstrate any</b> ability to answer scientific questions independently ( <i>i.e.</i> , with <b>constant assistance from Supervising Professor</b> ).	<b>Superficial ability</b> to answer scientific questions independently ( <i>i.e.</i> , with <b>frequent assistance from Supervising Professor</b> ).	<b>Satisfactory ability</b> to answer scientific questions independently ( <i>i.e.</i> , with <b>rare assistance from Supervising Professor</b> ).	<b>Exceptional ability</b> to answer scientific questions independently ( <i>i.e.</i> , with <b>no assistance from Supervising Professor</b> ).	

The **Overall Rating** reflects the student's total performance. The Overall Rating should be consistent with, but is not a mathematical average of, the individual ratings shown above that may each carry different weight.

<b>OVERALL RATING:</b>	
------------------------	--

**COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Indicate below, factors that influenced your ratings. Be particularly detailed if a rating of 1 or 2 is given; provide suggestions for how the student could improve the written dissertation document. Attach additional pages if needed.

Integrated Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Discipline  
**DISSERTATION SUPERVISING COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORT**  
(To be completed by the Dissertation Supervising Committee Chair)

STUDENT: \_\_\_\_\_

YEARS IN IBMS PROGRAM: \_\_\_\_\_

SUPERVISING PROFESSOR: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE OF DISSERTATION DEFENSE: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Overall Ratings

1. _____ (Committee Chair)	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____
4. _____	_____
5. _____	_____
Optional _____	_____

**FINAL GRADE: Honors (H)** - Mean of individual ratings = 3.5 - 4.0, and there is no Individual Assessment of < 3.0.

**Satisfactory (S)** - Mean of individual ratings = 2.5 - 3.4, and no more than 1 Individual Rating of < 2.0.

**Unsatisfactory (U)** - Mean of individual ratings < 2.5.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**MEAN OF OVERALL RATINGS**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**FINAL GRADE (H, S, or U)**

The student has demonstrated expected (satisfactory) ethical behavior  Yes  No

**COMMENTS:** Indicate factors resulting in the Final Grade shown above. If the student receives a Final Grade of U, indicate **specific weaknesses** that resulted in that grade. Indicate necessary revisions of the dissertation document. Attach additional pages if needed.

This summary report from the committee chair, together with original score reports from Dissertation Supervising Committee members, should be submitted for inclusion in student's academic file.

## **GUIDELINES FOR RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS**

**OVERALL RATINGS** provided by members of a student's Dissertation Supervising Committee will determine the assessment of the dissertation defense and can be one of the following:

Satisfactory with Honors (H); Satisfactory (S); Unsatisfactory (U); Incomplete (I)

### **Satisfactory with Honors:**

*A grade of **Honors (H)** may be posted for the final semester of IBMS 7099 (Dissertation) indicating that the student's writing of the dissertation document and performance during the dissertation defense demonstrated no major flaws or weaknesses, and was considered exceptional.*

This grade will be submitted to the Registrar for IBMS 7099 if the **Mean Overall Rating for the Dissertation Defense is 3.5 - 4.0**, and **no Overall Rating given by any committee member is less than 3.**

### **Satisfactory:**

*A grade of **Satisfactory (S)** may be posted for the final semester of IBMS 7099 (Dissertation) indicating that the student's writing of the dissertation document and performance during the dissertation defense demonstrated only limited flaws or weaknesses and was considered adequate for a student at the end of training.*

This grade will be submitted to the Registrar for IBMS 7099 if the **Mean Overall Rating for the Dissertation Defense is 2.5- 3.4** and **no more than one committee member gives an Overall Rating of less than 2.**

### **Unsatisfactory:**

*A grade of **Unsatisfactory (U)** may be posted for IBMS 7099 indicating that the student's writing of the dissertation document and/or performance during the dissertation defense demonstrated serious overall shortcomings.*

Typically, an Unsatisfactory (U) grade will be submitted to the Registrar for IBMS 7099 if the **Mean Overall Rating is < 2.5.**

If the Dissertation Supervising Committee recommends that a grade of Unsatisfactory (U) be posted for IBMS 7099 (a very rare occurrence), the student's Discipline Director/DEC will be informed so that the student can be notified that, as stipulated by the Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, a grade of U for the dissertation defense will require that a recommendation be submitted to the IBMS COGS that the student be considered for one of the following options: 1) Major revision of dissertation may be requested followed by a second and final attempt at oral defense; 2) Conferral of a terminal MS degree; or 3) Dismissal from the IBMS Graduate Program;. If the final DEC recommendation is for dismissal from the Program, that recommendation will be forwarded to the GSBS Dean,

### **Incomplete:**

A grade of Incomplete (I) would be appropriate if a student has a justifiable reason for not completing the Dissertation Defense process. The "I" grade would be changed to "S" if the student IBMS Program requirements for having the delayed defense; or would be changed to "U" if the student does not meet such requirements.