Graduate Program in Diagnostic Genetics and Genomics
MS Thesis Research Proposal Defense Evaluation
(To be completed by each supervisory/advisory committee member)
Due On or Before: 09/01/2021

1. When did you receive a copy of the written manuscript?
    4) Two weeks or more before the presentation date
    3) At least one week before the presentation date
    2) Less than one week
    1) Did not get copy

2. Does the research project have an IRB approval?

Yes	Expedited	Acquired
In Process	Exempt	

3. Plagiarism was evident in this manuscript.

    Yes   No
(If yes, provide evidence; inform the Chairman and the rest of the committee)

This section evaluates the written proposal

4. Use of Grammar
    4) Use correct grammar, sentence structure and spelling throughout the document
    2) Occasional errors in grammar, sentence structure or spelling
    1) Multiple errors in grammar, sentence structure or spelling

5. How would you rate the literature review?
    4) Complete leaving little to no questions about the drive behind the study
    3) Complete but included irrelevant article reviews
    2) Incomplete with minor questionable gaps of information
    1) Greatly lacking in justifying of the purpose of the study

6. Was the hypothesis stated clearly?
    4) Expresses a clear, coherent thesis statement
    3) Predominantly clear with one minor correction
    2) Vague or inconsistent statement of purpose
    1) Ill-defined or no thesis or statement of purpose

7. Were clear objectives stated for this project?
    4) Defined, simple and directed objectives were stated
    3) Over ambitious or too many objectives to be completed in the suggested time frame
    2) The idea is present but was poorly stated or unexplained
    1) Misunderstood, wrong or incomplete objectives were stated

8. How would you rate the explanation of the proposed methodology?
    4) Simplified and contained all needed components to give clear understanding and purpose of each method
    3) Too much detail and overwhelming to the audience
    2) Can further explain the methods or their purpose to the project
    1) Seem to be only a listing of methodology with no clear understanding of its applications

9. How would you rate the explanation of the proposed data analysis/statistical methods?
        4) Statistics were specific and appropriate for research data.
        3) Statistics were adequate for analysis of research data.
        2) Statistics were questionable for analysis of research data.
        1) Statistics were inappropriate for research data.

10. How would you rate the overall content of the research proposal?
        4) Very good and can explain the purpose of the project without listening to the presentation
        3) Needs few points of clarifications or elaborations
        2) Cannot be used as a stand-alone proposal and require the presence of the author to explain it
        1) Contain logical flaws, major grammatical and spelling errors or conveys little about the project

This section evaluates the oral presentation of the proposal

11. Was the introduction and the literature review sufficient to justify the project?
        4) Literature review followed a logical and timely sequence which the audience can follow
        3) Literature review was sufficient but prompted few clarification questions
        2) The literature review was difficult to follow because the student was not organized
        1) The audience cannot understand the purpose of the project because there was no clear sequence

12. How would you rate the student's understanding of the methodology and analytical tools proposed?
        4) Aware of the methods proposed regardless to experience
        3) Familiar with the proposed methods but shows uncertainty due to lack of experience
        2) Aware but does not understand the purpose of the use of proposed methods
        0) Unaware and does not understand the purpose of the suggested methods.

13. During the presentation, the student
        4) Took full charge of the presentation
        3) Frequently paused and to look at personal notes to proceed to the next point
        2) Lost his/her place and needed occasional assistance to get back on track
        1) Was led throughout the presentation by questions from the audience

14. When the student was faced with questions from the committee relating to the research proposal
        4) The student answered most questions with ease
        3) Clearly understands the answers but failed to elaborate
        2) Was uncomfortable answering questions and did so with continuous coaching/reassurance
        1) Did not have a grasp of the subject and so could not answer most of the questions

15. Did the student understand their specific role in the project and its potential contribution to science (the big picture)?
        4) Aware of the role and contribution of the project and its limitations
        3) Over- or under- predicted the contribution of the project
        2) Has partial grasp on the contribution of the project to the big picture
        1) Needs significant improvement

Total Score: _____ (A minimum score of **42 > 80%** is required for a PASS grade)   Pass   Fail

COMMENTS:

_____   _____
        Committee member name and signature   date