|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Program Name:  | Program Degree Level: | Date: |
| Student Name:  | UM ID: | Student School Code:  | Major Code: | Student Degree: |
| Rating of (circle one): Master of Arts Thesis Proposal / Defense Doctoral Dissertation Proposal / Defense / Doctoral Qualifying Exam Master of Fine Arts Thesis Project Proposal / Defense | Other: |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Rating Scale and Explanations** | **Rating** **(1-5, from scale to left)** |
| **1 = Unacceptable** | **2 = Poor** | **3 = Average/ Acceptable** | **4 = Very Good** | **5 = Exceptional** |
| **Knowledge of the discipline** | Error(s) in exposition of the field and/or omission of key source(s) | Minor errors, omissions, and/or lack of synthesis | Adequate and accurate exposition of key sources | Good coverage and synthesis of key sources plus additional relevant material  | Thorough review and excellent synthesis of sources, including some obscure but relevant ones |  |
| **Appropriate methodology** | Errors in methodology selection and/or use | Minor methodological errors and/or omissions  | Methodology applied correctly and adequately; appropriate documentation | Methodology applied correctly, explained clearly, and documented well  | Mastery of finer points of methodology plus elegant application and/or supplementary approaches |  |
| **Application of knowledge and methodology to original research topic** | Discipline and methodology not referenced/applied well | Some links to discipline knowledge and methodology but not clearly integrated with research | Adequate connection between knowledge of discipline and use of methodology and research | Clear exposition of relationship of disciplinary knowledge and methodology to original research | Insightful references to sources and application of methodology to excellent research topic |  |
| **Critical thinking**  | Muddled presentation with errors in reasoning and/or without much analysis and synthesis  | Reasoning sometimes confused, simplistic, and/or not clearly explained | Adequate reasoning, explanation of assumptions, and supporting evidence | Clear reasoning with organized presentation of evidence, assumptions, and conclusions | Clear and organized argument that represents sound, original, and complex thought  |  |
| **Effective written communication** | Writing generally unclear, with consistent errors and/or poor organization  | Writing sometimes unclear with weak organization and/or grammatical errors | Writing clear, concise, and organized, with minor or no grammatical errors  | Writing generally error-free with clear organization and depth  | Elegant writing with fully developed arguments, clear organization, and correct grammar  |  |
| **Effective oral communication** | Presentation generally unclear, with poor organization and/or marred by distracting mannerisms or language | Presentation sometimes unclear, with weak organization, and/or some distracting mannerisms or language | Presentation organized to convey main points of thesis/dissertation clearly and without distractions | Articulate presentation with clear organization and professional language | Elegant, confident, and engaging presentation with clear organization and flow |  |
| **Overall quality (not necessarily average of earlier ratings)** |  Unacceptable | Poor  | Average/acceptable | Very Good  | Exceptional  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |