Program Name:		Program Degree Level:	Date:	
Student Name:	UM ID:	Student School Code:	Major Code:	Student Degree:
Rating of (check 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: