

Rubric for Evaluating Masters Thesis *(This page filled out by Committee Chair or Graduate Director)*

Student _____ Advisor _____

Thesis Title _____

Date of entry into MS Program _____ Student was (check one) _____ part time or _____ full time.

Date of Defense _____

Total time to complete MS degree (circle one): > 36 mos 30-36 mos 24-30 mos 18-24 mos <18 mos (Time Score 1 to 5)

This student has produced (fill in the number): Scoring Factor (SF): Raw Scores: (Number × SF)

____ Accepted or published journal articles 2.5 _____

____ Submitted journal articles 2.0 _____

____ Conference publications 1.5 _____

____ National Conference presentations 1.0 _____

____ Potential Journal publications 0.5 _____

Total Publication Performance Score: _____

Committee Members (and Department):

- At the conclusion of the defense, each committee member should fill out the response sheet. For each attribute which a committee member feels is somewhat or very deficient, a short explanation should be provided.
- This document should be completed, even if the committee feels that the thesis is unacceptable.
- Please attach a copy of the abstract and conclusions to this evaluation form. The adviser should also include copies of any journal publications or referred conference proceedings that have already resulted from this dissertation
- Place of employment or additional graduate study, if known _____

MS Thesis Response Sheet

(one for each committee member – circle response and return directly and confidentially to designated department administrative staff)

Attribute	Very Deficient	Somewhat Deficient	Acceptable	Very Good	Outstanding	Comments
Quality of thesis.	Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of theses that we've reviewed	Acceptable, but disappointing (10 th to 25 th percentile of theses at Pitt.)	Acceptable (25 th to 75 th percentile of theses at Pitt.)	Among 75 th to 90 th percentile of theses at Pitt	Among top 10% of theses at Pitt	
Contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires committee to stretch to find originality • Closer to BS than MS work 	Shows a little originality, but mostly pedantic and plodding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates originality • Makes limited contributions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original, creative work; • At least one good contribution for an MS thesis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original and creative. • Several important contributions for an MS thesis. • Novel technical contributions; could be the basis of PhD work. 	
Quality of writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires a professional editor • Sentence structure, language and style deficient • Major revisions required for technical content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing is weak • A number of typos, grammatical and spelling errors <p>A number of technical changes required.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited number of typos (grammatical errors and spelling) that do not detract from work • Some changes necessary • Some new technical contributions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very well written; • Easy to read and understand • Few changes or additions required. • Significant technical contributions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well organized, relevant, and technically complete • Excellent clarity and use of references • Well edited 	

Attribute	Very Deficient	Somewhat Deficient	Acceptable	Very Good	Outstanding	Comments
Defense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very poorly organized. • Disjointed presentation. • Unable to answer a number of questions. • Slides of very poor quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not well organized; • Rambled; dwelt too long on less important aspects • Had difficulty with questions. • Some slides difficult to read • Typos and other errors in slides. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable – slides clear • Good presentation skills • Able to answer most questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well thought out slides. • Professional presentation • Almost all questions addressed in a professional manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well organized, very professional, • All questions addressed in a knowledgeable and respectable manner. • Slides outstanding. 	
Student has potential for PhD work	No	May have difficulty completing PhD at Pitt; should consider a lesser institution	Yes	Definitely at Pitt or an aspiration institution.	Without a doubt at Pitt or one of the top five institutions	

(09/10/2008) –

Any additional comments and explanations for any perceived deficiencies: