**Research Proposal Presentation (Oral and Written)** (rev. 11/16)

Student \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Committee Member\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | | **SCORE** | **SCALE** |
| **SLO 3**  Written skills 1 | Context and purpose |  | **4 = Exemplary**  **3 = Proficient**  **2 = Marginal**  **1 = Unacceptable** |
| Content development |  |
| Conventions |  |
| Sources and evidence |  |
| Syntax and mechanics |  |
| **SLO 3 Written skills 1  SUM** |  |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | | **SCORE** | **SCALE** |
| **SLO 3**  Oral presentation skills2 | Organization |  | **4 = Exemplary**  **3 = Proficient**  **2 = Marginal**  **1 = Unacceptable** |
| Language |  |
| Delivery |  |
| Supporting material |  |
| Central message |  |
| **SLO 3 Oral presentation skills2 SUM** |  |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | | **SCORE** | **SCALE** |
| **SLO 4 –M.S. SLO 5 – PhD**  Critical thinking and application of inquiry and analysis3 | Clear statement of research problem and motivation |  | **4 = Exemplary**  **3 = Proficient**  **2 = Marginal**  **1 = Unacceptable** |
| Value of research demonstrated |  |
| Knowledge of literature |  |
| Well-defined hypotheses or objectives |  |
| Sound methods/tools |  |
| **SLO 4 –M.S. SLO 5 – PhD** **Critical thinking** **SUM** |  |

SLO 3 (oral communication skills) = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (maximum 20, minimum 5)

SLO 3 (written communication skills) = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (maximum 20, minimum 5)

SLO 4 (M.S.) or 5 (PhD) (critical thinking ability) = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (maximum 20, minimum 5)

1 Taken from Written Communication VALUE Rubric – Association of American Colleges and Universities

2 Taken from Oral Communication VALUE Rubric - Association of American Colleges and Universities

3 Taken from Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric - Association of American Colleges and Universities

**Additional comments:**

**SLO Achievement:** These scores do not determine whether the student passes or fails the research proposal presentation. They are for the student and supervisor’s information to determine areas of strength and weakness that can be remedied before the conduct of the research and completion of the thesis or dissertation. All committee members should fill out a form and copies should be delivered to the Graduate Coordinator’s office for deposit in the student’s file. Supervisory committee chair - please share the results of this evaluation with your student, either summarizing their strengths/weaknesses or showing the individual score sheets.

**Rubric for scoring**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | | **4 - Exemplary** | **3 - Proficient** | **2- Marginal** | **1 - Unacceptable** |
| **SLO 3**  Written skills 1  (max. 20 points, min. 5 points) | **Context and purpose** | * Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that focuses all elements of the work. | * Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience and purpose, and a clear focus of the work. | * Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, and purpose of the work. | * Does not demonstrate attention to context, audience, and purpose of the work. |
| **Content development** | * Consistently uses appropriate, relevant and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer’s understanding. | * Consistently uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the subject. | * Use appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas throughout most of the work. | * Does not use appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work. |
| **Conventions** | * Detailed attention to and successful execution of all conventions specific to the discipline (organization, content, presentation, formatting, style) | * Consistent use of important conventions specific to the discipline. | * Follows expectations appropriate for specific discipline for organization, content and presentation. | * Does not use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation. |
| **Sources and evidence** | * Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate. | * Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas. | * Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas. | * Does not use sources to support ideas. |
| **Syntax and mechanics** | * Uses language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free. | * Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers and has few errors. | * Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity but may include errors. | * Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage. |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | | **4 - Exemplary** | **3 - Proficient** | **2- Marginal** | **1 - Unacceptable** |
| **SLO 3**  Oral presentation skills2  (max. 20 points, min. 5 points) | **Organization**  (specific introduction and conclusion, sequence of material in body, and transitions) | * Organizational pattern is clearly and consistently observable, is skillful, and makes the content of the presentation cohesive | * Organizational pattern is clearly and consistently observable | * Organizational pattern is intermittently observable | * No organizational pattern observable |
| **Language** | * Language choices enhance the effectiveness of the presentation and are appropriate for the audience. | * Language choices generally support the effectiveness of the presentation and are appropriate for the audience. | * Language choices partially support the effectiveness of the presentation and are appropriate for the audience. | * Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation and are not appropriate for the audience. |
| **Delivery**  (posture, use of pointer, eye contact, vocal expressiveness) | * Delivery techniques make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident. | * Delivery techniques make the presentation interesting and speaker appears comfortable. | * Delivery techniques make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative. | * Delivery techniques detract from the understandability of the presentation and speaker appears uncomfortable. |
| **Supporting material**  (explanations, examples, illustrations, figures, photos, diagrams, statistics) | * A variety of supporting materials makes appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation. | * Supporting materials make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation. | * Supporting materials make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation. | * Insufficient supporting materials make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation. |
| **Central message** | * Central message is compelling (strongly stated, appropriately repeated, memorable and strongly supported). | * Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material. | * Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated or is not memorable. | * Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation. |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | | **4 - Exemplary** | **3 - Proficient** | **2- Marginal** | **1 - Unacceptable** |
| **SLO 4 –M.S. SLO 5 – PhD**  Critical thinking and application of inquiry and analysis3  (max. 20 points, min. 5 points) | Has stated the research problem clearly,  providing motivation for undertaking the research | * Clear statement of the research problem with well stated associated rationale | * Statement of research problem with associated rationale | * Unclear statement of research problem OR rationale for undertaking the research is not well developed | * Unclear statement of research problem AND rationale for undertaking the research is not well developed |
| Demonstrated the potential  value of solution to the research problem in advancing  knowledge within the area of study | * Clearly states the value of the proposed research | * States the value of proposed research | * Recognizes the value of the research but didn’t state explicitly | * Doesn’t recognize the potential value of the proposed research |
| Demonstrates sound  knowledge of literature in the area, and of prior work on the  specific research problem | * Synthesizes in-depth information from relevant sources representing various points of view/approaches | * Presents in-depth information from relevant sources presenting various points of view/approaches | * Presents information from relevant sources representing limited points of view/approaches | * Presents information from irrelevant sources representing limited points of view/approaches |
| Planned research is creative and original with well-defined hypotheses or objectives | * Highly creative and original with well-defined hypotheses or objectives | * Somewhat creative and original with well-defined hypotheses or objectives | * Research not very creative and original OR hypotheses or objectives not well-defined | * Research neither creative nor original AND hypotheses or objectives not well-defined |
| Has proposed sound state-of-the field  research methods/tools to solve the defined problem and has  described the methods/tools effectively | * All elements of the methodology are skillfully developed. Appropriate methodology may be synthesized from across disciplines or from relevant sub-disciplines | * Critical elements of the methodology are appropriately developed, however, more subtle elements are ignored or unaccounted for | * Critical elements of the methodology are missing, incorrectly developed, or unfocused | * Design of experiments demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology |