

Grading - Env. Science/Biology/Policy & SusDev Senior Seminar

Author (of thesis/proposal):

Advisor:

Reviewer:

Date:

Grade:

Process (10% of grade)

The student was creative, resourceful, strategic, identified steps needed to reach goals, successfully managed the project, evaluated progress and adapted approaches.

(S)he implemented the project in a professional manner, met regularly and collaborated well with thesis mentor/advisor and peer, and carried the project through proactively.

Drafts were improved following advice from advisors, mentors and peers

(S)he handled uncertain, complex, real-world problems in the lab, field, etc.

Overall evaluation:

deficient good outstanding

Comment:

Presentations (10% of grade)

The student clearly communicated background, analysis, interpretations and significance through oral and poster presentations.

deficient good outstanding

Thesis (proposal) (80% of grade)

Dear reviewer: please evaluate the thesis (proposal) by checking the appropriate boxes below and provide more detailed comments in the space provided below the boxes

The **title** is clear, compact and to the point, it contains all key identifiers of the (proposed) research.

deficient good outstanding

The **abstract** introduces the topic and clearly describes the main (preliminary, i.a.) findings in a quantitative and space efficient way.

deficient good outstanding

The **introduction** contains a compact but comprehensive presentation of background and prior work in the topic area starting broad and narrowing to a clear thesis statement. It clearly defines the (proposed) research, and demonstrates student capacity to locate, organize, analyze, integrate, synthesize, and evaluate complex information from multiple and disparate sources. Statements of fact are always properly referenced.

deficient good outstanding

Analytical and quantitative (proposed) **methods/approaches** are selected adequately and presented comprehensively and demonstrate creativity.

deficient good outstanding

(Preliminary) **results** are comprehensive and presented in a clear and organized fashion. Data analysis is appropriate and exhaustive, including statistice where relevant.

deficient *good* *outstanding*

The **discussion** thoroughly interprets (preliminary) results in context of the thesis statement and properly cited studies. It fully and creatively explores the topic and demonstrates capacity to organize, analyze, integrate, synthesize, and evaluate complex information from multiple and disparate sources.

deficient *good* *outstanding*

Recommendations (broader implications) suggests further analysis, potential solutions to posed problems, and potential use of findings in a broader context.

deficient *good* *outstanding*

Writing quality - The manuscript flows without gaps in the logic. It is well organized and consistent with disciplinary style. Grammar is correct and there are no typos. The style enhances the grasp of ideas and engages the reader. Scientific terminology is adequately defined and used. Abbreviations and acronyms are used only when absolutely necessary.

deficient *good* *outstanding*

Figures, graphs and tables are easy to read and considerably enhance the understanding of the material. They adequately represent key points, have appropriate captions and are interleaved with the text. Figures are sharp, each axis/symbol is labeled, units are included and different symbols are legible.

deficient *good* *outstanding*

Literature is exhaustive and synthesized to enhance reader's understanding of the topic and to show the relationship of the study to the discipline. References include relevant and up-to-date sources (at least 15 for proposal, 30 for thesis). They follow the disciplinary format and are referred to in the text.

deficient *good* *outstanding*

Summary statement: