

MCB Final Exam Assessment

Date of Exam:

Student:

Committee Members:

Learning outcomes	Excellent 4	Good 3	Adequate 2	Deficient 1	Score
Ability to master and critically analyze literature related to the project.	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of knowledge in the project area, and the ability to consistently discern the meaning and relative validity of data in scientific research publications.	Demonstrates a good understanding of knowledge in the project area, and displays many examples of the ability to discern the meaning and relative validity of data in scientific research publications.	Demonstrates some understanding of knowledge in project area, and some ability to discern the meaning and relative validity of data in scientific research publications.	Demonstrates minimal understanding of knowledge in the project area, and is unable in many cases to discern the meaning and relative validity of data in scientific research publications.	
Ability to formulate relevant, testable hypotheses, devise clear experiments for addressing hypotheses, and analyze and interpret data appropriately.	Demonstrates thorough understanding of the scientific method, clear ability to generate hypotheses, understand and design complex experimental protocols, and analyze data with a clear and proper interpretation.	Demonstrates good understanding of scientific method, generating hypotheses, designing experiments appropriate for testing hypotheses, presenting data in an appropriate context.	Demonstrates some understanding of scientific method, needs assistance with complex experimental design and analyzing data, can present and interpret data with some help from PI.	Demonstrates little understanding of scientific method, limited ability to conceive experimental designs to address hypotheses, needs significant faculty input for data analysis and interpretation.	
Ability to orally communicate data and interpretation effectively with scientific peers, answer questions, and communicate ideas.	Articulates intimate understanding of project, is able to orally communicate and defend new ideas, thinks effectively on his/her feet, is consistently able to integrate knowledge from multiple disciplines and experience to answer questions or solve problems.	Has appropriate understanding of project, able to articulate ideas but lacks creativity, can think through basic problems when questioned, and in many cases can integrate knowledge appropriately to answer questions or solve problems.	Has a basic understanding of project but lacks depth, answers basic questions but has difficulty thinking on his/her feet, and is sometimes able to integrate knowledge to answer questions or solve problems.	Lacks understanding of project and is not able to communicate rationale for interpretation of data or direction of the project, and is unable to draw from different areas or experiences to answer questions or solve problems.	
Ability to communicate effectively through scientific writing.	Demonstrates thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose of the proposal; uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to convey contribution to the scientific discipline; pays detailed attention to and successful execution of grant-writing conventions including organization, content presentation, formatting, and style; uses relevant and credible references appropriately, uses skilled language that conveys meaning with clarity and fluency, and is nearly error free.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience and purpose of proposal; many examples of appropriate, relevant and compelling content to convey the contribution to the scientific discipline; consistently uses grant-writing conventions including organization, content, presentation, and style; consistently uses appropriate references to support ideas; uses clear language that generally conveys meaning to readers, with few errors.	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, and purpose of the proposal; has some examples of appropriate, relevant, and compelling content; follows expectations appropriate to grant writing for basic organization, content, and presentation; attempts to use credible and/or relevant references to support ideas; uses language that generally conveys meaning with clarity, though with errors	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose of the proposal; uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in parts of the work; attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation; attempts to use sources to support ideas; uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.	

Note: Non-integer scores should be used (e.g. 2.8, 3.5, etc.).

Comments/Suggestions for Improvement: