**Dissertation Defense (PhD – Marine Science) Assessment Rating Scale – (PhD Outcome 4)**

**Student\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Committee Member\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Circle the appropriated boxes in each category.** Each student’s Dissertation Defense will be scored in five categories: Oral Presentation, Visual Presentation, Scientific Knowledge, Response to Questions from the General Audience, and Response to Questions from the Thesis Committee. The committee’s ranking will be based upon a five point scale (5 = Exemplary, 4 = Strong, 3 = Competent, 2 = Marginal, 1 = Unacceptable). The minimum successful score will be “Competent” or better from a majority of the Committee, with no score being “Unacceptable”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Oral Presentation** | **Visual Presentation** | **Scientific Knowledge** | **Response to Questions from General Audience** | **Response to Questions from Thesis Committee** |
| **5 – Exemplary** | Presentation delivered in a highly professional manner; confident in material and able to communicate principles clearly; precise diction and syntax; clear command of Standard English. | All supporting visual aids (slides, PowerPoint, etc.) were designed in a highly professional manner; visual aids supported the oral presentation closely, and were clear, concise, and necessary. | Provides substantial, well-chosen evidence (research or textual citations) to support scientific concepts. Demonstrates high knowledge of concepts and terminology. | Responds incisively and directly to the questions asked. Responses to questions are specific, defendable, and complex. | Responds incisively and directly to the questions asked. Responses to questions are specific, defendable, and complex. |
| **4 – Strong** | Presentation was coherently arranged; scientific principals and results were effectively communicated; occasionally difficult to follow or awkward; some wordiness. | Visual aids were generally well-designed, and communicated the information desired; Some of the visual aids were unnecessary and could have been eliminated. | Provides sufficient and appropriate evidence to support scientific claims, and makes effort to place scientific findings in context. | Most responses are direct and relevant to the questions asked. Responses to question are more general, but still accurate; analyses go beyond the obvious. | Most responses are direct and relevant to the questions asked. Responses to question are more general, but still accurate; analyses goes beyond the obvious. |
| **3 – Competent** | Most scientific principals and results were adequately communicated; much of oral presentation was not adequately prepared or irrelevant; occasional grammatical errors, imprecise diction or awkward syntax; general wordiness. | Visual aids were only adequately designed and often were not able to communicate the information desired; Many of the visual aids were unnecessary and could have been eliminated.  | Provides some evidence to support scientific claims, but not always relevant, sufficient, or integrated into the response. May have some factual, interpretive, or conceptual errors. | Responds adequately to the questions asked; occasionally responds with unrelated information. Responses to questions are overly general and disorganized; may have some factual, interpretive, or conceptual errors. | Responds adequately to the questions asked; occasionally responds with unrelated information. Responses to questions are overly general and disorganized; may have some factual, interpretive, or conceptual errors. |
| **2 – Marginal** | Oral presentation generally confusing; repetitive, wanders; frequent grammatical errors, imprecise diction; wordiness and awkward syntax. | Visual aids were poorly designed and confusing; Many of the visual aids were irrelevant and should not have been used. | Evidence to support scientific findings usually only narrative or anecdotal, and is generally awkwardly or incorrectly incorporated. | Confuses some significant concepts in the questions asked. Responses to questions are vague or irrelevant. | Confuses some significant concepts in the questions asked. Responses to questions are vague or irrelevant |
| **1 – Unacceptable** | Oral presentation not understandable. Not able to communicate general concepts, results and findings.  | Visual aids were sloppy and could not be read or interpreted by the audience. | Little or no evidence cited to support scientific claims. | Does not understand questions and/or concepts. No discernable response to most questions given. | Does not understand questions and/or concepts. No discernable response to most questions given. |