Thesis Proposal Evaluation Form
for Master of Science in Biology

Instructions:

1. Page 1 is to be completed by the student or the Committee Chairman prior to the proposal.

2. One copy of pages 2 through 4 are to be completed by the committee at the end of the proposal while the student is outside of room during the committee’s deliberation. This form must be completed even if the committee determines that the proposal is unacceptable. Do not write the student’s name on pages 2-3.

3. Copies (pages 1-4) should be provided to the chair of the committee, the advisor (if not the same person as the chair), and the student. One copy of this document is to be placed in the student’s file in the Biology office.

4. The student should review the evaluation with the committee at the end of the proposal or with the advisor at a later date.

Student________________________________________________ Date of Presentation____________________________

Advisor________________________________________________

Proposal Title________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________

Semester admitted________________________________________

Thesis Committee

Name_________________________________________ (chair)________________________ Department________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________

Please check the following that apply.

☐ Thesis/Graduate Project Planning Form approved. If not, student must register planning form with graduate studies through https://pisco.grid.csun.edu/ETD/

☐ Student is Fully Classified. If not, list remaining conditions required and dates when conditions will be met.

________________________________________________________________________________________________
Proposal Evaluation Table for Biology MS

(Circle the cell below the ranking that best describes the student’s performance for each of the attributes listed in the first column)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Very Deficient</th>
<th>Somewhat Deficient</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proposal completed in timely manner</td>
<td>• Completed after 3rd semester</td>
<td>• Completed in 3rd semester</td>
<td>• Completed by start of 3rd semester</td>
<td>• Completed by end of 2nd semester</td>
<td>• Completed within 6 months of start of program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Contribution to field of study</td>
<td>• Difficult to find originality</td>
<td>• Little originality</td>
<td>• Demonstrates some originality</td>
<td>• Original and creative</td>
<td>• Original and creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Knowledge of Field of study</td>
<td>• Insufficient knowledge of literature relevant to area of research.</td>
<td>• Familiar with and/or has cited some key literature, but clearly needs to read more</td>
<td>• Familiar with and/or has cited most key literature relevant to area of research</td>
<td>• Proposal demonstrates a thorough review of the key literature relevant to area of research</td>
<td>• Proposal demonstrates a thorough review of key literature relevant to area of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Methodology</td>
<td>• Proposed methods as described are inadequate in meeting objective of study</td>
<td>• Proposed methods may be adequate but not as described</td>
<td>• Proposed methods are adequate for meeting objective of study</td>
<td>• Proposed methods includes the most currently accepted technologies for meeting objective of study</td>
<td>• Proposed methods include creative use or development of modern methods or technologies to meet objective of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unaware of suitable methods or technologies</td>
<td>• Vaguely aware of suitable methods or technologies</td>
<td>• Demonstrates awareness of suitable methods or technologies</td>
<td>• Evidence of training or experience in applying methods to collecting/analyzing data</td>
<td>• Demonstrates awareness of modern and emerging technologies in the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conducted preliminary study demonstrating skill and suitability of methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>Very Deficient</td>
<td>Somewhat Deficient</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. Quality of Writing| • Requires major revisions.  
• Sentence structure, language, and style are deficient.  
• should seek writing assistance | • Writing needs some improvement  
• Numerous typos and grammatical errors  
• Somewhat difficult to follow | • Acceptable writing (25th to 75th percentile)  
• Some minor editorial changes required (grammatical and spelling) | • Very well written  
• Easy to understand  
• Minimal editorial changes required | • Writing quality is consistent with that found in high profile scientific publications |
| 6. Presentation      | • Unorganized  
• Lack of flow in logic  
• Unable to answer many questions  
• Bluffed answers to questions rather than admitting not knowing the answer  
• Slides/handouts poor quality | • Presentation requires some reorganization  
• Some rambling, too much time spent on less important aspects  
• Some slides/handouts not clear  
• Distracting typos and errors  
• Difficulty answering with some questions | • Slides/handouts clear  
• Presentation skills good  
• Most questions answered competently | • Professional presentation  
• Nearly all questions answered knowledgably and respectively | • Well organized and professional  
• Slides/handouts outstanding  
• All questions answered knowledgably and respectively. |
| 7. Quality of Proposal| • Not acceptable  
• Student not prepared to begin research for MS thesis  
• Major revision of written proposal must be prepared in timeline specified by committee | • Deficient in many areas  
• Proposed research shows potential for an acceptable MS thesis.  
• Proposed research may be difficult to publish | • Within 25th to 75th percentile of proposals  
• Proposed research will most likely lead to an acceptable MS thesis with potential for publishing in relevant journals | • Among 10th to 25th percentile of proposals  
• Proposed research will most likely lead to a high quality MS thesis with potential for publishing in a high quality journal | • Among top 10% of proposals  
• Without doubt, proposed research will successfully lead to a high quality MS thesis with high potential for publication(s) in top-tier journals in relevant field |

Comments and Reasons for Noted Deficiencies: