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1. Does the research project have an IRB approval?

Yes Expedited

Exempt

2. Plagiarism was evident in this manuscript.

Yes No

*(If yes, provide evidence; inform the Chairman and the rest of the committee)*

**This section evaluates the final written document**

3. When did you receive a copy of the written manuscript?

4) Two weeks or more before the presentation date

2) At least one week before the presentation date

1) Less than a week or not received one at all

4. Did the manuscript follow the APA formatting guidelines?

4) Yes

2) Needs improvement

1) No

5. How would you describe the literature review and explanation of the research methodology?

4) Demonstrated disciplinary understanding and interconnections with expert advancement of the research plan

3) Complete leaving little to no questions about the drive behind the study

2) Complete but included irrelevant article reviews or minor vagueness or misconceptions

1) Inappropriate or insufficient review to support the research

6. Was the hypothesis stated clearly?

4) Creative, insightful and/or skillfully designed thesis

3) Expresses a clear, coherent thesis statement

2) Predominantly clear with one minor correction

1) Vague or inconsistent statement of purpose

7. Were the statistical methods used appropriate and justified in the project report?

4) Statistics were specific and appropriate for research data.

3) Statistics were adequate for analysis of research data.

2) Statistics were questionable for analysis of research data.

1) Statistics were inappropriate for research data.

8. How would you describe the analysis and discussion of the results?

4) Critical dissection of all acquired results with links that suggests discovery of novel information

3) Appropriate to data collected.

2) Incomplete and not appropriate for data collected.

1) Inaccurate and insufficient based on data obtained.

9. How would you rate the overall content of the written manuscript?

4) Has no fallacies and readability is enhanced by the language use.

3) Very good and can explain the purpose of the project without listening to the presentation

2) Needs few points of clarifications or elaborations

1) Cannot be used as a stand-alone manuscript and required the presence of the author to explain it

**This section evaluates the oral presentation of the proposal**

10. How would you rate the student's understanding of the statistical tools used?

4) Statistics were specific and appropriate for research data.

3) Statistics were adequate for analysis of research data.

2) Statistics were questionable for analysis of research data.

1) Statistics were inappropriate for research data.

11. During the discussion of the results and their meaning, the student

4) Was confident in, is understanding of the results and related them to other work to establish continuity of knowledge

3) Has a clear understanding of own results and their meaning and can discuss them easily

2) Lacked confidence in own data’s validity, their meaning or have difficulty discussing them

1) Could not explain the results and/or what the scientific conclusion gained from them

12. During the presentation, the student

4) Took full charge of the presentation

3) Frequently paused and to look at personal notes to proceed to the next point

2) Lost his/her place and needed occasional assistance to get back on track

1) Was led throughout the presentation by questions from the audience

13. When the student was faced with questions from the committee relating to the research proposal

4) The student answered most questions with ease

3) Clearly understands the answers but failed to elaborate

2) Student was uncomfortable answering questions and did so with continuous coaching/reassurance

1) Did not have a grasp of the subject and so could not answer most of the questions

14. Did the student explain the specific role of the project and its contribution to science (the big picture)?

4) Demonstrated scientific understanding of the project and connected findings to other work to make a solid conclusion

3) Aware of the role and contribution of the project to the big picture and its limitations

2) Over- or under- predicted the contribution of the project

1) Has partial grasp on the contribution of the project to the big picture

15. Regarding relevant future studies, the student

4) Suggested several feasible and innovative follow up experiment

3) Raised valid questions but did not suggest means to answer them

2) Suggested irrelevant, non-feasible or redundant follow up questions or experiments

1) Did not understand the purpose of this section and its contribution

16. How would you rate the overall merit of the research project?

4) Strong work that will lead to a scientific publication or to further work

3) Adequate for departmental research standards

2) Inadequate to meet departmental standards. Additional work required

1) Unacceptable, does not meet departmental standards.
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