

DEES Rubric for Evaluation of MS Thesis

Student Name:

Title of MS Thesis/Project:

Evaluator:

Evaluation Date:

Rating (1 through 10, with 1-3 being 'Inadequate', 4-6 being 'Adequate', 7-9 being 'Good' and 10 being 'Outstanding'; write 'UJ' or 'NA' if unable to judge or 'non-applicable', respectively.)

1. Problem Statement:

Rating __/10

Criteria for assigning rating (in a scale of 1 through 10):

[10]: Completely novel, well-motivated problem with clearly defined objectives. The solution of the problem would have an impact beyond the immediate research question.

[7-9]: Novel problem with well-defined objectives. Its solution would have some impact for the research area.

[4-6]: Well-studied problem with objectives but little chance of impact. Weakly motivated.

[1-3]: Uninteresting problem with little probability of impact. Objectives not defined. Absent or unconvincing motivation.

2. Literature Review/Background:

Rating __/10

Criteria for assigning rating (in a scale of 1 through 10):

[10]: Critical analysis of most relevant work, compares most relevant existing methods using quantitative measures, clearly and accurately evaluates weaknesses or knowledge gaps, gives a clear understanding of the current state of the art.

[7-9]: Presents pertinent work, compares and contrasts some existing methods using qualitative arguments, gives a clear understanding of the current state of the art.

[4-6]: Describes most existing approaches, little or no comparison and contrast, gives an acceptable, but incomplete understanding of the state of the art.

[1-3]: Significant work missing, describes work with little or no qualitative or quantitative assessment, gives an unacceptably incomplete understanding of the state of the art.

3. Proposed Theory / Research Methodology:

Rating __/10

Criteria for assigning rating (in a scale of 1 through 10):

[10]: Proposed theory or methodology represents a significant contribution (an improvement over existing methods, or a novel and sound alternative to existing methods) for accomplishing or evaluating the project objectives. Research steps are focused on the objectives.

[7-9]: Proposed theory or methodology is appropriate for accomplishing or evaluating the project objectives.

[4-6]: Theory or methodology is not innovative and does not clearly allow for an evaluation of the objectives.

[1-3]: Reproduction of existing work and/or lack of alignment between methods and objectives.

4. Results and Analysis:

Rating ___/10

Criteria for assigning rating (in a scale of 1 through 10):

[10]: Results and analysis clearly make the case that the method is a major and outstanding improvement in the state of the art and convincingly argue that the results support or nullify the research hypothesis.

[7-9]: Results and analysis suggest that the method is an improvement over the state of the art in most respects.

[4-6]: Results do not clearly demonstrate that the method is a significant improvement in the state of the art and/or critical interpretation in light of project objectives is missing.

[1-3]: Results are inadequate and could not support the research hypothesis; inadequate or absent analysis.

5. Discussion / Conclusions / Recommendations:

Rating ___/10

Criteria for assigning rating (in a scale of 1 through 10):

[10]: Discussion convincingly places the results in the broader context of the literature, argues for the method's significance, discusses weaknesses and limitations, and suggests avenues for future work.

[7-9]: Discussion places the results in the context of some related literature, argues for the method's significance, discusses weaknesses and limitations, and suggests avenues for future work.

[4-6]: Discussion weakly places the results in the broader context of the literature, misses arguments for the method's significance, provides limited discussion of weaknesses and limitations, and suggests few avenues for future work.

[1-3]: Inadequate or absent discussion.

6. Writing:

Rating ___/10

Criteria for assigning rating (in a scale of 1 through 10):

[10]: Clear, well-organized technical writing with no issues with formatting, grammar, spelling, mechanics, typography, equations, algorithms, proofs, figures, tables, and bibliography.

[7-9]: Clear, well-organized technical writing, but with minor to moderate with issues with the aforementioned elements.

[4-6]: Moderate to significant issues with writing and organization. Significant problems with the aforementioned elements.

[1-3]: Unacceptable writing, organization, or presentation.

7. Oral Presentation:

Rating ___/10

Criteria for assigning rating (in a scale of 1 through 10):

[10]: Clear, well-organized technical presentation with well-formatted presentation materials clearly focused on project objectives, methods, results and analysis and conclusions. Presentation was very professional, the presenter was confident and had great knowledge on the area of the research. Responded well to questions.

[7-9]: Clear, well-organized technical presentation, but with minor to moderate with issues with the aforementioned elements. Quality of presentation was above average. Minor issues with responses to questions.

[4-6]: Moderate to significant issues with presentation. Significant problems with the aforementioned elements. Difficulty responding to questions.

[1-3]: Unacceptable presentation materials. Unacceptable answers to basic questions.

8. Overall Quality of Research:

Rating __/10

Criteria for assigning rating (in a scale of 1 through 10):

[10]: Of publishable quality or findings have great chance of impactful implementation; would be definitely accepted for publication in top conferences and journals in the area.

[7-9]: Of nearly publishable quality or potential for findings to be implemented or form basis for future studies; with revision would likely be accepted for publication in top conferences and journals in the area.

[4-6]: Potentially publishable with moderate additional work and editing.

[1-3]: Little chance of publication. Inadequate.