

**Assessment of Graduate Candidate
Department of Ecosystem Science and Management**

This form is to be filled out by all graduate committee members, including the advisor, during the candidate's oral defense. When form is completed please send the form the ESM office, Graduate Coordinator, Ag 2013, or give to the major advisor.

Candidate's Name _____ Date _____
 Evaluator's Name _____ Department _____
 Major Advisor (check if yes) ___

Check the appropriate box for each category.

	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	N/A
Oral communication skills					
Written communication skills					
Quantitative skills					
Logic and critical thinking abilities					
Breadth of knowledge					
Professionalism					

Additional comments:

Rubric to evaluate graduate candidate

	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	N/A
Oral communication skills	Candidate thought on their feet well and addressed questions directly, logically and clearly	Candidate provided thoughtful and careful answers, but occasionally was hesitant or unsure	Candidate's answers varied some in logic or careful thought, and sometimes were off topic	Candidate's answers rambled, were off topic, or failed to show careful thought	Evaluator has insufficient information to judge
Written communication skills	Organization, logic and argument were very clear and concise. No writing errors and style was mature	Good organization and logic, but occasionally was wordy or had awkward sentence structure	Basic ideas were conveyed, but organization or logic needed improvement. Writing may have been wordy or imprecise	Organization was confusing and topics were not logically arranged. Writing had numerous errors, and was imprecise	Evaluator has insufficient information to judge
Quantitative skills	Candidate demonstrated complete mastery of data analysis, statistical evaluation and/or modeling	Candidate had sufficient understanding of statistical analysis and modeling, but not complete mastery	Candidate can accomplish very basic data analysis, but requires assistance	Candidate struggled significantly with mathematical and/or statistical evaluation of data	Evaluator has insufficient information to judge OR data analysis was not pertinent to thesis
Logic and critical thinking abilities	Candidate supported arguments with clear logic and could synthesize unrelated or disparate ideas and information	Candidate had capacity to synthesize a broad set of information, but may have occasionally struggled with interpretation	Candidate understood basic ideas of the argument, but struggled forming a coherent response to a complex problem	Candidate was incapable of developing a logical argument and could not synthesize the fundamental information	Evaluator has insufficient information to judge
Breadth of knowledge	Candidate's knowledge of concepts and theories within field was augmented substantially with knowledge from supporting disciplines	Candidate understood concepts and theories within field and occasionally supported arguments with knowledge from supporting disciplines	Candidate had basic understanding of concepts and theories within field, but struggled to incorporate knowledge from supporting fields	Candidate had poor understanding of concepts and theories within field, and could not draw on knowledge from supporting fields	Evaluator has insufficient information to judge
Professionalism	Candidate was punctual, organized, engaging, highly communicative and respectful	Candidate was respectful and organized, but may not have communicated meeting times effectively or was not always punctual	Candidate was respectful, but was occasionally disorganized, late to meetings, or did not communicate sufficiently with committee	Candidate frequently missed meetings, was disrespectful, and did not communicate sufficiently with committee	Evaluator has insufficient information to judge