



RICE UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF MATERIALS SCIENCE and
NANOENGINEERING
EVALUATION OF PHD THESIS DEFENSE
 (for faculty use)

Student's name: _____ **ID #:** _____

Semester entered program: _____ **Date of defense:** _____

Committee member: _____

Advisor: _____

MSNE faculty: _____ **Non-MSNE faculty:** _____

Please review the guidelines for evaluation on the reverse.

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Problem statement	-----	-----	-----
Literature review	-----	-----	-----
Scientific results	-----	-----	-----
Novelty	-----	-----	-----
Thesis text	-----	-----	-----
Presentation	-----	-----	-----
Replies to questions	-----	-----	-----

SUMMARY EVALUATION

I have reviewed this thesis defense, and recommend:

- pass
- conditional pass (see comments)
- fail

COMMENTS

Print name

Date

Committee Member's Signature



RICE UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF MATERIALS SCIENCE and
NANOENGINEERING
EVALUATION OF PHD THESIS DEFENSE
 (for faculty use)

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION

Problem statement	<p>Excellent: Compelling problem statement that demonstrates the challenge and utility of this work, as well as theoretical or practical applications</p> <p>Satisfactory: Problem is clearly stated; a case is made for the work's utility, applications</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Problem is not clearly stated; little context or justification is provided</p>
Literature review	<p>Excellent: Identifies all relevant results and techniques from the literature, and synthesizes them in a comprehensive discussion</p> <p>Satisfactory: Cites major works and places them in context for the present project</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Fails to cite or assimilate previous work</p>
Scientific results	<p>Excellent: Computational and applied mathematics content is substantial and correct</p> <p>Satisfactory: Content has acceptable depth and requires only minor corrections</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Content is shallow and/or contains significant errors</p>
Novelty	<p>Excellent: Original research that demonstrates distinct creativity in the problem formulation, methods of analysis, and/or computational techniques</p> <p>Satisfactory: (MS thesis) New perspective on established work (MS and MSCI PhD proposals) Describes a novel problem appropriate for a PhD</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Non-creative regurgitation of established results</p>
Thesis text	<p>Excellent: Good organization and few grammatical errors</p> <p>Satisfactory: Decent organization, coherent prose, and limited grammatical errors</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Poor organization, incoherent prose, and/or numerous grammatical errors</p>
Presentation	<p>Excellent: Engaging, highly polished presentation with well crafted slides that illustrate key results in the project and include a substantial conclusion</p> <p>Satisfactory: Professional presentation on par with a solid conference talk; includes a coherent project narrative and conclusion</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Too much or too little detail; unclear about project goals and direction; incoherent slides; read from slides</p>
Replies to questions	<p>Excellent: Complete answers that demonstrate a deep understanding of the discipline that extends beyond the contents of the thesis</p> <p>Satisfactory: Competent answers that illustrate a facility with the issues and techniques immediately relevant to the thesis</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Answers reveal a limited comprehension of the work and its context</p>