

**UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI - KANSAS CITY | SCHOOL OF MEDICINE**

Department of Biomedical and Health Informatics

*Master of Science Bioinformatics Degree Program*

**CAPSTONE PROJECT EVALUATION BY COMMITTEE MEMBER**

Student Name:

Final Capstone Examination Committee

Academic Field:

1.

Title of Capstone:

2.

3.

Director of Capstone:

(Chair, Supervisory Committee)

Committee Member Submitting Report:

**PROJECT EVALUATION**

**Research Methods:** Student demonstrates a command of the proper method of research or experimentation; demonstrates an understanding and application of appropriate research methodology.

| Superior <input type="checkbox"/> (4)                            | Good <input type="checkbox"/> (3)                                       | Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (2)                | Unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (1)   | Cannot Judge <input type="checkbox"/> (0) |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| Cutting edge methodology or novel application of existing method | Incremental advance in application of methodology and careful execution | Conventional use of methodology and adequate execution | Inappropriate use of method; use of method that cannot adequately address research question; poor execution | <b>Outside area of expertise</b>          |

Comments:

**Use of Existing Literature:** Student has a command of the relevant literature, and has incorporated this knowledge into the design and execution of the project.

| Superior <input type="checkbox"/> (4)                | Good <input type="checkbox"/> (3)   | Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (2)                | Unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (1)                  | Cannot Judge <input type="checkbox"/> (0) |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Comprehensive, in depth, appropriate interpretations | Thorough, may be slightly lacking in either comprehensiveness or depth, appropriate interpretations | Adequate breadth and/or depth; minor misinterpretation | Insufficient breadth and/or depth; major misinterpretation | <b>Outside area of expertise</b>          |

Comments:

**Project Initiative:** Student shows initiative in taking the lead on the project.

| Superior <input type="checkbox"/> (4) | Good <input type="checkbox"/> (3) | Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (2) | Unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (1) | Cannot Judge <input type="checkbox"/> (0) |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Comments:                             |                                   |   |   |   |

**Relevancy of Coursework:** Student demonstrates ability to draw relevant information from coursework into the design and execution of the project.

| Superior <input type="checkbox"/> (4)  | Good <input type="checkbox"/> (3)   | Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (2)  | Unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (1)                     | Cannot Judge <input type="checkbox"/> (0) |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| An original knowledge structure integrating methods, theories, paradigms, concepts, etc. from coursework | Skilled application of an existing knowledge structure integrating methods, theories, paradigms, concepts, etc. from coursework | Adequate application of coursework information and/or writing without meaningful integration | Inadequate application of different concepts from coursework. | <b>Outside area of expertise</b>          |
| Comments:  |   |  |   |   |

## ORAL PRESENTATION

**Communication:** Student demonstrates ability to communicate effectively throughout the presentation with adequate use of supporting tools and materials (e.g., PowerPoint slides, handouts).

| Superior <input type="checkbox"/> (4)   | Good <input type="checkbox"/> (3)   | Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (2)  | Unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (1)   | Cannot Judge <input type="checkbox"/> (0) |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| Clear and concise, well organized, professional, articulate, and engaging in productive discussions | Clear and concise, but minor weaknesses in organization, professionalism, and/or ability to engage in productive discussion | Inconsistently clear and concise, and/or some weaknesses in organization, professionalism, and/or ability to engage in productive discussion | Poor or absent clarity, conciseness, organization, professionalism, and/or ability to engage in productive discussion | <b>Outside area of expertise</b>          |
| Comments:   |   |  |   |   |

**Responses to Questions:** Student is able to provide responses that are clear, to the point, and reflect critical thinking.

| Superior <input type="checkbox"/> (4)                           | Good <input type="checkbox"/> (3)   | Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (2)                | Unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (1) | Cannot Judge <input type="checkbox"/> (0) |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Responses demonstrate originality and mastery of the discipline | Responses exceed usual expectations | Responses meet expectations for proposal presentations | Responses are deficient                   | <b>Outside area of expertise</b>          |
| Comments:   |                                     |  |   |   |

## WRITTEN REPORT

**Report Comprehensiveness:** Project is well described; sufficient information is provided to allow evaluation and/or replication; research question is logical and consistent with subsequent methods; integrity in designing, conducting and interpreting statistical tests; discussion demonstrates an understanding of results and limitations to methods and statistical issues.

| Superior <input type="checkbox"/> (4)   | Good <input type="checkbox"/> (3)   | Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (2)   | Unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (1)  | Cannot Judge <input type="checkbox"/> (0) |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Mastery of the specific skills and knowledge base for the project as well as its relevance to the field | Comprehensive and adept use of the specific skills knowledge base for the project as well as its relevance to the field, with only minor errors | Adequate use of the specific skills and knowledge base for the proposal as well as its relevance to the field, without fundamental errors | Inadequate use of the specific skills or knowledge base for the proposal as well as its relevance to the field, and/or with fundamental errors | Outside area of expertise                 |
| Comments:   |   |   |  |   |

**Writing Skills:** Demonstrates clarity, logical organization, and appropriate use of the English language.

| Superior <input type="checkbox"/> (4)   | Good <input type="checkbox"/> (3)               | Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (2)               | Unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> (1)                                 | Cannot Judge <input type="checkbox"/> (0) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1)Clear and concise;<br>(2)Well-organized;<br>(3)Proper spelling and grammar;<br>(4)Correct voice and formality;<br>(5) Citation style appropriate to discipline | Readable, solid work with few issues in writing | Readable, but some problems with two or more criteria | Issues in writing make it difficult to comprehend meaning and importance. | Outside area of expertise                 |
| Comments:   |   |   |   |   |

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Committee Member completing this form