

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI - KANSAS CITY
School of Medicine
Department of Biomedical and Health Informatics
Bioinformatics Master of Science Program

Master's Thesis Final Evaluation Form

Student Name:

Date of Meeting:

Thesis Title:

Committee Member Completing Report:

*Please complete this form and give it to the **Committee Chair** after the oral thesis defense.*

Please answer all questions below. Ranking questions use: superior, good, acceptable, unacceptable, and cannot judge.

Written Thesis

Thesis was distributed at least one week prior to the meeting:

Yes <input type="checkbox"/> (1)	No <input type="checkbox"/> (0)
----------------------------------	---------------------------------

Thesis project methods are thorough, logical, and well thought out: Hypothesis is logical and consistent with subsequent methods; integrity present in design, conduct, and analysis; discussion demonstrates an understanding of results and limitations to methods and statistical (or analysis) 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)
Hypothesis / Research question generation	Conceptualization and expression of the hypothesis or research question demonstrates that the student had an excellent handle on relevant literature; the hypothesis or question is logical; the project was of value to undertake.	Hypothesis or research question clearly stated. Demonstrates a connection to background literature and shows an understanding of the relevant literature. Majority of information is correct (a few misstatements). Value of project justified.	Has a clearly stated hypothesis or question, but has not identified all complexities. Identifies related literature, but connection to the question could be clarified. Most information is correct. Adequately justifies use of resources.	Question is too broad, vague, or not clearly stated. Relevant background literature is ignored, unidentified, or misinterpreted. Project lacks value; does not advance research, lacks direction, wastes resources (money, materials, subject & researcher time & effort).	Outside area of expertise
Methods	Selected methods including study design, population, and outcome measures were optimal to address the research question or hypothesis	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	Outside area of expertise

	Cutting edge methodology or novel application of existing method.				
Analysis & Interpretation	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)
	Selected an advanced analysis plan for project design and complexity; student was able to interpret results in context of other research and could project impact on future research.	Selected analysis plan was appropriate for project design and complexity; student was able to interpret results in context of other research.	Selected analysis plan was acceptable for the project design but lacked in addressing complexity; student was able to interpret results, but did place in context of other research.	Inappropriate analysis plan for project design. Incorrect interpretation uses outdated or unrelated resources. Neglects to provide citations or provides incorrect citations. Unable to put in context of relevant literature.	Outside area of expertise
Comments:					

Writing demonstrates clarity, logical organization, and appropriate use of English.

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; (2)Well-organized; (3)Proper spelling and grammar; (4)Correct voice and formality; (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:				

Use of Existing Literature: Student has a command of the literature on the subject.

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	Outside area of expertise
Comments:				

Originality: Originality and insight of the research question and interpretation of literature and findings.

Superior <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/>	Unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/>	Cannot Judge <input type="checkbox"/>
Ground-breaking study; original research question, approach, and interpretation of findings	Originality in one or two areas (question, approach, or interpretation)	Contributes to understanding but does not break any new ground	Does not contribute to understanding of problem	Outside area of expertise
Comments:				

Scope/Comprehensiveness: Adequacy of scope and of substance.

Superior <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/>	Unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/>	Cannot Judge <input type="checkbox"/>
Scope and substance beyond usual expectations	Either scope or substance beyond usual expectations	Scope and substance within usual expectations for dissertations	Scope or substance deficient	Outside area of expertise
Comments:				

Oral Presentation

Oral Communication: Student demonstrated ability to communicate effectively throughout the presentation.

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	Outside area of expertise
Comments:				

Responses to Questions: Student is able to provide responses that are clear and to the point.

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	Outside area of expertise
Comments:				

Relevancy of Coursework: Student demonstrates ability to draw relevant information from coursework, Exercises integrity in proposing, conducting, analyzing, and reporting research.

Overall	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.	Outside area of expertise
Applies principles of research integrity and addresses research policy	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)
	Took majority of responsibility (to extent possible by student) for communication with and creation and submission of documentation to appropriate ethics and compliance committees. Completed training requirements.	Had important role in communication with and creation and submission of documentation to appropriate ethics and compliance committees. Completed training requirements.	Recognized importance of communication with and creation and submission of documentation to appropriate ethics and compliance committees. Completed training requirements.	Does not show understanding of ethical issues Did not complete training or may have completed training requirements, but did not understand purpose of ethics and compliance committees.	Outside area of expertise
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)
Took complete responsibility (to extent possible by student) for all aspects of the project. Project could not have been completed without the student. Could be trusted to work autonomously once trained. Never needed prompting from advisor.	Had a major role in project completion, but did not lead some of major aspects (conception, design, conduct, analysis, summary). Could mostly work autonomously. Rarely need prompting from advisor.	Had an important role in project completion. Did not lead in several of the major aspects (conception, design, conduct, analysis, summary). Could mostly work autonomously. Rarely need prompting from advisor.	Played an important role in one aspect of project. Mostly shadowed or worked with advisors on completing the project. Needed much supervision and prompting.	Outside area of expertise
Comments:				

Date _____

Signature of committee member completing this report

Please submit completed form to Department of Biomedical and Health Informatics
