Modeling and Simulation Graduate Program
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

Thesis Defense Assessment

Candidate Name: _____   **Date of Assessment:** _____

The candidate listed above should be assessed according to the following outcomes and measures.

Student will be rated on a scale of 1-5 (Poor / Fair / Satisfactory / Good/ Excellent).   Committee members should provide an assessment for each measure, sign the form at the bottom, and submit the form to the chair at the end of defense. Comments are optional. Please use back of form if more space is needed.

Interdisciplinarity

Measure	Score	Comments
Thesis includes evidence of human-centered M&S as an interdisciplinary field		
Verbally articulates interdisciplinary aspects of M&S		

Communication

Measure	Score	Comments
Writing & organization quality		
Oral presentation quality		

M&S application*

Measure	Score	Comments
Thesis applies M&S tools and/or technologies to research		
Thesis contributes to M&S body of knowledge		

Thesis features

Measure	Score	Comments
Demonstrates strong understanding and awareness of relevant literature		
Provides a sufficiently clear and attainable methodology consistent with the requirements in the topic's major field of study		
Analysis techniques are appropriate for study format and data structures		
Discussion/conclusion bridges thesis to future research endeavors or implications		

Preparedness

Measure	Score	Comments
Defense provides evidence of preparation for M&S career		
Overall quality of research		

Faculty name (print): _____

Faculty signature: _____   Date _____

*Indicates metric used for programmatic assessment.

Scoring guidance	
1	A "poor" score indicates that the work provides little to no evidence of the category's measure. It would be extremely difficult to show that the student could consistently demonstrate the category.
2	A "fair" score indicates that, while there may be minimal evidence of the category present in the portfolio, it is at an immature or minimally professional state. This score acknowledges that there has been an attempt made, but that it does not meet standards of consistency or quality.
3	A "satisfactory" score indicates that the category has been met at an acceptable level. The work submitted has demonstrated this category's requirements adequately in quality, quantity, and consistency.
4	A "good" score indicates that the examples of work exceed minimal quality requirements, consistently. Quantity of artifacts is not, necessarily, an indicator of quality.
5	An "excellent" score reflects a maturity of work. The quality of work places it among those of peers in the peers in the field. Work readily could transfer into professional context.