



DEPARTMENT OF
PLANT AND SOIL SCIENCES

Thesis/Dissertation Writing Assessment

(to be completed by **each committee member** prior to defense)

Please return to Academic Program Coordinator

This instrument is only used for outcomes assessment. It is not intended to be part of your evaluation of this student's qualifications. It will not become part of the student's records. Your responses will be kept anonymous with respect to the student.

Evaluator's Name				
Student's Name				
Date of Assessment				
Degree Program of Student	M.S.(Crops)	M.S.(Soil)	Ph.D. (Crop Science)	Ph.D. (Soil Science)

DIRECTIONS: Please respond to each of the statements below using a scale of 1 (bad) to 5 (excellent). Comments are included with each statement indicating how your rating may be interpreted.

SCORE		
	A	Mechanics: (1) Many grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors, (5) No grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors
	B	Sources: (1) Some sources are not accurately documented, (5) All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented in the desired format.
	C	Quality of Information: (1) Information has little or nothing to do with the main topic, (5) Information clearly relates to the main topic. It includes several supporting details and/or examples.
	D	Stated Research Hypothesis/ Objectives: (1) Not discernible from the text, or so confused as to violate scientific principles, (5) Clearly stated and well crafted in an elegantly testable form; hypothesis/objectives made with very clear contextual connection.
	E	Analysis Techniques Applied: (1) Does not describe the results; does not indicate levels of confidence in the experimental results, and/or are inappropriate for data being analyzed (i.e., some assumptions of the technique are violated), (5) Elegantly used to clearly describe results and to indicate levels of confidence. Methods used are appropriate for the data being analyzed, and no assumptions of the quantitative methods are violated.
	F	Introductory Section: (1) Does not adequately review the historical literature and/or does not introduce the specific research problem by contextual framework, (5) Is very well written and provides a comprehensive review of the literature. The specific research problem is clearly and elegantly presented in the context of previous work and represents a logical extension of the research problem.
	G	Materials and Methods Section: (1) Procedures are vague, disorganized, and/or are filled with irrelevant information, (5) Procedures are so clear that they require no additional interpretation and could be used directly as protocol. Appropriate details are provided.
	H	Discussion Section: (1) Merely a restatement of the results and is devoid of comparison to previously published findings, (5) Clearly integrates current results with finding of previous research. Results are compared in a well constructed and detailed conceptual framework of previously published research.