THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE & LIFE SCIENCES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
Biosystems Engineering

BE Scoring Sheet for

Written Engineering Report/Thesis/Dissertation & Oral Defense

Student Name: _____

Title of Report/Thesis/ Dissertation: _____

Committee Member: _____ **Date:** _____

Directions:
Evaluate this student's written engineering report/thesis/dissertation and oral defense of the research with a score between 1 (Poor) and 4 (Excellent) for each of the criteria described below. Briefly comment on the rationale if your score is less than 4. Submit your completed scoring sheet to the committee chair before leaving the defense.

Score (1 – 4)	Criterion	Comment
	Organization of Oral Defense	
	Presentation Style	
	Presentation Pace	
	Content: Depth	
	Content: Accuracy	
	Use of Visual Aids	
	Responsiveness to Audience	

Engineering Report/Thesis/Dissertation Oral Defense Presentation Rubric

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (2)	Fair (3)	Poor (1)
Organization	The presentation is clear and logical. The listener can easily follow the line of reasoning.	The presentation is generally clear. A few minor points may be confusing.	The listener can follow the presentation with effort. The organization not well thought out	The presentation is very confused and unclear. Listeners cannot follow it.
Style	The level is appropriate for presentation of engineering results. Not too casual. Speakers are easy to hear and understand.	The level is generally appropriate. May have some trouble in hearing or understanding a speaker.	The presentation is too informal or unprepared. Difficult to hear or understand speakers. Much information is read.	The presentation is consistently at an inappropriate level. Information is read. Speakers can't be heard or understood.
Pace (N/A for peer evaluation)	The presentation is a planned conversation, paced for audience understanding.	One speaker 's pacing is too fast or too slow, repetitive or skipping important details.	More than one speaker is too fast or too slow, repetitive or skipping important details.	The presentation is far too long or far too short. Speakers generally are too fast or too slow.
Content: Depth	Design, methods, results, conclusions are clearly stated. Implications of results and "where do we go from here" discussed.	Description of project and results are generally clear. Some discussion of what results mean.	Some components of project description are minimal or missing. Little discussion of what results mean.	Description of project and results are very difficult to follow. No discussion of the meaning of results. Listeners learn little.
Content: Accuracy	Information given is consistently accurate. Facts and calculations are correct.	No significant errors are made. Listeners recognize errors as result of oversight or nervousness.	Enough errors made to be distracting, but some information is accurate.	Information is so inaccurate that listener cannot depend on the presentation.
Use of Visual Aids (N/A for peer evaluation)	Aids prepared in a professional manner. The font is large enough to be seen by all. Well organized. Main points stand out.	Aids contribute, but not all material supported by aids. Font size is appropriate for reading.	Aids are poorly prepared or used inappropriately. The font is too small. Too much information is included.	No aids are used, or they are so poorly prepared that they detract from the presentation.
Responsiveness to Audience	Responds well to questions. Restates and summarizes when needed.	Generally responsive to questions.	Reluctantly interacts with the audience. Responds poorly to questions.	Avoids audience interaction. Not responsive to the group.