Rubric for Seminar/ project work evaluation

Assessment Criteria	*Exceeds Expectations*	*Meets Expectations*	*Below Expectations*	*Not Acceptable*
Score	100%	90%	60%	30%
Rating	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Organization & Style **(15%)**	• Information is presented in a logical, interesting way, which is easy to follow. • Purpose is clearly stated and explains the structure of work.	• Information is presented in a logical manner, which is easily followed. • Purpose of work is clearly stated assists the structure of work.	• Work is hard to follow as there is very little continuity. • Purpose of work is stated, but does not assist in following work.	• Sequence of information is difficult to follow. No apparent structure or continuity. • Purpose of work is not clearly stated.
Content & Knowledge **(45%)**	• Demonstration of full knowledge of the subject with explanations and elaboration.	• At ease with content and able to elaborate and explain to some degree.	• Uncomfortable with content. • Only basic concepts are demonstrated and interpreted.	• No grasp of information. Clearly no knowledge of subject matter. • No questions are answered. No interpretation made.
Format & Aesthetics **(10%)**	• Format is consistent throughout including heading styles and captions. • Figures and tables are presented logically and reinforce the text.	• Format is generally consistent including heading styles and captions. • Figures and tables are neatly done and provide intended information.	• Mostly consistent format. • Figures and tables are legible, but not convincing.	• Work is illegible, format changes throughout, e.g. font type, size etc. • Figures and tables are sloppy and fail to provide intended information.
Spelling & Grammar **(5%)**	• Negligible (1 or 2 per page) misspellings and/or grammatical errors.	• Minor (5 to 10 per page) misspellings and/or grammatical errors.	• Several spelling (11 to 25 per page) and grammatical errors.	• Numerous spelling (> 25 per page) and grammatical errors.
References **(5%)**	• Reference section complete and comprehensive. • Consistent and logical referencing system.	• Minor inadequacies in references. • Consistent referencing system.	• Inadequate list of references or references in text. • Inconsistent or illogical referencing system.	• No referencing system used.
Viva voce **(20%)**	• Masterfully defends research by providing clear and insightful answers to questions	• Competently defends by providing very helpful answers	• Answers questions, but often with little insight	• Does not answer

Rubric for Lab work evaluation

Assessment Criteria (weight)	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Not Acceptable
Score	100%	90%	60%	30%
Rating	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Critical evaluation of findings *(30%)*	Recognizes defective results and eliminates the cause	Recognizes defective results and figures out the cause	Recognizes defective results but does not know what to do	Blind acceptance of clearly defective results
Ability to recognize main sources of error *(15%)*	Clear understanding	Adequate understanding	Errors in understanding	Not understood
Correlation between data and theory *(15%)*	Qualitative accounting for differences	Complete and done well	Done poorly or incompletely	Not done
Ability to draw proper conclusions from lab exercise *(40%)*	Correct conclusions correlated to other material	Correct conclusions drawn	Incorrect conclusions drawn	Conclusions not drawn

Rubric for Assignment evaluation

Assessment Criteria	*Exceeds Expectations*	*Meets Expectations*	*Below Expectations*	*Not Acceptable*
Score	100%	90%	60%	30%
Rating	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Demonstrated Knowledge *(50%)*	• Shows complete understanding of the problem • Demonstrates full knowledge of the subject with explanations and elaboration	• Shows substantial understanding of the problem • At ease with subject content • Able to elaborate and explain to some degree	• Response shows some understanding of the problem • Uncomfortable with content • Only basic concepts are demonstrated and interpreted	• Response shows a lack of understanding for the problem • No clear knowledge of subject matter
Requirements *(30%)*	• Goes beyond the requirements of the problem	• Meets the requirements of the problem	• Does not meet the requirements of the problem	• Fails to complete the problem
Report Format *(15%)*	• Format is consistent throughout, including heading styles and captions • Figures and tables are presented logically and reinforce the text	• Format is generally consistent, including heading styles and captions • Figures and tables are neatly done and provide intended information	• Mostly consistent format • Figures and tables are legible, but not convincing	• Work is illegible, format changes throughout, e.g., font type, size, etc. • Figures and tables are sloppy and fail to provide the intended information
Spelling and Grammar *(5%)*	• Negligible misspellings and grammatical errors	• Minor misspellings and grammatical errors	• Several spelling and grammatical errors	• Numerous spelling and grammatical errors

Rubric for Mid-term and Final Exam Questions evaluation				
Assessment Criteria	*Exceeds Expectations*	*Meets Expectations*	*Below Expectations*	*Not Acceptable*
Score	100%	90%	60%	30%
Rating	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Demonstrated Knowledge	• Shows complete understanding of the question • Demonstrates full knowledge of the subject with explanations and elaboration	• Shows substantial understanding of the question • At ease with subject content • Able to elaborate and explain to some degree	• Response shows some understanding of the question • Uncomfortable with content • Only basic concepts are demonstrated and interpreted	• Response shows a lack of understanding for the question • No grasp of information • No clear knowledge of subject matter

Rubric for evaluation of thesis work				
Assessment Criteria	*Exceeds Expectations*	*Meets Expectations*	*Below Expectations*	*Not Acceptable*
Rating	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Fundamental knowledge in the field **(15%)**	Consistently applies fundamental and advanced concepts to topics in subject area.	Frequently applies fundamental and some advanced concepts to topics in subject area.	Somewhat applies fundamental concepts to topics in subject area.	Does not apply fundamental concepts to topics in subject area.
Ability to access and critically evaluate the meaning, value, and contribution of published literature in the field (15%)	Command and understanding of the current research literature in the field.	Relates and understands the current research literature in the field.	Aware of the research literature in the field.	Knowledge is unrelated to the current research literature in the field.
Imagination and originality of thought (15%)	Problem/purpose of study very creative / original with new and innovative ideas; Explored original topic and discovered new outcomes.	Problem/purpose of study original or creative; Design/approach appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose of study moderately original or creative; Design/ approach moderately appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose of study lacked creativity or not new; Duplication of previous work.
Ability to identify methodology, experimental set up, analytical approach etc based upon earlier research work cited in the report? (20%)	• Data interpretation is appropriate and creatively uses correct methodology; • Identifies weaknesses in available theory/ experiment set ups/ data interpretation; • • Demonstrates an advanced ability to plan and design experiment	• Data interpretation is appropriate and uses correct methodology; • Identifies no weaknesses in available theory/ experiment set ups/ data interpretation; • Demonstrates an ability to use the available experiment	• Data interpretation is appropriate and uses limited number of correct methodology; • Identifies no weaknesses in interpretation of available data • Demonstrate	• Data interpretation is inappropriate and/or uses incorrect methodology; • Identifies no weaknesses in interpretation of available data • Demonstrates a lack of ability to use the available experiment setup to

			s an limited ability to use the available experiment setup to achieve identified objectives	achieve identified objectives
Ability to draw reasoned conclusions from a body of the knowledge (15%)	• Discussion was superior, accurate, and engaging; • Conclusions/summaries and recommendations appropriate and clearly based on outcomes.	• Discussion sufficient and with few errors; • Greater foundation needed from past work in area; • Conclusions/ summary based on outcomes and appropriate, included some recommendations.	• Major topics or concepts inaccurately described; • Considerable relevant discussion missing; • Conclusions/ summary not entirely supported by findings/outcomes.	• Little discussion of research findings/ outcomes; • Displayed poor grasp of material; • Conclusion/ summary not supported by findings/outcomes.
Impact of research on the field (5%)	The thesis is very relevant or has significant importance/ authenticity to field and will make an important contribution to field.	The thesis has fair relevance or significance/ authenticity to field and will make a good contribution to field.	The thesis only moderate relevance or significance/ authenticity to field and will make a nominal contribution to field.	The thesis has little relevance or significance/ authenticity to field and will make little contribution to field.
Oral presentation and defense of the thesis work (15%)	• Masterfully defends research by providing clear and insightful answers to questions; • Uses presentation resources as a guide, gives detailed explanations, is easily	• Competently defends research by providing very helpful answers to questions; • May occasionally manifest need for further reflection on minor points;	• Adequately defends research; • Answers questions, but often with little insight; • Relies too much on presentation and has difficulty	• Does not adequately defend research; • Does not answer key questions; • Frequently shows a need for deeper reflection on vital points;

	understandable. • Keeps appropriate eye contact with the audience.	• Uses presentation resources as a guide, is easily understandable, and keeps eye contact with the audience with the audience.	speaking freely to the audience, and is somewhat comfortable with the topic.	• Reads the material from presentation to make the report and is clearly not comfortable with the topic.