Department of Microbiology - Topic Exam Rubric

Criteria	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Organization and effectiveness of written proposal	 Writing is exceptionally clear and ideas are innovative Hypotheses, alternative approaches, and impact explicitly described 	 Proposal is clear, with minimal mechanical errors Proposal contains all relevant information 	 Proposal contains abundance of errors such that meaning is obscured One or more sections are missing
Organization and effectiveness of presentation	Mature scientific languageEngaging presentation	Presentation is clearRelevant information is included	 Presentation is hard to follow Relevant details are missing and/or irrelevant details are distracting
Central biological question is clearly defined and significance is conveyed	 Exhibited independence and depth of thought Synthesizes discrete data into a coherent model/hypothesis 	 Cites directly relevant experiments/papers Understands foundational experiments and scientific impact Critically evaluates gaps in the field 	 Not a logical extension of prior work or is incremental/already done Lack of understanding of foundational experiments and/or scientific impact Premise of the proposal is weak due to lack of critical thinking
Hypothesis is clearly stated; or are hypothesis-generating goals clearly defined?	 Hypothesis shifts the thinking in the field and, if true, would establish a new paradigm Exceptionally novel hypothesis-generating approach Project could advance other fields beyond the specific discipline 	 Hypothesis is logical, testable, and follows from previous observations Hypothesis-generating approach is feasible and will address the question 	 Hypothesis is not clearly testable or is a simple observation Hypothesis-generating approach fails to address the biological question
Aims will effectively test the hypothesis	 Even negative data will be impactful Anticipated outcomes show exceptional vision Multidisciplinary methods are used to test hypothesis 	 Logical progression of thought Well-controlled experimental approach Feasible Experiments distinguish between competing hypotheses 	 Experiments are ambiguous Lack of proper controls Lack of feasibility
Pitfalls and alternatives approaches are considered	 Fully-formed alternative approaches Detailed rationale for prioritization of experiments 	 Technical challenges recognized and acknowledged Alternative approaches considered 	 Has not considered alternative approaches Has not considered results beyond expected results
Technical knowledge proficiency	Can describe the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed techniques compared to others	Understands the underlying principles of all proposed experiments but may not know all the details of each protocol	Knows the name of the method but not underlying principles

General guidance based on number of 'Does not meet expectations' categories: 1-2 = conditional pass, 3-5 = re-examine, 6-7 = fail **Possible Outcomes:**

Pass

Conditional Pass: The committee requires the student to repeat some aspect(s) of the examination or other remedial work

Re-examine: The committee requires the student to repeat the examination and recommends that the student be placed on probation until successful re-examination.

Fail: The committee recommends that the student be dropped from the program.