**Final Evaluation of Biological Sciences Capstone Project**

**I. Written report**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date: | Student's Name: | | UAF ID#: |
| Project Title: | | | |
| Research Project Supervisor: | | Reviewer: | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes  (excellent) | Somewhat  (adequate) | No  (inadequate) |
| 1. Is the capstone project the product of data collection and/or analysis by the student? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the capstone paper make a compelling argument for the significance of the student’s research within the context of the current literature? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the capstone paper clearly articulate the student’s research goals? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the methods appropriate given the student’s research agenda? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the data analysis appropriate and accurate? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the author interpret the results skillfully and accurately? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the tables and figures clear, effective and informative? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is there a compelling discussion of the implications of findings? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the literature review appropriate and complete? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the citations presented consistently and professionally throughout the text and in the list of works cited? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the writing appropriate for the target audience? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the paper clearly communicated and free of language errors? |  |  |  |

Reviewer signature: **II. Oral Presentation**

Date of presentation:

Circumstances of presentation (e.g. class presentation, Research Day poster presentation, conference oral presentation):

Assessment of presentation quality:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent | Adequate | Inadequate |

Comments on oral presentation:

**III. Non-technical summary**

Date:

Assessment of non-technical summary quality:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent | Adequate | Inadequate |

Comments on non-technical summary:

Reviewer signature: