



THE UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST INDIES
CAVE HILL CAMPUS
School for Graduate Studies and Research
SEMINAR EVALUATION TOOL

Faculty: _____

Department: _____

Student Name:		Seminar date:	
Student ID no.:		Seminar location:	
Programme name		Seminar Chair:	
Enrolment:	<input type="checkbox"/> Full time <input type="checkbox"/> Part time	Supervisor present:	
Degree:	<input type="checkbox"/> PhD <input type="checkbox"/> MPhil	Co-supervisor present (if app.)	
Degree start:	<input type="checkbox"/> Year <input type="checkbox"/> Semester	Advisor present:	
Seminar number:		Advisor present:	
Working title of thesis:			
Seminar title:			

ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CONDUCT OF SEMINARS:

1. Both students and supervisor should agree on seminar presentation date
2. At minimum the main supervisor should be present at the seminar
3. The 1st seminars should be about 20 minutes in duration
4. The 2nd and 3rd seminar presentations should be about 25-30 minutes in duration

5. Except in extenuating circumstances, one seminar should be done a semester. Where two semesters are conducted in one semester the content should be substantially different from each other
6. An assessment committee should be convened by the Deputy Dean, Research or equivalent to assess the presentation and provide feedback
7. The assessment tool should be made available to the student and assessment committee 5-7 days prior to the seminar

Instructions to Assessors: This is a mandatory, non-credit research seminar for MPhil, PhD and other research students. **All criteria may not apply for Seminars 1 & 2.** Please select which holistic assessment best reflects your evaluation of the student's presentation

SEMINAR 1: Students must achieve Performance level 2 and above to satisfactorily pass Seminar 1

SEMINARS 2 & 3: Students must satisfactorily achieve Performance levels 3 and above to satisfactorily pass Seminars 2 & 3

Criteria for assessing Seminar 1	19-20	16-18	13-15	10-12	0-9
	Performance level 5	Performance level 4	Performance level 3	Performance level 2	Performance level 1
	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Weak
Appropriateness of introduction: introduction clearly articulates the research problem, the gap in the literature, the research question or hypothesis and the objectives of the research.					
Review of literature: shows a comprehensive understanding of relevant current and seminal literature and demonstrates competence in critically interrogating and appraising the literature to identify relevant gaps.					
Methodology: provides a sound and thoughtful discussion of the methodology to be applied to the research with proper justification of the methods and consideration of ethical concerns. Methods are appropriate to answer the research questions or hypotheses. If applicable, student is ready to request IRB approval and to proceed with research.					
Discussion of results and findings: provides a critical evaluation and application (rather than mere description) of the interpretation of					

results and justifiable conclusions and recommendations for policy and future research. There is recognition of limitations of research. (This criteria is not applicable to seminar 1; Supervisor(s) and advisory committee can determine if applicable for seminar 2 or only 3)					
Structure of presentation: well-organized demonstrating a clear and cohesive discussion where the arguments and conclusion are easy to follow					
Communication: presentation includes appropriate and easily understood visual and other aids. The presenter speaks clearly, making eye contact with the audience and uses slides for reference rather than reading entirely off of them.					
Responsiveness to audience: presenter is able to answer questions posed by the audience and clarify any ambiguity raised.					
TOTAL:					
RUBRIC DESCRIPTOR:					
<i>Excellent-Performance Level 5:</i>	Presenter demonstrates excellence in breadth of knowledge and evidences original thought, strong analytical and critical abilities and excellent organizational and presentation skills. The research reflects a well-woven symmetry between the research question or hypothesis, literature, methods and where applicable findings				
<i>Very Good-Performance Level 4:</i>	Presenter demonstrates critical and analytical thinking in most aspects of the research, utilizing a very good range of appropriate sources. The discussion is largely coherent and reflects strong organizational and presentations skills.				
<i>Good-Performance Level 3:</i>	Presenter demonstrates competence in terms of critical and analytical thinking utilizes a range of relevant sources to support arguments. The discussion is coherent and well-presented and in general the connections between the research question/hypothesis, literature and methods are well-made.				
<i>Satisfactory- Performance Level 2:</i>	Presenter demonstrates adequate knowledge of the topic through citing of a reasonable number of relevant sources. However, the theoretical insights are not always clearly linked to the research question and the discussion can sometimes be more descriptive than analytical. The presentation could be improved by better organization and preparation. Overall, more time needs to be spent in clarifying the research questions, the best theoretical/conceptual framework and the research design.				
<i>Weak or Unsatisfactory-Performance Level 1</i>	Presenter demonstrates minimal evidence of knowledge and understanding of the tenets of research or the research process. The literature is not always relevant, the argument presented is weak and overall, there is a disconnect between the ideas presented.				
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	SATISFACTORY/PASS			UNSATISFACTORY/FAIL	
Please indicate:					

ASSESSOR'S COMMENTS:

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY: Report submitted to the School for Graduate Studies and Research

Head of Department (PLEASE PRINT):

Date:

Supervisor: (PLEASE PRINT):

Date:

Supervisor (PLEASE SIGN):
