

Cal Poly MSc Aerospace Engineering – Thesis Proposal Feedback Form

The following criteria should be used by all committee members to evaluate the proposals of Masters candidates in the Aerospace Engineering department at Cal Poly. After the proposal has been completed, please return this form directly to the thesis advisor (not to the student).

Content (~65%)						
Introduction and Background (literature review): Is it clear where this work lies in the context of the field in general including external works?	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Motivation: What is the reason for this work and is it relevant to development of the field in general?	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Project: Is it new work? Will it contribute to the field? Will the student be doing something unique, or just repeating existing work?	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Scope: Is it clear what the scope is? Does it align with the general field? Is it well defined (not too broad or too narrow)?	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Methodology: Does the proposed plan seem feasible? Will it produce the required results? How will verification be performed?	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Analysis Plan: What are the minimum criteria for completion? How will results be statistically or otherwise proven?	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Schedule: Is the schedule feasible? Is there time built into the schedule for unexpected delays?	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Challenges: Expected challenges and alternate plans if something arises. Includes budget if relevant.	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Level of Technical Detail: (adequate for a proposal): <i>Keep in mind that this is a proposal so the student is still <u>developing</u> expert knowledge</i>	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent

Professionalism (~35%)													
Personal appearance (professionalism, clarity, expression, etc)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not included</td> <td>Needs significant improvement</td> <td>Needs improvement</td> <td>Good or developing</td> <td>Very good</td> <td>Excellent</td> </tr> </table>	0	1	2	3	4	5	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
0	1	2	3	4	5								
Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent								
Slide formatting (layout, readability, consistency, information, etc)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not included</td> <td>Needs significant improvement</td> <td>Needs improvement</td> <td>Good or developing</td> <td>Very good</td> <td>Excellent</td> </tr> </table>	0	1	2	3	4	5	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
0	1	2	3	4	5								
Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent								
Preparation (was it clear the student had thought through the presentation in advance, etc)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not included</td> <td>Needs significant improvement</td> <td>Needs improvement</td> <td>Good or developing</td> <td>Very good</td> <td>Excellent</td> </tr> </table>	0	1	2	3	4	5	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
0	1	2	3	4	5								
Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent								
Responding: Did the student respond well to comments and questions from committee members.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not included</td> <td>Needs significant improvement</td> <td>Needs improvement</td> <td>Good or developing</td> <td>Very good</td> <td>Excellent</td> </tr> </table>	0	1	2	3	4	5	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
0	1	2	3	4	5								
Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent								
Adaptability: Did the student openly accept comments and questions from the committee, and take the information on board to improve their plan.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not included</td> <td>Needs significant improvement</td> <td>Needs improvement</td> <td>Good or developing</td> <td>Very good</td> <td>Excellent</td> </tr> </table>	0	1	2	3	4	5	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
0	1	2	3	4	5								
Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent								
General Feedback and Comments													

Converting to a letter grade – guidelines for thesis advisor and students

$$Score = \frac{Sum\ of\ awarded\ scores}{70}$$

Department recommended: A = >88%, A- = >85%, B+= >82%, B= >75%, below 75%, set-up an 'incomplete' contract with the student