

# Second Year Research Assessment Form

UT Austin, Department of Astronomy

**Student's name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Research Project Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of meeting:** \_\_\_\_\_

*Instructions:* The committee will be chaired by a GSEC member who is not the student's advisor. The full research committee should discuss each indicator in turn after the closed-door portion of the student's 2nd Year Research Defense, once the student has left the room. The committee Chair, in consultation with the committee members, should complete the feedback on the rubric in full as soon as possible after the 2nd year defense (within two business days).

Indicator	1: Meets Expectations	3: Approaching Expectations	5: Unsatisfactory Progress	Evaluation (1-5, N/A)
-----------	-----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

<b>Research Astrophysics Concepts</b>	Fully grasps concepts underlying research project.	Can understand concepts involved in research project with some assistance.	Has little grasp of basic concepts underlying research.	
<i>What specific evidence supports this evaluation?</i>				
<b>Scientific Reasoning</b>	Is comfortable and fluent answering questions related to research and relevant topics.	Demonstrates an ability to reason through questions, occasionally guided by hints from the committee.	Does not demonstrate an ability to answer questions related to research and relevant topics. Struggles to answer even with assistance.	
<i>What specific evidence supports this evaluation?</i>				
<b>Knowledge of Literature</b>	Clearly and fluently discusses results from the papers sent by the committee. Synthesizes important topics and connects the literature to their project. Uses results from literature to motivate current and future work.	Discusses some results from the papers and adequately answers some questions related to the topics. Makes some connections between their work and the literature with assistance.	Does not adequately demonstrate an understanding of the papers sent by the committee.	

<i>What specific evidence supports this evaluation?</i>				
<b>Written Report</b>	Report is of high quality. Student clearly expresses the research questions, methods, and findings.	Report is clear and adequately presented, but may lack precision, details, or appropriate balance.	Has difficulty articulating research questions or adequately presenting data.	
<i>What specific evidence supports this evaluation?</i>				
<b>Oral Presentation</b>	Presentation is of high quality. Student clearly expresses the research questions, methods, and findings.	Oral presentation is clear and adequately presented, but may lack precision, details, or appropriate balance.	Has difficulty articulating research questions or adequately presenting data.	
<i>What specific evidence supports this evaluation?</i>				
<b>Progress toward publication(s)</b>	Student is on track to fulfill expectations for publications on the expected timescale at the Master's level (a paper on the 2nd year research is submitted to or published in a journal).	Paper draft(s) is in progress and is reasonably complete but is not yet submitted. Submission is on track to occur by the end of the summer.	Paper draft(s) is not yet complete and significant components of the planned paper are missing. Inadequate progress has been made towards publishing research results.	
<i>What specific evidence supports this evaluation?</i>				

Other comments the committee wishes to convey:

Overall assessment of research:

- The student has demonstrated satisfactory research proficiency.
- Recommend reexamination at a time to be arranged by the research committee.
- The student has not demonstrated satisfactory research proficiency.

Note that this evaluation only applies to the research component of the Second Year Assessment. The overall outcome of the Second Year Assessment will be made by the GSEC, which will evaluate students holistically and consider both course performance and research record. Passing the Second Year Assessment is a necessary but not sufficient requirement to go on to PhD candidacy.

**Committee members**

\_\_\_\_\_ (Chair / GSEC Member)

\_\_\_\_\_ (Supervisor)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Signatures**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_