

## ***CME 298/299– M.S. Thesis/Project Defense Approval Form***

Student Name			
Student ID Number			
Thesis/Project Title			
SJSU Thesis/Project Advisor <b>Must be Committee Member 1</b>			
Reading Committee Thesis (at least 3 members) 1. Tenure-track CME faculty 2. Tenure-track SJSU faculty 3. SJSU faculty or Senior Industrial Representative Project (at least 2 members/1 CME) 1. SJSU faculty 2. SJSU faculty or Senior Industrial Representative	Committee Member 1	SJSU Department	
	Committee Member 2	SJSU Department/Company	
	Committee Member 3	SJSU Department/Company	
	Committee Member 4 (optional)	SJSU Department/Company	
Upon completion of this form the SJSU Thesis /Project Advisor should email it to the following people: 1. Graduate Student(s) 2. CME Graduate Advisor 3. CME 298/299 Course Instructor			
Thesis/Project Defense Decision Choose one of the following  <b>Pass</b>  <b>Conditional Pass</b>  <b>Fail</b>  Enter conditions or comments in box to the right.	The Turnitin.com Report has been reviewed _____ SJSU Thesis/Project Advisor Signature  The student is recommended for (Select One) <b>Thesis</b> <b>Project</b>		
Approval of <b>Proposal Decision</b>  <b>NOTE:</b> <b>Do not sign form until all other information on both pages is completed.</b>	Name	Signature	Date
	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
	4.		

Reading Committee: As a team, please evaluate the oral and written presentations by scoring the following statements using a ranking of 1 to 5 where 5 = excellent, 3=acceptable and 1=unacceptable. NOTE: ANY SCORE  $\leq 3$  CALLS FOR A CONDITIONAL PASS AND REQUIRE CONDITION(S) TO BE MET BY THE STUDENT BEFORE THEY CAN PASS THEIR DEFENSE.

1. The student delivered a professional written report. (Note: 1 = insufficient technical content and/or major formatting, and/or lack of adequate referencing, and/or major grammatical/spelling errors, 3 = acceptable technical content, formatting, referencing and grammar/spelling, 5 = excellent report in all aspects)
2. The student delivered a professional oral presentation. . (Note: 1 = insufficient technical content and/or major errors in grammar/spelling and/or insufficient use of presentation software and/or in major errors in deliverance of a practiced presentation including response to questions, 3 = acceptable technical content, grammar/spelling, use of presentation software and deliverance of a practiced presentation including response to questions, 5 = excellent presentation in all aspects)
3. The student was able to show how his/her project relates to work reported in the literature. (Note: 1 = incomplete or irrelevant literature cited and/or inadequate literature discussion, 3 = adequate amount and discussion of relevant literature, 5 = excellent discussion of relevant literature)
4. The student was able to defend his/her proposed experiments based on established and accepted engineering, science and statistical principles. (1 = student did not or was not able to adequately justify the majority of their experimental proposal, 3 = student did adequately justify most aspects of their experimental proposal, 5 = excellent justification of all aspects of their experimental proposal)
5. The student was aware of the global impact of their work on society including the ethical and/or environmental and/or economic impact of his/her work. (Note: 1 = neither the oral nor written presentation had a separate section on the global impact of the proposed work, 3 = both the oral and written presentation had an adequate section on the global impact of the proposed work, 5 = both the oral and written presentation had an excellent section on the global impact of the proposed work).

Please write any other comments you think would help improve the quality of this proposal in the box below: