

RUBRIC FOR THE WRITTEN THESIS (revised 7/19/07)
Honors College Thesis Evaluation, UH 450

Student Name:

Evaluator:

Thesis title:

Discipline:

For each of the six criteria below, please circle

- key phrases that describe the work
- a whole number or indicate increment of .5 (Note: 4 = competency)

Add written comments to provide additional feedback to the student.

1. Includes a two-page précis.

Emerging		Developing		Well done		Excellent			
1	2	3	4	5	6				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Précis written in technical language. • Incomplete description of project/written work. • Link to larger context is missing or unclear. 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easily understood by a general university audience. • Includes description of research problem/project, context, approach, process, and conclusions. • Clearly links topic to larger context 					
Comments:									

2. Identifies the research issue, problem, or creative challenge; provides academic framework.

Emerging		Developing		Well done		Excellent			
1	2	3	4	5	6				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not identify the research issue, problem, or creative challenge; may represent it inaccurately or inadequately • Goals/objectives/hypothesis vague or incomplete • Lacks relevant historical context, identification of assumptions/bias, and/or ethical considerations • Inadequate description of how thesis topic connects to an issue in the field or larger context • Lacks connection to local, national, global or civic issues, where appropriate 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies and summarizes the research issue, problem, or creative challenge • Goals/objectives and hypothesis are clear • Includes historical context, assumptions/bias, and ethical considerations • Places research in academic framework and clearly connects thesis focus to an issue in the field and/or a larger context • Where appropriate, links to local, national, or global issue(s) 					
Comments:									

3. Includes a section on methodology/approach appropriate to disciplinary or interdisciplinary focus.

Emerging		Developing		Well done		Excellent			
1	2	3	4	5	6				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology/approach missing, incomplete, insufficiently detailed, or inappropriate • Relevant interdisciplinary considerations under-developed or missing • Topic minimally situated among sources and materials used 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delineates an appropriate methodology/approach • Uses procedures of the discipline, and includes any relevant inter-disciplinary considerations • Clearly situates topic among sources and materials used 					
Comments:									

RUBRIC FOR THE WRITTEN THESIS (revised 7-19-07)
Honors College Thesis Evaluation, UH 450

4. Examines supporting evidence and body of knowledge; discusses results.

Emerging		Developing		Well done		Excellent			
1	2	3	4	5	6				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate discussion of body of knowledge. Lacks sufficient evidential support for argument, or use of evidence is qualified or selective Does not distinguish between fact and opinion, or with little recognition of bias. Perspectives are limited. May not apply quantitative and/or symbolic tools appropriately. Limited evaluation, analysis, synthesis 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discusses body of knowledge thoroughly. Provides sufficient quality evidence. Questions accuracy and relevance of evidence, identifies bias. Considers multiple perspectives. Applies appropriate quantitative and/or symbolic tools. Critically evaluates and synthesizes information. 						
Comments:									

5. Identifies conclusions, implications, and consequences.

Emerging		Developing		Well done		Excellent			
1	2	3	4	5	6				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions, implications, and/or consequences are not included, or conclusions are relative or only loosely related to consequences or implications. Significance of what was discovered, learned, or created is not clear Assertions may not be qualified Lacks connection to local, national, global or civic issues, where appropriate, or larger ramifications of this work 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies conclusions, qualifications, and consequences, including the value of the project and its logical ramifications. Clearly presents significance of what was discovered, learned or created Qualifies assertions with balance Where appropriate, makes connections to local, national, global, or civic issues 						
Comments:									

6. Reflects high quality writing.

Emerging		Developing		Well done		Excellent			
1	2	3	4	5	6				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In places, language obscures meaning Grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors are distracting or repeated Work is unfocused Organization is clumsy or mechanical Sources are not cited or not used correctly 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas May at times be nuanced and eloquent Errors are minimal Organization is clear and effective Sources and citations used correctly 						
Comments:									

Dimension	Score	Dimension	Score
Precis		Evidence	
Questions/issue/creative challenge		Conclusions	
Methodology/approach		Writing	
<input type="checkbox"/> Thesis is of publishable quality with minor / major revision (circle one)			

RUBRIC FOR THE ORAL PRESENTATION (revised 7/31/07)
Honors College Thesis Evaluation, UH 450

Student Name:

Evaluator:

Topic:

For each of the six criteria below, please circle

- key phrases that describe the work
- a whole number or indicate increment of .5 (Note: 4 = competency)

1. Introduction

Emerging			Developing			Well done			Excellent		
1	2	3	4	5	6	4	5	6	4	5	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no introduction to topic. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interesting and engaging introduction • Previewed the topic and prepared the audience. 					

2. Organization

Emerging			Developing			Well done			Excellent		
1	2	3	4	5	6	4	5	6	4	5	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disorganized or poorly organized • Jumped between topics, and/or lacked periodic summaries. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well-organized and easy to follow • Smooth transitions and periodic summaries. 					

3. Delivery

Emerging			Developing			Well done			Excellent		
1	2	3	4	5	6	4	5	6	4	5	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper was read or seemed memorized • Speech was too slow / too fast / too soft. • Eye contact with audience lacking or absent • Delivery uncomfortable, stiff, unsure, or unprepared 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speech was smooth, clear, and articulate • Voice projection and pacing effective • Eye contact appropriate, helped connection to audience. • Delivery comfortable, poised, prepared 					

4. Content

Emerging			Developing			Well done			Excellent		
1	2	3	4	5	6	4	5	6	4	5	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper and presentation highly technical for specialized audience. • Terms undefined or minimally defined; background information and/or assumptions lacking. • Research deficient in evaluation or synthesis. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general audience could understand the presentation • Key terms defined and necessary background information provided. • Assumptions surfaced. • Research information evaluated and well synthesized. 					

5. Media and Resources

Emerging			Developing			Well done			Excellent		
1	2	3	4	5	6	4	5	6	4	5	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media and format poor choice for content • Materials sometimes confusing or distracting, or served as filler. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate media and format for content • All materials lucid, with pertinent information. 					

6. Response to Questions

Emerging			Developing			Well done			Excellent		
1	2	3	4	5	6	4	5	6	4	5	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misunderstands questions or cannot answer some questions. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers questions well and with reference to own work • Shows knowledge of subject. 					

<p>Comments on oral presentation</p>	<p>Overall evaluation (written and oral combined):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Nominate for Pass with Distinction <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Well done / Pass <input type="checkbox"/> Thesis needs minor revision to pass <input type="checkbox"/> Thesis needs significant revision to pass <input type="checkbox"/> Fail
--------------------------------------	---

OVERALL EVALUATION OF HONORS STUDENT

Student:

Semester:

Evaluator #1 recommendation

Emerging - Developing	Well-done - Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs minor revision to pass	<input type="checkbox"/> Nominate for Pass with Distinction
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs significant revision to pass	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/> Fail	<input type="checkbox"/> Pass / Well Done

Evaluator #2 recommendation:

Emerging - Developing	Well-done - Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs minor revision to pass	<input type="checkbox"/> Nominate for Pass with Distinction
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs significant revision to pass	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/> Fail	<input type="checkbox"/> Pass / Well Done

Thesis Advisor:

<p>Comments</p>	<p>Thesis is of publishable quality in the discipline with minor / major revision</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Student will publish or present their thesis work at a regional or national meeting.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
-----------------	---

Any other considerations and comments: (If the overall score differs from the scores by the evaluators, please record the rationale here.)

Overall evaluation:

- Nominate for Pass with Distinction
- Excellent
- Well done / Pass
- Thesis needs minor revision to pass
- Thesis needs significant revision to pass
- Fail

“Pass with Distinction:” This category is reserved for theses in which the research question or project demonstrated *unusual originality and creativity*, was elegantly executed and/or was innovative in its field. (e.g., analysis had more depth than is usual in an Honors thesis.)