

HONORS PROGRAM RUBRIC FOR THE WRITTEN PROSPECTUS

The thesis panel must **as a group** complete this evaluation of the student’s completed honors prospectus. The HP Chair is responsible for submitting the complete evaluation to the HP office.

Thesis Author: _____

Proposed thesis title: _____

Adviser: _____

In-field Reader: _____

HP Chair: _____

HP Rep (if applicable): _____

Providing brief comments will both provide additional feedback to the student as he or she prepares to write the thesis and aid discussion among Thesis panel members. A student who is well prepared to write the thesis should receive a rating of at least satisfactory (4) on each of the dimensions below, but this is not an inviolable rule. Panel discussion should carefully consider the range and pattern of ratings, the rationale behind each rating, and the relative importance of each dimension.

1. Awareness of background

| Unacceptable | | Marginal | | Satisfactory | | Outstanding | |
|---|---|----------|--|--------------|---|-------------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student demonstrates shallow or immature awareness of previous research/scholarship on the topic. • Student provides insufficient or muddled discussion of relevant literature. • Student fails to disclose work he or she has already done on this project and/or fails to disclose others’ contributions to the proposed project. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student demonstrates deep awareness of previous research/scholarship on the topic. • Student provides clear and thorough discussion of relevant literature. • Student provides clear and thorough description of any work he or she has already done on this project, including the contributions made by faculty or other students. | | | | |
| Score: _____ Comments: | | | | | | | |

2. Description of project

| Unacceptable | | Marginal | | Satisfactory | | Outstanding | | | |
|--|---|----------|--|--------------|---|-------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of proposed project is unclear or incomplete. Lacks description of how the proposed project connects to existing work, or such description is unclear or incomplete. Student fails to provide compelling reason(s) for the proposed project. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student provides clear, thorough description of proposed project, including all important steps of research and writing. Student clearly and thoroughly describes how the proposed project builds off previous work. Student provides compelling reason(s) for the importance of the proposed project. | | | | | | |
| Score: _____ Comments: | | | | | | | | | |

3. Preparation for Thesis

| Unacceptable | | Marginal | | Satisfactory | | Outstanding | | | |
|---|---|----------|---|--------------|---|-------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student fails to provide a calendar detailing how the proposed project will be completed within two semesters, or the calendar is unclear, incomplete, or unrealistic. Student provides no list of materials and/or funding needed to complete the proposed project, or this list is incomplete or unrealistic. Student fails to provide a list and description of possible funding sources (if funding seems obviously necessary), or this list is incomplete or lacks obvious detail. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student provides a complete, realistic calendar detailing how the proposed project will be completed within two semesters. Student provides a complete, good-faith list of materials and/or funding needed to complete the proposed project. If funding or travel is necessary, student provides a detailed list and description of possible funding sources. | | | | | | |
| Score: _____ Comments: | | | | | | | | | |

4. Writing

| Unacceptable | | Marginal | | Satisfactory | | Outstanding | | | |
|---|---|----------|---|--------------|---|-------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student relies too heavily on unexplained technical language or jargon. • Student's writing lacks syntactic clarity and/or displays numerous grammatical errors. • Student's writing lacks a clear organizational plan and/or is often difficult for the readers to follow. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student explains technical language and jargon for a general university audience. • Student's writing is clear and generally free of grammatical error. • Student's writing follows a clear organizational plan and is consistently easy for readers to follow. | | | | | | |
| Score: _____ | | | | | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | |

5. Student demeanor and performance

| Unacceptable | | Marginal | | Satisfactory | | Outstanding | | | |
|---|---|----------|---|--------------|---|-------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student often resisted reasonable feedback and/or failed to make suggested revisions. • Student often failed to meet deadlines determined by the HP and the panel. • Student often failed to work independently and/or required excessive oversight. • Student failed to maintain contact with his or her panel (e.g., regarding meetings and significant changes and/or progress on his or her project). • Student failed to react maturely to challenges and adversity. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student was receptive to reasonable criticism and made revisions accordingly. • Student consistently met deadlines determined by the HP and the panel. • Student performed research/scholarship and wrote, revised, and edited with reasonable independence. • Student maintained appropriate contact with his or her panel (e.g., regarding meetings and significant changes and/or progress on his or her project). • Student reacted maturely to challenges and adversity. | | | | | | |
| Score: _____ | | | | | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | |

NOTE: This page will not be shared directly with the student.

6. Compare this Prospectus and the performance of its writer to other approved Prospectuses.

Exceptional (top 5%)

Very good (top 20%)

Good (top 40%)

Adequate (top 60%)

Below average (bottom 40%)

7. Letter grade recommendation: _____

Address to the director of the honors program any comments about the student's performance or aptitude that can be used to help enhance the student's chances of succeeding in HONR 4000: Thesis.

Address to the director of the honors program any suggestions for change you would like to see made to this evaluation form. These changes can be additions, deletions, re-wording, or anything else you think would improve it as an assessment of student work.