

**HONORS PROGRAM RUBRIC FOR THE WRITTEN THESIS**

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

Thesis Author: \_\_\_\_\_

Thesis title: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Adviser: \_\_\_\_\_

In-field Reader: \_\_\_\_\_

HP Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

HP Rep (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

Providing brief comments will give additional feedback to the student as well as aid discussion among Thesis panel members. The HP Committee will also consider these rubrics when determining student awards. A student who attains Honors will typically receive a rating of at least satisfactory (4) on each of the dimensions below, and the ratings of truly outstanding student work should almost always be (6). Panel discussion should carefully consider the range and pattern of ratings, the rationale behind each committee member’s ratings, and the relative importance of each dimension.

**1. Research question/issue/creative challenge presented within academic framework**

Unacceptable		Marginal		Satisfactory		Outstanding	
1	2	3	4	5	6		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question/issue/creative challenge not identified, or inaccurately or inadequately represented</li> <li>• Goals/objectives/hypotheses are vague or incomplete</li> <li>• Historical context, assumptions/biases, and/or ethical considerations are lacking or underdeveloped</li> <li>• Thesis not presented/inadequately presented within academic &amp;/or creative framework</li> <li>• Thesis connection to appropriate local, national, global or civic issue(s) is lacking or underdeveloped</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question/issue/creative challenge identified and summarized</li> <li>• Goals/objectives/hypotheses are clear</li> <li>• Historical context, assumptions/biases, and/or ethical considerations are present/developed</li> <li>• Thesis presented within academic &amp;/or creative framework</li> <li>• Thesis connection to appropriate local, national, global or civic issue(s) is present/developed</li> </ul>				

Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

**2. Methodology/approach appropriate to disciplinary/interdisciplinary focus**

Unacceptable		Marginal		Satisfactory		Outstanding	
1	2	3	4	5	6		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Methodology/approach missing, incomplete, insufficiently detailed, or inappropriate</li> <li>Procedures standard to the discipline are not followed consistently</li> <li>Relevant interdisciplinary considerations are underdeveloped or missing</li> <li>Topic minimally situated among sources and materials cited</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Methodology/approach is appropriate and detailed</li> <li>Procedures standard to the discipline are followed consistently</li> <li>Relevant interdisciplinary considerations are displayed and developed</li> <li>Topic clearly contextualized among sources and materials cited</li> </ul>				
Score: _____ Comments:							

**3. Supporting evidence &/or creative background**

Unacceptable		Marginal		Satisfactory		Outstanding	
1	2	3	4	5	6		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence &amp;/or creative background inadequately discussed</li> <li>Evaluation, analysis, and synthesis are limited</li> <li>Evidential support for argument &amp;/or use of creative background is selective or inadequate</li> <li>Fact v. opinion not well distinguished; potential bias(es) are ignored or not recognized</li> <li>Perspectives are limited</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence &amp;/or creative background thoroughly and intelligently discussed</li> <li>Sufficiently evaluates, analyzes, and synthesizes information &amp;/or creative background</li> <li>Amount and quality of evidence &amp;/or creative background is sufficient</li> <li>Evidence &amp;/or creative background used relevantly and accurately; potential bias(es) identified</li> <li>Multiple perspectives considered</li> </ul>				
Score: _____ Comments:							

#### 4. Conclusions, implications, and consequences

Unacceptable		Marginal		Satisfactory		Outstanding			
1	2	3	4	5	6				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conclusions, implications, and/or consequences lacking, or conclusions are loosely related to consequences or implications</li> <li>• Significance of what was discovered, learned, or created is unclear</li> <li>• Assertions are unqualified or unwarranted</li> <li>• Appropriate connections to local, national, global or civic issue(s) are lacking; ramifications of work not discussed</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conclusions, qualifications, and consequences, including value of thesis, are presented and well developed</li> <li>• Significance of what was discovered, learned or created is clear</li> <li>• Assertions are qualified and well supported</li> <li>• Connections to local, national, global, or civic issue(s) discussed; ramifications of work presented and discussed</li> </ul>						
Score: _____ Comments:									

#### 5. Writing

Unacceptable		Marginal		Satisfactory		Outstanding			
1	2	3	4	5	6				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Language obscures meaning/unclear in places and/or lacks appropriate eloquence</li> <li>• Grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors are distracting or repeated</li> <li>• Work is unfocused</li> <li>• Organization is clumsy or mechanical</li> <li>• Sources not cited or not used correctly</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas and is appropriately nuanced and eloquent</li> <li>• Writing errors are minimal</li> <li>• Writing and organization are clearly focused</li> <li>• Organization is clear and effective</li> <li>• Sources and citations used correctly</li> </ul>						
Score: _____ Comments:									

### 6. Student demeanor and performance

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

Criterion	Score
Question/issue/creative challenge	
Methodology/approach	
Evidence/findings	
Conclusions, implications, consequences	
Writing	
Student demeanor and performance	
TOTAL SCORE (for 6 criteria) =	

***This page will not be shared with the thesis writer***

Address to the director of the honors program any suggestions for change you would like to see made to the Prospectus and Thesis process.

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.

An HP subcommittee will use this form for determining winner(s) of the Best Thesis Award. Please include below any information or opinions that might help this subcommittee make its decision.