

## FOR WRITTEN DOCUMENT

### GRADUATE STUDENT PROPOSAL/PRACTICUM-THESIS-DISSERTATION RUBRIC

The attached evaluation tool (rubric) is adopted from A-State Office of Assessment with minor modifications to assist faculty in the evaluation of their degree program. The rubric includes four broad evaluation criteria, and encourages the addition of criteria important to individual departments/programs. Evaluation of a thesis/dissertation proposal and the thesis/dissertation can be an integral part of graduate student learning outcomes assessment conducted by graduate programs. It is applicable to all programs that have a thesis or dissertation requirement.

This evaluation tool is intended to:

- provide students, with a clear understanding of the aspects of their proposal deemed most important to their graduate program, although they should still follow their advisor's guidance.
- provide clear and concise feedback to students on how well their proposal does in meeting those program objectives, at a time when the feedback can be used to improve the final version of the proposal and final version of the thesis/dissertation
- encourage conversations among departmental colleagues about improving graduate student learning outcomes and assessment
- serve as a model for a "tool" that can be used by graduate programs both as they prepare their students to meet program learning objectives and as they report on their success in required assessment reports.

#### **Instructions:**

1. The advisor and students should review and become familiar with the criteria in the evaluation tool, as a guide, prior to the preparation of a thesis/dissertation proposal and prior to the final thesis/dissertation.
2. Part I (page 2) should be completed by the Student and a copy should be submitted to each committee member and the Advisor.
3. Part II (page 2) should be completed by the Student or Advisor.
4. The rubric (Part IV, page 3) should be then be scored once by each of the Committee Members and the Advisor. For each attribute which a committee member feels is somewhat or very deficient, a short explanation should be provided on the summary page (Page 4) along with all additional feedback. Score each expectation within an attribute from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Use "Absent" if the expectation is relevant but cannot be evaluated. Choose N/A if the expectation is not relevant.
5. Each committee member should bring the completed rubric to the oral presentation to give feedback to the student, and summarized by the advisor in written format on the summary page (Part V, page 4).
6. The Advisor should collect all completed rubrics and make a photocopy for the student as feedback for thesis/dissertation proposal improvement, as well as for developing their final thesis/dissertation/practicum.
7. The original completed rubrics should be treated as **confidential** information and delivered to the relevant program (EVS/MBS or Biology) director. These records should be retained in a secure file in the office for use as a valuable tool in graduate student learning outcomes assessment.

**Part I: Student Information**

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Last four digits of Student ID: \_\_\_\_\_

Circle the Program: BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES    ENVRIONMENTAL SCIENCE    MOLECULAR BIOSCIENCE

Circle the Degree:    MA    MS    PhD

Check below which applies:

- Thesis Proposal
- Practica Proposal
- Dissertation Proposal
- Thesis – Final
- Practica – Final
- Dissertation – Final

**Part II: Committee Information**

**TO BE COMPLETED BY ADVISOR/STUDENT:**

Advisor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Committee Members and Affiliation:

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

**Part III: Reviewer Information**

Name of Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Review: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part IV: Written Document Rubric****TO BE COMPLETED BY ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS, at the time of the oral presentation.****Student Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Expectation</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Comment on strengths and weaknesses</b>
Mastery of Theories and Concepts in the Field	Arguments are correct, coherent, and clear							
	Objectives well defined							
	Mature critical thinking skills							
	Mastery of subject and associated literature							
	Mastery of theoretical concepts							
	Excellent use of citations (literature well covered)							
	Hypotheses are (were) well formulated, relevant, and testable (were tested) with data collection plan							
	Overarching goal of study well-reasoned and supported							
Mastery of Methods of Inquiry	Design of study excellent							
	Plan for analysis (proposal) acknowledges limitations & critically considers alternatives. Analyses (final document) are appropriate, sound, and rigorous							
	Regulatory compliance appropriately addressed							
Quality of Writing	Writing is publication quality							
	No grammatical or spelling errors							
	Excellent organization, flow, and transitions							
	All citations in text are present in the Reference list and vice versa, and format use is consistent throughout the document							
Originality and Potential for Contribution to Discipline	Research question is novel and has high potential for publication							
Overall Assessment	Exceeds level expected of a M.A./M.S./Ph.D. student							

**Part V: Feedback Summary**

**TO BE COMPLETED BY ADVISOR ONLY:**

*Please summarize all feedback given by committee to the graduate student:*