

# UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

## HESC-MS THESIS STUDENTS: RUBRIC FOR WRITTEN PROPOSAL AND DEFENSE

Student: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria	Does not meet expectations = 1	Meets expectations = 2	Exceeds expectations = 3	Score
1. Mastery of theories and concepts in the field demonstrated in problem statement and literature review	1) Arguments are sometimes incorrect, incoherent, or flawed 2) Objectives are poorly defined 3) Demonstrates limited critical thinking skills 4) Reflects limited understanding of subject matter and associated literature 5) Demonstrates limited understanding of theoretical concepts 6) Documentation is weak 7) Inadequate statement of hypotheses	1) Arguments are coherent and reasonably clear 2) Objectives are clear 3) Demonstrates acceptable critical thinking skills 4) Reflects understanding of subject matter and literature 5) Demonstrates understanding of the critical concepts 6) Documentation is adequate 7) Generates adequate hypotheses	1) Arguments are superior 2) Objectives are well defined 3) Exhibits mature, refined critical thinking skills 4) Reflects mastery of subject matter and associated literature. 5) Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts 6) Documentation is excellent 7) Generates well-reasoned and well-supported hypotheses	Max: 21
2. Mastery of methods of inquiry	1) Design inappropriate to questions 2) Confused or ineffective plan for analysis 3) Lacks anticipation of regulatory compliance requirements	1) Design reasonable for questions acknowledges some limitations 2) Plan for analysis reasonable, acknowledges some limitations 3) Considers regulatory compliance	1) Design, analysis plan, excellent 2) Plan for analysis goes beyond the obvious, acknowledges limitations and critically considers alternatives 3) Demonstrates regulatory compliance	Max: 9
3. Quality of writing	1) Writing is weak 2) Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent 3) Organization is poor 4) Style is not appropriate to discipline	1) Writing is adequate 2) Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent 3) Organization is logical 4) Style is appropriate to discipline	1) Writing is publication quality 2) No grammatical or spelling errors apparent 3) Organization is excellent 4) Style is exemplary	Max: 12
4. Originality and potential for contribution to discipline and policy	1) Limited potential for discovery 2) Limited extension of previous published work in the field 3) Limited theoretical or applied significance 4) Limited publication potential	1) Some potential for discovery 2) Builds upon previous work 3) Reasonable theoretical or applied significance 4) Reasonable publication potential	1) Exceptional potential for discovery 2) Greatly extends previous work 3) Exceptional theoretical or applied significance 4) Exceptional publication potential	Max: 12
<b>Overall judgment:</b>	<b>Does not meet expectations (&gt;42)</b>	<b>Meets expectations (43-47)</b>	<b>Exceeds expectations (48-54)</b>	