

HESC-MS THESIS/COMPREHENSIVE EXAM ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

Every member of theses and comprehensive exam committees should complete the below rubric following the student's defense/exam meeting. Completed rubrics should be emailed to hescgrad@uark.edu. Rubrics are for internal assessment purposes only.

DNME: Does Not Meet Expectations, ME: Meets Expectations, EE: Exceeds Expectations	DNME (0)	ME (1-2)	EE (3)	Item Score
1. Identification of main issues in area ^{SL01}				
2. Evidence-based knowledge & reasoning ^{SL01}				
3. Mastery of field theories and concepts ^{SL03}				
4. Quality of research questions, hypotheses, or other inquiry statements ^{SL02}				
5. Mastery of research design/methods ^{SL05}				
6. Appropriate use of critical perspective and analysis ^{SL03}				
7. Conclusions/solutions are contextually appropriate, feasible, relevant, & actionable ^{SL02}				
8. Organization ^{SL04}				
9. Level of detail ^{SL03}				
10. Writing quality ^{SL04}				
11. Presentation quality ^{SL04}				
12. Format, mechanics, and grammar ^{SL04}				
13. Ability to accept and respond to critical feedback ^{SL04}				
14. Originality and potential for contribution ^{SL02}				
15. Overall impression				
16. Completed by deadline (<i>circle score</i>) ^{SL05}				0 or 5
TOTAL SCORE:				/50
Comments:				

Faculty Scoring Guide:

1. Identification of main issues in area^{SL01}

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Does not identify or analyze the issues addressed in the literature (0 points)	Identify and analyzes some of the issues addressed in the literature (1-2 points)	Describes detailed summary of main issues, provides thorough analysis of main issues addressed in literature (3 points)

2. Evidence-based knowledge & reasoning^{SL01}

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Does not provide enough details or cited evidence to support content, methods, and/or analysis (0 points)	Provides good evidence but may be lacking in detail (1-2 points)	Provides enough details and cited evidence to fully support content, methods, and/or analysis (3 points)

3. Mastery of field theories and concepts^{SL03}

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Arguments are sometimes incorrect, incoherent, or flawed; Limited critical thinking skills; Limited understanding of subject matter and associated literature; Limited understanding of theoretical concepts (0 points)	Arguments are coherent and reasonably clear; Acceptable critical thinking skills; Understanding of subject matter and literature; Understanding of critical concepts (1-2 points)	Arguments are superior; Mature, refined critical thinking skills; Mastery of subject matter and associated literature; Mastery of theoretical concepts (3 points)

4. Quality of research questions, hypotheses, or other inquiry statements^{SL02}

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Objectives/research questions are poorly defined; Weak documentation; Inadequate hypotheses (0 points)	Objectives/research questions are clear; Adequate documentation; Adequate hypotheses (1-2 points)	Objectives/research questions are well defined; Excellent documentation; Well-reasoned and well-supported hypotheses (3 points)

5. Mastery of research design/methods^{SL05}

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Design is inappropriate to questions; Confused or ineffective plan for analysis; Lacks awareness of regulatory compliance requirements (0 points)	Design is reasonable for questions and acknowledges limitations; Plan for analysis is reasonable and acknowledges some limitations; Considers regulatory compliance (1-2 points)	Design and analysis plan are excellent; Plan for analysis goes beyond the obvious and acknowledges limitations while considering alternatives; Demonstrates regulatory compliance (3 points)

6. Appropriate use of critical perspective and analysis^{SL03}

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Does not choose an appropriate lens or applied insufficiently; Does not make a cogent argument (0 points)	Chose a workable lens for the text at hand; Sufficiently thorough and accurate application; Made acceptable argument that may not be completely appropriate or convincing (1-2 points)	Chose the most appropriate lens for the text at hand; Applied thoroughly and accurately; Made appropriate, thorough, and convincing argument (3 points)

7. Conclusions/solutions are contextually appropriate, feasible, relevant, & actionable^{SL02}

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Identification of problems involves solutions that are not sensitive to context or demographics, relevance for public policy is not addressed, and could not be implemented (0 points)	Identifies and addresses problems by forming solutions that somewhat consider context or demographics, somewhat articulate a relevance to policy, and could feasibly be implemented (1-2 points)	Identifies and addresses complex problems by forming solutions that are sensitive to context and demographics, relevant for public policy, and could be readily implemented (3 points)

8. Organization^{SL04}

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Not logically organized; Does not follow guidelines (0 points)	Overall, logically organized but some organizational problems at writing or presenting levels (1-2 points)	Logically organized at the presentation, paper, paragraph, and sentence levels in all parts of the project (3 points)

9. Level of detail^{SL03}

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Does not provide enough details or evidence throughout project (0 points)	Provided good evidence but may be lacking in detail (1-2 points)	Provided enough details and evidence to fully support project (3 points)

10. Writing quality^{SL04}

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Writing is weak; Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent; Difficult to read/comprehend (0 points)	Writing is adequate; Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent but they do not interfere with reading or comprehension (1-2 points)	Writing is publication quality; No grammatical or spelling errors apparent; Excellent readability and comprehension (3 points)

11. Presentation quality^{SL04}

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Very boring; Unpleasant to listen to; Poor	Interesting; Pleasant to listen to; Good	Very interesting; Pleasant to listen to; Excellent

communication; Inappropriate body language/eye contact; Incorrect language use that impairs understanding; Illogical flow with unclear objectives; Does not demonstrate mastery of subject; Poor visual aids that are difficult to read or distracting (0 points)	communication; Appropriate body language/eye contact; Correct language use that facilitates understanding; Logical flow with objectives; Demonstrates adequate mastery of subject; Appropriate visual aids that do not detract from presentation (1-2 points)	communication; Engaging body language/eye contact; Advanced use of language that enhances understanding; Logical flow with clear objectives; Advanced mastery of subject; Excellent visual aids that enhance presentation (3 points)
--	---	---

12. Format, mechanics, and grammar^{SL04}

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Does not follow APA style; Lots of grammatical errors that distract from the project (0 points)	Follows APA style; Some mistakes in formatting or a few mechanical or grammar errors (1-2 points)	Properly formatted following the most updated APA style; No mechanical or grammar errors (3 points)

13. Ability to accept and respond to critical feedback^{SL04}

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Does not request, accept, or follow critical feedback from project advisor or committee members throughout project (0 points)	Requested, accepted, and mostly followed critical feedback from project advisor or committee members throughout project (1-2 points)	Was highly engaged with advisor and/or committee throughout project to request, accept, and implement critical project feedback (3 points)

14. Originality and potential for contribution^{SL02}

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Limited potential for discovery; Limited extension of previous published work in the field; Limited theoretical or applied significance; Limited publication potential (0 points)	Some potential for discovery; Builds upon previous work; Reasonable theoretical or applied significance; Reasonable publication potential (1-2 points)	Exceptional potential for discovery; Greatly extends previous work; Exceptional theoretical or applied significance; Exceptional publication potential (3 points)

15. Overall impression

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Low quality project; Low quality writing; Low quality presentation (0 points)	Adequate project with adequate writing and presentation quality (1-2 points)	High quality project with advanced writing and presentation quality (3 points)

16. Completed by deadline^{SL05}

On time = 5; Not on time = 0