

# Rubric for the Thesis Advisor's Assessment<sup>1</sup>

Providing brief comments will give additional feedback to the student as well as inform the post-defense deliberation among committee members.

A student who attains *honors* will typically receive a rating of at least *satisfactory* (4) on each of the dimensions below and on the rubrics connected with other facets of the thesis and defense. This is not an inviolable rule. The post-defense 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. Likewise, the ratings of a student who receives *highest honors* are almost always all *outstanding* (6).

1. Relationship with the advisor

| Unacceptable Marginal |   | Satisfactory Outstandi |   |   |   |
|-----------------------|---|------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1                     | 2 | 3                      | 4 | 5 | 6 |

- Assesses own knowledge, skills, and abilities accurately
- Perseveres toward attaining mutually agreed upon goals
- Displays high standards of attendance and punctuality
- Responds thoughtfully to feedback
- Sets, reflects upon and adjusts priorities in order to balance professionalism

| വ | 'n | m | $e^{1}$ | nts | ٠ |
|---|----|---|---------|-----|---|
|   |    |   |         |     |   |

2. Relationship with the project

| Unacceptable Marginal |   | Satisfactory Outstand |   |   |   |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---|---|---|
| 1                     | 2 | 3                     | 4 | 5 | 6 |

- Clearly understands the big picture while attending to the details of the specific project
- Works independently; is a consistent "self-starter"
- Reliably recognizes the existence of a problem, identifies potential causes, and implements possible solutions
- Seeks and evaluates information using multiple criteria for topics/issues under consideration

| $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ |   |    |     |     |
|-----------------------|---|----|-----|-----|
| $\mathbf{C}$          | m | ım | ıen | ts: |

<sup>1</sup> Adapted, with permission, from the rubric of the Washington State University Honors College.

## 3. Assessment of the thesis project

#### • Originality of thesis

Was the thesis idea developed by the student? Does the work done for the thesis represent an original perspective?

#### • Contribution of thesis to disciplinary or interdisciplinary scholarship

Does the thesis introduce new knowledge or analysis? Will the thesis serve to stimulate other research or scholarship?

#### • Publishability of thesis

Is the thesis likely to result in a peer-reviewed journal article? Is the thesis likely to result in a presentation at a professional meeting? Is the thesis suitable for publication in a student journal or presentation at a student session?

### • Comparison of thesis work to master's level work in field

Does the thesis work compare favorably to masters thesis work in the field? Does the thesis work compare favorably to first-year master's student work in the field?