

Academic Magnet High School

Senior Thesis Rubric

This thesis grading sheet will be used to rate the student at the oral presentation. Grading criteria for each member of the final thesis committee are listed separately. Each member of the committee will rate the student based on the specific criteria relevant to the role that he or she served. The scores are weighted as follows:

Mentor	35% of grade
Advisor	42.5% of grade*
Third Party	12.5 % of grade
Senior Thesis Final Exam Grade	7.5% of grade

- This grading rubric has been adapted from that being used by the Chemical Engineering Department at Princeton University.

*7.5% of the grade will automatically reflect thesis deadlines. Students who miss a thesis deadline without an extension approved by the Senior Thesis Committee will be eligible for a grade no higher than 93%. A copy of the signed deadline sheet must accompany all grades.

MENTOR GRADING: Maximum 70 points

The student's mentor should carefully evaluate the student on all the criteria listed below and give the score that he or she feels to be most appropriate for each section.

- 1. Student Work Ethic:** This component includes evaluating the student's level of effort, purpose, preparation, and ownership over the thesis process. *Students who miss multiple deadlines should score lower in this category.*

14-15 points – The student worked on the project enthusiastically and with diligence. He or she met regularly with me and/or met the regular contact requirements outlined in the initial mentor/advisor/student meeting. Student came fully prepared to meetings and demonstrated a strong commitment to the thesis process.

13 points – The student was enthusiastic about topic and adhered to the terms of the initial mentor/advisor/student meeting contract. Student was adequately prepared for meetings.

12 points – The student made an effort to meet routinely with me but did not demonstrate enthusiasm about topic AND/OR did not demonstrate consistent diligence to task. Student was sporadic in adhering to the terms of the initial mentor/advisor/student meeting contract.

11 points – The student met and/or contacted me sporadically; he or she did not adhere to the terms listed in the initial meeting with mentor/advisor/student; met minimum progress requirements. Student was not prepared for meetings and showed little progress.

10 points – The student only contacted me when he or she was in need of immediate assistance; did not meet terms of initial contract agreement between mentor/advisor/student. Came to meetings unprepared.

0-9 points – The student worked rarely or not at all; he or she did not meet any of the criteria listed on the initial contract agreement between mentor/advisor/student.

- 2. Thesis Scholarship:** This component includes evaluating the student's intellectual drive and consistency in pursuit of mastery; the student's grasp of material and the depth of the research should be considered.

19-20 points – Student was a model scholar and demonstrated mastery of issues related to thesis topic. Scope of thesis was ambitious and was carried out. Student examined literature far beyond the minimum 15 sources required and sources were scholarly and well chosen. Demonstrated mastery of issues related to thesis topic and responses to probing questions. Student actively initiated thesis work. Document went beyond the requirements laid out by the parameters of the topic.

17-18 points Student demonstrated above average scholarship. Scope was ambitious, but may have not been fully realized. Demonstrated competence in knowledge of literature and thesis process; however, some subtleties, references, or issues were missed. The student initiated his or her own research.

16 points – Student exhibited average scholarship. He or she did not go much beyond the sources required and/or recommended by thesis class or mentor. Important issues and references were missed. It was obvious that the student did the work to meet AMHS requirements but did not extend learning beyond these parameters. Results collection and analysis met requirements of thesis but student did not demonstrate an interest in extending knowledge beyond basic requirements.

14-15 points – Exhibited below average scholarship. The student showed limited mastery over literature – essentially not “learning” from research – just “doing” research. Important material was neglected. Student’s written work was below average and not carefully checked. Results collection and analysis was hastily done and not with care.

11-13 points – Scholarship was poor. The student demonstrated little knowledge of his or her topic. He or she did not meet or contact me enough to get suggestions for scholarly literature. The document was poorly written and results collection/analysis almost non-existent.

0-10 points – Thesis requirements were not met.

3. Overall Quality: This component includes evaluating the student’s thesis document throughout the process not just the final paper; consider how well the writing was well organized and ordered, its level of maturity and sophistication, the accuracy of the content, and the state of the paper at each step/deadline.

24-25 points – Thesis was a pleasure to read. Document was well written. This document was of a quality that could be published or otherwise used in some capacity within my field. Student clearly grasped the protocol of a thesis. It was clear that the student edited the paper carefully before bringing to me.

21-23 points – Document was clear and well written. Student understood the thesis protocol. If scope had been more ambitious, or more fully realized, paper could be used in some capacity within the field.

19-20 points – Paper was well written but required a fair amount of editing. It was clear that the student did not pay attention to details of writing and/or did not edit prior to giving to me.

17-18 points – Document was poorly written. Significant portions were sloppy or unclear. The paper contained spelling and/or grammatical errors.

15-16 points – It was clear that the student did not put enough effort into writing this document. Most sections were unclear and did not cover the minimum required.

0-14 points – The document was incomplete.

4. Defense: This component includes both the student's presentation and the quality and content of the question and answer session.

10 points – The student demonstrated an expert's understanding of the topic and its issues. Gaps, limitations, and implications were clearly and thoroughly covered without prompting. The format of the presentation ideally suited the work.

9 points – The student demonstrated a solid understanding of the field and his or her own work. Gaps, limitations, and implications were acknowledged. The format of the presentation fit the research well.

8 points -- The student definitely understood the field and his or her own work. Subtleties, including the limitations or implications of the work, were not covered. The format of the presentation was fine.

7 points -- There were clear gaps in the student's understanding of the research. The presentation itself needed improvement.

0-6 points – The student did not demonstrate an understanding of the research. The presentation was poor.

POINTS FOR STUDENT WORK ETHIC _____

POINTS FOR THESIS SCHOLARSHIP _____

POINTS FOR OVERALL QUALITY _____

POINTS FOR DEFENSE _____

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED BY MENTOR _____

ADVISOR GRADING: Maximum 70 points

The faculty advisor should carefully evaluate the student on all the criteria listed below and give the score that he or she feels to be most appropriate for each section.

1. Student Work Ethic: This component includes evaluating the student's level of effort, purpose, preparation, and ownership over the thesis process. *Students who miss multiple deadlines should score lower in this category.*

14-15 points – The student worked on the project enthusiastically and with diligence. He or she met regularly with me and/or met the regular contact requirements outlined in the initial mentor/advisor/student meeting. Student came fully prepared to meetings and demonstrated a strong commitment to the thesis process.

13 points – The student was enthusiastic about topic and adhered to the terms of the initial mentor/advisor/student meeting contract. Student was adequately prepared for meetings.

12 points – The student made an effort to meet routinely with me but did not demonstrate enthusiasm about topic and/or did not demonstrate consistent diligence to task. Student was sporadic in adhering to the terms of the initial mentor/advisor/student meeting contract.

11 points – The student met and/or contacted me sporadically; he or she did not adhere to the terms listed in the initial meeting with mentor/advisor/student; met minimum progress requirements. Student was not prepared for meetings and showed little progress.

10 points – The student only contacted me when he or she was in need of immediate assistance; did not meet terms of initial contract agreement between mentor/advisor/student. Came to meetings unprepared.

0-9 points – The student worked rarely or not at all; he or she did not meet any of the criteria listed on the initial contract agreement between mentor/advisor/student.

2. Thesis Scholarship: This component includes evaluating the student's intellectual drive and consistency in pursuit of mastery; the student's grasp of material and the depth of the research should be considered.

19-20 points – Student was a model scholar and demonstrated mastery of issues related to thesis topic. Scope of thesis was ambitious and was carried out. Student examined literature far beyond the minimum 15 sources required and sources were scholarly and well chosen. Demonstrated mastery of issues related to thesis topic and responses to probing questions. Student actively initiated thesis work. Document went beyond the requirements laid out by the parameters of the topic.

17-18 points Student demonstrated above average scholarship. Scope was ambitious, but may have not been fully realized. Demonstrated competence in knowledge of

literature and thesis process; however, some subtleties, references, or issues were missed. The student initiated his or her own research.

16 points – Student exhibited average scholarship. He or she did not go much beyond the sources required and/or recommended by thesis class or mentor. Important issues and references were missed. It was obvious that the student did the work to meet AMHS requirements but did not extend learning beyond these parameters. Results collection and analysis met requirements of thesis but student did not demonstrate an interest in extending knowledge beyond basic requirements.

14-15 points – Exhibited below average scholarship. The student demonstrated limited mastery over literature – essentially not “learning” from research – just “doing” research. Important material was neglected. Student’s written work was below average and not carefully checked. Results collection and analysis were hastily done and not with care.

11-13 points – Scholarship was poor. The student had little knowledge of his or her topic. He or she did not meet or contact me enough to get suggestions for scholarly literature. The document was poorly written and results collection/analysis almost non-existent.

0-10 points – Thesis requirements were not met.

3. Overall Quality: This component includes evaluating the student’s thesis document throughout the process not just the final paper; consider how well the writing was well organized and ordered, its level of maturity and sophistication, the accuracy of the content, and the state of the paper at each step/deadline.

24-25 points – Thesis was a pleasure to read. Document was well written. This document was of a quality that could be published or otherwise used in some capacity within the field. Student clearly grasped the protocol of a thesis. It was clear that the student edited the paper carefully before bringing to me.

21-23 points – Document was clear and well written. Student understood the thesis protocol. If scope had been more ambitious, or more fully realized, paper could be used in some capacity within the field.

19-20 points – Paper was well written but required a fair amount of editing. It was clear that the student did not pay attention to details of writing and/or did not edit prior to giving to me.

17-18 points – Document was poorly written. Significant portions were sloppy or unclear. There were spelling and/or grammatical errors.

15-16 points – It was clear that the student did not put enough effort into writing this document. Most sections were unclear and did not cover the minimum required.

0-14 points – The document was given to me in incomplete form.

4. Defense: This component includes both the student's presentation and the quality and content of the question and answer session.

10 points – The student demonstrated an expert's understanding of the topic and its issues. Gaps, limitations, and implications were clearly and thoroughly covered without prompting. The format of the presentation ideally suited the work.

9 points – The student demonstrated a solid understanding of the field and his or her own work. Gaps, limitations, and implications were acknowledged. The format of the presentation fit the research well.

8 points -- The student definitely understood the field and his or her own work. Subtleties, including the limitations or implications of the work, were not covered. The format of the presentation was fine.

7 points -- There were clear gaps in the student's understanding of the research. The presentation itself needed improvement.

0-6 points – The student did not demonstrate an understanding of the research. The presentation was poor.

POINTS FOR STUDENT WORK ETHIC _____

POINTS FOR THESIS SCHOLARSHIP _____

POINTS FOR OVERALL QUALITY _____

POINTS FOR DEFENSE _____

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED BY ADVISOR _____



THIRD PARTY GRADING: Maximum 25 points

- 1. Planning:** This component includes evaluating the student's level of preparation for your involvement.

5 points – The student discussed the thesis with me and presented me with the written document at least one week prior to the oral defense.

4 points – The student gave me the written document in sufficient time for me to read but did not discuss project with me.

3 points – The student gave me the written document less than one week before presentation and did not discuss project with me.

2 points – Student gave me the written document less than three days before presentation – forget any discussion.

1 point – Student gave me the document on the day of the presentation.

- 2. Overall Quality:** This component includes evaluating the student's thesis document; consider how well the writing was well organized and ordered, its level of maturity and sophistication, the accuracy of the content, and the state of the paper at each step/deadline.

10 points – Superior. Document was a pleasure to read. It was clear that the student edited the paper carefully before bringing to me. Document demonstrated a full understanding of the protocol of a thesis. Design, results collection, and analysis were exemplary.

9 points – Excellent. Document was well written. Student demonstrated an understanding of the thesis process; perhaps could have edited or prepared a bit more thoroughly. Methodology and results collection were appropriate for a well-designed thesis. Results collection and analysis were thorough.

8 points – Average. Paper was complete but required a fair amount of editing. It was clear that the student could have paid more attention to the details of writing and/or the thesis protocol. Results collection might not have been as thorough as initially designed.

7 points – Poor. Document was poorly written. Results collection and analysis were weak.

6 points – Without merit. It was clear that the student did not put the necessary effort into writing this document or conducting independent research. Most sections were unclear.

0-5 points – The document was incomplete.

3. Defense: This component includes both the student's presentation and the quality and content of the question and answer session.

10 points – The student demonstrated an expert's understanding of the topic and its issues. Gaps, limitations, and implications were clearly and thoroughly covered without prompting. The format of the presentation ideally suited the work.

9 points – The student demonstrated a solid understanding of the field and his or her own work. Gaps, limitations, and implications were acknowledged. The format of the presentation fit the research well.

8 points -- The student definitely understood the field and his or her own work. Subtleties, including the limitations or implications of the work, were not covered. The format of the presentation was fine.

7 points -- There were clear gaps in the student's understanding of the research. The presentation itself needed improvement.

0-6 points – The student did not demonstrate an understanding of the research. The presentation was poor.

POINTS FOR PLANNING _____

POINTS FOR OVERALL QUALITY _____

POINTS FOR DEFENSE _____

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED BY THIRD PARTY _____



Academic Magnet High School Senior Thesis Grade Sheet

STUDENT NAME: _____

MENTOR TOTAL _____ Signature:

ADVISOR TOTAL _____ Signature:

THIRD PARTY TOTAL _____ Signature:

SENIOR THESIS PREPARATION
FINAL EXAM GRADE _____ Signature:

(10% of 200 pts; calculate by multiplying the Senior Thesis Final Exam grade by .2)
(Note: this grade and thesis teacher signature MUST be present before oral defense begins)

If all thesis deadlines were met,
ADD 15 points
DO NOT ADD POINTS IF THE STUDENT
MISSED ONE OR MORE DEADLINES _____ Signature:

(Advisor must attach signed thesis deadline sheet.
If student has missed more than one deadline,
it is expected that the Student Work Ethic point
total will reflect the additional missed deadlines.)

TOTAL POINTS _____

POINTS/200 = _____ %

The student's Review Committee (mentor, advisor and third party) may choose to share its evaluation with the student immediately after the oral defense, or, because of time constraints on the part of the mentor, the advisor may schedule a private meeting with the student. That meeting generally takes place the day of the presentation. Students may be asked to edit a written presentation that has faulty mechanics (spelling, punctuation, typos). It is expected that all errors will be corrected and the paper resubmitted before the final deadline set up by the student's Review Committee. The student's grade will remain "incomplete" until a corrected version of the paper is approved by the advisor. Failure to meet this final deadline will impact the student's grade.

Advisors are responsible for submitting the grade sheet, signed thesis deadline sheet, Senior Thesis Submission Form, and an electronic version of the thesis to Susan Henley within one week of the oral defense.