



## Capstone Experience/Thesis (CE/T) Final Evaluation

Students should complete the first section of this form before e-mailing it to their readers the day before the defense. Once signed, this form (the Final Evaluation **and** Evaluation Rubric) must be submitted to the CE/T Advisor ([cet.advisor@wku.edu](mailto:cet.advisor@wku.edu)) by a member of the CE/T committee immediately following the defense.

<b>Student Name:</b>		<b>WKU E-mail:</b>	
<b>Defense Date &amp; Time:</b>			
<b>Final CE/T Title:</b>			

*Please ensure the following section is filled out and understood by student and committee.*

Revisions:

Revision Deadline: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Student elects to make revisions.      \_\_\_\_\_ Student elects NOT to make revisions.

Signature, Student: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Revision Outcomes: Revisions should be sent via email to [cet.advisor@wku.edu](mailto:cet.advisor@wku.edu) on or before the revision deadline.**

This section is to be completed by the *third reader* based upon the completed **Evaluation Rubric** on p. 3-4:

Scholarly/Intellectual/Creative Merit score (50%): \_\_\_\_\_

Writing Style and Quality score (30%): \_\_\_\_\_

Follow Guidelines of MHC score (10%): \_\_\_\_\_

CE/T Defense score (10%): \_\_\_\_\_

**Distinction Assessment Scale**

**TOTAL SCORE:** \_\_\_\_\_

Pass w/ <i>Distinction</i> : 100-95	(clearly superior in every way, ~10% of CE/Ts)
Pass w/ <i>Honors</i> : 94-85	(~80% of all CE/Ts)
Pass: 84-70	(~10% of all CE/Ts)
Fail: 69 and below	(extremely rare designation)

Decision to be awarded if revisions are completed and accepted: \_\_\_\_\_

Decision to be awarded if revisions are inadequate/not completed: \_\_\_\_\_

The following section to be completed by the *first and second readers*.

Letter Grade

HON 403: \_\_\_\_\_

HON 404: \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Mentor/First Reader** (to be signed at the conclusion of the CE/T Defense):

Name:

Signature:

Date:

Department:

Email:

Phone:

**Second Reader** (to be signed at the conclusion of the CE/T Defense):

Name:

Signature:

Date:

Department:

Email:

Phone:

**Third Reader/MHC Representative** (to be signed at the conclusion of the CE/T Defense):

Name:

Signature:

Date:

Department:

Email:

Phone:

### CE/T Evaluation Rubric

Scholarly/ Intellectual/ Creative Merit <i>points awarded</i>	POOR/FAIL <i>0-5.5 points</i>	PASS <i>7 points</i>	PASS WITH HONORS <i>8.5 points</i>	PASS WITH DISTINCTION <i>10 points</i>
<i>Rationale</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	no clear rationale or a weak rationale for the project	some rationale presented, begins to motivate the work	provides and discusses a suitable rationale	persuasive and creative rationale
<i>Complexity in Framing Topic</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	frames complex questions as simple ones	invests question with some complexity, may oversimplify or overextend	reasonable balance between focus and complexity	frames the topic with a full appreciation of its complexity while retaining appropriate focus
<i>Approach/ Methodology</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	not clear what was done or why, or an inappropriate method	approach is generally appropriate and properly executed	clearly described and justified, well-chosen and appropriate, and well-executed	creative and sophisticated methods
<i>Scholarly Content</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	does not demonstrate awareness of appropriate scholarship, may over rely on too few sources	demonstrates a reasonable awareness of appropriate scholarship	demonstrates broad awareness and situates own work within the appropriate scholarship	demonstrates a broad awareness of appropriate scholarship, situates own work within the appropriate scholarship, and makes contributions to the field, or identifies a new direction for investigation
<i>Position</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	does not take a clear or defensible position or draw a clear conclusion	clearly describes, or begins to support, test, extend, or critique a position that is already in previous scholarship	thoroughly and effectively supports, tests, extends, or critiques a position that is already in previous scholarship	develops a clear and defensible position of his/her own, draws a significant conclusion
<i>Argument</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	weak, invalid, or no argument, perhaps a simple assertion	Some arguments valid and well-supported, some not	main arguments valid, systematic, and well supported	arguments both well supported and genuinely compared to conflicting explanations
<i>Use of Data/ Evidence</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	draws on little or no evidence, mostly relies on assertions or opinions, or evidence not clearly presented	some appropriate use of evidence but uneven	feasible evidence appropriately selected and not over interpreted	fully exploits the richness of the data/evidence/ideas, and is sufficiently persuasive
<i>Insight, Seeing Patterns and Connections</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	treats related ideas or data as unrelated, or draws weak or simplistic connections	begins to establish connections and perceive implications of the material	brings together related data or ideas in productive ways, thoroughly discusses implications of material	develops insightful connections and patterns that require intellectual creativity

*total:* \_\_\_\_\_ x 0.625 = **score for section** \_\_\_\_\_ (out of 50 max)

<b>Writing Style and Quality</b>	<b>POOR/FAIL</b> <i>0-5.5 points</i>	<b>PASS</b> <i>7 points</i>	<b>PASS WITH HONORS</b> <i>8.5 points</i>	<b>PASS WITH DISTINCTION</b> <i>10 points</i>
<i>Grammar and Spelling, Usage</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	significantly impairs readability	numerous errors	some errors	a few minor errors
<i>Organization</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	author does not demonstrate awareness of the scholarly literature, may over rely on too few sources	structure is of inconsistent quality, may have choppy transitions and/or redundancies or disconnections	structure supports the argument, clearly ordered sections fit together well	structure enhances the argument, strong sections and seamless flow
<i>Clarity, Style, Readability as Appropriate to Genre/Discipline</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	gets in the way of reading for content	style is inconsistent or uneven	good, easy to follow and read for content	exceptional, including elegant style, transparent argument structure

score for section \_\_\_\_\_ (out of 30)

<b>Follows MHC Guidelines</b>	<b>POOR/FAIL</b> <i>0-5.5 points</i>	<b>PASS</b> <i>7 points</i>	<b>PASS WITH HONORS</b> <i>8.5 points</i>	<b>PASS WITH DISTINCTION</b> <i>10 points</i>
<i>Size of Project (Treat as a Continuum of Where This Project Falls)</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	workload (research & resulting CE/T) equivalent to less than the work for one 3-hour course	workload equivalent to one 3-hour courses	workload equivalent to two 3-hour courses	workload equivalent to more than two 3-hour courses

score for section \_\_\_\_\_ (out of 10)

<b>CE/T Defense</b>	<b>POOR/FAIL</b> <i>0-5.5 points</i>	<b>PASS</b> <i>7 points</i>	<b>PASS WITH HONORS</b> <i>8.5 points</i>	<b>PASS WITH DISTINCTION</b> <i>10 points</i>
<i>Oral Presentation</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	very weak or poor oral presentation (disorganized and difficult to follow)	a weak oral presentation, unclear at times, difficulty answering questions	a solid, but not great oral presentation	a superior defense: took the presentation beyond the written work; handled questions well, showed poise and confidence.

score for section \_\_\_\_\_ (out of 10)

Scholarly/Intellectual/Creative Merit score (50%): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Writing Style and Quality score (30%): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Follow Guidelines of MHC score (10%): \_\_\_\_\_  
 CE/T Defense score (10%): \_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL SCORE:** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Distinction Grading Scale</b>
----------------------------------

Pass w/ <i>Distinction</i> : 100-95	(Clearly superior in every way, ~10% of CE/Ts)
Pass w/ <i>Honors</i> : 94-85	(~80% of all CE/Ts)
Pass: 84-70	(~10% of all CE/Ts)
Fail: 69 and below	(extremely rare designation)

**DISTINCTION AWARDED:** \_\_\_\_\_

## CE/T Evaluation Criteria

A CE/T project is evaluated in two ways: first, a letter grade and second, an honors designation. The members of the CE/T committee determine both after the project's defense. The CE/T committee members (specifically, the project advisor/chair and second reader) provide a grade based on equivalent independent work within their discipline. A second evaluation is done based upon Mahurin Honors College criteria (here the MHC representative should have greater influence). The evaluations are Pass with Distinction, Pass with Honors, Pass, and Poor/Fail. There is not intended to be a direct correlation between letter grade and the honors designation. For example, the vast majority of CE/T projects earning "A" grades will not be awarded the Pass with Distinction designation, but there should not be any projects earning the Pass with Distinction designation that do not earn "A" grades. The committee may decide to withhold passing the CE/T until necessary revisions are made. In such cases, a time limit should be set for completion of the revisions.

The committee's evaluation must consider the student's performance in the following areas:

- Scholarly/Intellectual/Creative Merit;
- Adherence to guidelines set forth by the Mahurin Honors College;
- Quality and style of writing and/or any additional work presented (as appropriate to discipline); and
- Quality of the oral defense/presentation.

Pass with Distinction: Clearly a *superior* project in every way. This designation is granted only to those candidates whose performance is superior and distinctive in all areas and if the draft presented at the defense requires only minimal revision. Additional guidelines that might be helpful are:

- The student's performance on the oral exam is clearly outstanding;
- The student showed extraordinary initiative and originality during the project;
- The project is clearly in the top 10% of CE/Ts;
- The CE/T is publishable, in part or whole (depending on the traditions of the disciplinary press) or deemed competitive in juried forums appropriate to field; and
- The CE/T is comparable to competent graduate work at the M.A. or M.S. level.

Pass with Honors: This designation is the typical decision; it should be awarded to students whose CE/T work is, at a minimum, *good* in all of the listed categories. A CE/T that is outstanding in a few of the categories, but not in most or all, should be awarded *Pass with Honors* rather than *Pass with Distinction*. Between the distinguished top 10% and the merely acceptable, *Pass with Honors* is the evaluation earned by the majority of MHC scholars.

Pass: This designation is granted to those CE/Ts projects that are *adequate*, but not up to the standards of *Pass with Honors*. This includes CE/Ts that may be good/superior in a few of the areas but only acceptable/adequate in the others. Those earning the *Pass* designation may be

characterized by:

- A weak, but acceptable, oral presentation;
- Acceptable research, but poor or weak written presentation of materials;
- Acceptable presentation of CE/T, but significant (and correctable) problems in argumentation or research;
- Content and presentation that are adequate for graduation, but that lack depth or originality; and
- A need for significant revision, which must be approved by the CE/T Advisor.

Poor/Fail is for work that is *unacceptable* in most or all of the five areas. Very few CE/Ts are failed because CE/T committee members should discourage students from standing for oral examination if they are not fully prepared and the committee members have not read and approved of the CE/T, at least conditionally.