



OGR EVALUATION FORM 4

THESIS/DISSERTATION MANUSCRIPT GRADING SCHEME

PROF/DR EVALUATOR	NAME	CANDIDATE	NAME
	DATE RECEIVED		DEGREE <input type="checkbox"/> MS/MA <input type="checkbox"/> PhD

PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS	PERFORMANCE RATINGS: 4 = EXCEPTIONAL; 3 = PROFICIENT; 2 = SATISFACTORY; 1 = LIMITED (Exceptional) 19-20 points; (Proficient) 17-18 points; (Satisfactory) 12-16 points; (Limited) 4-11 points <small>Adapted from a rubric by Douglas E. Cowan found at http://c.faculty.umkc.edu/cowande/rubric.htm.)</small>	ENCIRCLE SCORE
A Content Information and Comprehension	Thesis statement/research question is clear and appropriate. <u>Exceptionally</u> focused, informative & <u>comprehensively</u> developed and argued.	4
	Thesis statement is relevant and adequately developed, <u>but has some unsupported arguments.</u>	3
	Thesis statement is present, <u>but is undeveloped</u> , lacking focus with inconsistent argument.	2
	Thesis statement is flawed, <u>vaguely developed showing poor understanding of the topic.</u>	1
B Presentation Grammar, spelling, and vocabulary	Grammar and spelling are correct. Variety of proper sentence structures deployed using appropriate terminology.	4
	Grammar and spelling are correct, <u>but has</u> some inconsistent sentence structure.	3
	A few grammar and spelling errors, <u>but has</u> some inconsistent sentence structure.	2
	<u>Many</u> grammatical and/or spelling errors. (Fragmented/mechanically incorrect sentences)	1
C Organization of Material Clarity, transition, and flow	Logical progression and development of ideas introduction and conclusion. Ideas expressed <u>clearly</u> with <u>effective transitions</u> between ideas.	4
	Organization of intro to conclusion, <u>has some ineffective transitions</u> between ideas	3
	Organization of intro to conclusion, <u>has incoherent ideas and ineffective transitions.</u>	2
	<u>Incoherent organization.</u> Lacks introduction with unclear and/or vague conclusion.	1
D Sources and Documentation Variety / Credibility of References Appropriate sources and formatting	Documentation is <u>complete</u> and <u>correct</u> . Variety of relevant, updated/peer reviewed references supporting the arguments is present.	4
	Documentation is <u>flawed, but some references lack accuracy or relevance</u> to the thesis.	3
	Documentation is <u>highly flawed dominated</u> by unreviewed or outdated internet sources.	2
	<u>Documentation lacking.</u> Very few references <u>lacking variety and up datedness</u> are used.	1
E Contribution to Research	Thesis/Dissertation is an <u>original contribution</u> to the body of knowledge.	4
	Manuscript has <u>minor</u> corrections. An extract <u>maybe submitted</u> to a <u>peer reviewed journal</u>	3
	Manuscript is <u>flawed</u> . An extract <u>maybe submitted</u> to a <u>non-peer reviewed journal</u>	2
	Manuscript is <u>highly flawed</u> . Any resulting written extract <u>is not publishable at all.</u>	1
alejandro	PLEASE TOTAL	

ADDITIONAL RELEVANT COMMENTS PERTAINING TO THE RESEARCH PAPER MAYBE WRITTEN AT THE BACK PAGE.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION:

Accepted without revision with MINOR revision(s) with MAJOR revisions (POINT SCORES: 4 to 8)

Additional comments(s):

UST: AO10-01-FO13

EVALUATOR'S SIGNATURE / DATE