Senior Seminar Evaluation Form: *Paper*

Rate the student in each category by assigning numerical grades (1-5, with 5 being the best); use the space on the right to comment constructively but critically. Please consider the rubric (next page) when rating each category.

**Subject Matter**

*Understanding*

*Context*

*Depth*

*Literature*

**Writing**

*Organization*

*Mechanics*

*Clarity*

**Overall Report Grade and general comments** (you may use + or - modifiers, such as A- or C+)

Evaluator  ____________________________
Numerical grades are part of the departmental self-assessment process. Students should consider both the ratings and comments as valuable feedback for improving future written scientific reports.

Subject Matter

Understanding: did the student show an understanding of the material appropriate to an undergraduate chemistry major?

5: The student understood all the material deeply.
4: The student understood all of the material, but the understanding of some points was superficial.
3: The student has almost complete understanding, but there are some errors.
2: The student showed understanding of many issues, but errors are frequent.
1: The student committed many errors, and demonstrated little understanding of the material.

Context: did the student place the work in its appropriate scientific context?

5: The student showed deep awareness of the previous work in the area, and other current work.
4: The student showed some awareness of both current work and previous work, but not exhaustively.
3: The student showed awareness, not deep, of the current context or the previous work.
2: The student barely touched on issues of context.
1: The student presented no contextual information.

Depth: was the subject treated in detail and not superficially?

5: The student covered all the necessary topics in depth.
4: The student covered most topics, and all essential ones, in depth.
3: The student covered some topics in depth, but not all of the essential ones.
2: The student covered few topics in depth.
1: The student covered all topics only at a superficial level.

Literature

5: The student provided an extensive review of the relevant literature. Student included more than the minimum literature to support all necessary topics. The student appropriately cited outside work.
4: The student provided a good literature search. The student included the minimum necessary literature to cover all necessary topics.
3: Many topics were covered by the minimum necessary literature but not all.
2: Some topics were supported by the literature.
1: Minimal literature was used in support of the work. Citations of outside sources were lacking.

Written Work

Organization

5: The paper followed a logical organization. The overall structure was well organized, as well as paragraph and sentence structure.
4: The paper had excellent paragraphing and sentence structure, but there is some awkwardness in the overall organization.
3: Most paragraphs were well structured. Sentence structure was good throughout the paper. There were problems with overall structure.
2: Paragraphing was average to poor. The overall structure was poor.
1: The paper was randomly organized. There was little logical flow anywhere in the paper.

Mechanics: grammar, format, and spelling

5: There was excellent spelling and grammar throughout the paper, excellent proofreading, and appropriate page layout.
4: There were some minor errors in spelling and proofreading.
3: There were a moderate number of grammatical, spelling and proofreading errors. The page layout was careless.
2: There were a significant number of errors. The page layout was poor.
1: There were frequent errors in writing mechanics. Careless and incompetent work.

Clarity

5: The writing was extremely clear. The flow from section to section was smooth, and the quality of the writing made understanding of the material easier.
4: The writing was clear, and flowed well, but had occasional lapses in which ideas were not expressed clearly.
3: A significant number of ideas were presented poorly and were hard to understand.
2: Many of the sections were difficult to understand.
1: The paper was impenetrable.

Overall Grade

The overall grade is the letter grade the evaluator wishes to assign the student for the written portion of the seminar course.