

Senior Seminar Evaluation Form: *Paper*

Student _____

Date _____

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 _____

Grading Rubric

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.