

HTCC Honors Research Conference Abstract Scoring Rubric

The review process includes looking over a student's proposal (including the title, 25-word description, and 250-word abstract) and assigning a score using the scoring system listed below.

As you evaluate the proposals, please use the scoring system listed below. The rubric emphasizes innovative and well-researched projects that add something to scholarly work rather than simply rehashing well-known academic positions. It also emphasizes well-argued and well written proposals. I understand that it will be difficult to assess all aspects of a student's work based only on a 250-word abstract, but that is what we have to work with so please do the best you can. This year we are also expecting that the abstract will include a small number of relevant citations (up to 5) so that should help determine the relevance and currency of the research. Evaluators may use half scores (i.e. 1.5 or 2.5) but must not use further breakdowns such as 2.3 or 2.75.

SCORING SYSTEM:

1= Excellent – The excellent abstract is well-written with few errors, demonstrating a significant level of writing sophistication. The argument or thesis is clearly stated and well defined and is relevant to the project. The abstract contains evidence to support the argument or thesis and the author uses appropriate citations to help support his or her position. The research appears to be of a high quality and an appropriate extent. The thesis and/or the research are innovative and contribute to the body of scholarly work on the subject. Sources for project are quality, academic sources and all sources provided are cited correctly in the appropriate discipline format. This submission should be accepted under any circumstances.

2= Good – The good abstract is similar to the excellent abstract but is lacking in one or two areas. The writing is good and demonstrates some sophistication but may have a few more errors. The argument or thesis should still be clearly stated and should still be relevant to the project but may lack the level of definition of the excellent abstract. The abstract contains evidence to support the argument or thesis although there may not be in text citations (or the citations may not be as appropriate). The research is of a good quality and the project seems interesting even though it may not be as innovative. Sources for project are mostly quality, academic source material and most if not all sources provided are cited correctly in the appropriate discipline format. The abstract demonstrates work that has merit and the submission should be accepted.

3= Adequate - The adequate abstract will include an argument or thesis, but it is not innovative, compelling or clearly presented. The writing is adequate, with a number of errors. There are elements of research provided and the research is relevant to the topic. The thesis is supported by evidence, but the evidence is lacking in quality. Sources for the project are often inferior or missing and there may be incomplete or errors in the citations also. This paper is more consistent with a report on the subject at hand rather than as a true research paper.

4= Poor – The poor abstract has little to redeem it. The thesis or argument is either unclear or absent all together. There are numerous writing errors. The research may not pertain to the thesis (if present) and/or contradicts the thesis. Some of the most important elements of the abstract proposal such as the 25-word description or citations may be incomplete, incoherent or missing entirely. This abstract should be denied under all circumstances.

Please note that artistic presentations are expected to have some form of analysis or background research as part of the presentation, and should be scored accordingly.