****

**Capstone Experience/Thesis CE/T of the Year Nomination**

Eligible students should complete the following form and then submit it to their faculty advisor. Once the advisor has written the letter of support, the advisor should submit the application to Dr. Christopher J. Keller at the Mahurin Honors College. All students must have defended and submitted the final electronic copy to [cet.advisor@wku.edu](mailto:cet.advisor@wku.edu).

**Dr. Keller must receive all letters of nomination by** **Wednesday of the last week of classes**.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student: |  |  |  |  | |
|  | *Last* | *First* | *Middle* | *Major* |  |
| Defense Date: |  |  |  | | |
| Final CE/T Title: |  | | | | |
| Name of Advisor: |  | | | | |

* I have submitted the final version of my thesis to [cet.advisor@wku.edu](mailto:cet.advisor@wku.edu)
* I waive my right to access information in this nomination.

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

**Faculty Nomination Guidelines**

Only students whose CE/T projects earned the “Pass with Distinction” designation will be considered for this award. Projects that receive this distinction are clearly superior 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 at the defense is clearly outstanding;
* The student showed extraordinary initiative and originality during the project;
* 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 masters-level.

Please attach a letter explaining how your student’s project meets these criteria. You might also describe/evaluate the student’s performance in the following areas:

* Scholarly/intellectual/creative merit;
* Quality and style of writing and/or any additional work presented (as appropriate to discipline); and
* Quality of the defense/presentation.

As you write your letter, it might be helpful to review the Evaluation Rubric attached. This can also be found on pages 38 – 41 of our CE/T Handbook:

<http://www.wku.edu/honors/documents/cet_handbook_11_12-1.pdf>

Please note: This is an interdisciplinary evaluation. Your letter of support should speak to faculty across disciplines. Also, quotes from the letter may be used for recruiting, development and/or sponsorship purposes.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scholarly/**  **Intellectual/**  **Creative Merit (50%)** | **POOR/FAIL** | **PASS** | **PASS WITH HONORS** | **PASS WITH DISTINCTION** |
| *Rationale* | 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 |
| *Complexity in Framing Topic* | frames complex questions as simple ones | invests question with some complexity, may over simplify or over extend | reasonable balance between focus and complexity | frames the topic with a full appreciation of its complexity while retaining appropriate focus |
| *Approach/*  *Methodology* | 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 |
| *Scholarly Content* | author does not demonstrate awareness of appropriate scholarship, may over rely on too few sources | author demonstrates a reasonable awareness of appropriate scholarship | author demonstrates broad awareness and situates own work within the appropriate scholarship | author 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 |
| *Position* | 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 |
| *Argument* | 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 |
| *Use of Data/*  *Evidence* | 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 |
| *Insight, Seeing Patterns and Connections* | 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 |
| **Writing Style and Quality (30%)** | **POOR/FAIL** | **PASS** | **PASS WITH HONORS** | **PASS WITH DISTINCTION** |
| *Grammar and Spelling,*  *Usage* | significantly impairs readability | numerous errors | some errors | a few minor errors |
| *Organization* | 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 |
| *Clarity, Style, Readability as Appropriate to Genre/Discipline* | 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 |
| **Follows Guidelines of**  **Honors College (10%)** | **POOR/FAIL** | **PASS** | **PASS WITH HONORS** | **PASS WITH DISTINCTION** |
| *Size of Project (Treat as a Continuum—Mark Your Estimate of Where This Project Falls)* | equivalent to less than the work for one three hour course | equivalent to one three hour courses | equivalent to two three hour courses | equivalent to more than two three hour courses |
| **CE/T Defense (10%)** | **POOR/FAIL** | **PASS** | **PASS WITH HONORS** | **PASS WITH DISTINCTION** |
| *Oral Presentation* | 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. |