

MANISA CELAL BAYAR UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
PIR 4168 Senior Thesis Grading Form

Thesis Title: _____	Semester: 20..... / 20.....
---------------------	-----------------------------

--	--

Student Name: _____	Student ID: _____
---------------------	-------------------

Advisor: _____	Date: _____
----------------	-------------

Evaluation Criteria	%	Criterion Description	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Failing	Score
Introduction & Thesis Statement	15	Evaluate the introduction for clearly presenting the research topic and purpose, engaging the reader, and articulating a concise and thought-provoking thesis statement that previews the structure of the essay.						
		Performance Level:	15	11	8	4	0	Score
		Performance Standard:	Excellent (100%)	Good (75%)	Fair (50%)	Poor (25%)	Failing (0%)	
Literature Review	20	Evaluate the literature review for the breadth and variety of sources consulted, the depth of engagement with the conceptual and theoretical framework, and the quality of academic writing.						
		Performance Level:	20	15	10	5	0	Score
		Performance Standard:	Excellent (100%)	Good (75%)	Fair (50%)	Poor (25%)	Failing (0%)	
Methodology & Findings	20	Evaluate the appropriateness of the data collection and analysis method (survey, interview, content analysis, archival research, etc.) and the adequacy and clarity of the findings presented.						
		Performance Level:	20	15	10	5	0	Score
		Performance Standard:	Excellent (100%)	Good (75%)	Fair (50%)	Poor (25%)	Failing (0%)	
Argumentation & Organization	15	Evaluate the logical and coherent sequencing of ideas, the effectiveness of transitions between paragraphs and sections, and the overall consistency of the argument throughout the thesis.						
		Performance Level:	15	11	8	4	0	Score
		Performance Standard:	Excellent (100%)	Good (75%)	Fair (50%)	Poor (25%)	Failing (0%)	
Conclusion	15	Evaluate the conclusion for its ability to synthesize the findings, restate and support the thesis, identify the contribution to the existing literature, and propose directions for future research.						
		Performance Level:	15	11	8	4	0	Score
		Performance Standard:	Excellent (100%)	Good (75%)	Fair (50%)	Poor (25%)	Failing (0%)	
Citation, Bibliography & Style Guide	10	Evaluate the accuracy of citation techniques (direct quotation / summary / paraphrase), the completeness of the bibliography (minimum 30 academic sources: journal articles and books, no internet-only sources), and adherence to the thesis style guide (page layout, cover pages, table design, etc.).						
		Performance Level:	10	7	5	3	0	Score
		Performance Standard:	Excellent (100%)	Good (75%)	Fair (50%)	Poor (25%)	Failing (0%)	

Academic Writing Quality	5	Evaluate the fluency and coherence of writing, variety of sentence structures, appropriate use of academic terminology, and correctness of grammar, punctuation, and spelling.						
		Performance Level:	5	4	3	1	0	Score
		Performance Standard:	Excellent (100%)	Good (75%)	Fair (50%)	Poor (25%)	Failing (0%)	
TOTAL								
Evaluator's Name: _____				Signature: _____				
GRADING SCALE								
90–100 AA (4.0)		80–89 BA (3.5)		75–79 BB (3.0)				
70–74 CB (2.5)		60–69 CC (2.0)		50–59 DC (1.5)				
40–49 DD (1.0)		30–39 FD (0.5)		0–29 FF (0.0)				

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES MAPPING

Evaluation Criterion	LO-1	LO-2	LO-3	LO-4
Introduction & Thesis Statement	✓		✓	✓
Literature Review	✓	✓		✓
Methodology & Findings		✓		✓
Argumentation & Organization	✓		✓	✓
Conclusion	✓		✓	✓
Citation, Bibliography & Style Guide	✓	✓	✓	
Academic Writing Quality			✓	

MANISA CELAL BAYAR UNIVERSITY
Department of Political Science and International Relations
PIR 4168 SENIOR THESIS — MIDTERM EVALUATION FORM

Thesis Title:	Semester:
Student Name:	Student ID:
Advisor:	Date:

Components assessed at midterm: Advisor Contact & Project Progress, Thesis Statement & Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology Plan, Academic Writing Quality.

Evaluation Criterion	Weight (%)	Excellent (100%)	Good (75%)	Developing (50%)	Failing (0%)	Score
Advisor Contact & Project Progress Did the student conduct their project work in regular contact with their advisor? Assessed based on meeting frequency, responsiveness to feedback, and evidence of iterative progress.	20%	Excellent (100%) (20 pts) Student maintained consistent and proactive contact with the advisor; feedback was systematically incorporated; clear progress is evident at each stage.	Good (75%) (15 pts) Student contacted the advisor regularly with only minor lapses; most feedback was addressed.	Developing (50%) (10 pts) Contact with the advisor was irregular; feedback was only partially acted upon.	Failing (0%) (0 pts) Student did not maintain meaningful contact with the advisor; no evidence of iterative progress.	
Thesis Statement & Introduction Clarity of the research question and purpose; ability to engage the reader; articulation of a concise, arguable thesis statement; preview of the paper's structure.	30%	Excellent (100%) (30 pts) Research question is precise and original. Thesis statement is strong, defensible, and guides the entire study. Structure is fully previewed.	Good (75%) (22 pts) Research question and argument are clear with minor gaps. Structure is mostly previewed.	Developing (50%) (15 pts) Argument exists but is underdeveloped; research question is vague. Structure is only partially communicated.	Failing (0%) (0 pts) No discernible research question or argument. No structural preview provided.	
Literature Review Breadth and variety of sources consulted; depth of engagement with conceptual and theoretical frameworks; critical synthesis of the existing scholarship.	25%	Excellent (100%) (25 pts) Theoretical framework is rigorously constructed; sources are critically synthesised rather than merely summarised.	Good (75%) (19 pts) Source count is adequate and the theoretical framework is present but contains minor gaps; critical evaluation is partially carried out.	Developing (50%) (12 pts) Insufficient sources or weak theoretical framework; sources are mostly summarised without critical engagement.	Failing (0%) (0 pts) Literature review is absent or relies exclusively on internet sources.	
Methodology Plan Appropriateness and clarity of the proposed data-collection and analysis method (survey, interview, content analysis, archival research, etc.) in relation to the research question.	10%	Excellent (100%) (10 pts) Method is fully appropriate to the research question, clearly justified, and described in detail.	Good (75%) (7 pts) Method is largely appropriate; justification is partially provided.	Developing (50%) (5 pts) Method is addressed superficially; its connection to the research question is weak.	Failing (0%) (0 pts) No methodology plan is presented or the chosen method is entirely inappropriate.	
Academic Writing Quality Fluency and coherence of writing; variety of sentence structures; appropriate use of academic terminology; correctness of grammar, punctuation, and spelling; accuracy and consistency of APA citation format; completeness of the bibliography and correct application of citation techniques.	15%	Excellent (100%) (15 pts) Writing is fluent, error-free, and consistently academic in register; terminology is used accurately; APA format is applied flawlessly and bibliography is complete.	Good (75%) (11 pts) Writing is largely clear and academic; occasional grammar or style errors; minor APA deviations.	Developing (50%) (7 pts) Noticeable errors affect readability; academic register is inconsistently maintained; APA format is inconsistent.	Failing (0%) (0 pts) Frequent errors seriously impede comprehension; academic register is absent; APA format is largely incorrect or missing.	

Evaluation Criterion	Weight (%)	Excellent (100%)	Good (75%)	Developing (50%)	Failing (0%)	Score
TOTAL SCORE						/ 100

GRADING SCALE

90–100 AA (4.0)	80–89 BA (3.5)	75–79 BB (3.0)	70–74 CB (2.5)	60–69 CC (2.0)	50–59 DC (1.5)	40–49 DD (1.0)	30–39 FD (0.5)	0–29 FF (0.0)
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES MAPPING

Evaluation Criterion	LO-1	LO-2	LO-3	LO-4
Advisor Contact & Project Progress	✓	✓		
Thesis Statement & Introduction	✓		✓	✓
Literature Review	✓	✓		✓
Methodology Plan		✓		✓
Academic Writing Quality			✓	

Advisor Academic Staff: _____

Signature: _____