

(04/11/16)

Evaluation of Art History honors projects:

The honors project will normally be evaluated by two readers, typically the thesis tutor and a second member of the Art History faculty, to be chosen by the tutor in consultation with the student candidate at the beginning of the spring semester. Eligible readers include all faculty listed in the Art History faculty roster, including those with primary appointments in Classical Studies, curators who hold adjunct faculty appointments in Art History, full-time visiting faculty, and visiting Sullivan Scholars in Art History. In certain cases, a third reader from outside the Art History Program, but with particular expertise which would prove beneficial for the evaluation, may also be proposed by the thesis tutor in consultation with the student. In rare cases where the tutor is not a member of the Art History faculty, but the thesis is being considered for honors in Art History, a third reader is required so that there will be at least two readers who are members of the Art History faculty. In all cases involving readers from outside Art History, the Honors Coordinator should explain to them that their evaluation will be in addition to the two required from within the Program, and should provide them with a copy of these procedures and inform them of the relevant deadlines.

Each reader is required to submit a written evaluation of the honors project to the Art History Program Honors coordinator, at least one working day before the date scheduled for the Senior Honors Talks. For the 2015-16 Academic year, evaluations are to be submitted no later than Wednesday, April 20, 2016. Written evaluations will be duplicated and distributed to all program faculty prior to the Honors Talks and the ensuing meeting at which honors are awarded (Thursday, April 21, 2016). In addition to the written evaluation, the reader must also complete the Honors evaluation form, assigning one of the following grades:

No honors, with a grade of: (B or below)

No honors/No-bar honors, with a grade of: (B only)

Honors, with a grade of: (B+ or A-)

Honors/No-bar high honors, with a grade of: (A- only)

High honors, with a grade of: (A or A+)

The No Bar option indicates that the evaluator has no objection to the project being awarded the next higher grade if the other evaluator has given it a higher grade. The No Bar option is only called into play when there are only two readers. Two grades of No Bar do not activate each other. That is, two grades of No Honors/No Bar Honors would not be sufficient to validate a recommendation for Honors.

In theses with only two readers, if the recommendation of both readers is the same, that determines the outcome. When the two evaluators are in disagreement about the grade (e.g. one gives a grade of Honors while the other gives a grade of No Honors or High Honors, or one recommends No Honors and the other recommends High Honors) and the disagreement cannot be resolved through recourse to the No Bar option, the Art History Honors Coordinator will, in consultation with the tutor, select a third evaluator from among the Art History faculty. The third reader renders a judgment, but is not expected to submit a written evaluation.

In theses with three readers, or in the case of two-reader theses that have gone to a third reader, the outcome is determined in the following manner: If at least two

recommendations agree, then the majority recommendation holds. If all three recommendations disagree – i.e., where they include No Honors, Honors, and High Honors – the outcome will be resolved collectively by the art history faculty.

After the Program Director has reported the outcome of thesis projects to the Registrar, the Honors Coordinator will forward to each thesis/essay writer their readers’ reports. These readers’ reports should include the name of the faculty reader, but should not include the recommendation for honors or grade. These reports will be mailed to individual students along with a letter from the Program Director, which informs students of the faculty’s decisions regarding honors and prizes.

NOTE: The tutor is responsible for assigning the grade for the honors tutorial(s). There is no necessary correlation between this grade and the letter grades assigned by readers on the honors evaluation form.

The following chart illustrates the various possible outcomes. The first box covers theses with two readers, where there is agreement or where disagreement can be resolved through application of the No Bar (=nb) option. The second and third boxes illustrate possible resolutions of disagreement between two readers through the evaluation of an additional, third reader. (Note: “H/Hnb” = Honors or Honors, No Bar High Honors, etc.) The fourth box illustrates the various possible outcomes in the case of theses with three readers.

Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Recommendation
NH	NH		NH
NH	NHnb		NH
NHnb	NHnb		NH
H	NHnb		H
H	H		H
H	Hnb		H
Hnb	Hnb		H
HH	Hnb		HH
HH	HH		HH
H/Hnb	NH	NH/NHnb	NH
H/Hnb	NH	H/Hnb	H
H/Hnb	NH	HH	Resolution by Program
HH	H	NH/NHnb	Resolution by Program
HH	H	H	H
HH	H	HH	HH
NH/NHnb	HH	NH/NHnb	NH
NH/NHnb	HH	H/Hnb	Resolution by Program
NH/NHnb	HH	HH	HH
NH/NHnb	NH/NHnb	NH→HH	NH
H/Hnb	H/Hnb	NH→HH	H
HH	HH	NH→HH	HH
NH/NHnb	H/Hnb	HH	Resolution by Program