

GRADING RUBRIC FOR ASSIGNMENT ON “TELLING AN ENERGY STORY”

Quality of content (tells a significant energy story)	10 9 8	7 6 5 4	3 2 1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tries to change reader’s original view about some aspect of energy production or consumption • Has a clear informative purpose • Increases reader’s understanding of an energy issue • Shows significance of issue 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear and easy to follow	Meets some criteria; uneven or has some lapses in clarity or development	Meets few criteria; often unclear or undeveloped
Quality of graphic(s)	10 9 8	7 6 5 4	3 2 1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graphics are visually appealing and easy to read • Graphics have effective titles that refer to all pertinent dimensions of the graphic (both axes, legends) • Graphics have effective labels, legends • Graphics are effectively referenced in text 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear and developed	Meets some criteria; uneven; take too much reader time to comprehend	Meets few criteria; often unclear or undeveloped
Quality of the interrelationship between graphics and words	10 9 8	7 6 5 4	3 2 1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follows principle of “independent redundancy” (tells in words the same story told by the graphic) • Chooses effective details from the graphic to highlight the graphics’ message • Is easy to follow—reader readily sees how graphic supports story and story supports graphic 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear, easy to follow;	Meets some criteria; uneven or has some lapses in clarity	Meets few criteria; often unclear or undeveloped; graphic doesn’t match text
Has strong overall effectiveness (professional appearance, clarity, impact)	10 9 8	7 6 5 4	3 2 1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is camera-ready formatted to look like a magazine page • Effectively integrates graphics into the page design • Is clear, well-organized, concise, adequately developed, and graceful • Is well-edited without errors in grammar, punctuation, usage, or spelling (see separate reduction below for editing errors) 	Meets all criteria at high level	Meets some criteria; uneven	Meets few criteria

Deductions for rule-based errors in grammar, punctuation, usage, or spelling

POSITIVE ETHOS	ANNOYING NOISE	ERRORS DESTROY ETHOS
+5 0 -3	-5 -8 -10	-12 -15

SCORING GUIDE FOR TEMPEST PAPER

Title and introduction

Criteria	10 9 8	7 6 5 4	3 2 1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has complete academic title forecasting content Presents and develops the problem of whether <u>The Tempest</u> supports or opposes the colonial project Provides background or context for the problem through a summary of de Las Casas and Hakluyt or other means Ends with contestable thesis showing your position on the problem 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear	Meets some criteria; uneven; less clear	Meets few criteria; unclear

Overall quality of ideas, argument, effective evidence

Criteria	30 27 24	21 18 15 12	9 6 3 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has strong, clear insights Has well supported argument that addresses question while anticipating and responding to alternative views Effectively connects views in <u>The Tempest</u> to views expressed by either de Las Casas or Hakluyt—connects argument to colonial issue Uses “textually dense” evidence (frequent references to specifics in the play including brief quotations, paraphrase, or summary of scenes) 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear	Meets some criteria; uneven; less clear; thinner; less precise use of evidence	Meets few criteria; unclear

Use of Hakluyt and de Las Casas

Criteria	10 9 8	7 6 5 4	3 2 1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has accurate, brief summaries of Hakluyt and de Las Casas Crisply highlights their differing views of the colonial project Works summaries smoothly into the writer’s own argument (usually as contextual background in the introduction) 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear	Meets some criteria; uneven; less clear	Meets few criteria; unclear

Use of Kermode

Criteria	10 9 8	7 6 5 4	3 2 1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurately summarizes Kermode’s interpretation of Caliban/Prospero as it relates to the writer’s argument about colonialism Finds an effective place for the summary and works it smoothly into the writer’s argument 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear	Meets some criteria; uneven; less clear	Meets few criteria; unclear

Organization and Development

Criteria	10 9 8	7 6 5 4	3 2 1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has clear, easy-to-follow structure (reader doesn’t get lost) Has sufficient development so that ideas are fully explored Follows old/new contract (problems marked as “O/N”) Has points connected to thesis and developed with textual particulars to form unified/coherent paragraphs Uses effective transitions between paragraphs 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear	Meets some criteria; uneven; less clear	Meets few criteria; unclear

Sentence Clarity and Grace

Criteria	10 9 8	7 6 5 4	3 2 1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has clear, graceful, grammatically correct sentences Maintains focus through effective subordination and coordination Concise (non-wordy) easy-to-follow style 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear	Meets some criteria; uneven; less clear	Meets few criteria; unclear

MLA conventions

Criteria	10 9 8	7 6 5 4	3 2 1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looks like a professional critical argument in literature Follows MLA conventions for citation and documentation Follows MLA formatting for Works Cited and page design 	Meets all criteria at high level	Meets some criteria; uneven; some deviation	Meets few criteria

Penalty for editing errors

+ 5 0 -2	-4 -6 -8	-10 -15 -20
Flawless paper (+5) or an occasional but minor error. Strong professional ethos.	Some distracting noise via spelling, punctuation, or apostrophe errors or occasional grammar mistakes (subject-verb agreement; fragments; non-parallel constructions). Writer seems careless.	Paper seriously marred by editing errors or grammatical mistakes; professional “ethos” of writer is destroyed by errors.

SCORING GUIDE FOR FINAL PAPER

Title and introduction

Criteria	10 9 8	7 6 5 4	3 2 1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has academic title that entices listeners at undergraduate conference Explains question to be addressed; hooks reader's interest in problem Provides needed context (shows awareness of old and new information for audience) Ends with contestable thesis statement; forecasts direction and purpose 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear	Meets some criteria; uneven; less clear	Meets few criteria; unclear

Overall quality of ideas and argument

Criteria	30 27 24	21 18 15 12	9 6 3 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presents a clear and persuasive critical argument Has engaging problem and contestable thesis that pushes against an alternative reading Effectively uses textual detail for evidence; clearly understands difference between textual fact and textual interpretation Exhibits appropriate complexity of thought Anticipates readers' objections and alternative views Has new, challenging, or surprising ideas for undergraduate audience 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear, significant, engaged argument	Meets some criteria; uneven; less clear; less textual density, less awareness of alternative views	Meets few criteria; unclear; ineffective use of text; says the obvious

Effective use of research sources across BEAM (background, evidence, argument, or theory/method sources)

Criteria	20 18 16	14 12 10 8	6 4 2 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses sources effectively while carrying argument in writer's own voice Effectively summarizes the critical conversation surrounding writer's question; number and kinds of sources are appropriate to thesis Smoothly integrates sources into writer's own argument; use of sources is accurate, balanced, and purposeful Uses attributive tags clearly; writer's views are effectively differentiated from source's; sources are effectively cited and documented 	Meets all criteria at high level; effectively joins critical conversation	Meets some criteria; uneven; thin research; problems with citation; unclear framing of quotations	Meets few criteria; unclear; very thin research

Organization and development

Criteria	15 14 12	10 9 8 7	5 4 2 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a well-organized, easy-to-follow structure Effectively manages old and new information (follows the old/new contract) Has effective transitions between paragraphs Creates effective topic sentences for each paragraph; topic sentences are connected to thesis and developed with appropriate and sufficient details Reader never confused about structure 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear, complex, engaging	Meets some criteria; less clear; occasional confusion about structure; some paragraphs lack transitions, unity	Meets few criteria; unclear; reader often lost

Clarity and Grace

Criteria	10 9 8	7 6 5 4	3 2 1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has clear, graceful, grammatically correct sentences Concise (non-wordy) easy-to-follow style; avoids broad reference pronouns ("this" as sentence subject) Makes effective word choices appropriate for undergraduate research conference Reader never confused about meaning of sentences 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear	Meets some criteria; uneven; less clear	Meets few criteria; unclear

MLA conventions

Criteria	10 9 8	7 6 5 4	3 2 1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looks like a professional scholarly paper in literary criticism Follows MLA conventions for citation and documentation Follows MLA formatting for Works Cited and page design 	Meets all criteria at high level	Meets some criteria; uneven; some deviation	Meets few criteria

Penalty for editing errors

+ 5	0	-2	-4	-6	-8	-10	-15	-20
Flawless paper (+5) or an occasional but minor error. Strong professional ethos.			Annoying spelling, punctuation, or apostrophe errors or occasional grammar mistakes (subject-verb agreement; fragments; non-parallel constructions). Writer seems careless.			Paper seriously marred by editing errors or grammatical mistakes; professional “ethos” of writer is destroyed by errors.		

Has an acknowledgments page thanking two outside readers explaining how readers influenced later revision 7 points (10 points if one reader is a writing center consultant)
10 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Possible Redesign of Melissa's Rubric to Keep Generic Lab Features but Allow Easy Adaptation to Different Rhetorical Contexts

Memo to Your Supervisor about Spring Research

Uses memo format organized according to supervisor's request	3	2	1	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains that problem or question posed about some aspect of springs Shows why this question is problematic, interesting, or otherwise worth pursuing Presents your results and supporting data in logical order 	Meets all criteria for memo format and structure	Meets some criteria; uneven;		Meets few criteria
Identifies the objective of the lab and the relevant physics concepts	3	2	1	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly states objective or purpose of the research Clearly and concisely presents relevant physics concepts 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear and developed	Meets some criteria; uneven; less developed understanding of concepts		Meets few criteria; poor understanding of concepts
Appropriate and complete data collection and analysis	3	2	1	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly describes experimental design Collects appropriate, relevant, and sufficient data Effectively analyzes data Clearly presents all key aspects 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear, easy to follow; strong understanding	Meets some criteria; uneven or has some lapses in clarity or development		Meets few criteria; often unclear or undeveloped;
Identifies assumptions and/or sources of experimental uncertainty	3	2	1	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies uncertainties and assumptions Discusses assumptions/uncertainties completely; shows that these concerns are clearly thought out 	Meets all criteria at high level	Meets some criteria; uneven		Meets few criteria
Evaluates the results in the context of the lab objective	3	2	1	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluates the results in the context of the lab objective Clearly shows how the results contribute to the objective Shows clear reasoning 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear and developed	Meets some criteria; uneven; some lapses in clarity		Meets few criteria; often unclear or undeveloped
Presents data in a meaningful way	3	2	1	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presents data clearly in appropriate, well-laid-out charts/graphs References charts/graphs in the text Titles charts and graphs, labels axes, and identifies units of measure Charts/graphs are understandable to an independent observer 	Meets all criteria at high level; clear, easy to follow;	Meets some criteria; uneven or has some lapses in clarity or development		Meets few criteria; often unclear or undeveloped
Communicates the relevant ideas well	3	2	1	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document is well-written, easy-to-follow, complete Has no grammatical or usage errors Use language precisely; avoids weasel words such as "some," "few" Reader is never lost or annoyed 	Meets all criteria at high level	Meets some criteria; uneven		Meets few criteria

Some notes:

- In this version, all the rows except the first are generic, applicable to any lab. For different rhetorical contexts only the first row needs to be changed
- Melissa's original rubric is better, I think, because I like the way she has "stepped down" the criteria from strong to weak. However, the effort required for the elaborate version often discourages instructors from adapting the rubric to different assignments.
- With this version, the instructor needs only specify the "strong performance" criteria in the first column