

### A Comprehensive Set of Questions for Rubric-Building<sup>6</sup>

<b>A. Content</b>	Strong	Accept.	Weak	Not Accept.
1. How appropriate is the topic for the assignment?				
2. To what extent is there a clear, appropriate, and significant focus or purpose?				
3. How ambitious is the content--in terms of source materials (library or other), concepts taken up, allusions, connections, and so on?				
4. To what extent is the evidence/information: Relevant? Accurate? Necessary Comprehensive?				
5. How effectively does the writer provide a context or exigency?				
<b>B. Reasoning, Analysis, Synthesis</b>	Strong	Accept.	Weak	Not Accept.
1. How significant and ambitious are the claims, conclusions, or ideas?				
2. How sufficient is the quantity of the evidence?				
3. How sufficient is the quality of the evidence?				
4. To what extent does the writer provide discussions that explicitly connect evidence to claims (rather than simply tossing in the evidence and leaving it to readers to make connections)?				
5. To what extent are assumptions made explicit and justified or critiqued?				
6. To what extent are counter arguments, interpretations, or positions acknowledged and dealt with?				
7. To what extent does the interpretation or analysis of evidence/sources/information show: Depth of thinking? Logical reasoning? Complex reasoning? Accurate conclusions? Justifiable recommendations?				
<b>C. Organization</b>	Strong	Accept.	Weak	Not Accept.
1. How well does the overall organization achieve the writing's purpose?				
2. How well do the elements of the paper (not only different ideas, source materials, or data but also visual and graphic elements) connect with one another?				
3. How clearly are readers led through the paper? Is there a sense of purposeful progression? (Yet, is that sense not insultingly obvious or artificial?)				

<sup>6</sup> You'd likely go daft applying each of these questions to every single paper you evaluate. I offer them, instead, to provide a pantry of ideas from which you might select and create your own recipes to evaluate specific tasks.

<b>D. Rhetoric of the Discipline</b>	Strong	Accept.	Weak	Not Accept.
1. To what extent is there evidence of disciplinary ways of thinking? That is, to what extent would "experts" accept the paper as an appropriate example of ways of thinking and presenting information in the discipline?				
2. How appropriate to the discipline is genre of the paper? The format?				
3. To what extent does the writer demonstrate knowledge of the subject that would strike a member of the discipline as sufficiently informed?				
4. To what extent does the use of specialized concepts demonstrate real understanding (as opposed, for example, to parroting jargon without necessarily grasping it)?				
<b>E. Conventions/Presentation</b>	Strong	Accept.	Weak	Not Accept.
1. To what extent is there clear evidence of editing and proofreading?				
2. How accurately and completely is information or source material cited?				
3. How appropriate and accurate is the documentation style?				
4. How effective is the format used?				
5. To what extent is the style (reflected in word choices, sentence structures, metaphors, allusions, and analogies) not only clear but even lucid and deft, creating a sense of not only a competent writer but someone with an adroit command of language?				



## A Sample Hybrid Response Rubric

I want my written and marginal comments to engage the students' ideas and strategies; I try not to comment simply to justify the grade I've assigned. However, students frequently want to know "what they did wrong" (or right). And, frequently I need to provide feedback to lots of students in short order. Therefore, I sometimes run off copies of a feedback sheet, check the appropriate responses, and attach the page to each student's paper. Here's an example from an assignment I made in a literature course.

---

First some essential questions about your paper:

Does the paper make an argument?	Y	N
Are assertions supported with evidence from the text?	Y	N
Do you discuss that evidence?	Y	N
Is the paper easy to follow?	Y	N
Is the paper well-edited?	Y	N
Does the paper match MLA conventions?	Y	N

If so, your paper meets the assignment and qualifies for at least a C.

**Grades of A and B** depend on degrees of excellence in three other criteria:

1. the ambition and quality of the insights presented (quality of thesis)
  - adequate; perhaps "safe" or standard.
  - frequently thoughtful or innovative
  - consistently thoughtful and innovative; even striking
2. the quality of the explanations, reasoning, and analysis used to support those insights
  - adequate; perhaps "safe" or developed minimally or obviously
  - frequently thoughtful or innovative; detailed
  - consistently thoughtful and innovative; even striking or subtly argued
3. the style of the paper, including not only how engaging are the introduction, development, and conclusion but also how energetic are the sentences, how sophisticated and vital is the author's voice, how the paper uses metaphor or allusions to make points, etc.
  - adequate and standard; correct but perhaps predictable
  - frequently engaging, innovative or stylistically inviting
  - consistently engaging, innovative, stylistically sophisticated and inviting

**One quality of the project I found interesting or particularly successful is:**

**One suggestion I have for improving this project (or future projects like it) is:**