

109H Grading Rubric

Project 1

Spring 2016

CONTENT

	Superior (10-9)	Strong (8 pts.)	Competent (7 pts.)	Weak (6 pts.)	Unacceptable (5-1 pts.)
Who	- Every major stakeholder in the story is included - All major stakeholders are clearly introduced - Stakeholders are clearly and vividly contextualized - Stakeholders are described using vivid description that communicates the stakeholder's appearance, identity, mannerisms, important background info, etc.	- All of the important stakeholders are included - All major stakeholders are clearly introduced - Stakeholders are clearly and vividly contextualized - Stakeholders are described using appropriate and vivid description	- Most of the important stakeholders are included - Major stakeholders are clearly introduced - Stakeholders are clearly contextualized - Stakeholders are described using some specific detail	- Some of the important stakeholders are not included or are under-represented - Stakeholders are not always clearly introduced - Stakeholders are not always clearly contextualized - Stakeholders are described in generic or vague terms that lack specific detail	- Key stakeholders are missing or under-represented - Introductions for stakeholders are missing or lacking in clarity - Contextual details for stakeholders are missing or lacking in clarity - Descriptions of stakeholders are missing, generic, banal or under-developed
What	- What all of the stakeholders are saying in public is presented directly to the audience - The chosen evidence is an excellent and nuanced representation of what the stakeholder thinks/feels/believes about the	- What all of the stakeholders are saying in public is presented directly to the audience - The chosen evidence is an excellent and nuanced representation of what the stakeholder thinks/feels/believes about the	- What all of the stakeholders are saying in public is presented directly to the audience - The chosen evidence is a good and nuanced representation of what the stakeholder thinks/feels/ believes about the controversy - The context for all acts of public speech is clearly explained - How the stakeholders	- What the stakeholders are saying in public is presented, but not always clearly; key stakeholders are ignored or underrepresented - The chosen evidence is somewhat incomplete, with	- What the stakeholders are saying in public is not clearly presented; perhaps key stakeholders ignored or underrepresented - The chosen evidence is incomplete,

Why	- controversy - Real insight is offered into the context for each act of public speech, clarifying with depth and rigor how and why the context matters - How the stakeholders construct their public speech acts is clearly explained - The RHETORICAL SITUATION for any and all sources is used to introduce and contextualize the sources	- controversy - The context for all acts of public speech is clearly explained and real insight is being offered into how the context matters - How the stakeholders construct their public speech acts is clearly explained	construct their public speech acts is clearly explained	- important details ignored or left out - The context for all acts of public speech is not always clearly explained - How the stakeholders construct their public speech acts is vague or not clearly explained	- with important details ignored or left out - The context for acts of public speech is often unclear - How the stakeholders construct their public speech acts is not clear or not included
	- How the evidence shows us the underlying motivations/beliefs/worldviews of each stakeholders is clearly and vividly explained - How each stakeholder chooses to phrase and express their thoughts/feelings/opinions is clearly explained with some depth and insight - Why each piece of evidence <i>matters</i> to the project as a whole is clearly explained with some depth and insight	- How the evidence shows us the underlying motivations/beliefs/worldviews of each stakeholders is clearly and vividly explained - How each stakeholder chooses to phrase and express their thoughts/feelings/opinions is clearly explained with some depth and insight - Why each piece of evidence <i>matters</i> to the project as a whole is clearly explained with some depth and insight	- How the evidence shows us the underlying motivations/beliefs/worldviews of each stakeholder is clearly explained - How each stakeholder chooses to phrase and express their thoughts/feelings/opinions is clearly explained - Why each piece of evidence <i>matters</i> to the project as a whole is clearly explained	- The underlying motivations/beliefs/worldviews for each stakeholder are not always clearly explained - How each stakeholder chooses to express their thoughts/feelings/opinions is not always clearly explained - Why each piece of evidence <i>matters</i> to the project as a whole is not always clearly explained	- The underlying motivations/beliefs/worldviews for each stakeholder are missing or incoherent - How each stakeholder chooses to express their thoughts/feelings/opinions is missing or incoherent - Why each piece of evidence <i>matters</i> to the project as a whole is missing or incoherent
	Some key historical and cultural events	Some key historical and cultural events	Some key historical and cultural events	Key historical and cultural	Key historical and cultural

	[locally, nationally or globally] that were occurring around the time of your controversy are clearly introduced • The <i>reason why</i> these other events matter to your controversy is clearly and vividly explained • The impact of those historical/cultural events on your stakeholders/the events of your controversy is clearly explained	[locally, nationally or globally] that were occurring around the time of your controversy are clearly introduced • The <i>reason why</i> these other events matter to your controversy is clearly and vividly explained • The impact of those historical/cultural events on your stakeholders/the events of your controversy is clearly explained	[locally, nationally or globally] that were occurring around the time of your controversy are clearly introduced • The <i>reason why</i> these other events matter to your controversy is clearly explained • The impact of those historical/cultural events on your stakeholders/the events of your controversy is clearly explained	events [locally, nationally or globally] that were occurring around the time of your controversy are either not introduced or are confusing, unclear or seemingly random • The <i>reason why</i> these other events matter to your controversy is not explicitly stated or made clear • The impact of those historical/cultural events on your stakeholders/the events of your controversy is underdeveloped or unclear	events [locally, nationally or globally] that were occurring around the time of your controversy are lacking • The <i>reason why</i> these other events matter to your controversy is unclear or confusing • The impact of those historical/cultural events on your stakeholders/the events of your controversy is incoherent or missing
Where	• How the geography, local history, climate, and/or other key features of setting impacts or shapes the story is clearly and vividly explained • The contextual details included about setting reframe, reshape or recontextualized some elements of the controversy and offer us a deeper, more	• How the geography, local history, climate, and/or other key features of setting impacts or shapes the story is clearly and vividly explained • The contextual details included about setting enrich and deepen our understanding of the story	• How the geography, local history, climate, and/or other key features of setting impacts or shapes the story is clearly explained • The contextual details included about setting add something useful to our understanding of the story	• How the geography, local history, climate, and/or other key features of setting impacts or shapes the story is not always clearly explained • Contextual details about setting do not add something useful to our understanding of the story	• How the geography, local history, climate, and/or other key features of setting impacts or shapes the story is missing or incoherent • Contextual details about setting are missing or incoherent

	nuanced understanding					
Content Total						

FORM

Genre	Superior (50-45)	Strong (44-40 pts.)	Competent (39-35 pts.)	Weak (34-30 pts.)	Unacceptable (29-0 pts.)
STANDARD COLLEGE ESSAY	- Creative title that uses a key descriptive phrase as a main title and a clarifying subtitle and tells the reader <i>exactly</i> what the essay is about - Uses the conventions of the Standard College Essay effectively, creatively and dynamically to create an engrossing reading experience	- Creative title that uses a key descriptive phrase as a main title and a clarifying subtitle and clearly tells the reader what the essay is about - Uses the conventions of the Standard College Essay effectively and creatively to create a meaningful reading experience	- Title that uses a key descriptive phrase as a main title and a clarifying subtitle and clearly tells the reader what the essay is about - Uses the conventions of the Standard College Essay effectively to create an average reading experience	- Title isn't composed of a main title and subtitle and the subject of the essay is not immediately clear - Uses a few of the conventions of the Standard College Essay, but with mixed results; A mediocre or frustrating reading experience	- Title does not clearly communicate what the essay is about - Uses a few of the conventions of the Standard College Essay, but with poor results; A frustrating and/or or deeply confusing reading experience
QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE	- Creative title that clearly explains the usefulness of the Quick Reference Guide [QRG] to the reader and makes the reader want to read immediately - Uses the conventions of the Quick Reference Guide (based on Genre Examples in D2L) effectively, creatively and dynamically to create an engrossing reading experience	- Creative title that clearly explains the usefulness of the QRG to the reader - Uses the conventions of the QRG effectively and creatively to create a meaningful reading experience	- Title that clearly tells the reader what the essay is about, though may lack creativity and interest - Uses the conventions of the QRG effectively to create an average reading experience	- Subject and usefulness of the QRG are not immediately clear - Uses a few of the conventions of the QRG, but with mixed results; A mediocre or frustrating reading experience	- Title does not clearly communicate what the QRG is about - Uses a few of the conventions of the QRG, but with poor results; A frustrating and/or or deeply confusing reading experience
VIDEO ESSAY	Creative title that	Creative title that	Title that	Subject and	Title does not

	tells the viewer <i>exactly</i> what the video is about and makes the viewer want to watch immediately • Uses the conventions of the video essay (based on Genre Examples in D2L) effectively, creatively and dynamically to create an engrossing viewing experience	tells the viewer <i>exactly</i> what the video is about • Uses the conventions of the video essay effectively and creatively to create a meaningful viewing experience	clearly tells the reader what the video is about, though may lack creativity and interest • Uses the conventions of the video essay effectively to create an average viewing experience	usefulness of the video are not immediately clear • Uses a few of the conventions of the video essay, but with mixed results; A mediocre or frustrating viewing experience	clearly communicate what the video is about • Uses a few of the conventions of the video essay, but with poor results; A frustrating and/or or deeply confusing viewing experience	
PODCAST SEGMENT	• Creative title that tells the listener <i>exactly</i> what the segment is about • Uses the conventions of the podcast segment (based on Genre Examples in D2L) effectively, creatively and dynamically to create an engrossing listening experience	• Creative title that tells the listener <i>exactly</i> what the podcast is about • Uses the conventions of the podcast segment effectively and creatively to create a meaningful listening experience	• Title that clearly tells the reader what the podcast is about, though may lack creativity and interest • Uses the conventions of the podcast segment effectively to create an average listening experience	• Subject and usefulness of the podcast are not immediately clear • Uses a few of the conventions of the podcast segment, but with mixed results; A mediocre or frustrating listening experience	• Title does not clearly communicate what the podcast is about • Uses a few of the conventions of the podcast segment, but with poor results; A frustrating and/or or deeply confusing listening experience	
Content Total						44
Form Total						44
Project Total						88

I appreciated the clear and succinct nature of your QRG, just as the genre is designed to be. I like your title, but I think it could use a little bit more of a hook. As far as format goes, some pictures were too small and engulfed in words - I believe they should really assert the point you're making preceding the picture so perhaps making them bigger would make them more powerful. I found no grammatical error, I really found it pleasantly easy to read because of the word choice and flow. The most notable thing I encountered was how efficiently and clearly the stakeholders were presented, I knew right off the bat who was on what side and who had what to lose. Considering it is a political matter, I think more contextual matters could be weaved into the matters including what was happening in the world locally and globally.