

Module Rubric with Expanded Descriptions

This rubric will be used to evaluate module assignments and the first draft of your paper. Additional descriptions for each box of the rubric are given below each row. Use these descriptions as a guide as you complete each module assignment.

Topic 15%	1 - Paper does not have a unified topic.	2 - The paper topic is too broad for the assignment.	3 - The paper topic is slightly too broad for the assignment.	4 -Paper's topic is somewhat narrowed.	5 -Paper has an appropriately narrowed topic.
<p>5: The project not only has a question, but the question leads to a problem-solving exercise in which information is a tool. <i>Or</i> The question is focused clearly enough that the reader has a certainty about the paper's goal. <i>Or</i> The question is absolutely singular—one goal expressed as one simple question</p> <p>4: The project has a fairly narrow topic but the question is merely informational in its goal. <i>Or</i> The project has a fairly narrow topic but the question does not provide a clear mental image of the writer's goal. <i>Or</i> There are two or more related questions on the same topic so that it is unclear which question is the primary goal. <i>Or</i> The question is fairly narrow, but it is capable of being answered in a variety of ways.</p> <p>3: The project not only merely gathers information, but is itself a survey of a broad subject area without any question to answer. <i>Or</i> Both the topic and its goal are not defined clearly enough to be understood. <i>Or</i> There are two or more questions really dealing with different aspects of the topic, so that no attempt to unify them into one question is going to succeed. <i>Or</i> The question is quite broad and is capable of being answered in a variety of ways.</p> <p>2: Topic is seriously flawed: answer can be found by consulting a single source; or supporting evidence is not possible because: 1) no relevant facts exist, or 2) the question is based on personal preference or taste, or 3) you cannot obtain or use the sources your reader will think are useful, or 4) someone else cannot plausibly disprove your answer, or 5) there are too many broad questions.</p> <p>1: Question cannot be answered given current state of knowledge. Different topic needed.</p>					
Sources 15%	1 - No sources used and/or paper plagiarizes sources.	2 - Sources are too few or are inappropriate for the topic. Direct quotations are overused in the paper, source material is rarely used in the paper, and/or patchwork use of sources.	3 - Minimal number of appropriate sources. Integrates some source material well.	4 - Most sources reflect an appropriate level of scholarship. - Integrates most source material skillfully.	5 - Uses appropriate academic resources. Integrates source material skillfully.
<p>5: Reputable academic publishers, primary sources, articles 5+ pages long from scholarly journals, recent publications/reflects recent conversations, credible web sources. Skillful interaction with sources: direct quotations are used discriminately, summary and paraphrase are employed. Writer enters into the scholarly conversation through interaction with sources.</p> <p>4: Most of the sources used in the paper are academic sources. Skillful interaction with sources in most of the paper: direct quotations are used discriminately, summary and paraphrase are employed in most of the paper. Writer enters into the scholarly conversation through interaction with sources in most of the paper.</p> <p>3: Some of the sources used in the paper are academic sources. 3: Some of the paper contains skillful interaction with sources: direct quotations are used discriminately, summary and paraphrase are employed in some of the paper. Writer does not show evidence of entering the scholarly conversation: sources are not presented as scholarly dialogue about the writer's argument. Sources are not synthesized effectively (strings of Ibid., etc.)</p> <p>2: Popular publishers, short articles, dubious web sources used in the paper. Skillful interaction with sources rare in the paper. Quotations used in place of writer's own words and not expanded on.</p> <p>1: No sources used in the paper.</p>					

Central Claim 15%	1 - Paper lacks central claim.	2 - The central claim is difficult to identify, and may be too broad or too narrow.	3 - The central claim is too broad or too narrow. May be descriptive rather than analytic.	4 - Paper has a focused central claim, but no striking insights developed.	5 - Paper has a focused central claim that will require thoughtful support.
<p>5: Paper has focused central claim that directly states the writer's argument. Supporting the claim will require critical thinking.</p> <p>4: Paper has focused central claim, but may not require a high level of critical thinking.</p> <p>3: Central claim is too broad or too narrow for the length of the paper. It may describe the topic or describe what the paper will do instead of stating the writer's argument about the topic.</p> <p>2: Central claim is difficult to identify, or there may be more than one distinct central claim.</p> <p>1: No central claim given in the introduction.</p>					
Argumentation 20%	1 - The paper does not utilize reasons, evidences, or acknowledgements.	2 - Most of the paper does not utilize reasons, evidences, or acknowledgements.	3 - Reasons, evidences, and acknowledgements are utilized in some of the paper.	4 - Reasons, evidences, and acknowledgements are utilized in most of the paper.	5 - Paper utilizes reasons, evidences, and acknowledgements skillfully.
<p>5: Supports the main claim with cogent reasons, evidences, and acknowledgements utilized throughout the paper.</p> <p>4: Cogent reasons, evidences, and acknowledgments in most of the paper. Argumentation is successful in most of the paper. Weakens argument for main claim by failing to acknowledge and respond to alternate arguments against the main claim.</p> <p>3: Cogent reasons, evidences, and acknowledgments in some of the paper. Argumentation is successful in some of the paper. Weakens argument for main claim by often failing to support one or more reasons with evidence OR too often relies on citations to secondary sources as evidence.</p> <p>2: Cogent reasons, evidences, and acknowledgments lacking in most of the paper. Substitutes unsubstantiated personal opinions for evidence.</p> <p>1: Cogent reasons, evidences, and acknowledgments lacking in the paper. Paper fails to support main claim with an argument.</p>					
Organization and Logical Development of the Paper 20%	1 - Ideas are presented in a random fashion. Contains instances of unnecessary repetition, logical inconsistencies, and/or obvious contradictions. No effort to provide topic sentences or transitions in thought.	2 - Major lapses in the logical progression of ideas are evident: unnecessary repetition, logical inconsistencies, and/or contradictions. Some paragraphs have topic sentences. Transitions rarely used.	3 - Logical progression of ideas, but the organization has conspicuous lapses present. Many paragraphs lack topic sentences and transitions, and/or many transitions seem forced, not natural.	4 - Logical progression of ideas, but the organization has minor lapses present. Some paragraphs lack topic sentences and transitions, and/or some transitions seem forced, not natural.	5 - Organization is a logical progression of ideas/events supporting the main claim. Topic sentences and natural paragraph transitions support the flow of thought.
<p>5: Organization is clear at both the micro and macro level. Sections are arranged in a logical order, and paragraphs have topic sentences, natural transitions, and are unified around one main idea.</p> <p>4: Sections are arranged in a logical order. Most paragraphs have topic sentences, natural transitions, and are unified around one main idea.</p> <p>3: Sections are arranged in a logical order. Some paragraphs have topic sentences, natural transitions, and are unified around one main idea.</p> <p>2: Serious flaws in organization at either the micro or macro level. Points may be repeated unnecessarily; ideas may be presented randomly at either the section or paragraph level. Topic sentences and transitions may be rare.</p> <p>1: Serious flaws in organization at both the micro and macro level. No effort to provide topic sentences or transitions in thought.</p>					

Mechanics 15%	1 - Fundamental errors in grammar make paper difficult to understand. Shows no evidence of editing.	2 - At times, errors in grammar interfere with understanding. Shows little or no evidence of editing.	3 - Many grammatical errors. Shows little evidence of editing.	4 - Some grammatical errors. Shows evidence of editing.	5 - Few grammatical or issues noted. Shows evidence of careful editing.
<p>5: Few errors (perhaps 5-8 in a 15-20 page paper) detected.</p> <p>4: Some errors (several per page) detected.</p> <p>3: Many errors detected per page and/or paper has occasional unintelligible sentences (not more than one per page).</p> <p>2: Paper has more than one unintelligible sentence per page.</p> <p>1: Paper is unintelligible because of the amount and/or severity of grammatical errors it contains.</p>					