|  |
| --- |
| **Analytic Rubric for a Research Paper in the Humanities** |
| **Attribute** | **Excellent (4)** | **Good (3)** | **Acceptable (2)** | **Unacceptable (1)** |
| **Introduction** | Strong introduction of topic’s key question(s), and terms;Clearly delineates subtopics to be reviewed;Specific thesis statement. | Conveys topic and key question(s);Delineates subtopics to be reviewed;General thesis statement. | Conveys topic, but not key question(s);Describes subtopics to be reviewed;General thesis statement. | Does not adequately convey topic;Does not describe subtopics to be reviewed;Lack an adequate thesis statement. |
| **Focus & Sequencing** | All material clearly related to subtopics and main topic;Strong organization and integration of material within subtopics;Strong transitions linking subtopics and main topic. | All material related to subtopics and main topic;Logically organized within subtopics;Varied transitions linking subtopics and main topic. | Most material related to subtopics and main topic;Material may not be organized within subtopics;Attempts to provide variety of transitions. | Little evidence material is logically organized into a main topic or subtopics;Many transitions are unclear or nonexistent. |
| **Support** | Strong peer-reviewed research-based support for thesis. | Sources well selected to provide some support for thesis. | Sources are generally acceptable but not peer-reviewed research-based evidence. | Few insignificant or unsubstantiated sources supporting thesis. |
| **Conclusion** | Strong review of key conclusions;Strong integration with thesis statement;Insightful discussion of impact of the researched material on topic. | Good review of key conclusions;Good integration with thesis statement;Discusses impact of researched material on topic. | Review of key conclusions;Some integration with thesis statement;Some discussion of impact of researched material on topic. | Does not summarize evidence with respect to thesis statement;Does not discuss the impact of researched material on topic. |
| **Grammar & Mechanics** | The paper is free of grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors. | Grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors are rare and do not detract from the paper. | Very few grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors interfering with reading paper. | Grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors substantially detract from the paper. |
| **Communication** | Scholarly style;Writing flow is easy to follow. | Scholarly style;Writing has minimal awkward or unclear passages. | Word choice occasionally portrays an informal tone;Writing has a few awkward or unclear passages. | Work choice is informal in tone;Writing is choppy, with many awkward or unclear passages. |
| **Citations & Reference** | All references and citations are correctly written and present no errors in MLA style. | Rare errors in MLA style that do not detract from the paper. | Errors in MLA style are noticeable. | Reference and citation errors significantly detract from paper. |
| (Adapted from the University of Kentucky, as cited in The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill’s Guide to using Rubrics to Assess Student Learning: <https://oira.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/297/2017/07/Developing-and-Using-Rubrics.pdf>)  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Developmental Rubric for a Paper in the Social and Behavioral Sciences** |
| **Attribute** | **Exemplary** | **Accomplished** | **Developing** | **Beginning** | **Unacceptable** |
| **Focus** | * Relevant research is thoroughly and completely discussed;
* Key concepts are identified and operationally defined;
* Objective stance maintained throughout document.
 | * Relevant research is adequately addressed;
* Most of the key concepts are identified and operationally defined;
* Contains some irrelevant information but does not detract from focus;
* Objective stance mostly maintained.
 | * Paper addresses the relevant research generally satisfactorily, though explanations and elaborations may be imprecise;
* Most of the key concepts are identified and operationally defined, though the definitions may be imprecise;
* Contains some irrelevant information but does not detract from focus;
* Objectively mostly maintained, though occasional subjective remarks occur.
 | * Paper does not adequately address the relevant research;
* Very few key concepts are identified and clearly defined;
* Paper contains too much irrelevant information that seriously detracts from focus;
* Frequent subjective intrusions.
 | * Relevant research not discussed;
* Key concepts either not identified or are identified in a confusing manner;
* Contains irrelevant information;
* Very frequent subjective remarks.
 |
| **Organization & Development** | * Organization and development of content is logical and well-developed;
* Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are clearly formulated and articulated;
* Conclusion is fully and clearly articulated.
 | * Organization and development of content is logical with minimal errors;
* Content ad central ideas are developed;
* Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are adequately formulated and articulated;
* Conclusion is adequately and clearly articulated.
 | * Organization of content is adequate;
* Content not well developed;
* Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are stated, but may lack precision and clarity;
* Conclusion is stated but lacks precision and clarity.
 | * Organization and development of content is insufficient;
* Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are poorly stated and do not become evident until the end;
* Conclusion is poorly stated and is faulty;
* Paper has many problems with structure.
 | * Organization and development of content are lacking;
* Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are not stated and may only become evident at the end;
* Conclusion is not stated;
* Paper has no logic and paragraphs are random and lack explanation.
 |
| **Style** | * Sophisticated and varied sentence structure and length;
* Objective and efficient academic language.
 | * Frequently varied sentence structure and length with rare style or structure errors;
* Mostly objective and efficient academic language.
 | * Occasional variation in sentence structure and length;
* Generally, pragmatically adequate, though some informal style may appear.
 | * No variation in sentence structure – very simple syntax, short and simple sentences;
* Style frequently pragmatically inadequate with excess informal language.
 | * No variation in sentence structure – very simple and frequently erroneous syntax;
* Very short sentences;
* Style mostly pragmatically inadequate with excess informal language.
 |
| **Research** | * Flawless APA format and document design;
* Unfailingly correct in-text citations;
* Flawless reference section;
* Complete absence of plagiarism.
 | * Mostly appropriate APA section headings and subheadings;
* Infrequent errors in in-text citations;
* Occasional errors in reference section;
* Complete absence of plagiarism.
 | * Some lapses in APA conformity;
* Some errors in in-text citations and in reference section;
* Complete absence of plagiarism.
 | * Frequent lapses in APA conformity;
* Frequent errors in in-text citations and in reference section;
* Complete absence of plagiarism.
 | * Paper mostly APA inconsistent;
* Widespread errors in-text citations and in reference section;
* Evidence of plagiarism.
 |
| (Adapted from Texas A&M University as cited in The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill’s Guide to using Rubrics to Assess Student Learning: <https://oira.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/297/2017/07/Developing-and-Using-Rubrics.pdf>) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Analytic Rubric for Thesis in Linguistics** |
| **Attribute** | **High Pass****(4)** | **Pass****(3)** | **Low Pass****(2)** | **Fail****(1)** |
| **Statement of the Problem** | * Very well written;
* Articulates a concise and interesting hypothesis about a significant empirical linguistic problem and its broad significance.
 | * Clearly written;
* Presents an interesting hypothesis and describes its importance.
 | * Provides a general discussion of the hypothesis and relevant issues but does not discuss its broader significance.
 | * Shows a fundamental lack of understanding of the problem;
* Poorly written, incomplete, and lacks structure.
 |
| **Grounding in the Literature** | * Places the work within a larger context;
* Appropriately integrates relevant material;
* Shows deep understanding of the significance of the research.
 | * Provides a meaningful summary of the literature and builds a case for the research.
 | * Cites most of the key literature;
* Lacks critical analysis and synthesis.
 | * Fails to cite important, relevant literature;
* Does not clearly relate the literature to the student’s contribution;
* Misinterprets the literature.
 |
| **Methods and Data Sources** | * Uses original or creative use of linguistic analysis methods;
* Data are novel and appropriate for the study.
 | * Uses existing linguistic analysis methodology well;
* Data are appropriate to the study design.
 | * Demonstrates competent use of existing methods;
* Collected data allow an adequate test of the hypothesis.
 | * Uses incorrect methodology;
* Data are not handled appropriately.
 |
| **Results** | * Meaningful results obtained from sophisticated data analysis;
* Analyses map back to the hypotheses;
* Discusses the limitations of the analysis.
 | * Well executed;
* Shows good understanding of the analytical methods;
* Provides good arguments for or against the hypotheses.
 | * Analyses are executed correctly, but additional analyses may have yielded further insights.
 | * Mis-analysis data or fails to analyze relevant data;
* Results do not follow from the analysis and mistakes are made in interpretation.
 |
| **Discussion/ Conclusion** | * Places the study in a larger theoretical context;
* Informs our understanding of the nature language.
 | * States what was done and identifies its significance and limitations.
 | * Summarizes and repeats what was found;
* Does not discuss the significance or limitations of the research.
 | * Insufficient or incoherent discussion of results;
* Shows lack of understanding of linguistic theories.
 |
| **Overall** | * Original and significant.
 | * Informative, clearly written, and well-organized.
 | * Demonstrates competence.
 | * Poorly written; does not understanding basic concepts.
 |
| (Adapted from the Department of Linguistics, University of Kansas: [https://linguistics.ku.edu/sites/linguistics.ku.edu/files/docs/Linguistics%20PHD%20Form%20D.pdf)](https://linguistics.ku.edu/sites/linguistics.ku.edu/files/docs/Linguistics%20PHD%20Form%20D.pdf%29) |