

History Rubric

Rubric for Research Seminar (Capstone) and Other Major Research Papers History Department, Southwestern University				
	Below Basic	Basic	Good	Excellent
Ideas	Shows minimal engagement with the research topic; fails to recognize multiple dimensions and/or perspectives; lacks even basic observations.	Shows some engagement with the research topic without elaboration; offers basic observations but rarely original insight.	Demonstrates engagement with the research topic, recognizing multiple dimensions and/or perspectives; offers some insight.	Demonstrates rich engagement with the research topic, recognizing multiple dimensions and/or perspectives with elaboration and depth; offers considerable insight.
Focus and Thesis	Paper lacks focus and/or a discernible thesis.	Some intelligible ideas, but thesis is weak, unclear, or too broad.	Identifiable thesis representing adequate understanding of the assigned topic; minimal irrelevant material.	Clear, focused thesis representing full understanding of the assignment; every word counts.
Evidence	Little to no evidence.	Some evidence but not enough to develop argument in unified way (e.g., lacks engagement with primary sources). Evidence inaccurate, irrelevant, or inappropriate for purpose of the paper. Citations incomplete.	Evidence accurate, well documented, and relevant, but not complete (e.g., limited engagement with primary sources), well integrated, and/or appropriate for the purpose of the paper.	Evidence is relevant, accurate, complete, well integrated, well documented, and appropriate for the purpose of the paper. Evidence includes substantive engagement with primary sources.
Organization	Organization is missing both overall and within paragraphs. Introduction and conclusion may be lacking or illogical.	Organization, overall and/or within paragraphs, is formulaic or occasionally lacking in coherence; few evident transitions. Introduction and conclusion may lack logic.	Few organizational problems at any level (overall, paragraph, transitions). Introduction and conclusion are effectively related to the whole.	Organization logical and appropriate to assignment; paragraphs well developed and appropriately divided; ideas linked with smooth and effective transitions. Introduction and conclusion are effectively related to the whole.
Style and Mechanics	Multiple and serious errors of sentence structure; frequent errors in spelling and capitalization; intrusive and/or inaccurate punctuation such that communication is hindered. Proofreading not evident.	Sentences show errors of structure and little or no variety; many errors of punctuation, spelling and/or capitalization. Errors interfere with meaning in places. Careful proofreading not evident.	Effective and varied sentences; some errors in sentence construction; only occasional punctuation, spelling and/or capitalization errors.	Each sentence structured effectively, powerfully; rich, well-chosen variety of sentence styles and length; virtually free of punctuation, spelling, capitalization errors.

Writing Rubric: Phy53-334 Classical Mechanics I (to be implemented in the lab component of the course)

	Below Proficient	Proficient	Exemplary
Lab Report Writing Style	1. Lab report has <u>little</u> structure. 2. Writing <u>lacks clarity</u> AND is <u>not concise</u> . 3. All elements are <u>not logically</u> connected. 4. <u>Frequent</u> grammar AND/OR spelling errors.	1. Lab report has <u>some</u> structure. 2. Writing style <u>lacks clarity</u> OR is <u>not concise</u> . 3. SOME elements are <u>not logically</u> connected. 4. <u>Occasional</u> grammar AND/OR spelling errors.	1. Lab report has <u>appropriate</u> structure. 2. Writing style is <u>clear</u> AND <u>concise</u> . 3. ALL elements are <u>logically</u> connected. 4. <u>Minimal</u> grammar AND/OR spelling errors.
Elements: 1. Numerical 2. Graphical 3. Mathematical	1. <i>Handwritten</i> tables and/or graphs with <u>minimal</u> captions, scaling OR labeling. 2. <i>Hand-drawn</i> figures with <u>minimal</u> captions, scaling OR labeling. 3. <i>Handwritten</i> equations in the lab report. 4. <u>Few</u> elements appropriately integrated into the lab report.	1. <i>Embedded</i> tables and/or graphs with <u>good</u> captions, scaling OR labeling. 2. <i>Embedded</i> figures with <u>good</u> captions, scaling OR labeling. 3. <u>Most</u> equations <i>typeset</i> in the lab report. 4. <u>Most</u> elements appropriately integrated into the lab report.	1. <i>Embedded</i> tables and/or graphs with <u>appropriate</u> captions, scaling AND labeling. 2. <i>Embedded</i> figures with <u>appropriate</u> captions, scaling AND labeling. 3. <u>All</u> equations <i>typeset</i> in the lab report. 4. <u>All</u> elements appropriately integrated into the lab report.
Integration of Theory with Experiment	1. <u>Minimal</u> discussion of the underlying physical theory tested by the experiment. 2. <u>Minimal</u> discussion <i>connecting</i> the experimental apparatus OR the experimental procedure with the theory tested by the experiment.	1. <u>Good</u> discussion of the underlying physical theory tested by the experiment. 2. <u>Good</u> discussion <i>connecting</i> the experimental apparatus OR the experimental procedure with the theory tested by the experiment.	1. <u>Clear</u> discussion of the underlying physical theory tested by the experiment. 2. <u>Clear</u> discussion <i>connecting</i> the experimental apparatus AND the experimental procedure with the theory tested by the experiment.
Data Analysis Discussion	1. <u>Minimal</u> description of experimental data. 2. <u>Minimal</u> discussion of the salient elements of the data analysis. 3. <u>Minimal</u> discussion of experimental errors.	1. <u>Good</u> description of experimental data. 2. <u>Good</u> discussion of the salient elements of the data analysis. 3. <u>Good</u> discussion of experimental errors.	1. <u>Clear</u> description of experimental data. 2. <u>Clear</u> discussion of the salient elements of the data analysis. 3. <u>Clear</u> discussion of experimental errors.
Conclusions and References	1. Conclusions show a <u>minimal</u> understanding of how the experimental results relate to theoretical predictions. 2. <u>Minimal</u> references to any external sources of data and/or theory associated with the experiment. 3. <u>Poor</u> placement of any references in the lab report.	1. Conclusions show a <u>good</u> understanding of how the experimental results relate to theoretical predictions. 2. <u>Adequate</u> references to any external sources of data and/or theory associated with the experiment. 3. <u>Good</u> placement of most references in the lab report.	1. Conclusions show a <u>clear</u> understanding of how the experimental results relate to theoretical predictions. 2. <u>Thorough</u> references to any external sources of data and/or theory associated with the experiment. 3. <u>Appropriate</u> placement of all references in the lab report.

Note: The choice of this class for the WA course is appropriate for SU Physics Department physics majors because: (1) it is an upper level course taken before their capstone work. As such, skills learned here should carry over into their capstone work. (2) The subject matter is sufficiently difficult to challenge the student to in a meaningful way to improve both their writing and their understanding of theoretical and experimental physics.

Political Science

Guidelines and Rubric for Essays: Writing Attentive Course

<p>“Proficient” means the criteria listed below have been fulfilled with a more advanced level of competence; “Meets expectations” means that the criteria have been fulfilled in an satisfactory way; “Below expectations” means that some of these criteria have been neglected or inadequately addressed.</p>	<p>Below Expectations</p>	<p>Meets Expectations</p>	<p>Proficient</p>
<p>RESEARCH PUZZLE AND PROBLEM: Identifies a relevant, appropriate, and manageable puzzle or problem as an area of substantive research and articulates the significance of this question to the study of politics.</p> <p>Explanation: This puzzle or problem should be open to multiple perspectives as opposed to one-sided, it should be something that can be tested against the textual evidence, and it should be a question that can be manageable and persuasively explored within the length of the essay. Your question should not simply set you up to summarize a theory and should not be too simplistic or self-evident. For the purposes of this class, the best questions identify a puzzle or a problem within the text itself, highlighting contradictions, paradoxes, assumptions, implications, or exclusions that – when explored – will help open the theory up to greater critical analysis and understanding.</p>			
<p>THESIS: Outlines the thesis to be tested or the argument to be asserted and defended</p> <p>Explanation: After testing your working hypothesis against the evidence, you should lay out a well-developed claim based on your research that addresses your initial research question. Based on your research and your weighing and analysis of the evidence, you should develop a claim that you can persuasively advance – drawing on appropriate textual evidence – through the course of the essay. Your claim should be clearly stated and fully developed to give the reader a full sense of the argument you will be advancing throughout the essay.</p>			
<p>EXPLANATION OF THE INTRODUCTION AS A WHOLE: Your introduction, based on the criteria listed above, should fully explain your research puzzle, clearly state your thesis, as well as giving any background information necessary to “set the stage” for your exploration of this problem so the reader understands the significance of the question (i.e., you should address the “so what” question and articulate why this research matters) and explain how this puzzle is important to the study of politics. All this should be done in your introduction.</p>			

<p>EVIDENCE & ARGUMENT: Analyzes a broad and appropriate body of facts and data to test the thesis and to assert and defend the argument, using primary and secondary sources appropriate to the discipline of political science as evidence.</p> <p>Explanation: You should draw upon relevant and appropriate evidence to advance your claim. Your analysis of this evidence should show a good understanding of the sources from which you are drawing. You should <i>analyze</i> your evidence in terms of your thesis or claim and avoid simply summarizing or describing the theory.</p>			
<p>COUNTERARGUMENT(S): In addition to using evidence to assert and defend a primary argument, the author also addresses and responds to competing scholarly arguments or perspectives.</p> <p>Explanation: Your analysis of the evidence should take into account contradictory or opposing evidence. You should not “cherry pick” by only discussing the evidence that supports your thesis, but should also address, respond to, or situate opposing or contradictory evidence.</p>			
<p>WRITING: Persuasively advances argument in language that is clear, coherent, concise, and grammatically sound.</p> <p>Explanation: Your essay should be clearly written and understandable to the reader. It should be free of typos and misspellings, and awkward sentences. It should employ active verbs and put characters/subjects in charge of the action of the sentence, expressed via active verbs.</p>			
<p>ORGANIZATION: Organizes the paper clearly and logically.</p>			
<p>REVISION: Integrates and responds to feedback, constructive criticism, and suggestions for revision.</p>			
<p>CITATION: Cites evidence according to scholarly and disciplinary norms, using Kate Turabian’s <i>A Manual for Writers</i>, a guide to the Chicago Manual of Style.</p>			
<p>HONOR CODE: the Honor Code is written on the essay.</p>			

CREATIVE THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Creative thinking is both the capacity to combine or synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of thinking, reacting, and working in an imaginative way characterized by a high degree of innovation, divergent thinking, and risk taking.

Framing Language

Creative thinking, as it is fostered within higher education, must be distinguished from less focused types of creativity such as, for example, the creativity exhibited by a small child's drawing, which stems not from an understanding of connections, but from an ignorance of boundaries. Creative thinking in higher education can only be expressed productively within a particular domain. The student must have a strong foundation in the strategies and skills of the domain in order to make connections and synthesize. While demonstrating solid knowledge of the domain's parameters, the creative thinker, at the highest levels of performance, pushes beyond those boundaries in new, unique, or atypical recombinations, uncovering or critically perceiving new syntheses and using or recognizing creative risk-taking to achieve a solution.

The Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric is intended to help faculty assess creative thinking in a broad range of transdisciplinary or interdisciplinary work samples or collections of work. The rubric is made up of a set of attributes that are common to creative thinking across disciplines. Examples of work samples or collections of work that could be assessed for creative thinking may include research papers, lab reports, musical compositions, a mathematical equation that solves a problem, a prototype design, a reflective piece about the final product of an assignment, or other academic works. The work samples or collections of work may be completed by an individual student or a group of students.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- Exemplar: A model or pattern to be copied or imitated (quoted from www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/exemplar).
- Domain: Field of study or activity and a sphere of knowledge and influence.

CREATIVE THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

Creative thinking is both the capacity to combine or synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of thinking, reacting, and working in an imaginative way characterized by a high degree of innovation, divergent thinking, and risk taking

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
Acquiring Competencies <i>This step refers to acquiring strategies and skills within a particular domain.</i>	Reflect: Evaluates creative process and product using domain-appropriate criteria.	Create: Creates an entirely new object, solution or idea that is appropriate to the domain.	Adapt: Successfully adapts an appropriate exemplar to his/her own specifications.	Model: Successfully reproduces an appropriate exemplar.
Taking Risks <i>May include personal risk (fear of embarrassment or rejection) or risk of failure in successfully completing assignment, i.e. going beyond original parameters of assignment, introducing new materials and forms, tackling controversial topics, advocating unpopular ideas or solutions.</i>	Actively seeks out and follows through on untested and potentially risky directions or approaches to the assignment in the final product.	Incorporates new directions or approaches to the assignment in the final product.	Considers new directions or approaches without going beyond the guidelines of the assignment.	Stays strictly within the guidelines of the assignment.
Solving Problems	Not only develops a logical, consistent plan to solve problem, but recognizes consequences of solution and can articulate reason for choosing solution.	Having selected from among alternatives, develops a logical, consistent plan to solve the problem.	Considers and rejects less acceptable approaches to solving problem.	Only a single approach is considered and is used to solve the problem.
Embracing Contradictions	Integrates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas fully.	Incorporates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in a exploratory way.	Includes (recognizes the value of) alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in a small way.	Acknowledges (mentions in passing) alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas.
Innovative Thinking <i>Novelty or uniqueness (of idea, claim, question, form, etc.)</i>	Extends a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product to create new knowledge or knowledge that crosses boundaries.	Creates a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product.	Experiments with creating a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product.	Reformulates a collection of available ideas.
Connecting, Synthesizing, Transforming	Transforms ideas or solutions into entirely new forms.	Synthesizes ideas or solutions into a coherent whole.	Connects ideas or solutions in novel ways.	Recognizes existing connections among ideas or solutions.