

CSC290 Critical Review Grading Rubric

	A 8-10	B 7-7.9	C 6-6.9	D 5-5.9	F <5
<p>Summary (20%)</p> <p>How well does the student summarize the text?</p>	<p>Clearly presents author's thesis and describes his/ her strategies for supporting it.</p> <p>Clearly and succinctly describes organization and presentation of text.</p>	<p>Presents author's thesis and describes his/her strategies for supporting it.</p> <p>Describes organization and presentation of text.</p>	<p>Presents author's thesis, but may not provide sufficient description of strategies for supporting it.</p> <p>Describes organization and presentation of text, but may need more details</p>	<p>Insufficient explanation of author's thesis, and/or insufficient description of strategies for supporting thesis.</p> <p>Insufficient description of text's organization and presentation.</p>	<p>No explanation of author's thesis, and/or no description of strategies for supporting thesis.</p> <p>Poor or no description of text's organization and presentation.</p>
<p>Overall Quality of Analysis (20%)</p> <p>How well does the student analyze the text?</p>	<p>Exhibits clarity, complexity, perceptiveness, originality, and depth of thought about the topic.</p> <p>Provides excellent evaluation of text's weaknesses or strengths; evaluative criteria are unique and interesting.</p> <p>Uses creativity to interpret text (e.g., places it in interesting context or compares / contrasts with other relevant texts).</p>	<p>Exhibits clarity, and some depth about the topic, but lacks the qualities of complexity, perceptiveness, and originality exhibited in level A.</p> <p>Provides clear evaluation of text's weaknesses or strengths; evaluative criteria are unique and interesting.</p> <p>Puts text in meaningful context when interpreting it.</p>	<p>Exhibits some clarity, though only minimal depth of thought about the topic.</p> <p>Makes some attempt to present the weaknesses or strengths of the text; evaluative criteria are used.</p> <p>Places text in context.</p>	<p>Exhibit some faulty logic, and/or stereotypical or superficial thinking about the topic.</p> <p>Insufficient attempt to present the weaknesses or strengths of the text; evaluative criteria are unclear.</p> <p>Insufficient attempt to put text in context</p>	<p>Exhibit little or no evidence of effective thinking about the topic (please note that there may be effective thinking in the composition, but not about the topic).</p> <p>Poor to no attempt to present the weaknesses or strengths of the text; no obvious criteria for evaluation.</p> <p>Poor to no attempt to put text in context.</p>
<p>Support of Analysis (20%)</p> <p>How well does the student select, summarize and/or paraphrase supporting evidence from the text to demonstrate and support analysis?</p>	<p>Exhibits command of focus, coherent organization, and interesting development (with carefully chosen, insightful details, examples, arguments, etc.) of the topic.</p>	<p>Exhibits control of focus, organization, and development (all of the subject matter is relevant to the topic, but is not as insightfully selected as a response at level A) of the topic.</p>	<p>Exhibits some control of focus, organization (structure may be formulaic or be organized loosely around the topic), and development (may contain some poorly chosen information, but major ideas are adequately supported).</p>	<p>Exhibit insufficient control of focus, organization (way ramble, be repetitious, or locked into a formula), and/or development (it may be mostly descriptive or lack adequate support) of the topic.</p>	<p>Exhibit a basic/elementary sense of organization (may be purely descriptive or strictly formulaic), but ideas about the topic are generally undeveloped, illogical, irrelevant, or inconsistent.</p>

<p>Organization & Content (20%)</p>	<p>Review is very well organized, containing an introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion.</p> <p>Paragraphs contain clear topic sentences, focus on a single issue, are coherent, and organized according to an obvious pattern of argument.</p> <p>Effective use of transitional expressions and other signposts that make the structure of the document clear.</p> <p>Student's tone and diction enhance the argument being made about the text under review.</p>	<p>Review is well organized, containing an introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion.</p> <p>All paragraphs contain topic sentences, focus on a single issue and are coherently structured.</p> <p>Some use of transitional expressions and other signposts that make the structure of the document clear.</p> <p>Student's tone and diction are appropriate for the argument being made about the text under review.</p>	<p>Review has separate introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion, but connections among these could be improved.</p> <p>Most paragraphs focus on a single topic and are coherently structured.</p> <p>Topic sentences signal structure of argument, but may require more focus. Transitions are present and help connect parts of argument.</p> <p>Student's tone and diction are occasionally inappropriate for the target audience.</p>	<p>Distinction between introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion is unclear.</p> <p>Paragraph structure needs improvement (some may be incomplete, or focus on too many issues, or be incoherent).</p> <p>Topic sentences do not effectively signal structure of argument or lack focus / clarity. More transitions are needed to develop argument.</p> <p>Student's tone and diction are marginal.</p> <p>Paper is much longer or shorter than the assignment requirement.</p>	<p>General structure of review is difficult to follow, and/or student failed to follow the prescribed format.</p> <p>Paragraphs are unfocused, incoherent or require restructuring.</p> <p>Topic sentences are absent or unconnected to the paragraphs that follow. Transitions are absent or used incorrectly.</p> <p>Student's tone and diction are inappropriate.</p> <p>Paper is unreasonably too long or too short.</p>
<p>Grammar & Mechanics (20%)</p>	<p>Clear, concise sentences.</p> <p>No grammatical errors.</p> <p>Citations are included in the correct ACM format.</p>	<p>Mostly clear, concise sentences.</p> <p>May have some minor grammatical errors.</p> <p>Citations are included in the correct ACM format; may have minor errors.</p>	<p>Adequate sentence structure but may require editing for clarity/wordiness.</p> <p>Some grammatical errors, but these do not impede understanding.</p> <p>Citations are included with some issues in ACM formatting.</p>	<p>Poor sentence structure. Writing may be wordy or difficult to follow in places.</p> <p>Many grammatical errors.</p> <p>Citations are included but not in the ACM format.</p>	<p>Very poor sentence structure, and/or Uses inappropriate language or language that is too informal.</p> <p>Significant grammatical errors, and/or Contains errors that are identified by MS Word software but were not corrected.</p> <p>Citations are missing.</p>