

Grading Rubric

Please note that, in the interest of offering students practice in proofreading and editing their own work, comments offered through reproductions of the form below are general in nature. That is, they identify systematic problems and make broad suggestions rather than making line-by-line corrections.

The same rubric will be used for both the Eval RV and the Eval FV. Grading of the Eval PV is detailed above.

With the rubric below, all papers start at a grade of C, as baseline competence is presumed unless there is reason to believe otherwise.

Category	Comments	Steps Yes/No
Assigned Guidelines Met	•	+0/-3
Clear and Appropriate Thesis Provided	•	+0/-2
Clear, Sufficient, and Appropriate Criteria Provided	•	+2/-1
Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Evidence Provided	•	+1/-2
Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Explanations Provided	•	+2/-2
Organization Effective	•	+1/-1
Correct Formatting Provided	•	+0/-1
Mechanical Correctness Displayed	•	+0/-1
Engagement Developed	•	+1/+0
Total Change in Steps and Grade Equivalent		
Overall Comments		

- Assigned Guidelines Met—Is the paper at the required length? Is it of the assigned genre?
- Clear and Appropriate Thesis Provided—Does the paper state a decisively argumentative thesis that articulates an overall assessment of whether or not the piece assessed is representative of the asserted (sub-) genre?
- Clear, Sufficient, and Appropriate Criteria Provided—Does the paper explicitly indicate what (sub-) genre will be used as an assessment rubric? Does the paper explicitly assert suitable criteria against which to evaluate its focal piece? Are the criteria reasonable for the (sub-) genre as part of which the focal piece is evaluated?
- Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Evidence Provided—Does the paper make appropriate reference to the chosen piece and to the materials used to develop criteria, such that a general reader who has not read the pieces in question can understand what is being

discussed? Does it follow formal citation guidelines adequately? Does it introduce information from the pieces appropriately?

- **Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Explanations Provided**—Does the paper explain how the evidence provided to support the thesis serves to support the thesis? If it includes counterargument, does it explain the movement of the counterargument appropriately? Are the explanations sufficient to convince a general reader who is not familiar with the piece?
- **Organization Effective**—Does the paper adhere to either emphatic or topical order consistently? Does it transition smoothly and appropriately between paragraphs and larger textual divisions? Does it forecast its organization and adhere to the forecast?
- **Correct Formatting Provided**—Is the paper submitted as a .doc, .docx, or .rtf file? Is it typed on a letter-size sheet in 12-point, double-spaced Times New Roman or Garamond font? Does it have a heading, title, and page numbers in accordance with MLA standards?
- **Mechanical Correctness Displayed**—Do the paper's usage, spelling, punctuation, and similar surface-level concerns conform to the standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time? Do they correspond to the level of discourse to be expected of students in lower-division college coursework?
- **Engagement Developed**—As a sort of extra-credit component, does the paper offer some particularly engaging or poignant elements unusual or exceptional in a work of first-year composition? Does it stake out an unusual position or make a solid and reasonable attempt to push the boundaries of the assignment in productive ways?