A rubric is a set of criteria by which an assignment is marked. As you write your paper and revise for final submission, use these categories to understand how we will mark your work. As you can see, we will mark based on four Categories – Structure, Overall Effectiveness, Academic Quality, and Peer Review. Within each category we are looking for more specific points. Read each Category description carefully. As you can see, there are four possible Results for each Category.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **RESULTS****CATEGORIES** | **Obliterates expectations** (this is reserved for the best papers: difficult--but possible--to achieve) | **Exceeds expectations** (many papers fall into this category: this comes with hard work and creativity) | **Meets expectations** (many papers fall into this category: good but needs improvement) | **Below expectations** (a few papers fall into this category)  |
| **STRUCTURE (5 pts)**This category evaluates the structure, style, and clarity of the paper. Structure and clarity require organization (introduction and conclusion, as well as section headings and sub-headings where applicable). The paper should be laid out logically so that it is easy to understand and even a pleasure to read. Style marks will be given for meeting requirements of length, font, margins, word count, line spacing, and page numbers, as well as grammar, language usage, and referencing style. | The introduction and conclusion are succinct, and the thesis statement is inspired. Headings and sub-headings (where applicable) coherently link sections. The paper's structure displays unrivaled clarity, making it easy and enjoyable to read. The text effectively uses standard English conventions of usage and mechanics and is completely free from typographical or syntactic errors. The paper fulfills all other style requirements. The paper consistently uses the correct referencing system. | The introduction and conclusion are well-written, and the thesis statement is concise and relevant. The paper's structure is clear, making it easy to read. The text effectively uses standard English conventions of usage and mechanics and is largely free from typographical or syntactic errors. The paper fulfills other style requirements. The paper uses the correct referencing system with few inconsistencies or errors. | The introduction and conclusion are acceptable, but the thesis statement lacks clarity and rambles. The paper's structure makes it sometimes difficult to read. The text utilizes standard English conventions of usage and mechanics, but has several typographical and syntactic errors that distract the reader. The paper meets most other style requirements. The referencing system suffers from several inconsistencies or errors. | The introduction and/or conclusion are unclear. The thesis statement is either missing or impossible to locate. The paper's structure makes it difficult to read. The text poorly utilizes standard English conventions of usage and mechanics and suffers from many typographical and syntactic errors, making the paper difficult to read. The paper fails to meet several other style requirements. There is no consistency on reference system or no attempt made to use the required style. |
| **OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS (5 pts)**This category evaluates the relevance of the topic to the module and the overall effectiveness of the paper as an academic exercise. Attempts should be made to link the paper to themes addressed in lecture, tutorial, or readings. | The paper synthesizes seemingly disparate ideas into a coherent whole, in an original way. The paper shows clear evidence of the dynamic academic growth of the author. | The paper shows some synthesis of broad ideas and some originality. The paper shows steady academic growth on the part of the authors. | The paper shows some relevance within the context of the module and that the authors have grown academically through the exercise. | The paper has little or no relevance to the rest of the module. The paper provides little or no evidence that the authors have grown academically through the exercise. |
|  **RESULTS****CATEGORIES** | **Obliterates expectations** (this is reserved for the best papers: difficult--but possible--to achieve) | **Exceeds expectations** (many papers fall into this category: this comes with hard work and creativity) | **Meets expectations** (many papers fall into this category: good but needs improvement) | **Below expectations** (a few papers fall into this category)  |
| **ACADEMIC QUALITY (5 pts)**This category evaluates the academic quality of the paper, focusing on the quality of the thesis, the tone of the argument, and the analysis of scholarship that supports the thesis. In particular, this evaluates the author’s incorporation of scholarship on Home, including any theories and/or scholarly debates. Care must be taken to ensure the paper has an argument/claim, and is not only a recitation of facts. | The paper breaks new academic ground with either its analysis or conclusions. The argument is innovative, relevant, and compelling, and the home-related object analyzed is original and insightful. The connections to home are clear, with the author showing a keen awareness of the various debates surrounding Home. The paper is written in an engaging and adequately academic tone. The scholarship supports an exciting claim and is not a descriptive recitation of facts. | The paper makes an effective and interesting claim and supports the claim with evidence from a range of ideas discussed in class. The argument is interesting and clear, and the home-related object analyzed is interesting. The connections to home are clear, with the author showing how this representation links to one or more definitions of Home. The paper is written in an academic tone. The paper successfully avoids a descriptive recitation of facts. | The paper focuses on an argument and supports the argument with at least one idea recognizable from class. The argument is acceptable and mostly clear, and the home-related object analyzed is relevant. The author shows a link between the representation and ideas of Home, but the overall effect is not very convincing. The paper is mostly written in an academic tone, only occasionally becoming informal. The paper may suffer from too much description at the expense of the central argument. | The paper is mostly descriptive and lacks a clear argument. The paper tries to connect the topic to ideas from class but misinterprets the original source or fails to convince the reader of the connection. The thesis is either irrelevant or unclear. The paper is written in an inappropriate tone - either too informal or inconsistent.  |
| **PEER REVIEW (5 pts)** | Clear understanding of the author’s aims and restating of the thesis. Clear recognition and articulation of the evidence used. Insightful understanding of the theories that are—and can be—used. Overall, supportive and useful feedback. | Some understanding of the author’s aims and passing attempt to restate the thesis. Some recognition and articulation of the evidence used. Some understanding of the theories that are—and can be—used. Adequate, actionable feedback. | Reviews sometimes miss the point the author is trying to make. Reviews focus too much on typos and grammatical errors and miss the chance to more substantively impact the paper. Reviews miss the opportunity to suggest additional theories and/or to explain how they apply. Feedback is curt, not objective, or sometimes mean.  | Reviews are short and largely useless for the author.  |