

Application paper rubric

1) Identifies and summarizes the problem/question at issue (and/or the source's position).			
<i>Scant</i>	<i>Minimally Developed</i>	<i>Moderately Developed</i>	<i>Substantially Developed</i>
Does not identify and summarize the problem, is confused or identifies a different and inappropriate problem. Does not identify or is confused by the issue, or represents the issue inaccurately.	Identifies the main problem or question but does not recognize subsidiary or implicit aspects of the problem. Demonstrates a basic understanding of the assignment.	Identifies the main problem or question and some but not all of the complexities or nuances associated with the problem. Demonstrates a good understanding of the assignment and related course material.	Identifies the main problem and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the problem, and identifies them clearly, addressing their relationships to each other. Identifies not only the basics of the issue, but recognizes nuances of the issue.
2) Identifies existing, relevant knowledge and views			
<i>Inadequate</i>	<i>Minimally Developed</i>	<i>Moderately Developed</i>	<i>Substantially Developed</i>
Review of relevant knowledge is seriously incomplete. Major issues are ignored. Many factual errors or inconsistencies <u>1</u> You seem to be misunderstanding some of the basic theoretical material. You need to reread the text material or double check your notes with me or someone else in the class.	Uses some appropriate elements about the system/problem, but discussion omits important aspects of the principle/example. <u>2</u> You make some inaccurate statements in your analysis, mainly involving subtle aspects of the theories or research concepts.	Uses appropriate elements about the system/problem, but does not make clear connections between this information and the example to be investigated. Most information is factually correct <u>3</u> Most of your analyses are accurate, with only minor conceptual misunderstandings or a loss of clarity.	Provides a thorough and relevant review of relevant principles. There are clear linkages among the information and to the example under consideration. All information is factually correct. <u>4</u> All your analyses are accurate and clearly stated!
3) Integration of Theoretical Concepts with Personal/Practical Experiences and Reactions:			
<u>1</u> a. You offer personal/practical reactions to issues, but you haven't used theory and research to analyze the event. Be sure to compare empirical findings and predictions with your personal experiences OR b. You offer mostly review of theory and/or empirical findings with little use of personal/practical experience to illustrate these	<u>2</u> a. You tend too much toward discussing personal/practical reactions to issues. What you need to increase is an analysis of these experiences using the theory and research. OR b. You tend too much toward discussing theory and/or empirical findings. Work toward using more in-depth descriptions of	<u>3</u> You've got a good balance between personal/practical reactions and theoretical analysis, overall. Well done. a. Just give a little more stress to the theoretical analysis of your experience. b. Just give a little more stress to providing personal/practical experiences that illustrate the theoretical material.	<u>4</u> Excellent balance between personal /practical reactions and theoretical analysis!

concepts.	personal/practical experiences to illustrate the theory and research. OR c. Your entries include both a discussion of theory and research and a discussion of personal/practical experiences, but you've kept the two separate from each other. Weave the two together.		
4) Analysis/synthesis			
<i>Inadequate</i>	<i>Minimally developed</i>	<i>Moderately developed</i>	<i>Substantially developed</i>
Vague discussion of detail. Lack of insight/analysis <u>1</u> Your entries are missing far too many aspects of the theoretical concepts.	Vague discussion of detail. Little insight/analysis; that which is provided is conventional or underdeveloped. <u>2</u> Your entries cover most of the basics of the concepts, but your analyses tend to stop there, missing an application of the more subtle aspects.	Adequate discussion of detail Adequate depth of insight/analysis <u>3</u> It's evident that you've begun to push your analyses beyond the basic applications and toward their more subtle implications. Care to attempt a) a few more speculations, b) integrations with previously covered material?	Excellent discussion of detail. Impressive depth of insight/analysis <u>4</u> Your analyses go far beyond the basics and evidence very good insights into the material.
5) Identifies and considers the influence of the context on the issue.			
<i>Scant</i>	<i>Minimally Developed</i>	<i>Moderately Developed</i>	<i>Substantially Developed</i>
Does not present the problem as having connections to other contexts-cultural, political, etc.	Recognizes the importance of issues such as political and economic feasibility their question, but does not discuss their impact.	Analyzes the issue considering relevant contexts, but fails to consider some important context.	Analyzes the issue with a clear sense of scope and context, including an assessment of the audience of the analysis. Fully considers pertinent contexts such as political, economic, and social.

6) Identifies and assesses conclusions, implications and consequences			
<i>Scant</i>	<i>Minimally Developed</i>	<i>Moderately Developed</i>	<i>Substantially Developed</i>
<p>Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences of the issue or the key relationships between the other elements of the problem, such as context, implications, assumptions, or data and evidence.</p> <p>Fails to reflect upon own work.</p>	<p>Draws incomplete conclusions or considers only some of the consequences of the conclusions.</p> <p>Fails to reconsider assumptions identified earlier.</p> <p>Fails to reflect upon own work.</p>	<p>Draws appropriate conclusions from evidence/data/example. Identifies and discusses some, but not all, consequences of these conclusions.</p> <p>Fails to consider the limitations of their own work.</p> <p>Identifies some directions for further inquiry.</p>	<p>Identifies and discusses conclusions, implications, and consequences considering context, assumptions, data, and evidence.</p> <p>Objectively reflects upon their own assertions. Acknowledges the value judgments on which their position is based.</p> <p>Identifies appropriate directions for further inquiry.</p>

This rubric is based on the Washington State Critical Thinking Rubric (<http://wsuctproject.wsu.edu/ctr.htm>) and the Paper Assessment Sheet (http://academics.smcvt.edu/jadams/social/Apl_Paper_Eval.htm), with modifications made by Cecilia Shore with the help of Beverley Taylor.