

Sample Rubrics

Perspectival Paper

This seminar provides students with an opportunity to understand and analyze the implications of a Reformed worldview with the basic assumptions and concepts of the discipline of sociology. In particular, this paper or project requires that students bring together these two large areas of inquiry. This requirement is intentionally open-ended to allow students a wide berth in pursuing an area of concern that is of interest to them personally. The intent of the paper is perspectival, that is, students are to develop and articulate an informed perspective about some question or issue related to sociology. Students are expected to work on this paper throughout the semester.

To ensure that topics meet course expectations, and to increase the likelihood of staying on task, several due dates must be honored. Students will earn points for submitting a statement of the problem (5 points) on February 28, a preliminary literature review (5 points) on March 14, and a paper draft (10 points) on April 25. Students will also be assigned a paper to peer review both in writing and in the presentations (10 points). Any assignment submitted after the scheduled due date will forfeit all points for that assignment.

The finished draft is worth 90 points. Evaluation will focus on the major sections of the paper: title page (2 points), abstract (3 points), statement of the problem (10 points), literature review (15 points), integration of sociology and a Reformed worldview (50 points), and conclusion (5 points). An additional 10 points will be used to assess overall writing (e.g., grammar, syntax, formatting, etc.) The final paper should be approximately 20 pages in length, double-spaced, 12-point font, and standard MS Word margins. It is due Monday, May 16 at 5:00 pm. Late papers will be accepted at a deduction of 15 points per day.

A few (and in some cases, rather lengthy) comments about each section of the paper. Please note that students must use ASA for formatting and citing in your paper.

- Title Page: Choose an interesting title, one that grabs the reader's attention. Check ASA Style Guide for formatting and other inclusions (p. 18).
- Abstract: See page 19 in the ASA Style Guide.
- Literature Review: In writing this paper, student's should cite at least 15 peer-reviewed sources. Some of these sources will be from the sociological literature while others will be from theological and/or philosophical databases (perhaps other disciplines as well, depending on topic). NOTE: It is not necessary to have a separate section of this paper entitled "Literature Review." It is more likely that students will draw on sociological sources when they identify the question, its significance to sociologists, and the way in which sociologists have historically understood the question being considered. When students bring the lens of Christian faith to bear on the question, it is likely that students will draw on other disciplines. Mastery of the research tools used by sociologists is demonstrated. Please consult that ASA Style Guide for details on citing correctly.
- Integration of sociology and Christian faith: When students consider the question or problem through the lens of Christian faith, students are bringing some framework or model to bear on the sociological problem. The framework or model used must be a major part of this paper and clearly articulated. It must be informed by pertinent disciplinary literature. It must be appropriate to your question. And it must be applied to the question. The analysis of the issue presented in the paper should reflect an understanding of differing perspectives on the issue and should highlight possible tensions and congruence between them.
- Conclusion: In the end, students must clearly articulate their perspective on the question. The conclusion should follow logically from the integrative model.
- Overall Writing: Students will be provided with a copy of the ASA Style Guide. Please use it. Students who know that they difficulty writing papers are strongly advised to use the Rhetoric Center services.

The evaluation matrix that will be used when grading final papers is attached.

Evaluative Criteria for Perspectival Paper

The following criteria guide our evaluation of your paper:

	1	2	3	4
Title Page (2 points)	Title is interesting and draws the reader in; Title page has ASA inclusions	Title is adequate	Title is inadequate Required ASA inclusions are missing or incomplete	Title page is missing
Abstract (3 points)	Abstract page formatted correctly	Abstract is included but attention to necessary details is	Abstract is included but attention to detail is lacking	Abstract is missing

	<p>Abstract is brief (150-200 words)</p> <p>Abstract is an excellent descriptive summary of key findings</p> <p>Abstract is limited to one paragraph</p>	<p>uneven (i.e., formatting incorrect, word count is too long/short, summary is adequate, or presented in multiple formats)</p>		
Literature review (15 points)	<p>More than 15 peer-reviewed sources are cited - uses a wide range of empirically-based sociological, theological, and other disciplinary literature as appropriate to discuss the concern such that the reader is convinced that reading the paper is a worthy undertaking;</p> <p>Sources are integrated smoothly and accurately. Mastery of research tools used by sociologists is demonstrated</p>	<p>Fifteen peer-reviewed sources are cited - uses empirically-based sociological, theological, and other disciplinary literature to discuss the concern;</p> <p>Sources are integrated albeit in a clumsy or awkward manner.</p>	<p>Less than 15 peer-reviewed sources are cited - partial attempt to use empirically-based sociological and theological literature;</p> <p>Attention to citing sources and integrating them is uneven</p>	<p>No use is made of empirically-based sociological literature to discuss concern.</p>
<p>Description of the sociological concern/issue/tension</p> <p>(10 points)</p>	<p>Clearly identifies the concern, including particular nuances of the concern;</p> <p>addresses why this is a concern for sociologists;</p>	<p>Sociological issue is identified;</p> <p>importance of issue for sociologists is implicit rather than explicit or developed only partially in explicit terms;</p>	<p>Presentation of the sociological concern is fuzzy;</p> <p>reasons for caring about the concern are unclear;</p>	<p>Sociological concern is not identified;</p>
Contextualization/integration of Christian faith with the identified sociological issue (50 points)	<p>Clearly identifies and develops a Christian “framework” congruent with a Reformed tradition to use in developing a perspective;</p> <p>the framework chosen is appropriate to the sociological concern;</p> <p>The application to and integration of a Christian framework to the sociological concern is thorough and creative;</p> <p>application and integration is defensible in regard to other points of view;</p>	<p>Christian “framework” is described;</p> <p>connection of the framework to the identified concern is partially applicable;</p> <p>Christian framework is integrated with concern in a conscientious but somewhat methodical and/or expected manner;</p> <p>other viewpoints are considered superficially;</p>	<p>Christian framework comes largely from writer’s experience, with little or no attempt to inform this perspective with appropriate sources;</p> <p>the framework is not applicable to the issue at hand.</p> <p>Christian framework is not integrated consistently with concern;</p> <p>other viewpoints are not considered;</p>	<p>Christian framework is not articulated.</p> <p>No integration occurs; no perspective is defended.</p>
Conclusion (5 points)	<p>The writer’s perspective on the sociological concern is clearly articulated in conclusion.</p>	<p>The writer’s perspective is not clearly articulated in the conclusion.</p>	<p>The writer’s perspective is missing.</p>	
Writing mechanics (10 points)	<p>Paper is free of errors with respect to grammar, punctuation, and spelling;</p> <p>sentences are clear and complete;</p> <p>paragraphs are complete with clear transitions;</p>	<p>While writing convention errors exist, they do not cause serious problems in reading and understanding what the writer is saying;</p> <p>overall organization is effective but somewhat mechanical;</p> <p>Attention to ASA is evident, although inconsistencies exist.</p>	<p>Understanding the main ideas of the paper is hard work for the reader because of multiple writing convention errors;</p> <p>organization is confusing to reader;</p> <p>Minimal attempts are made to use ASA.</p>	<p>The main ideas of the paper are undecipherable due to writing convention errors;</p> <p>organizational structure of paper is missing;</p> <p>ASA is not used;</p>

	<p>overall organization is clear and hangs together;</p> <p>ASA is used for citing within the body of the paper and in sources cited;</p> <p>The paper is free of plagiarism.</p>			Sections of the paper appear plagiarized.
--	---	--	--	---

Ethnographic Informant/interview Writing Assignment – soc. 153

Your assignment will be evaluated using the following rubric:

1 = poor, 2 = satisfactory, 3 = very good, 4 = superior

- _____ Final copy has no more than 3 mechanical errors (punctuation - correct use of quotation marks, usage or grammatical).
- _____ Introduction is engaging, draws reader into the essay.
- _____ Paper includes description of informant, his/her qualifications, what you wanted to find out and why.
- _____ Thesis statement is evident in the introduction.
- _____ Supports conclusions with evidence, quotations and other details from interview (at least 2 direct quotes).
- _____ Organization is logical and moves clearly from introduction, to body, to conclusion.
- _____ Introduction, body and conclusion are developed with adequate explanation (this may be done with numbered topics).

General Essay Writing Grading Rubric

Your assignment will be evaluated using the following rubric:

1 = poor, 2 = satisfactory, 3 = very good, 4 = superior

1. Content. Is the content pertinent, interesting, accurate, etc.?
2. Focus. How effectively does the writing clarify the point and keep readers' attention focused on the point?
3. Purpose. How effectively does the writing address and achieve a clear purpose?
4. Audience. How effectively does the writing understand and address its audience?
5. Ethos. How effectively does the writing convey an appropriate authorial stance?
6. Structure. How effectively does the writing employ strategies for arranging and connecting its parts?
7. Detail. How effectively does the writing use appropriate specific and concrete information to support and clarify?
8. Style. How effectively does the writing employ style that is both appropriate and inventive?
9. Correctness. How effectively does the writing comply with standards of correctness (grammar, mechanics, and usage) that are appropriate to the particular situation?

Oral Presentation Grading Rubric

Your assignment will be evaluated using the following rubric:

1 = poor, 2 = satisfactory, 3 = very good, 4 = superior

Topic

- c. Was the topic appropriate for the occasion and audience?
- d. Was the topic well researched?

Organization

- e. Did the introduction gain the audience's interest?
- f. Were the main ideas of the speech easy to follow?
- g. Were transitions and connectives used effectively?
- h. Did the conclusion provide closure and a memorable ending?

Language

- i. Was the language clear and concrete?
- j. Was the language vivid and colorful?
- k. Was the language appropriate to the topic, audience, and occasion?

Delivery

- l. Did the delivery enhance the message?
- m. Did nonverbal communication add to or detract from the speech?
- n. Was strong eye contact maintained throughout most of the speech?
- o. Were pauses, rate, pitch, and vocal variety used effectively?

Ethics

- p. Did the speaker avoid over relying on emotional appeals?
- q. Were there any fallacies?
- r. Did the speaker respect the audience?

Qualitative cross-cultural participation observations research project

- 1. Formulate a Research Question (10) _____
- 2. Statement of the Problem (10) _____
- 3. Literature Review (5@2=10) _____
- 4. Hypothesis (10) _____
- 5. Theory (10) _____
- 6. Operationalization (10) _____
- 7. Data Analysis (10) _____
- 8. Draw Conclusion (10) _____
- 9. Two limitations (5) _____
- 10. Two future research suggestions (5) _____
- 11. Overall Quality (10) _____

TOTAL SCORE _____