**HISTORY SENIOR PROJECT RUBRIC**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality**  **Criteria** | **No/Limited**  **Proficiency (1)** | **Some Proficiency (2)** | **Proficiency (3)** | **High Proficiency (4)** | **Rating** |
| **CONTENT** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Thesis/Focus:  (a) Originality | Thesis Question and/or Thesis is missing. | Thesis may be obvious or unimaginative. Somewhat general and not indicative of intense reading. | Thesis is reflective of general reading knowledge, but somewhat pedestrian. | Thesis develops fresh insight that challenges the reader’s thinking. |  |
| 2. Thesis/Focus:  (b) Clarity | Reader cannot determine thesis question and/or purpose. | Thesis and purpose are  somewhat vague. | Thesis and purpose are  fairly clear, but could be misconstrued. | Thesis and purpose are  clear to the reader. |  |
| 3. Use of secondary  sources/familiarity with scholarly literature (applies primarily to conclusion and annotated bibliography) | Neglects important secondary sources. Overuse of  quotations or paraphrasing  to substitute writer’s own ideas. (Possibly uses source material without acknowledgement.) | References relevant secondary sources but  lacks in variety of sources. Does not fully grasp interpretative differences among scholars or where own thesis fits with existing literature. | Uses secondary sources to support, extend, and inform conclusion, but does not effectively compare or contrast thesis with scholarly interpretations that lead the field. | Uses secondary sources to support, extend, and inform own thesis, but not substitute writer’s own development of idea. Also makes strong argument in support of conclusion either for or against other interpretations that currently dominate the field. |  |
| 4. Introduce topic, primary documents, and details (applies primarily to introduction) | Neglects to provide all of the Who, What, When, Where, and How details of topic. Also gives insufficient background regarding primary sources. | Provides some of the Who, What, When, Where, and How details, but not all. Generally fails to see connection between background questions and primary source materials. | Provides all of the background material relating to topic and primary source documents. | Provides all of the background material relating to topic and primary sources documents and understands the relationship of primary documents to their prospective audiences. |  |
| **WRITING** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Organization | Unclear organization OR organizational plan is inappropriate to thesis. No transitions. | Some signs of logical  organization. May have  abrupt or illogical shifts and ineffective flow of ideas. | Organization supports  thesis and purpose.  Transitions are mostly  appropriate. Sequence of ideas could be improved. | Fully and imaginatively  supports thesis and purpose. Sequence of ideas is effective. Transitions are effective. Writing flows and assists reader in following logic of ideas expressed. |  |
| 6. Support/  Reasoning  (a) Ideas  (b) Details | Offers simplistic,  undeveloped, or cryptic  support for the ideas.  Inappropriate or off-topic generalizations, faulty assumptions, errors of fact. | Offers somewhat obvious support that may be too broad. Details are too general, not interpreted, irrelevant to thesis, or inappropriately  repetitive. | Offers solid but less  original reasoning.  Assumptions are not  always recognized or  made explicit. Contains some appropriate details or examples. | Substantial, logical, and concrete development of  ideas. Assumptions are  made explicit. Details are germane, original, and convincingly interpreted. |  |
| 7. Clarity and Coherence | Sentence structure, word choice, lack  of transitions and/or sequencing of ideas make reading and understanding difficult. | Sentence structure and/or word choice sometimes interfere with clarity.  Needs to improve sequencing of ideas within paragraphs and transitions between paragraphs to make the  writing easy to follow. | Sentences are structured and varied words are chosen to communicate ideas clearly. Sequencing of ideas within paragraphs and transitions between  paragraphs make the writer’s points easy to follow. | In addition to meeting the requirements of previous block, writing flows smoothly from one idea to another. The writer has taken pains to assist the reader in following the logic of the ideas expressed. |  |
| **STYLE, GRAMMAR, AND PROFESSIONAL ETIQUETTE** | **No/Limited**  **Proficiency (1)** | **Some Proficiency (2)** | **Proficiency (3)** | **High Proficiency (4)** |  |
| 8. Knowledge of Conventions in grammar and *Chicago Manual of Style* | Writing contains numerous errors in  spelling, grammar, punctuation, and/or sentence structure which interfere with comprehension. Style and/or format are  inappropriate for the assignment. Fails to  demonstrate thoroughness and competence in documentation according to the *Chicago Manual of Style*. | Frequent errors in spelling, grammar (such as subject/verb agreements and tense), sentence structure and/or other writing conventions distract the reader. Writing does not consistently follow  appropriate style (CMS) and/or format. Source documentation is incomplete. It may be unclear which references are direct quotes and which are paraphrased. | While there may be minor errors, the paper follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout and has been carefully proofread. Appropriate  conventions for style and format are used consistently throughout the writing sample. Demonstrates thoroughness and  competence in documenting sources; the reader would have little difficulty referring back to cited sources. | In addition to meeting the requirements mentioned previously, the writing is essentially error free  in terms of mechanics. Models the style and format appropriate to the assignment. |  |
| 9. Making Deadlines, Making Revisions. | Makes no effort to submit work on time. | Sporadic in submitting work by deadline. Continued submission of unrevised drafts. | Usually turns work in on time. Edited work generally is addressed. Some errors left uncorrected. | Always makes deadlines. Edited work always is addressed. All errors are corrected. |  |
| **ANNOTATED**  **PRIMARY DOCUMENTS** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Attention to documentation style (Chicago) and descriptive annotations. | Footnotes/endnotes are deficient in documentation style. Format is incorrect. Annotations are filled with spelling, typographical, punctuation, and structural errors. | Some sporadic errors in style. Failure to punctuate correctly on a consistent basis. Generally under-annotated. Annotations may be too brief and lacking in detail. | Footnotes/endnotes consistently adhere to correct style. Format is correct. Tends to be underannotated. Some of the annotations may be brief and erfunctory. | Annotated transcript is clean. No errors. Concepts as well as proper names are annotated. Annotations are informative and comprehensive. |  |

\*The above rubric is an adaptation of several models. A listing of the sources would include: Northeastern Illinois University, Winthrop University, Virginia Community College System, University of Washington, California State University at Fresno, and Tennessee State University (Dr. Beth Dachowski).