

Rubric to be used for Grading Graduate Comprehensive Exam Papers

Gradations

Criteria	Level 1 (Novice)	Level 2 (Partial Proficient)	Level 3 (Proficient)	level 4 (Advanced)
<p>Organization of Ideas</p> <p>20%</p>	<p>Weak introduction of topic, thesis & subtopics</p> <p>Articulation of ideas is confusing or impoverished.</p> <p>Paragraphing is bad or non-existent.</p> <p>Radical reorganization would be needed to reach a Pass-Partial Proficient level.</p>	<p>Adequate introduction to topic but thesis/position not clear or just implied.</p> <p>Weak transitions from one idea to the next.</p> <p>Line of argument has some gaps or is difficult to follow.</p> <p>Substantial reorganization of ideas would be needed to reach the Proficient level.</p>	<p>Proficient introduction that states thesis or position, all subtopics in a logical order. Good transitions from one idea to the next.</p> <p>Argument is developed fully and can be followed by reader/listener.</p> <p>Minor reorganization would be needed to make the work advanced or exceptional.</p>	<p>Exceptional introduction grabs interest of reader/listener. Thesis/position and subtopics are crisply stated, ordered and argued in a way that that supports an exceptional elegant and mature response/argument for MA level.</p> <p>The work is of professional quality in terms of how ideas are organized.</p>
<p>Content</p> <p>30%</p>	<p>Little or no understanding of the question or the appropriate literature base is evident. Information is missing or is not accurate.</p> <p>Presentation of ideas is limited to the level of descriptive summary or is vague or too general.</p> <p>Writer/speaker fails to make appropriate connections or justify claims.</p>	<p>Response demonstrates some basic understanding of the question posed, but incomplete. Attempts to go beyond level of descriptive summary but claims are not consistently justified with evidence from the appropriate literature base. Little/no use of counterarguments when needed. Limited sources but they are appropriate.</p>	<p>Response shows solid understanding of question. Consistent connections when appropriate. Demonstrates awareness of counterarguments. Analysis appropriate for the question posed. Strong understanding of the literature is evident. Uses critical evidence from a variety of appropriate sources.</p>	<p>Exceptionally critical response with relevant and consistent connections. Demonstrates nuanced understanding of the question, possible counterarguments and the appropriate literature base. Uses critical evidence from many sources in an original way to support the argument. Command of literature is professional or near professional quality.</p>
<p>Mechanics and Documentation</p> <p>20%</p>	<p>Inconsistent or bad grammar, and spelling (>3 errors).</p> <p>Many instances of questionable word choice/usage.</p> <p>APA style is not attempted for references and headers. Sources are missing or not complete.</p>	<p>3 or fewer errors in spelling, grammar and usage.</p> <p>Some questionable word choice.</p> <p>APA style is attempted but there are many errors. All sources are referenced with minor errors in format.</p>	<p>Very good grammar and spelling with one error or less. Appropriate word choice and usage.</p> <p>APA style is used consistently with only minor errors. All sources are properly referenced.</p>	<p>Use of language is at a professional or near professional level.</p> <p>APA style is used consistently and accurately. All sources are properly referenced.</p>
<p>Perspective Personal view/ Position</p> <p>30%</p>	<p>Thesis is weak, trivial or lacks an arguable position</p> <p>Or there is no thesis or position implied or apparent to the reader/listener.</p> <p>Response is not convincing or leads nowhere.</p>	<p>Non-trivial thesis or position is implied or alluded to but not clearly stated. Implied thesis/position could lead to a good argument but it is not well thought out.</p> <p>Ownership is there but it is tenuous at best.</p>	<p>Convincing articulation of justifiable position/thesis. Demonstrates ownership of position/argument and awareness of how his/her position fits with literature.</p> <p>Able to defend the position when challenged.</p>	<p>Thesis/position would be of interest to other professionals. Demonstrates ownership and can extend the argument if pressed to do so.</p> <p>Originality of view articulated goes beyond expectations for the MA level.</p>