SocW 500 HUB - Grading Rubric Example

**Grading Criteria:** Since the issues we tackle in this course involve multiple perspectives, grading is based on your capacity to frame a coherent topic, present it in sufficient detail, and build a well-supported argument for your ideas, using appropriate citations and evidence. Key grading criteria include: a) thoroughness and completeness of content, b) clarity and logic of presentation c) evidence of critical thought and self-reflection, and d) writing and editing quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>3.9</th>
<th>3.8</th>
<th>3.7</th>
<th>3.6</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>3.4</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>2.9</th>
<th>2.8</th>
<th>2.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100-99</td>
<td>98-97</td>
<td>96-95</td>
<td>94-93</td>
<td>92-91</td>
<td>90-89</td>
<td>88-87</td>
<td>86-85</td>
<td>84-83</td>
<td>82-81</td>
<td>80-79</td>
<td>78-77</td>
<td>76-75</td>
<td>74-73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.0** Excellent and exceptional work: unusually thorough, well-reasoned, sophisticated, and well written. Work shows an incisive understanding of the topic, and demonstrates a high level of critical analysis, creativity and/or complexity in completion of the assignment.

**3.7** Strong work. Work at this level shows creativity, is thorough and well-reasoned, and is presented professionally. Demonstrates mastery of subject content beyond expected competency, and sound analytic/methodological skills, but room for further development in areas such as critical analysis, creativity, or complexity.

**3.5** Competent and sound work for a graduate student; well-reasoned and thorough, sound content but not especially creative or sophisticated. Mastery of subject content at level of expected competency; meets course expectations: This is the grade that indicates neither unusual strength nor exceptional weakness.

**3.3** Adequate work, though some weaknesses are evident. Moderately thorough and well-reasoned, but some indication that understanding of the important issues is less than complete. Less than adequate competency, but demonstrates student learning and potential for mastery of subject content.

**3.0** Borderline work, barely meeting the minimal expectations. Understanding of key issues is incomplete, methodological or analytical work performed is minimally adequate. Technical competence uneven or poor. Significant areas need improvement to meet course expectations.

**2.7** Non-satisfactory work that does not meet minimal expectations. Work is inadequately developed or flawed by numerous errors and misunderstanding of important issues. Methodological or
analytical work is weak and fails to demonstrate knowledge of course content or technical competence expected at the graduate level.