Six Criteria for Writing in This Class

1) **Central Purpose**: Are the reasons for your writing clear, appropriate, and fully responsive to the prompt?

2) **Details**: Do you offer your readers sufficient details and examples that are both relevant and effective in developing and supporting the paper’s central purpose?

3) **Organization**: Can your reader easily follow and understand your paper from beginning to end? Are there writing elements, like transitions and topic sentences, which maintain a coherent, narrative flow?

4) **Fullness**: Do you do enough to carry your case? Is the document substantial enough to leave the desired impression upon the reader?

5) **Fluency**: How fluid, sophisticated, and effective is your writing at the sentence and paragraph level? Are sentences and word choices varied, clear and appropriate?

6) **Presentation**: Is your paper well-edited and spell-checked? Have you reviewed your verb tense/agreement, punctuation, and other grammatical elements? Have you followed all guidelines pertaining to formatting, citation standards, and other rules of appearance as they are described in the course syllabus?
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The Grid

On papers for this class you'll find in addition to comments a set of six numbers, like:

3 1 2 3 4 2

These numbers correspond to each of the criteria described above in "Six Criteria for Writing in This Class" (i.e., the first number is the score for criteria item 1, “Central Purpose,” the second number is a score for “Details,” and so on). In general, all count equally towards the final grade for the assignment.

The point of these numbers is to give you a quick mini-grade on each of the criteria we use to score papers. You can get a score from 1 (not very good at all) up to 6 (as good as it gets) in each category. The number represents our judgment about how well your paper has done on that one category, as measured against both our general sense of how well 100-level students ought to perform, and the performances of other students in the class. As we assign each number, we have in mind the following general sense of what they mean:

1. Not enough sense of this category to be functional in college level work. (e.g., a paper that hasn’t any specific details to explain or clarify the argument.)

2. A sense of what this category is asking for, but not much more. (e.g., a paper that offers specific details, but doesn’t explain or develop them sufficiently to be effective.)

3. Functional success with this category, but not yet showing full control. (e.g., some exploration of a few details, for example, but without fullness, or without consistency.)

4. Functional success with this category, with some lapses and/or inconsistencies. (e.g., full exploration of details, for example, but not with all, or without consistency or clear relevance.)

5. Success with this category but a success not rhetorically integrated throughout the draft. (e.g., a paper with a good sense of how to use details and to develop them far enough to make them useful to the argument, but not well deployed throughout the paper.)

6. Full success with this category. (e.g., a paper with insightful and well-developed details, all relevant and effectively informative.)

The relationship between these numbers and the final score you get will not always be exact (we don't just add them up), but there is a very strong correlation. Six 6's, for example, would undoubtedly earn a 4.0.
Questions I would have in a kind of Check-back process after a year:

1. Tell about the challenges of making an assignment truly course integrated, and have you designed your course such that you spend some time supporting the intellectual/writing steps students will need to be taking.

2. Have you developed a rubric that presents a clear idea of what you want/value in the target assignment? (Here are three from you all—each with its own virtues—and each quite different from the others.)

3. Are students working on their project over the length of the quarter, or do you have a shorter time line? What sorts of scaffolding are you providing? Have you developed low stakes assignments? How are you managing them?

   (Sample Papers very interesting—and illustrative of the complexity built into each of the three assignments!)

4. Have you any room for peer response?

5. How are you giving feedback? (aka managing the paper load)

What questions do you have?