RA Rubric for Workshop Your Name:

Your Partner’s Name:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Description** | **Points Available** | **Your Estimate** |
| Title | Your partner has a title that is both creative/engaging and descriptive of what you cover in your RA.  *Comments:* | 1 |  |
| Introduction | Your partner gets your reader’s attention with a compelling anecdote or set of facts/statistics.  *Comments:* | 2 |  |
|  | Your partner defines your topic and key terms and concepts that are relevant.  *What is your partner’s topic, in 1-2 sentences?*  *List some of the key terms that the paper covers, and underline the ones that could use a bit more definition:* | 3 |  |
| History | You partner traces the history of your topic. What is the background? How did this issue/topic emerge?  *Is there enough history of the topic? How could your partner EXPAND this background section? Share at least one idea here:* | 4 |  |
| Body of Research | |  |  |
|  | Taking a systems-thinking approach, your partner breaks down the topic, drawing from at least 3 different disciplines, making sure to explain the content, methodological, and epistemelogical distinctions of each discipline’s contribution to the topic.  *Which three (or more) disciplines does your partner engage in this paper? List them.*  *Does your partner go through the information/knowledge that each discipline brings to the conversation, as well as differences in how each discipline approaches the question/problem and how the different worldviews of the discipline contribute to the issue and/or conflict? How could your partner improve their conversation around disciplinarity in the paper?* | 6 |  |
| You quote from your sources liberally (one quote per paragraph on average), using MLA or APA style (for database articles or books) or hotlinks (for websites) to cite sources.  *Is there roughly one quote for every “body” paragraph in the paper? Does the article quote from diverse sources? Is there enough evidence from sources to back up the paper? Explain.* | 4 |  |
| Your partner summarizes the main ideas of key sources clearly and in their own words.  *Are the sources nicely introduced? Does your partner clearly explain how the source material relates to the paper’s message? Discuss.* | 3 |  |
| Synthesis | Your partner ties together the varied research perspectives, integrating knowledge by using contextualization.  *Is there a section in the paper that ties things together? How could that section be stronger?* | 4 |  |
| First-Person Experience | Your partner adds an interview or personal story to incorporate a human element into their research.  *Does the paper have a human element? Is it engaging and helpful to the argument? How could that section or sections be improved?* | 2 |  |
| Grammar/  Mechanics | Your partner has no grammatical or mechanical errors in their paper (especially apostrophe errors, run-ons, and fragments).  *Use Hypothes.is to add grammar corrections or questions. Mark any sentences that seem awkward.* | 4 |  |
| Flow | Your partner’s paper reflects strong internal planning and organization, and has section titles and/or good transitions to help readers find their way through the reading.  *Use Hypothes.is to point out any paragraphs that lack a topic sentence or which seem to tackle more than one main idea.* | 2 |  |
| Conclusion | Your partner’s paper summarizes its key contribution, asks new questions, and invites their readers to get involved in discussion.  *Comments:* | 3 |  |
| Images | You partner add openly-licensed images to their paper to engage the reader visually in their message.  *Are there images?*  *Are the captions correct?* | 2 |  |
| Hotlinks | Your partner uses hotlinks to provide additional information and sources to their readers.  *Are their hotlinks in the paper? Are they text-based, rather than URL-based?* | 2 |  |
| Works Cited | You have a properly cited Works Cited page at the bottom of your post.  *Yes? No?* | 2 |  |
| TOTAL |  | 44 |  |