



FIVE

The Claremont Colleges Journal of Undergraduate Academic Writing

FIVE Rubric

The six criteria below will be used in evaluating writing submitted to be considered for publication in FIVE. Detailed ratings within these criteria are provided in the table that follows.

Context and Purpose:

Refers to the circumstances which inspired the writing, for example, the assignment. The purpose for writing is the writer's intended effect on an audience. Writers might want to persuade or inform; they might want to report or summarize information; they might want to work through complexity or confusion; they might want to argue with other writers, or connect with other writers; they might want to convey urgency or amuse.

Content Development

Refers to the ways in which the text explores and represents its topic in relation to its audience and purpose.

Communication of Ideas and Evidence/Outside Sources*

Refers to the ways writers communicate their own ideas in meaningful ways, comprehensible to the intended audience, and integrate outside sources effectively into the flow of the writers' own ideas.

Choice of Evidence*

Refers to the ways writers draw on evidence, which will often include outside sources, for a variety of purposes -- to extend, argue with, develop, define, or shape their ideas, for example. Outside sources extend, in purposeful ways, writers' ideas in a text.

Attribution of Sources*

Refers to the identification of outside sources appropriately, both in the text and in notes and bibliography.

Syntax and Mechanics

Refers to the correct and effective use of grammar and structure so that they do not interfere with the readers' ability to comprehend the text.

*Although most academic writing incorporates evidence, which frequently includes outside sources, use of these is not required for publication in FIVE.

Rubric for effectiveness of communication

	1	2	3	4
Context and Purpose	Audience for which the paper is written is unclear and may change as the paper develops. Reader cannot understand or determine the point of the paper.	Audience and purpose for the paper is generally clear, but development in places leads to reader confusion. Reader must work to understand.	Writing is understandable by a broad audience; one or two references may confuse the audience because background is not provided. Very little content is included that does not further the purpose.	Writing is understandable by a broad audience; if background is needed, it is provided by the author. Thesis is clear and purpose is significant. Author's approach to and development of the content are appropriate for the paper's purpose. The reader is not confused as to the point of the paper.
Content Development	Thesis is unclear or nonexistent. Some content seems appropriate and relevant to the general ideas in the paper. Arguments and ideas presented are simplistic. Paragraphs do not flow well from one to the next.	Paper has a thesis but the reader has to work to understand it. Thesis seems to change or some paragraphs do not appear to support it. Some paragraphs do not appear to flow logically from the previous one. Paper may show weakness in critical thinking or lack development of key ideas.	Uses appropriate and relevant content, conveying the writer's understanding and shaping the work. While most paragraphs support the thesis, paper lacks tight structure. Despite some disjointedness/lack of focus, the reader can follow the argument.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work. Develops the thesis with clarity of thought, coherence, logic, complexity, and evidence. Offers counterarguments and examples to strengthen the argument. Paper flows effectively and all parts support the thesis/purpose of the paper.
Communication of Ideas and Evidence/Outside Sources	The entire paper is a compilation of the ideas of others, or there is no distinction between author's ideas and the ideas of others. Context of direct quotations and other evidence is not provided. Evidence is not used effectively to support an argument. Purpose for using evidence is unclear.	Frequently difficult to distinguish between the author's ideas and those of others. Direct quotations and paraphrasing of long blocks of text are overused. Integration of outside sources is weak and inhibits the flow of the paper.	Ideas are generally communicated effectively, and the distinction between the author's ideas and those of others is usually clear. Uses evidence to support the purpose of the paper. Outside sources are effectively integrated into the author's argument.	Structure is smooth and ideas are communicated clearly. Author's own contribution to the ideas/ concepts/arguments presented are obvious; author's ideas are effectively integrated with ideas from outside sources (articles, books, examples, illustrations, etc.). Outside sources have been critically analyzed and evaluated, and evidence, examples, ideas, and other information from outside sources are used effectively within the context of the paper. Direct quotations are used sparingly and to make a point. Paraphrasing and summarizing of ideas from outside sources are used effectively.
Choice of Evidence	Evidence is needed to support the paper's claims, but there is none. Evidence is inappropriate for the context. Writer displays confusion about how and when to use sources.	Evidence shows little awareness of the universe of information available to illustrate or support the paper's content. Sources appear to be chosen out of convenience to meet a requirement.	Evidence is appropriate but lacks variety or depth. Evidence used may not be the best to support the argument. May use too many or too few sources. May rely too heavily on a single source.	Use of evidence is appropriate to the context and purpose of the writing and demonstrates sophisticated thought and critical selection from the variety of sources available.

Rubric for technical aspects of the paper

Attribution of Sources	Use of evidence and citation identifying outside sources is so poor that it is impossible to evaluate the argument or sources. Fundamental errors in notes and bibliography. Fails to name or cite non-textual sources.	Missteps in attribution interfere with the argument or point to fundamental misunderstanding of sources. Frequently cites sources incorrectly or fails to cite. Makes some attempt to attribute non-textual sources.	Cites sources throughout the paper with few errors or inconsistencies. Misses opportunities to give attribution to the ideas of others. Generally cites and labels non-textual sources.	Outside sources are given appropriate attribution, both in the text as well as in notes and bibliography. Documents sources—both text-based and non-textual—correctly and consistently. Names and labels figures and graphs clearly and completely.
Syntax and Mechanics	Significant irregularities in grammar, syntax, and/or punctuation throughout the paper. Errors make the content difficult to understand.	Several significant irregularities in grammar, syntax, and/or punctuation throughout the paper which distract from the paper's line of reasoning. Paper lacks variety in sentence structure and exhibits clumsy phrases.	Uses language that conveys meaning to readers and has few errors. May include some awkward phrases. Good transitions between paragraphs and sections.	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency. Very few, if any, irregularities in grammar, syntax, and/or punctuation. Sentence structure is smooth and ideas are communicated clearly.