

**Grading rubric: Article reviews**

	<b>Excellent (A)</b>	<b>Competent (B–C)</b>	<b>Needs work (D–F)</b>
<b>Basic mechanics (less weight)</b>	• Length 3-4 pp	• Somewhat too long/short	• Much too long/short
	• Reference, and article or URL	• Reference or article/URL	• No reference or article given
	• Technical terminology and formalism are used correctly	• Small number of errors in terminology or formalism	• Terminology, formalism frequently misused
<b>Understanding of article</b>	• Chosen point identified and clearly explained	• Chosen point identified, but explanation not fully clear	• No point identified, or explanation very unclear
	• Factually correct as report of chosen aspect of article	• Minor errors in report of authors' meaning	• Major errors in report of authors' meaning
	• Explains chosen point; goes beyond merely paraphrasing or quoting	• Chosen point paraphrased in student's own words, but very close to original	• Relies on quotations or superficial paraphrase; little evidence of understanding
	• Class knowledge used correctly where appropriate	• Minor misunderstandings related to class knowledge	• Major problems from not applying class knowledge
<b>Active and critical thinking; argumentation</b>	• Goes beyond summary; includes critique, connects to other data or ideas, etc.	• Shows understanding of relevant issues, but contributes no substantial original points	• Critical discussion missing, or shows serious misunderstanding of article
	• Tight focus on main point	• Focus is somewhat loose	• No clear focus
	• Report is well organized; paragraphs and overall discussion focused, coherent	• Some organization, but relationships between ideas not always clear	• Structure of discussion has no clear organization
	• Examples, data used appropriately	• Crucial examples, data not always given	• Examples used, but not connected to discussion