**PILOT DIVISION III RUBRIC**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Product Criteria** | **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** |
| **Focal Question, Hypothesis, or Position** | Not clearly stated | Stated but unfocused, too broad, or too simplistic | Clearly stated, at an appropriate level of complexity | Significant and/or creative focus |
| **Rationale/ Motivation** | No clear rationale or a weak rationale for the project | Some rationale presented, begins to motivate the work | Rationale makes clear why topic is worth investigating | Persuasive and creative rationale |
| **Approach/ Methodology** | Not clear what approach is used or why, or an inappropriate method | Approach is generally appropriate for the topic | Clearly described and justified, well-chosen and properly executed | Creative and sophisticated methods |
| **Scholarly Context** | Author over-relies on too few sources, or refers to published work without citations | Author demonstrates some awareness of a range of relevant literature | Author demonstrates broad awareness of the literature including works presenting other perspectives | Author situates own work in a way that makes a contribution or identifies a new direction for investigation |
| **Position** | Does not state a clear or defensible position | States and/or critiques a position that is in the literature | Effectively supports, tests, extends, or critiques a position that is in the literature | Develops a clear and defensible position of his/her own |
| **Argument** | Weak, invalid, or no argument, perhaps a simple assertion | Some arguments valid and well supported, some not | Main arguments valid, systematic, and well supported | Arguments both well supported and genuinely compared to conflicting explanations |
| **Use of Evidence** | Mostly relies on assertions or opinions rather than evidence, or evidence not clearly presented | Some appropriate use of evidence but uneven | Feasible evidence appropriately selected and not over-interpreted | Fully exploits the richness of the data/evidence/ideas, and is sufficiently persuasive |
| **Analytical Insight** | Treats related ideas or data as unrelated, or draws weak or unfounded connections | Begins to establish connections and perceive implications of the material | Brings together related data or ideas in productive ways, discusses implications of material | Develops insightful connections and patterns that require intellectual creativity |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Writing Mechanics** | **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** |
| **Grammar, spelling, usage** | Significantly impairs readability | Frequent or serious errors | Some minor errors | Virtually no errors |
| **Organization** | Needs significant reorganization | Structure is of inconsistent quality, may have choppy transitions, redundancies, or discontinuities | Structure supports the argument, clearly ordered sections fit together well | Structure enhances the argument; strong sections, seamless flow |
| **Clarity, style, readability** | Style or lack of clarity gets in the way of reading for content | Style or clarity is inconsistent or uneven | Effective prose style, follows relevant scholarly conventions, emergence of voice | Mastery of the genre, including elegant style, established voice |
| **Meets guidelines for submission** | No | Partially | Fully |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Process Criteria** | **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** |
| **Solving problems** | Only a single approach is considered and used  | Considers and rejects less acceptable approaches  | Having selected from among alternatives, develops a logical, consistent plan  | Develops a logical, consistent plan, and articulates consequences of the solution  |
| **Risk taking** | Does not consider new directions or approaches | Considers new directions or approaches but does not incorporate them  | Incorporates new directions or approaches to the work | Actively seeks out and follows through on untested or potentially risky directions or approaches  |
| **Reflection and self-assessment** | Describes own performance with general descriptions of success and failure | Articulates specific strengths and challenges and sets goals | Evaluates changes in own learning over time; sets clear goals that are related to specific contexts | Envisions a future self, making plans that build on past experiences (perhaps that occurred across contexts) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Embraces contradictions** | Ignores complexity or contradictory perspectives, evidence, methods, or styles | Mentions complexity or contradictory perspectives, evidence, methods, or styles in a cursory way | Incorporates contradictory perspectives, evidence, methods, or styles in an exploratory way | Integrates contradictory perspectives, evidence, methods, or styles fully |
| **Time management** | Does not follow timeline or meet goals regularly and/or is not in good contact with the committee. Work at end is too rushed for revision and reflection. | Inconsistent in goal setting and/or meeting goals; generally stays in touch; some time for revision | Creates appropriate goals, and meets them much of the time; meets regularly with committee; leaves time for revisions | Creates ambitious, but doable goals, works to meet them; meets regularly with committee; leaves sufficient time for multiple revisions and reflection |