

	<b>Not expected in Genre – N/A</b>	<b>Very Strong – 4</b>	<b>Weaknesses Do Not Interfere – 3</b>	<b>Weaknesses Interfere – 2</b>	<b>Very Poor - 1</b>
<p><b>Strategic Inquiry</b> How well does the student set up a researchable or investigable topic and scope of inquiry and then follow through with those plans?</p>	Does not require a researchable question. (Especially observation or reaction papers.)	Topic and scope of inquiry are clear, intellectually rigorous, and well matched with the genre, discipline, and evidence at hand.	Generally consistent and appropriate topic and scope of inquiry with few tangents. Rarely creates a rhetorical environment in which inquiry and strategy are mismatched.	Inconsistent, clumsy, or poorly scoped inquiry. Identifiable but poorly executed rhetorical strategy.	Intellectually lazy, no clear genre, scope is badly off, evidence is mismatched with claims if present at all, conclusions are unrelated to evidence and analysis.
<p><b>Use of Evidence</b> How effectively does the student deploy evidence to support and/or contextualize claims?</p>	Does not include claims that should be supported with evidence beyond description or opinion. (Especially observation or reaction papers.)	Evidence is integrated, synthesized, and contextualized to support claims. Non-textual elements are clearly labeled and discussed in the prose of the paper. Evidence is used responsibly and ethically.	Generally employs evidence to support rhetorical goals, but may present some evidence without context or without integrating it well in the paper.	Frequently fails to put sources into context or to synthesize and integrate evidence to support claims. May exhibit “patch writing.”	Evidence does not support the claims, or many claims are unsupported at all. Evidence not used instrumentally.
<p><b>Attribution of Evidence</b> How clearly does the student attribute the work of others in human-readable form?</p>	Does not use or refer to sources created by others. (Especially some lab reports and data analysis papers)	Sources are documented consistently and completely in keeping with genre conventions.	Good attribution practices with few inconsistencies, though may miss some opportunities to attribute others’ ideas.	Missteps in attribution interfere with reader’s ability to interpret claims or point to misunderstandings about when and how to cite.	Citation is so poor that it is impossible for the reader to know what sources were used or which ideas are the student’s.
<p><b>Evaluation of Sources</b> How sophisticated are the student’s abilities to select appropriate sources?</p>	Does not call for source evaluation or selection. (Especially some lab reports, data analyses, and primary source analyses)	Sources match rhetorical goals, demonstrating sophisticated thought about source collection, evaluation, and/or selection.	Generally employs appropriate sources, though may miss some obvious avenues for exploration and analysis.	Exhibits a weak understanding about how to collect, evaluate, and/or select sources that contribute to rhetorical goals. May rely too heavily on one or two sources or on inappropriate sources.	Sources are inappropriate, not contributing to rhetorical goals or displaying fundamental confusion about source collection, evaluation, and/or selection.