

	Not expected in Genre – N/A	Strong – 4	Weaknesses Do Not Interfere – 3	Weaknesses Interfere – 2	Poor - 1
Strategic Inquiry How well does the student set up a researchable or investigable topic and scope of inquiry and then follow through with those plans?	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, facile, or poorly scoped inquiry. Identifiable but poorly executed or poorly chosen rhetorical strategy.	Not intellectually rigorous, no clear genre, scope is badly off, or evidence is mismatched with claims if present at all. Conclusions are often unrelated to evidence and analysis.
Use of Evidence How effectively does the student deploy evidence to support and/or contextualize claims?	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 may appear without clear purpose.	Evidence does not support the claims, or many claims are completely unsupported. Evidence not used instrumentally in service of claims.
Attribution of Evidence How clearly does the student attribute the work of others in human-readable form?	Does not use or refer to sources created by others. (Especially some lab reports and data analyses)	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.	Misteps 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.
Evaluation of Sources How sophisticated are the student’s abilities to select appropriate sources?	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. May occasionally rely on secondary summaries or quotations rather than consulting the original scholarship.	Misses some obvious avenues of exploration, or employs some sources clearly selected out of convenience. May rely heavily on one or two sources, on inappropriate sources, or on secondary summaries or quotations.	Sources are inappropriate or do not contribute to rhetorical goals. Displays fundamental confusion about source collection, evaluation, and/or selection.