

**RUBRIC FOR INTERVIEW PROJECT: Mother's Story Assignment**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Research question &amp; originality</b>	Easily identifiable, plausible, novel, sophisticated, insightful, crystal clear.	Promising, but may be slightly unclear or slightly predictable.	Somewhat lacking in insight or originality.	May be unclear, appear unoriginal, or offer relatively little that is new.	Difficult to identify at all, may be bland restatement of obvious point.	
<b>Structure &amp; ability to apply readings to interview material</b>	Crystal clear, easily understandable, & appropriate for HNRS 349. Excellent transitions from point to point. Paragraphs support solid topic sentences. Order makes sense, flows, and hangs together.	Generally clear and appropriate, though may wander occasionally. May have a few unclear transitions, or a few paragraphs without strong topic sentences. Not enough analysis of interviewees' quotes.	Logical order but no flair. Organization is rough but workable. Writing may drag then race ahead. Embedded quotes left hanging w/o analysis.	Generally unclear, often wanders or jumps around. Few or weak transitions, many paragraphs without topic sentences. No clear use of quotes from interview.	Unclear, often because thesis is weak or non-existent. Transitions confusing and unclear. Few topic sentences.	
<b>Use of evidence from interview</b>	Interview information used to buttress points. Excellent integration of quoted material into sentences. No extraneous or gratuitous use of quotes.	Examples used to support most points. Some evidence does not support point, or may appear where inappropriate. Quotes well integrated into sentences.	Examples used to support some points. Points often lack supporting evidence, or evidence used where inappropriate. Quotes may be poorly integrated into sentences.	Very few or very weak examples. Quotes not integrated into sentences; "plopped in" in improper manner.	General failure to support statements, or evidence seems to support no statement.	
<b>Critical analysis</b>	Author clearly relates evidence to main points; analysis is fresh and exciting, posing new ways to think of the material or women's experiences.	Analysis is strong and to the point with good use of evidence. Perhaps a little bit predictable.	Evidence related, though links perhaps not very clear.	Weak analysis or analysis offers nothing beyond the quote.	Very little or very weak attempt to relate evidence to argument	

