

Task 2 Individual Written Argument (IWA): Peer Edit by Rubric

What is the research question (RQ)?

What is the central thesis or argument (aka how do they answer the RQ)?

Row 1: Connection to Stimulus Documents

This is really just your opinion, after reading, which are most integral to proving the paper's argument/thesis!

Identify the stimulus documents utilized in this paper *in order of importance* below. Then answer the questions.

Title & Author of S.D.	Where did you find it within their paper?	How is it being used? Select ONE.	Would the argument be as strong without the use of this stimulus document?	Good Use or Needs work?
#1	<input type="radio"/> Introduction <input type="radio"/> Body Paragraph <input type="radio"/> Conclusion	<input type="radio"/> Justification of context for the research question <input type="radio"/> Evidence for claim <input type="radio"/> Counter-argument <input type="radio"/> Part of solution	<input type="radio"/> NO (<i>it's an important link in the chain—good!</i>) <input type="radio"/> YES (<i>this is a problem; the most imp. S.D. should have an impact</i>)	<input type="radio"/> Good <input type="radio"/> Needs Work
	Do you feel the writer clearly connects this source to the RQ and/or theme of SDs? Explain.			
#2	<input type="radio"/> Introduction <input type="radio"/> Body Paragraph <input type="radio"/> Conclusion	<input type="radio"/> Justification of context for the research question <input type="radio"/> Evidence for claim <input type="radio"/> Counter-argument <input type="radio"/> Part of solution	<input type="radio"/> NO (<i>it's an important link in the chain—good!</i>) <input type="radio"/> YES (<i>as long as #1 gets a NO to this question, you're okay</i>)	<input type="radio"/> Good <input type="radio"/> Needs Work
	Do you feel the writer clearly connects this source to the RQ and/or theme of SDs? Explain.			
#3 (<i>there may only be two; that's okay!</i>)	<input type="radio"/> Introduction <input type="radio"/> Body Paragraph <input type="radio"/> Conclusion	<input type="radio"/> Justification of context for the research question <input type="radio"/> Evidence for claim <input type="radio"/> Counter-argument <input type="radio"/> Part of solution	<input type="radio"/> NO (<i>it's an important link in the chain—good!</i>) <input type="radio"/> YES (<i>as long as #1 gets a NO to this question, you're okay</i>)	<input type="radio"/> Good <input type="radio"/> Needs Work
	Do you feel the writer clearly connects this source to the RQ and/or theme of SDs? Explain.			

NOTE: If only one source is used, you receive an automatic ZERO for Row 1 of this rubric.

Row 2: Research Question & Context Are Clear

Most of these will be addressed in the Introduction...

1. Area of inquiry: what is this research paper about, in your own words?

2. Who are the specific major stakeholders mentioned in this debate?

3. Context/History:

- a. When does it say the issue began?

- b. Where (physical location on the globe) does it say this debate is an issue?

- c. What are the reasons given for why you (re: the audience) should feel this issue is important and/or significant? Why should we care?

- d. At this point, do you feel the research presented would allow for an ***answerable*** solution? Explain.

- e. Are you convinced that the problem/issue matters in the grander scheme of things? YES NO
(if no, that's a problem!)

Oh, and about that title....

Is there a title? YES NO

If yes, write it here:

Does the title offer **specific** context about what the report covers? YES NO

If you answered no to either question above,
write a suggestion for the title here:

Circle one: After reading the introduction, I feel...

I have a strong understanding of what problem this paper is attempting to find a solution for.	I have a decent understanding of what problem this paper is attempting to solve, but it could be more clear.	I have a weak understanding of what problem this paper is hoping to solve, because it's too broad or vague.	I don't understand what problem this paper is hoping to solve, because no clear problem is ever identified.
6	4	2	0

Row 3: Complex Perspectives (Many & Presented Well)

***Remember: a PERSPECTIVE (for this class) is defined as a point of view as conveyed through an argument.

- 1. Draw a box around all areas where a **new** or perspective concerning the research question is **introduced** into the argument (just the first sentence is fine). Label them **3A**.
- 2. For each of those boxed perspectives, underline the evidence used which supports that perspective/POV. Draw arrows to the Label them **3B**.
- 3. From your observation, do you notice any glaringly obvious perspectives that are missing? If yes, list them here.
- 4. From your observation, did you notice any **counter-arguments & refutations of those counters** given?
YES NO (*if no, that is potentially a problem*)

Relevant Connections Among Perspectives

Throughout this paper, the perspectives need to be “in conversation with each other” (as described by the Capstone British Lady)—meaning, the paper does not seem like information was just dropped in like a report, but rather thoughtfully presented and introduced with enough context so the audience (re: you) understands how each addition to the line of reasoning relates to the overall problem being addressed.

Picture this imagery:

A perspective is represented by a single puzzle piece and a good conversation is represented by a completed puzzle.

- *The vibe of a GOOD conversation among perspectives* = a puzzle all put together with a beautiful scenic view of a green landscape of Ireland on a dewy spring morning; it all makes sense!
- *The vibe of an OKAY conversation among perspectives* = the edges of the puzzle are done, so you get an idea of where the image starts and begins, but you still aren’t really sure if this green piece is of the grass or a tree, or the blue one is a river or the sky; you haven’t quite figured out which pieces go with what yet, but you’re making progress and you have a sense of where things will go.
- *The vibe of a BAD conversation among perspectives* = someone opened a box of puzzle pieces, turned it upside down and emptied it on the table and proudly announced, “ISN’T THIS A LOVELY PICTURE OF A SCENIC LANDSCAPE??!”—and there’s no picture on the box, so, no, you do not, in fact, believe this is a lovely landscape picture, *because there is no picture* formed by the pieces.

So, with that lovely image in mind, circle the statement which feels most true about this paper:

Yes, the perspectives seemed like they were in conversation with each other (re: all the puzzle pieces fit together).	Sometimes they did, but there were moments where I didn’t understand the context (re: the puzzle is only half finished).	No, it all just seemed thrown together and I didn’t get how one thing related to another (re: a mess of puzzle pieces thrown on a table).
6	4	2

Row 4: Synthesis of Evidence

A. Wide Range of Sources:

Are your sources *generally* complex enough for an academic paper? [Capstone language: wide range of sources]

Eye-ball the Works Cited page. Count the number of sources listed. Write total # here: _____

Are there at least 15 sources? YES NO (*if no, that's potentially a problem*)

How many sources are journalistic (from newspapers, magazines, written by journalists, etc.)? _____

How many sources are scholarly (written by scientific sources, in peer-reviewed journals, etc.)? _____

Do some math – what percentage of sources are scientific? _____ %

Is that number under 75%? NO YES (*if yes, that's potentially a problem*)

Refer back to your list of stakeholders from Row 2, Question 2: do you feel these sources will offer information from each of their perspectives and point-of-views? YES NO (*if no, that's potentially a problem*)

B. Use of Evidence to Support Argument:

ACTION TASK #1: throughout the paper, highlight evidence in YELLOW that you feel is NOT explained well, meaning its connection to the claim or research question is not clearly and explicitly articulated, or is not articulated AT ALL and therefore you really couldn't understand the point of it being included.

Do you feel that evidence from the sources was being dumped in your lap with little to no explanation?			
No – it was great!	No – but could be explained better at times.	Sometimes – some good, some not.	Yes – often didn't understand the relevance
6	4	4	2

Row 5: Organization

Consider the paper as a whole...

1. Did you feel like the argument was logical? YES NO

a. If no, explain why and/or suggestions you have to fix it here.

2. Did you feel that the organization of the paper was clear? YES NO

a. If no, explain why and/or suggestions you have to fix it here.

*****NOTE: If either #1 or #2 are a NO above, then this paper will score no more than a 4 on Row 5. Ex: if the paper is well organized, but the argument is illogical OR the argument is logical, but the paper is disorganized.**

Row 5: Organization, continued...

- | | | | |
|----|---|-----|----|
| 3. | Does the paper include sub headings to help guide the reader? | YES | NO |
| a. | If no, what are your suggestions for this paper's subheadings (re: grounds)? List them below. | | |

4. Are there any instances where communication to the reader would have been more clear through the use of images, maps or visual representation of data (charts, graphs, etc.)? Specify those moments here:

Row 6: Solution

A 'NO' to any of the following questions is problematic...

- | | | | |
|----|--|-----|----|
| 1. | Is there a specific solution given to address the research question? | YES | NO |
|----|--|-----|----|

What is the solution presented? Write it concisely here:

- | | | | |
|----|--|-----|----|
| 2. | Does the solution specifically and clearly answer <i>the actual RQ?</i> | YES | NO |
| 3. | Is this solution <i>plausible</i> —meaning it could happen in the real world? | YES | NO |
| 4. | Are the drawbacks or “holes” in the solution addressed? | YES | NO |
| 5. | Do you have any suggestions, questions, or comments to make about the solution given? Write them here. | | |

*****NOTE: If no solution is given, you will receive a score of zero (0) on Row 6 of the rubric.*****

Row 7: Perspectives

- | | | | |
|--|-----|----|--------|
| 1. Are there at least two perspectives represented within this paper? | YES | NO | |
| 2. Are they presented in a critical, meaningful way? Meaning that the author has included information which may contradict an argument, and a rationale for how that information fits in the overall scope of research—limitations of information are included and addressed. | YES | NO | MAYBE? |
| 3. Are the objections, implications, and/or limitations given supported by evidence? | YES | NO | |

*****NOTE: Including two perspectives, but not subjecting them to meaningful critique means you will score no higher than a 4 in row 7 of the rubric. Ex: mentioning a counter-argument and labeling it as weak, but not explaining or offering evidence as to *why*.*****

Row 8: Citations

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| 1. Is there a completed Works Cited page? | YES | NO |
| 2. Is the Works Cited page properly formatted? | YES | NO |
| 3. Are there in-text citations throughout the paper? | YES | NO |
| 4. Are the in-text citations properly formatted? | YES | NO |
| 5. Action Task: Cross-reference the Works Cited page and the in-text citations for accuracy. | | |
| a. Start with the first work listed on the Works Cited page and find where it is referenced within the paper. | | |
| b. If the citations match up, check both of them off. | | |
| c. If you find an in-text citation where the source is NOT listed on the WC page, circle it and write the source list on the Works Cited page. | | |
| d. If you find a source on the Works Cited page that is NEVER referenced within the paper, write an X next to the source. | | |

*****NOTE: If you are missing either a Works Cited page or the in-text citations, you will receive no higher than a 4 in Row 8. If you have no citations at all, you will receive a zero.*****

Row 9: Quality of Writing

Circle the box which most accurately conveys the writing of this paper...		
Writing is really clear and well-expressed. There are few flaws and great sentence structure. The thoughts of this writer are expressed with clarity and in an academic tone.	Writing is clear, but sometimes there are flaws in grammar or sentence structure, or a less-than-academic tone is taken. However, the flaws do not (generally) inhibit my understanding.	The writing is so poor that it affects the integrity of the paper. It is not academic in tone, and there are many flaws which impede my understanding or the flow of the paper as a whole.
6	4	2