

**FRANCISCAN SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY**  
**RUBRICS FOR WRITING PROJECTS**

	<b>“A” Range</b>	<b>“B” Range</b>	<b>“C” Range</b>
<b>Thesis and Purpose</b>	The thesis and purpose of the project are clearly expressed.	The thesis and purpose are somewhat clear, with the boundaries and scope a bit vague.	The thesis is unclear and the purpose of the project is ill-defined.
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of the thesis is well thought-out, includes all relevant evidence, and respects the inner logic of the material.</li> <li>• Use of quoted material does not substitute for student’s own development of the thesis.</li> <li>• The paper is convincing, leaving no important aspect of the topic unaddressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting details are adequate though some important material is missing.</li> <li>• Resources are too limited.</li> <li>• Paper shows understanding of relevant issues but lacks depth.</li> <li>• Uses too many direct quotes to substitute for developing own argument.</li> <li>• Some of the key connections between ideas and concepts are missing or stand in isolation from others to which they are logically connected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting material is disorganized and inadequate.</li> <li>• Analysis is superficial, shows signs of struggling to understand the relevant issues.</li> <li>• Lacks connections between related ideas, concepts, and themes.</li> <li>• Uses too many quotations so that own development gets lost, or uses no quotations to make own development the sole authority.</li> </ul>
<b>Organization</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction draws the reader in, and the conclusion leaves the reader with a sense of resolution.</li> <li>• Material is presented in an orderly fashion.</li> <li>• Paragraphs are well-focused and cohe-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction does not create a strong sense of anticipation and the conclusion does not tie the paper together into a coherent whole.</li> <li>• Ideas generally ordered, though key connections between ideas are missing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no clear set-up of the project and the conclusion does not wrap things up.</li> <li>• Logical ordering of material is vague with major points undeveloped.</li> <li>• Transitions are absent or weak.</li> </ul>

	<b>“A” Range</b>	<b>“B” Range</b>	<b>“C” Range</b>
	<p>rent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transitions are thoughtful and show how ideas are connected with major sections and subdivisions clearly marked.</li> <li>• Major points are clear with the subordinate points clearly distinguished from the key, controlling ones.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transitions leave connections between ideas fuzzy.</li> <li>• Opening paragraph(s) do(es) not give clear direction of project and conclusion does not bring together key themes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction does not capture the scope of the project and conclusion lacks focus.</li> </ul>
<b>Style</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses English effectively to communicate thesis.</li> <li>• Paragraphs are well-focused and coherent.</li> <li>• Uses technical terms accurately.</li> <li>• Few errors of grammar and punctuation guide the reader through the text.</li> <li>• Correctly uses headings and subheads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of English is generally effective.</li> <li>• Grammatical and punctuation errors distract from the flow of the presentation.</li> <li>• Use of technical terms is confusing.</li> <li>• Headings and subheads do not effectively present the relation of the material.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English is poorly used.</li> <li>• Too many grammatical and punctuation errors.</li> <li>• The material is not properly subdivided with headings and subheadings.</li> <li>• Quotations and summaries break the flow of the piece and do not seem to fit.</li> <li>• Errors in grammar distract and interfere with meaning.</li> </ul>
<b>Documentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All sources are clearly cited according to the Turabian style.</li> <li>• Footnote and bibliographic form follow Turabian style.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citations are generally good.</li> <li>• Citations are too limited for the scope of the project.</li> <li>• Use of Turabian style is inconsistent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lacks appropriate citations.</li> <li>• Documentation form is inadequate.</li> <li>• Turabian style is ignored.</li> </ul>