## Howard University School of Divinity Writing Rubrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading (→) Criteria (1)</th>
<th>-A- Exemplary</th>
<th>-B- Good</th>
<th>-C- Average</th>
<th>-D- Inadequate</th>
<th>-F- Substandard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PURPOSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis, main theme or idea</td>
<td>-Introduced and stated clearly</td>
<td>-Introduced and stated clearly</td>
<td>-Introduction only describes what will be done</td>
<td>-Unclear</td>
<td>-Thesis or purpose, if stated is not tenable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfills assigned task</td>
<td>-Demonstrates superior grasp of subject matter</td>
<td>-Demonstrates good grasp of subject matter</td>
<td>-Demonstrates minimal grasp of subject matter advanced</td>
<td>-No demonstration of grasp of subject matter</td>
<td>-Work not relevant to the course or specified assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules of Style (RoS)</td>
<td>-Correct and consistent adherence to RoS with no errors</td>
<td>-Correct and consistent adherence to RoS with few errors</td>
<td>-Inconsistent use of RoS</td>
<td>-Excessive RoS errors</td>
<td>No adherence to RoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminology</td>
<td>-Uses appropriate language and terminology of the discipline throughout the paper</td>
<td>-Uses appropriate language and terminology of the discipline throughout the paper</td>
<td>-Adequate use of language and terminology with minimal errors</td>
<td>-Inadequate use of language and terminology</td>
<td>-Inappropriate, if any, use of language and terminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference/Source Integration</td>
<td>-Uses scholarly sources in &quot;prooftexting&quot; fashion without regard for the contexts of the sources and author’s intentions</td>
<td>-Uses scholarly sources in &quot;prooftexting&quot; fashion without regard for the contexts of the sources and author’s intentions</td>
<td>-Merely reports/reells information, facts that are relevant to the thesis</td>
<td>-Superficially identifies sources, information, facts</td>
<td>-Fails to connect or identify appropriate sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succinctness (Readability)</td>
<td>-Understandable to a &quot;learned reader&quot;</td>
<td>-Understandable to a &quot;learned reader&quot;</td>
<td>-Understandable to a &quot;learned reader&quot;</td>
<td>-May be difficult for anyone to read and understand</td>
<td>-Confusing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>-Ideas are presented in a unified and orderly sequence</td>
<td>-Ideas are presented in a unified and orderly sequence</td>
<td>-Organized logically but there are either no headings to guide the reader through the paper or a poor construction of headings and topic sentences</td>
<td>-Ideas are unclear/unfocused</td>
<td>-Unfocused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar and Spelling</td>
<td>-Demonstrates mastery and skill of written communication</td>
<td>-Has minor errors that do not interfere with meaning or argument</td>
<td>-Some errors that interfere with meaning or argument</td>
<td>-Excessive errors</td>
<td>-Excessive errors render the paper as illegible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format/Length</td>
<td>-Proper length and number of pages</td>
<td>-Proper length and number of pages</td>
<td>-Acceptable length of pages; exceeds/less than specified number of pages</td>
<td>-Strays considerably from format and size requirements</td>
<td>-Cross disregard of format and size requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effect of Usage**: The above rubrics provide recommended guidelines for assisting students in preparing scholarly written documents. These rubrics are informational and are neither a contract nor binding on the School of Divinity. Individual faculty may adjust weighting of criteria or amend any guideline applicable to their course whenever it is deemed appropriate or necessary prior to a written assignment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COHERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence (Supported)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relates to course/program objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality/New Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Uses fallacious or irrelevant reasoning |
- Minimally shows cause & effect relationships |
- Demonstrates superficial, if any, recognition of the author’s context, implications or consequences of the debate |
- No recognition of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition or hasty dismissal of alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of author’s context, implications or consequences of the debate |

- Little or inappropriate supporting material |
- Little command of material |
- Minimal violation of rules of logic |
- Minimally analyzes some alternative points of view and contexts |
- States briefly the author’s context or implications or consequences of the debate |
- No use or proper application of relevant frameworks or methodology |
- Information, if provided, is erroneous and not supportable |
- Barely stated |
- No command of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No identification of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No identification or hasty dismissal of alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of author’s context, implications or consequences of the debate |

- Identifies critical theories or viewpoints |
- Identified some critical theories or viewpoints |
- Identities few if any critical theories or viewpoints |
- Few or irrelevant ideas |
- Uncritical borrowing of ideas |
- Poorly explained ideas |

- Demonstrates connections among key points |
- Competently analyzes alternative points of view and contexts |
- Identifies few if any critical theories or viewpoints |
- No recognition of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No identification or hasty dismissal of alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of author’s context, implications or consequences of the debate |

- Identifies critical theories or viewpoints |
- Identified some critical theories or viewpoints |
- Identities few if any critical theories or viewpoints |
- Few or irrelevant ideas |
- Uncritical borrowing of ideas |
- Poorly explained ideas |

- No command of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No identification or hasty dismissal of alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of author’s context, implications or consequences of the debate |

- Demonstrates connections among key points |
- Competently analyzes alternative points of view and contexts |
- Identifies few if any critical theories or viewpoints |
- Few or irrelevant ideas |
- Uncritical borrowing of ideas |
- Poorly explained ideas |

- No command of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No identification or hasty dismissal of alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of author’s context, implications or consequences of the debate |

- Demonstrates connections among key points |
- Competently analyzes alternative points of view and contexts |
- Identifies few if any critical theories or viewpoints |
- Few or irrelevant ideas |
- Uncritical borrowing of ideas |
- Poorly explained ideas |

- No command of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No identification or hasty dismissal of alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of author’s context, implications or consequences of the debate |

- Demonstrates connections among key points |
- Competently analyzes alternative points of view and contexts |
- Identifies few if any critical theories or viewpoints |
- Few or irrelevant ideas |
- Uncritical borrowing of ideas |
- Poorly explained ideas |

- No command of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No identification or hasty dismissal of alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of author’s context, implications or consequences of the debate |

- Demonstrates connections among key points |
- Competently analyzes alternative points of view and contexts |
- Identifies few if any critical theories or viewpoints |
- Few or irrelevant ideas |
- Uncritical borrowing of ideas |
- Poorly explained ideas |

- No command of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No identification or hasty dismissal of alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of author’s context, implications or consequences of the debate |

- Demonstrates connections among key points |
- Competently analyzes alternative points of view and contexts |
- Identifies few if any critical theories or viewpoints |
- Few or irrelevant ideas |
- Uncritical borrowing of ideas |
- Poorly explained ideas |

- No command of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No identification or hasty dismissal of alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of author’s context, implications or consequences of the debate |

- Demonstrates connections among key points |
- Competently analyzes alternative points of view and contexts |
- Identifies few if any critical theories or viewpoints |
- Few or irrelevant ideas |
- Uncritical borrowing of ideas |
- Poorly explained ideas |

- No command of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No identification or hasty dismissal of alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of author’s context, implications or consequences of the debate |

- Demonstrates connections among key points |
- Competently analyzes alternative points of view and contexts |
- Identifies few if any critical theories or viewpoints |
- Few or irrelevant ideas |
- Uncritical borrowing of ideas |
- Poorly explained ideas |

- No command of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No identification or hasty dismissal of alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of author’s context, implications or consequences of the debate |

- Demonstrates connections among key points |
- Competently analyzes alternative points of view and contexts |
- Identifies few if any critical theories or viewpoints |
- Few or irrelevant ideas |
- Uncritical borrowing of ideas |
- Poorly explained ideas |

- No command of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No identification or hasty dismissal of alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of author’s context, implications or consequences of the debate |

- Demonstrates connections among key points |
- Competently analyzes alternative points of view and contexts |
- Identifies few if any critical theories or viewpoints |
- Few or irrelevant ideas |
- Uncritical borrowing of ideas |
- Poorly explained ideas |

- No command of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No identification or hasty dismissal of alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of author’s context, implications or consequences of the debate |

- Demonstrates connections among key points |
- Competently analyzes alternative points of view and contexts |
- Identifies few if any critical theories or viewpoints |
- Few or irrelevant ideas |
- Uncritical borrowing of ideas |
- Poorly explained ideas |

- No command of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of obvious alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No identification or hasty dismissal of alternative viewpoints or contexts |
- No recognition of author’s context, implications or consequences of the debate |

- Demonstrates connections among key points |
- Competently analyzes alternative points of view and contexts |
- Identifies few if any critical theories or viewpoints |
- Few or irrelevant ideas |
- Uncritical borrowing of ideas |
- Poorly explained ideas |