## **Synthesis Paper Rubric**

| Rating>                                    | Exceeds Expectations   | Meets Expectations  | Does Not Meet<br>Expectations  | Grossly Fails to<br>Meet Expectations   |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| Criteria                                   | 4  | 3   | 2  | 1   |
| Introduction,<br>thesis, and<br>conclusion | Intro provides context for<br>the rest of the paper;<br>thesis is explicit and clear;<br>conclusion recasts thesis<br>and provides cohesion to<br>whole paper.   | Either intro provides<br>insufficient context for<br>the rest of the paper,<br>thesis is lacking in<br>clarity, OR conclusion<br>fails to recast thesis<br>effectively.   | Intro provides little context<br>for the paper; thesis is<br>implicit and hard to find;<br>conclusion makes<br>insufficient reference to<br>thesis.  | Intro does not provide<br>context for the paper;<br>thesis is undetectable;<br>conclusion seems<br>unrelated to the rest of<br>the paper.   |
|  | 20   | 15  | 10   | 5   |
| Analyses of<br>works                       | Each text is analyzed<br>judiciously and succinctly<br>with ideas that clearly<br>relate to the thesis and<br>effectively support the<br>common theme shared by<br>all works. Final copy<br>shows evidence of fine<br>revision where needed. | Analyses support the<br>central theme but could<br>be more clearly related<br>and/or substantially<br>supported; all ideas are<br>not explicitly related to<br>thesis. Good revision<br>from rough draft to final<br>copy is evident. | Analyses are either<br>unclear, too broad, or too<br>narrow to demonstrate<br>relation to central theme;<br>mostly superficial<br>treatment or summation in<br>the place of insightful<br>analysis. Insufficient<br>revision from rough draft<br>to final copy has occurred. | Analyses are poorly<br>constructed with<br>carelessly selected<br>details; no connection<br>to the central theme;<br>some analyses may<br>be missing. The final<br>draft is no more than a<br>word-processed copy<br>of rough drafts. |
|  | 28   | 21  | 14   | 7   |
| Thematic<br>Synthesis                      | There is a clearly<br>identified synthesis of<br>theme based on well-<br>selected and well-<br>supported points of<br>comparison among the<br>texts in relation to a<br>central theme.   | Synthesis identifiable but<br>could be more explicit<br>and better developed;<br>sufficiently supported by<br>ideas from the texts.   | Synthesis is hard to find<br>or poorly developed;<br>insufficiently supported by<br>ideas from the texts.  | No connection among<br>texts or no apparent<br>attempt at developing<br>a synthesis.  |
|  | 20   | 15  | 10   | 5   |
| Organization<br>and coherence              | Logical sequence of<br>paragraphs; transition<br>sentences and cohesion<br>markers used effectively<br>throughout paper.   | Sequence of paragraphs<br>is good but could be<br>improved; some<br>transition sentences and<br>cohesion markers are<br>used but could be more<br>effective.  | Sequence of paragraphs<br>seems to be out of logical<br>sequence; insufficient<br>transitions and cohesion<br>markers.   | Paragraphs seem to<br>be out of order and<br>haphazard throughout;<br>no transition<br>sentences or cohesion<br>markers are used.   |
|  | 20   | 15  | 10   | 5   |
| Mechanics,<br>Usage, &<br>Formatting       | Superior editing – limited<br>errors in spelling,<br>grammar, word order,<br>word usage, and<br>punctuation; proper<br>citation of texts.  | Good editing – few<br>errors <u>per page</u> in<br>spelling, grammar, word<br>usage, and punctuation;<br>few errors in citations.   | Careless editing – several<br>errors <u>per paragraph</u> in<br>spelling, grammar, word<br>order, word usage,<br>punctuation; several<br>errors in citations.  | No editing – many<br>errors throughout in<br>spelling, grammar,<br>word order, word<br>usage, punctuation,<br>and citations.  |
|  | 12   | 9   | 6  | 3   |

 Total Rubric Points Earned:
 / 100

 x
 \_\_\_\_\_3

 +
 \_\_\_\_\_(date turned in: \_\_\_\_\_)

 Total Synthesis Paper Grade:
 / 300