

STONE SOUP EVALUATION RUBRIC

Student Essay #: _____ Score (out of 10): _____

PLEASE NOTE: All sections are assigned equal weight (1 point), except for the “Connections to Access to Justice” section which will be weighted at 3, for a total of 10 points.

The Professor reserves discretion to give “bonus points” or deduct points for unexpected elements of the assignment. For example, if the student engages in unethical conduct during the course of the assignment, the instructor reserves the right to assign a Failing grade.

Attributes	Skilled: (8-10)	Developing: (5-7)	Undeveloped/Needs Work (1-4)
Choice of Interview Subject	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview subject has relatively recent, well-remembered dispute IS able to describe details necessary for assignment completion Interview subject describes dispute with access to justice implications 	Interview subject did not remember many details of the dispute, or was unable to engage with questions Interview subject’s dispute did not seem to have many access to justice implications	Interview subject was not an appropriate choice (type of dispute, ethical issues, inability to engage for whatever reason)
Description of Dispute/ Problem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dispute is well and accurately described from the perspective of the interview subject. Dispute was rich with detail for access to justice analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dispute was well described, but might be missing key pieces of information Connections to access to justice are unclear or shallow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dispute was poorly described with little relevant information present no or few connections to access to justice
Quality of Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions were clear and understandable Questions elicited appropriate insights Questions were appropriate mix of open/ closed/ hypothetical/ other Questions were appropriate to the interview subject 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions were mostly clear Questions might not elicit fulsome information Questions were of one type Questions did not at times reflect the needs of the interview subject 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions were not clear or incomplete Questions were inappropriate to the assignment and/or interview subject
Attention to Ethical and Professional Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student follows all rules regarding confidentiality (names, confidentiality notice, etc.) as contained in the Instructions Student addresses other ethical issues as they arise and seeks help as needed Evidence that subject was treated with courtesy and professionalism (i.e. interview subject was given enough time to schedule the appointment, subject treated with respect) 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student does not follow ethical guidelines. <p><i>Please note this assignment is of a nature that attention to ethical considerations is not “optional”. Even minor deviations will be treated as “failure”.</i></p>
Connections to Access to Justice literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing explores insights gained and developments in writer’s knowledge, values, or beliefs with respect to access to justice in the context of BOTH the interview and the literature examined in the class Writer may include unique materials from outside the course to supplement analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing explores insights but does not make clear connections between access to justice and the case. Writing includes some reference to course materials and discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing does not adequately reference course materials Writing does not connect access to justice and the case in question

Overall quality and depth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing shows full and substantial treatment of the topic, with related analysis, reflection and student growth evident in the piece. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing shows significant treatment of the topic, but the analysis, reflection and/or evidence of student growth is missing or superficial. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing shows cursory treatment of the topic, with limited analysis, reflection, contextualization.
Writing Mechanics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing is personal, flows well, and paints a vivid picture. • Uses clear and concise sentences, appropriate word choice, effective paragraph structure using topic and transition statements. • Negligible errors in grammar, usage, punctuation, or style. • Reflects careful and thorough proofreading and line editing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing is strong, but shows weaknesses in flow or structure (<i>e.g.</i>, rambling, mechanical, cliché). • Sentence structure is competent, but needs editing for transition, concision, and/or word choice. • Mostly free of grammatical, spelling, punctuation, and other style errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing is poorly organized. • Writing uses has multiple errors in grammar or usage. • Requires extensive editing for concision, word choice; most paragraphs poorly structured. • Multiple distracting errors in grammar, punctuation, style, and/or spelling.
Professionalism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets page requirements • Includes required notations • Follows formatting rules • Addresses specific topic assigned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complies with some but not all instructions and formatting requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ignores formatting rules • Inadequately addresses topic • too long or too short